As we wrestle with the problem of war, it is incumbent upon us as those who hold the Bible to be the Word of God that we relate our beliefs to Biblical principles. All our discussion of ethical questions must begin with serious investigation and study of the models of the shape of love given us by God in holy scripture. We have no other recourse as Christians than to bind our consciences by the statements and implications of the Word of God. Doing this, however, in the case of the ethical question under consideration is fraught with difficulty. One of the most troublesome features of the Biblical data for many Christians is the specific command in the Old Testament, repeated often, to wage total war. God is known as Yahweh Sabaoth "Lord of Armies," Ex. 15:3 says, "Yahweh is a man of War," and in 1 Sam. 15:3 Saul is commanded to "Go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have; do not spare them, but kill both man and woman, infant and suckling ..." Passages such as these have caused some Christians to question the place of the Old Testament in the Bible, while others in Christian history have simply and uncritically condoned war either as an instrument of the policy of the state or, worse yet, as a means of extending the Kingdom of God. Let us, then, ask ourselves: What are the implications of these biblical statements for the complex modern problem of war? Do they mean that our God is a God of war and that war is a legitimate part of modern international politics or national foreign policy which a Christian must support and to which he must give assent as an obedient subject of the state? To gain a handle on these questions and on the role of war in the Bible in general and in the Old Testament in particular, it will be helpful to study the use of the divine title Yahweh Sabaoth, "Yahweh of Armies."

To begin, let us note that the Hebrew word saba', the singular of sabaoth, is a military term. It is used (1) to indicate an army (Judges 8:6, 9:29, etc.). This usage is frequent and clear. It is also used (2) to refer to the heavenly hosts (or armies) of angels (1 Kings 22:19, Josh. 5:14, etc.); and (3) it is used to refer to the sun, moon, and stars in the phrase "the host (army) of heaven." In Gen. 2:1 it is used to refer to all the created bodies of earth and heaven.

One of the most numerous uses of saba' is in the phrase in question Yahweh Sabaoth "Yahweh of armies/hosts." The question naturally follows, what is the force of Sabaoth in this epithet? Is it used with the meanings designated (1), or (2), or (3) above? Again the answer is clear, it refers in the main to the primary meaning (1) "army." He is Yahweh of armies. This is clear from such passages as 1 Sam. 17:45 where David answers Goliath's contemptuous challenge with the statement: "I come to you in the name of Yahweh Sabaoth, God of the armies of Israel." This much is clear and indisputable.

The distribution of this epithet, however, is very interesting and significant. It does not occur once in the Pentateuch, Joshua, or Judges. Thus it is important to note that in those great passages where the meaning and significance of God's personal name Yahweh is revealed, Exodus 3:13-15 and 33:17-23, 34:5-8, the emphasis is not on his nature as Yahweh of armies. It is quite other. Yahweh here is the God of grace and mercy who redeems his people and requires that they keep his covenant law. God's answer to Moses' request in Ex. 33:18 to reveal his glory runs: "Yahweh, Yahweh, a God merciful and gracious, (Contd. Page 2)
slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast love for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, but who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children and the children's children, to the third and fourth generation." And yet, although the epithet is not used in Exodus, the idea of Yahweh as the leader of the armies of Israel is clearly there. In Ex. 6:26 Yahweh says to Moses "Bring out the people of Israel from the land of Egypt by their armies." Jerusalem Bible translates "in battle array." In Ex. 7:4 God says, "I will ... bring forth my armies, my people the sons of Israel, out of the land of Egypt," and Ex. 12:17, 41, and 51, refers to the day "I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt."

The first time the epithet Yahweh Sabaoth is used in the Bible is in I Sam. 1:3 in connection with the ark at Shiloh. I Sam. 4:23ff. is illuminating. The Philistines had defeated Israel, so the elders of Israel brought the "ark of the covenant of Yahweh Sabaoth (Yahweh of armies)" to Shiloh to lead them in battle and "that he may come among us and save us from our enemies." When God through Samuel commanded Saul to destroy the Amalekites in I Sam. 15:2ff., he says, "Thus says Yahweh of armies, I will punish what Amalek did to Israel in opposing them on the way, when they came up out of Egypt." Again in Ex. 15:3 in the song Moses and the people sang after the mighty deliverance at the Red Sea, they proclaim, "Yahweh is a man of war." In the continuance of the confrontation between David and Goliath in I Sam. 17 to which we referred above, David concludes his response to Goliath's challenge with the affirmation, "Yahweh saves not with spear and sword, for the battle is Yahweh's..."

Now all of this, the idea in Exodus that Yahweh is a man of war (Ex. 15:3) who leads his armies out of Egypt (Ex. 7:4, 12:17), the idea that the battle is Yahweh's alone (I Sam. 17:47), that he, through his presence in the ark of the covenant of Yahweh of armies, leads them to victory (I Sam. 4:3ff.), is part of that concept of military thinking in the OT which is usually referred to as "the holy war." Basically it refers to the fact that Yahweh himself declares (Ex. 17:16, I Sam. 15:2ff.), leads (I Sam. 4:3ff.), and wins (I Sam. 17:47) the wars of his chosen people. These wars are called "Yahweh's wars" (I Sam. 18:17, 25:28). The number of Israel's soldiers is unimportant (I Sam. 14:6) for, "Yahweh your God is he that goes with you, to fight for you against your enemies, to give you the victory" (Deut. 20:4). As the chariots of Egypt bear down on Israel, trapped at the Red Sea, Moses tells them, "Yahweh will fight for you, you have only to be still" (Ex. 14:14). Note that this concept begins with the Exodus, the great saving event of Yahweh on behalf of his people, and continues through the events of the establishment of Israelite superiority in the wars with the Philistines in the time of Saul and David. In fact it is here that the term Yahweh Sabaoth comes into current usage.

The term Yahweh Sabaoth occurs by far the most frequently, however, in the prophetic literature (247 out of 285 times). Here the usage is somewhat different. The prophets, while not abandoning the idea of Yahweh's direct action in war, inverted it in a way that was ominous and terrible in the light of the background we have sketched above. In the prophetic message Yahweh turned the military forces of Israel's enemies against Israel herself in judgment upon her for her violation of the covenant. Yahweh Sabaoth now meant Yahweh of armies in a threatening, not saving, sense.

Now, it is of the utmost importance to note that all of this is specifically connected with the historical realization of God's choice of Israel as his people in the Exodus and his establishment, maintenance, and chastisement of them as his people in the land he has given them as their heritage. That is, all this war-like activity is narrowly and specifically connected with God's saving activity in history on behalf of his people, redeeming them, granting and maintaining their inheritance of the land of Palestine, and then chastising and ultimately taking that inheritance away in the Exile. It is all specifically connected with establishing and maintaining the Kingdom of God in the OT, in which economy the Kingdom has a materialistic, ethnic, and geographical character.

As L. E. Toombs puts it in his JDB article on war in the OT:

...the holy war, although an important part of Hebraic theology, is never represented as an end in itself. The war looks beyond the day of battle to the time of peace which the victorious conclusion of hostilities will bring. The war itself is an instrument of the delivering God of the covenant by which he brings his people into that condition of well-being and prosperity which in the OT is called "peace." The OT war ideology is, therefore, an integral part of OT covenant theology, emphasizing the sovereignty of God, his initiative, his concern for his people, and his activity as deliverer and preserver.
WAR AND THE OLD TESTAMENT
(Contd. from Page 3)
It does us no good, then, to contend
that this warlike activity is part of
Israel's civil life as the people of
God, for it is performed more by Yahweh
than Israel as part of the covenant and
activity of the redeeming God. Further,
the OT knows no such distinct categories
as civil and religious, secular and sac­
cred. Life is all one piece of cloth,
illed as God's people under his rule.

Further, it is also of utmost importance
note to it that this just such use of
force in the establishment of the King­
don of God that is explicitly denied by
Jesus to the people of the new covenant,
the Church: "If my kingdom were
of this world, my servants would fight" (John 18:36),
and "Put your sword back into its place, for all who take
the sword will perish by the sword" (Matt.
26:52). In the progress of revelation
and redemptive history, as the Kingdom
of God leaves behind the ethnic, physi­
cal and geographical aspects of its OT
manifestation, and becomes International,
Interracial, and spiritual in its
New Testament culmination in the Body
of Christ, the use of war and physical
force as a method of the establishment
of the Kingdom becomes utterly unhink­
able and proscribed.

This means, then, that to argue from
the Old Testament's epithet for Yahweh
as "Yahweh of armies" or from the Old
Testament's frequent divine commands to
join in war that our God is a God of war
is a dangerous generalization based up­
on very specifically historically con­
ditioned data. Further, the blanket
claim, on the basis of the Old Testa­
ment commands and pattern, that war is a
legitimate element of modern Interna­tional
relations and foreign policy
can only be made by lifting the evi­
dence out of its context and misusing
it. It is to identify the modern state
(for us the United States) with the
people of God, for war in the Old Testa­
ment is specifically and narrowly "holy
war" - one of God's redemptive activi­
ties on behalf of his people under­taken as their covenant God and stem­
mong directly from his covenant rela­tion­ship. Against this background
can anyone who believes the Bible af­
firm that the war between the United
States and North Viet Nam can be sup­
ported by an appeal to a Biblical
pattern which is in actuality one of
God's redemptive acts on behalf of his
people undertaken as their covenant
God? Especially when war (or any vio­
ence) as one of the means of extending
the Kingdom of God Is specifically re¬
publied and proscribed in the New
Testament culmination and fulfillment
in the body of Christ, the Church?

No, the only way modern war can be re­
lated to the believer and his role as
a member of the people of God is as
part of the complex relationship be­
tween Church and state. War is an ac­
tivity of the state and the Christian
(Contd. Col. 2)

WHEN WILL IT END?

When will it end?
This war in Viet Nam.
It seems it will always
go on and on.

Sometimes I cry,
For the boys over there,
For the children who die.
Does God really care?

But then It's not God
who makes these wars
It's we ourselves.
And our fathers before.

God cares about me
and he cares about you.
He cares about everyone
and about what we do.

It hurts him to see,
the way we live,
We think more of receiving
Than we think to give.

This war will be over,
when we ourselves
learn to put our hates
upon the shelves.

When we learn to live
with each other you see,
when we all work together
All Countries.

When we all pray together
And we all become one
This war will be over.
Freedom for all
No more children dying
Not mine
Not yours.

Poem submitted by Mrs. Doris Wilson,
wife of Mr. Chuck Wilson, who is the
head gardener on Fuller campus.
In the past few weeks at Fuller, I have noticed several discussions taking place concerning how we might better relate our faith to the world we are in. Sometimes we who are in the midst of a situation cannot see clearly enough to understand the full implications and results of what is going on. At such a time it is wise to consult someone without that particular difficulty. In this case, one who is outside the Western influences, yet, one who has been in them in the past may provide some insight. I am referring to Josef Lukl Hromadka, a Czech theologian. Born in 1889, he has been through several political and societal changes in his own country, from the old empire to Marxism. During Hitler's rule in Czechoslovakia, he was in exile in the U.S., teaching at Princeton Theological Seminary. Much of his wisdom has been left gathering dust in the libraries of the West because of his reputation as the "Red Theologian." Had the churchman of the past generations looked beyond their fears in the political realm to see the spirit of his message, we would find the centrifugal forces within the Church and the condemnation from without to be of much less degree and justification. Our own library has only two of his books. His latest writings speak to the very real need of dialogue between East and West, which carries over to dialogue among ourselves. Let it be understood that Hromadka is an Evangelical theologian who holds to the "Reformation heritage." He cannot agree with the liberalism that was so quick to drift with the wind toward Hitler. Hopefully, what he has to say will spark some serious thinking and research. Much of his material is available through inter-library loans.

Following is a brief summary of some of Hromadka's observations.

Hromadka sums up the present situation of the world today in the following manner:

"Before our eyes mankind stands in his bare existence, in his danger; but also with his longing for dignity and freedom, for justice and equality, for love and pity. Against this, what are all the prejudices, all the preconceived notions, mistrust, pride, and self-justification ... and all the curtains which are pulled here and there and behind which man has hid, despised and declared an "enemy"?"

Once this idea is understood, what must we in theology do to relate it with our studies and world? In other words, what is the task of our theological studies?

Hromadka points out that the main task is to find where "the vertical line of the Lord of the universe intersects the horizontal line of our life." This must be done in order to understand how God is now a present reality. After searching the depths of our faith, we must look to the fringes. Hromadka finds too much political influence in the faith. He points out that "Christian Civilization is an illusion, and every attempt to fight in its name against so-called un-Christian ideas — is a self-deception and a grave danger to the church itself.

So now we come face-to-face with our own society. Consider that the next quotation was written in 1945. What he says was true then is obvious today:

What we euphemistically called an absolute honesty and frankness, or a total absence of hypocrisy on the part of the American youth, may in fact be an indication that the essential foundations of our moral life have disintegrated, that our people have ceased to be interested in the eternally valid criteria of faith, thought and morality. They are frank and honest in a negative way; not only do they not believe in traditional and conventional standards of life, but they do not even think any absolute norm of our conduct and thought matters or exists. Is this a manifestation of youth and virile strength or of weariness and decay?

Now we arrive at the aspect of who is guilty. Let us not be quick to "pass the buck" or to grab for guilt. Rather, let us consider truthfully what the Church has been, and still is. Does it have a character of lukewarmness to outsiders, of superficiality with its own members, even a touch of hypocrisy? These are the traits which Hromadka says "have pushed modern man into the abyss of doubt and hopelessness." Not only is he without hope, but in his hopelessness he has taken the initiative "to throw out the old moral, social and political order and to save what is human in its real structure and existence.

Why is it true of the Church that this has been the result of its inadequacies? Because the Church "carries within it all the imperfections of the 'world' through its members." The Church does not have the right to stand aloof from the world. It must recognize solidarity with other people. But, we don't:

That is exactly what is perverted with our "Christian" action; we declare our readiness to communicate with the sinful atheist, but we stand above the sinful world and self-righteously wait until [Contd.]
A succinct statement from which to begin a theology of education is II Timothy 3:16-17. Now while St. Paul is speaking of the Scriptures his description can in part, apply also to education. This is especially so since earlier Paul told Timothy to commit his teachings to faithful men who would be able to teach others. In a seminary this pastor-teacher role reaches its apex. He goes on to tell Timothy that he is to handle the Word of God rightly. Surely that is a goal of a theological education.

Theological education one would think should be "useful for correcting error, for resetting the direction of a man's life, and training him in good living..." It should also give man "comprehensive equipment and fit him fully for all branches of his work." How this is accomplished will depend upon curriculum, philosophy, and methodology. It is doubtful a theology of any one method of instruction can be constructed. Such a construct would probably confuse culture with theology.

Jesus Christ never used any one method to the exclusion of others. He lectured (direct discourse, parable), discussed ("Who do men say that I am?", woman at the well, etc.), rejoinder ("It is written...but I say to you.") and acted parable (miracles, the "deed" of the word-deed essence of revelation), practiced (commissioning of the disciples). It will be noted he was flexible and reached men at their level. Saint Paul did likewise (cf. his Mars Hill lecture with I Cor. 2:1). Thus the teacher considers each situation individually seeking to communicate with the pupil on a common level, with the ultimate aim of bringing the pupil to a higher level of understanding and insight.

Now a seminary should be a community of the faithful. Both faculty and pupils should be believers in Christ. If this be true then faculty and students are (or should be) one in Christ. Thus they compose the body of Christ. "The eye cannot say to the hand, 'I have no need of you.' "But God has so adjusted the body...that the members may have the same care for one another. If one member suffers, all suffer together; if one member is honored, all rejoice together." (I Cor. 12:21, 24b-26). Therefore, if the faculty suffers, students should feel it; if students should suffer, faculty should feel it. Community is either real or it isn't; and community is a part of theology of education. Frequently, ours is a community of crisis. Sharing ourselves would appear to be biblical. To be heard and consulted appears to be verbs which are axiomatic with a biblical concept of community.

There is equality yet Inequality ("inferior part", v. 24, ASV). Yet the body is so adjusted as to eliminate discord (v. 25). Each has a role, yet a role within community(vv. 27-31). (Contd. Page 6)

BLOW OFF THE DUST (Contd. from Page 4)

It repents and changes. This is a real contradiction of the position of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Man and the word which became Flesh.

Why do we wait instead of going out? Certainly waiting is not what the Gospel calls us to do. In large measure there is a fear of losing privileges under another political system. Yet, what Hromadka is trying to say is that the Gospel is not beholding to any person or thing. It is free from any political or cultural system. Therefore, how is one to go before the atheist the reality of faith and to demonstrate that what we understand from the Gospel and Living Church, transcends by far the traditional and frequently worn out conceptions of religion; and that genuine faith in the Gospel of Jesus of Nazareth is very different from what the Marxistic atheist conceives of as being religion. This Gospel is free and open to all scientific and critical attempts to discover man, history and nature. It is free towards all social and political -- also revolutionary -- upheavals and reforms. In conclusion, Hromadka writes that when we have been overwhelmed by the word of God, we shall become His Instruments so that our faith will be re-examined and re-fortified so that all the past bindings upon our faith are dropped, to be utilized by a dynamic, mountain moving faith. How open is our faith to such investigation? Indeed, are we willing to make such investigations, or better still, are we willing to be changed by the word of God?

Footnotes:
2. Doom And Resurrection, Medras House, Richmond, Va., 1945., p. 90.
3. The Church And Theology In Today's Troubled Times, Ecumenical Council of Churches In Czechoslovakia, Prague, 1956, p. 82.
5. Gospel For Atheists, p. 17.
8. Gospel For Atheists, p. 28.
9. Ibid., p. 46.

Michael B. Hughes is a Junior at Fuller Theological Seminary.
Since the first meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee this quarter, the editorial staff considered it advantageous to the student body to remark on several aspects of the meeting specifically and on student involvement generally.

As we recall, the goal established last spring was student involvement in every feasible area of the seminary community — no small ideal. An initial step was an enlarged Academic Affairs Committee with student representation. Though this is only an advisory committee and consequently has limited powers, the agenda for the year includes the major gut-level issues that surfaced as a result of last year's questionnaire. We express optimism in the efforts of this committee, but with one reservation. Namely, unless there is overt expression on behalf of the student body and student government concerning vital issues which are sure to nip at the heels of many, misrepresentation of the pulse of the community is inevitable. Student involvement then becomes a fiasco. Of course, it is a two-way channel. Democratic procedure demands elected representatives to hunt for the pulse, but only you can create the beat.

Student evaluation is in many academic circles already passé. Either it is now an accepted part of classroom procedure or it has been dismissed as one of the many mere whims and fancies of a few hyper-active individuals. In our community, according to last year's questionnaire, it is a very live issue still. The last meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee left student evaluation on the "hot-seat" with coals burning brightly. To list pros and cons in this article would be too lengthy. The bulletin board is more appropriate. Possibly a better approach is to ask you some questions:

1. Does student evaluation do away with academic freedom?
2. Should student evaluation be a possibility rather than a must?
3. Does it demand a professor to conform to a certain manner of teaching which may be alien to his natural ability?
4. Is it simply a technique for those who are ignorant to pass judgment upon those who are learned?

We suggest the answer to all of the above questions is a positive "No." The question arises: how important is student evaluation to you? Is last year's questionnaire already outdated? We think not. It is a must. If it is shelved and catalogued as "NAIVE," the academics of this Institution will remain impaired and the student body disillusioned.

Marvin Erisman is an elected student representative on the Academic Affairs Committee. He is a joint student and faculty advisory committee set in function last year as a product of student request.
LONG RANGE ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
OF THE TEN YEAR PLAN
by Sue Ellen Porter

On Oct. 15, 1969 the Long Range Academic Planning Committee which is composed of:
the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, the Interfaculty Committee,
three alumni rep. and six student rep. was convoluted. The purpose of this subcommittee
of the Ten Year Plan is "to consider long range academic goals and programs, primarily
those that relate to all three schools, and secondarily those that relate to the major
improvements in the programs of the separate schools:
1. by reviewing the progress made in the academic program
2. by revising and modifying the Ten Year Plan
3. and by extending the Ten Year Plan through the academic year 1980."

At this meeting there arose five major areas of discussion. The first concerned hiring
professional educational consultants. There was general favorable reaction to the
suggestion that Fuller needs to take advantage of professional expertise in educational
design and technology.

A second discussion recognized a growing opposition to the Hebrew requirement—espe­cially
in the Psychology School. It was noted that careful deliberation must be continued
on the value of retaining Hebrew and possibly even Greek.

Concerning the Black Action Program, various possibilities of attracting more blacks
were put forward. One area of agreement was that we must work toward a program which
includes blacks at every level from trustees down.

A discussion of possible new schools being added to the Fuller cluster was initiated.
Favorable consideration was expressed for schools of Sociology, Urban Problems, Com­munications, and Continuous Education.

Finally, the school of World Missions presented the urgent need for the establish­ment
of a research and later, a professional doctorate in missions. There was some
discussion on the definition of the discipline as Missiology or Applied Anthropology.

Satellite School Concept
When the committee met for its second time on Dec. 1, 1969, these ideas which earlier
had been preliminarily probed were pursued further along with several additional de­velopments. The various possibilities of new types of degree programs loomed large in
the discussion. One projection of what Fuller's degree spectrum could possibly look
like one day was presented. Six schools were visualized as radiating from the hub of
Fuller Seminary: Theology, Psychology, World Missions, Sociology, Communications, and
Lay Ministry. The first level of degree which the schools could grant would be res­pectively:
Master of Theological Studies (Theol. School); M.A. (Psy. School); M.A. (Missions School); a professional M. Social Work, and academic M.A. (Sociology School); M.A. in Music, Journalism, Cinema, Music, Drama, Radio and Mass Media (Communications
School) and M.A. in Youth Ministries, Religion, Marriage Counseling, Religious Edu­cation, etc. (Lay Ministry School). On the second and third level of degrees there
would be both an academic and professional doctorate in the schools of Theology (D.Th.P,
Th.M. and Th.D.), World Missions (D.Miss, Ph.D.), and Social Work (D.S.W., Ph.D.). The
Psychology and Communications schools would offer the one Ph.D. degree.

While it is true that this kind of speculation may be a long way from realization; it
is notable that the principle of satellite schools was accepted with virtually no chal­lange. Concerning the schools of Sociology and Communications, such modest tentacles
as selected courses, symposia or conferences are all that might presently be feasible. Yet,
upon this grounding and with proper tucking these schools are not at all an im­ possibleity.

The New Masters of Youth Ministry
As a matter of fact, an advance toward a school of Lay Ministry is progressing well
in the form of a proposed Youth Ministry M.A. degree. The field director of Young
Life, Dr. Jewett, Dr. Schoonhoven and others are working together to complete the de­tails of curriculum finance and operations by Jan. 1, 1970. Young Life has budgeted
the funds to support ten students and the special faculty resources for the fall term
1970.

proposed Missions Degrees
The Missions School has now proposed a program, beyond its present M.A. in Missions
which would include the D. Missiology In 1970 and a Ph.D. In Missiology several years
later. The Missiology program will require a B.D. or equivalent for admission. Both
the proposed new missions and Lay Ministry Programs were referred to subcommittees for
continued developing.

New B.D. Degree
Meanwhile, back at the old Theology School, it is looking like even the ancient B.D.
degree will undergo change. The American Association of Theological Schools through
a special committee has recommended that "the term Bachelor of Divinity (may) be
phased out". In its place they suggest a four year program leading to a doctorate
(D.Div.) and the standard professional degree. Consequently, there is expected
a fourth year with a "strengthening of both the academic rigor and the integration
of field education and/or internships into such a doctoral program, both through pro­fessional supervision and by programs placed at significant points in the life of
Church and society." The committee also recognizes the place for the shorter theological
degree which, stopping short of more intensive field work, would ground students
for diversified careers in other fields. Such a degree might be called "Master of
(cont. p. 8)
Implications for Continuing Education and Extension Work

One as yet undiscussed implication of this new doctorate concerns the proposal for a program of Continuous Education, which is presently being developed by a special alumni committee. If the B.D. is eventually replaced by the professional doctorate, (alternately named either D.MIN. or D.Div.); then most probably many Fuller grads will want to complete any extra work required for the standard pastoral degree. In this case, a strong program of continuing theological education would become a virtual necessity.

Steps toward accepting for the B.D. the extension theological work completed at the Pasadena Bloy House are already underway. In another area, the movement toward more extension work is also being accepted. A full formed M.A. and doctorate program in missions might be quite advantageously established in several mission fields themselves. The World Missions faculty would direct course requirements, content, and parochial Institutes. The program would be administered by local field and a central Fuller supervisor. The values of the program would be in lowering educational costs and attacking foreign residence obstacles while opening up advanced mission work to indigenous leaders and providing opportunity for on the field missions research work. These prospects of extension and continuous education will undoubtedly need to be pursued to their limits as the Mission School and Alumni Committees develop and present their progress to the Long Range Planning Committee.

Psychology School Curriculum

The Psychology School students and faculty are carrying on a running debate concerning not only language requirements, but also their whole theological curriculum. From the viewpoint of Long range planning it was suggested that a languageless Masters in Religion (Lay Ministry School) or the Masters of Theological Studies would more appropriately fit the needs of a clinical psychologist. It was also noted that there seems to be a consensus in the Psychology School to make Hebrew and possibly even Greek optional. Yet, theology is not considered to be a "minor" in a true Psychology-Theology Integration program. Further action is being taken by a joint student-faculty curriculum committee in the Psychology School. It was resolved that they should present to the next meeting of the Long Range Planning Committee a concrete recommendation considering all aspects of a languageless program, such as additional faculty, costs, courses etc.

Grading Systems

Alternatives to the present theological school grading system constituted another major agenda item. The present undergraduate A,B,C,D,E,F, system; a graduate system of A,B,C; Pass/Fail; Honors-Satisfactory- Unsatisfactory; or a more finely differentiated individual rank designation for each course were all mentioned. It was noted that both World Missions and Psychology Schools de facto grade according to graduate school standards. Opinion was divided as to whether the Theology School should necessarily parallel the grading procedures of the other two schools. An Honors-Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory system was cited as superior to Pass/Fail because a failure was not detrimentally retained on ones record. Instead, all that is presented is an opportunity and need to recover the unsatisfactory work. Xerox material was provided for the L.R.A.P. meeting which describes the Honors-Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory system put in operation this 1969-70 school year at Union Theological Seminary, N.Y. The Union Commission Report advocated "moving toward a concept of total evaluation of student progress rather than periodic grading." They recommend the H-S-U as a transitional grading scale in the "light of our present participation in a wider academic community." These grades in addition to a paragraph over-all evaluation which the professor shares with the student become a part of his permanent file. An "incomplete" is changed to an "unsatisfactory" only after a full year from the end of the semester.4

The function of grades was summarized as: 1) student motivation device and 2) screening mechanism for further graduate studies. On the other hand, it was noted that grades are rarely used to determine church positions.) The possibility of investigating means other than grading for motivating students was suggested. Some courses such as preaching, ministry, or sensitivity training are unquestionably more suitable for such other systems as S/U, or Pass/Fail. In the broader view, the committee proposed that a subcommittee of one faculty and one student from each school report with both specific short term implementation for 1970-71 school year and areas for further study.

Opportunity for Move to U.C.L.A.

Several years ago a decision was made not to move the Fuller campus from its present Pasadena site. All of the reasoning which went into this earlier decision have yet to be reviewed for the present committee members. One major factor however was Fuller's easy accessibility to the major population areas of L.A. from Pasadena. (This would not be the case for example, in Covina or Claremont.) It was pointed out that a lesser yet appreciable extent a move to U.C.L.A. would take us to the coastal fringe of L.A. (p. 9 and the remainder of this article is found on the reverse side of p.7)
the populace. The factors which reopen the question concern the new land and affiliation possibilities at U.C.L.A. First of all, the Mount St. Mary's College property which is located directly across Sunset Blvd. from U.C.L.A. is now being vacated. The property is desperately being sought by U.C.L.A., but is being effectively held out of their hands by the local residents. They feel that if U.C.L.A. were to acquire Mt. St. Mary's, U.C.L.A. would adjoin it to the present campus and try to relocate Sunset Blvd. around the edge of the property. Because any alteration of Sunset is disadvantageous to the residents, they are now very open to selling the property to another private school which would remain separated from the U.C.L.A. campus. From U.C.L.A.'s side, there are indications that a recognized "great defect" lies in their lack of channels to make contributions to community education of clergymen as well as lawyers, doctors, etc. A collaborative arrangement whereby such facilities as library and courses were mutually available yet at the same time strictly maintaining Fuller's autonomy, might be considered very optimistically. The fact that a department of Religion is not projected for U.C.L.A. opens the door for working arrangements to be made with several types of individual religious institutions. This is especially true in a time when religion studies are becoming increasingly popular on c mpus and Berkeley's association with San Francisco Theological Seminary sets a certain precedence for Southern California models. From the viewpoint of Fuller's long range planning, if we indeed do develop viable satellite schools such as Sociology, Communications, Political Science etc. the resources and interaction of a large school might be a critical determinant in the success of such endeavors. Even without these additional satellites the present schools of Psychology and Missions need to be near a large technical library. In fact the School of World Missions seems to use the UCLA library so frequently that it might eventually be more efficient for them to move independently if necessary. A task force was suggested for the investigation of further relationships with several institutions; however, a specific subcommittee pursuing a specific UCLA relocation was not recommended at this time.

Black Action Program

The long range project of attracting more blacks made several observations. 1) A major drawing card for the 20-30 students at schools like Yale is its full scholarship program. 2) The World Missions School is presently looking for a black professor. Possibly a joint venture could be worked out with the School of Theology.

The Educational Model at Fuller

What kind of an educational Institution is Fuller Seminary becoming? In light of the preceding discussion, the school will be undergoing both great pressure and transformation in the next decade. Common to Fuller as well as educational institutes everywhere are such plaguing issues as the relationship of teaching to writing/research, theoretical and practical work, individualization vs. mass education, the relevance of certain courses, professional retraining, increased student self-determination, nonfunctional methodology etc. Your theological student representatives proposed that since educational planners are designing some highly effective new approaches to these and other traditional problems, it would seem essential that we avoid either piecemeal problem solving tactics or ossification in our original planning. Suggested need to take best possible advantage of over-all educational evaluation and innovation. Several types of consultants were mentioned at the L.R.A.P. meeting, including planning innovators with a broad general background as well as more narrowly defined specialists. A subcommittee was formed to research further through Deans and Education Department Heads of major schools, the types of resources which might prove most useful.

Opportunities for Involvement

In closing, I would emphasize that there is a very definite rationale behind publicizing Long Range Academic Planning. What the school is and becomes will be a product not only of committees but also of the larger community interest and consensus attitudes. Definite proposals will be submitted at the next meeting March 31. The subcommittees would appreciate specific suggestions and proposals (from students?) as they prepare for this meeting. After these recommendations, the mechanism for decision making is as follows: 1) L.R.A.P. committee formulate recommendations 2) Joint faculty-trustee meeting review this work 3) Board of Trustees approve in principle 4) pertinent faculty committees discuss the formulations 5) Board of Trustees give final approval.

Last year students mobilized their resources and worked together through an Ad-Hoc Education Committee to institutionalize their voice on the Academic Affairs Committee. Other student-initiated action projects included the reformation of the M-305 course which incorporated the previous social concerns and missions committees. Also a group of juniors on their own published a complete set of church history notes for the class. The Ad-Hoc Education Committee of the Student Council can be used also this year as a clearing house to guide and direct the efforts of student representatives or for the coordination of any new student action projects.

Another profitable area is the initiation of meaningful dialogues concerning any long range academic goals or current proposals. Articles in the opinion, on the bulletin board or arranged debates could make known community consensus in several areas. It is toward just such an informed dialogue that the social concerns committee is planning (the remainder of this article is found on p.10—on the reverse side of p.8).
a mid February conference on "Educational Change". By providing a context which presents 1) the educational developments at large as well as that occurring in other seminaries (Union, Princeton etc.) and 2) the theological issues underlying certain trends; we hope to explore creatively our own potential. If you would like to help on this conference working in the framework of the new M-305 course, please see me, Sue Ellen as soon as you can.

Footnotes
1) The members of this committee are: Dr. J. Lawrence Kulp, Mr. C. Davis Weyerhaeuser, Mr. Merlin W. Call, Mr. Max DeFrees, Mr. Ray Stedman, Dr. Daniel P. Fuller, Mr. Paul K. Jewett, Dr. George E. Ladd, Dr. Donald A. McGarva, Dr. Calvin R. Schoenhoven, Mr. Alan R. Tippett, Dr. Donald F. Tweedle, Dr. Lee Edward Travis, Dr. Gary Darnell, Mr. James Morrison, Mr. Walter Becker, Mr. Wendall Broon, Mr. James Mitchell, Miss Sue Ellen Porter, Mr. Daniel Shirbroun, Mr. Frederick Wagner, Dr. David Allan Hubbard
4) Report of the Union Commission, 1969, from What's Ahead at Union Theological Seminary, p. 13
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