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FOR YOUR INFORMATION

by Gary Tuttle

Some students serve in a number of key positions in the Seminary and can be of significant help to the student body if the existing communication and power channels are used effectively. First, however, the student body must know who these students are who can render service. Following is a list of the committees or positions and the students who fill them. I suggest you keep the list for future reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Dennis Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Assistant to Dr. Schoonhoven</td>
<td>Walt Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Field Work Coordinator</td>
<td>Steve Kobernik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Housing/Employment Director</td>
<td>Walt Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Administrative Committee</td>
<td>Gary Tuttle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Bruce Dreon, Marvin Erisman, Gary Tuttle, Fred Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Student-Faculty Liaison Committee</td>
<td>Shel Burkhalter, Gary Tuttle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Chapel Committee</td>
<td>Jon Wilson, Dave Fahner, Marcie Woody, Wayne Grudem, Jim Rueb, Steve Hoogerbrugge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Facilities Committee</td>
<td>Reg Reimer, Eric Jacobsen, Bill Weyerhauser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Long Range Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Dan Shirbroun, Walt Becker, Fred Wagner, Bill McIvor, Samuel Kau, Lloyd Kwast, Walt Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Alan Gates, Gary Tuttle, Jake Coss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE LANGUAGE PROGRAM REVISITED

by Gary Tuttle

Since I have become closely involved with the language program at Fuller I have become increasingly aware both of the need for language study and the stress which the institution places upon it. I am convinced of the need. My misgivings concern the emphasis placed upon the acquisition of language skills - particularly the way this stress has been worked out practically.

In the first place, the languages are the only subject area in which one must maintain and frequently demonstrate comprehensive knowledge. I realize that the nature of language study is such that earlier material cannot be forgotten if any kind of advancement is to take place. My concern is with the Biblical Department's dictum that one must pass the language exam to pass any core course. If the languages constituted more than half the material in the course, such a decision would be warranted. However course content frequently overshadows the language by a ratio of three to one. Any way one looks at it, twenty-five percent F and seventy-five percent A, B, C or D does not legitimately make one hundred percent F. I would like to hear the Biblical Department's rationale.

My second area of concern, which I consider more serious, revolves about the language review and tutorial classes given each quarter. As I understand the matter, if one receives a probationary grade (D) in Greek or Hebrew or any Biblical core course he must take a language tutorial the following quarter. (If he cannot demonstrate sufficient competence in the language by the end of his middler year, he cannot be admitted to the Senior class.) Each of these tutorials is three units and may be taken in lieu of a special interest seminar. It is quite possible for one to take six remedial language tutorials during his first two years - one following each Summer Greek, Hermeneutics, New Testament, Summer Hebrew, Pentateuch and Latter Prophets - a total of 18 hours of remedial language toward his B.D. Hence, it is possible for one to skip six special interest seminars to take remedial language courses, have those 18 units count toward his degree and graduate with it being assumed that he is as well trained as one who took those six seminars in the area of his interest. I have some concern for the quality of the degree Fuller offers, but much more concern for the individual whose special interest seminars are offered on the altar of the idol of language learning.

Perhaps six remedial courses for one student is the extreme, but I think the Registrar could testify to the fact that there are currently a substantial number of middlers and seniors (perhaps as many as 15) who have already completed three or four tutorials. Somehow the program has got to be corrected so that men do not graduate with a warped education. If we continue to maintain such a high view of language then perhaps we should require a higher level of proficiency in the initial Greek and Hebrew courses and require men to take the course (9 hours) over rather than condemn him to a series of tutorials and perhaps ruin both his motivation for education and his disposition toward the ministry. I say "condemn"
THE LANGUAGE PROGRAM REVISITED (Con't)

because it is usually impossible for a man to get up to par in Hebrew, for example, by taking Hebrew Review. The reason is this: for a man to have received a probationary grade in Hebrew 15 he probably would not have learned more than 60 percent of the material. Hence he has 40 percent to make up. Forty percent of nine hours is 3.6 hours. Therefore he has 3.6 hours of material to learn but only 3 hours in the tutorial in which to learn it. In addition, during that same three hours, he is supposed to review the other 60 percent he supposedly knew at the end of Hebrew 15. Certainly it would have been more merciful and probably more beneficial if he had not passed the course in the first place.

The third area of my concern is more ambiguous than the previous two. It involves the thought which comes across from various professors now and then (often offered as a reason for language study) which, by its tone, seems to imply a mistrust of commentators by suggesting that we each, as individuals, must sit in judgement on the commentators to decide upon the truth of their work. Such a disposition intended or not may result in a certain skepticism among seminarians regarding the competency and possibly even the motives of commentators. Certainly we must be responsible for what we believe and teach. If we choose to believe a commentator who is in error (even if we choose in ignorance), then we must accept that responsibility. If we teach that error to others then the responsibility is multiplied on our own heads. I do not doubt that knowing the original languages thoroughly is one of the best means of getting at Biblical truth, but I do not think that the wrangling western concept of the self-made man is a valid paradigm for the theologian. The self-made theologian who trusts no one and judges all is surely to be avoided. The concept is not Biblical and is, in fact, destructive.

These are just a few elements related to language study about which I am uneasy. I think my second concern is of particular importance and I would like to get feedback from the community concerning the matter. It may be that I am only leary of shadows. If so, I would be pleased to have them dispelled. Whatever is done, however, must be for our mutual benefit for the strengthening of the church and the Glory of God. That is the spirit with which I offer these comments.

BLACKS ON CAMPUS

by Joe Simms

In a recent discussion posted on the Board of Declaration, a missions student aired his frustration that there are no significant numbers of black students on the campus. Professor LaSor responded that we have tried at Fuller in the past at great lengths to recruit black students and faculty, and those attempts have failed.

But let's follow his reasoning a little bit by comparing it to God's relationship to man. In the Garden, Adam chose to reject God. Repeatedly the Jews turned their backs on what they knew was the way of obedience. God had every reason to say to mankind that He's tried to communicate with us and at every step of the way He's been met head-on with rejection and rebellion. His recourse to the behavior of His people might just as well have been a large, technicolor vision in Todd-AO sound telling them in no uncertain terms what lice they were and called them to repentance or destruction.

God's love, however, is unlimited to the extent that it is never cut off by the rejection of man, no matter what the degree. The meaning of the Cross is that God was willing to suffer the ultimate rejection to illustrate His love for man. The actual physical suffering of the cross is secondary to what it says about God's willingness to lay down His life for people with no strings attached, at extreme cost.
BLACKS ON CAMPUS (Con't)

Reconciliation was the number-one goal of the cross. What could possibly be a greater case of alienation in America today than the utter failure of the people of God to minister effectively the Gospel of reconciliation to the Blacks of our cities? If God had followed the "I've tried" reasoning, Christ would have never come, or if He had, He simply would have avoided the Cross by being taken up into heaven.

There is no excuse for a seminary the stature of Fuller's not having a hard-hitting, visionary program for recruitment of Blacks. Let's face it, they're all going to the liberal seminaries whose theology we find incorrect. But they're still going. That is a sad indictment. It's not as simple as just saying we care about the ghetto. Everyone cares about ghettos, with about as much energy as they care about the fact that tomorrow the sun will rise.

We need a program which will educate Blacks who will be useful in the Black community. They don't do anyone any good off somewhere in some college teaching Black studies. Nobody said this would be easy, or happen overnight. But I, for one am sick of the hypocrisy of all talk and no real action in this crucial area at Fuller.

OUT OF THE DARK CONTINENT

by Reid Trulson

"Africa is accustomed always to produce new and monstrous things."--Rabelais, Works Bk V. ch 3.

"Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye lands."--Psalm 100:1

Some have called it "monstrous" and "noise". Others say it is "new" and "joyful". Disregarding this debate, one can still say two things about TWENTY-ONEHUNDRED which are indisputable: it is from Africa, and it is given unto the Lord.

TWENTY-ONEHUNDRED is an experiment in presenting the gospel through multimedia communication. This concept evolved, or was created, in 1968 by Eric Miller, then a Fuller missionary intern with African Enterprise in Nairobi, Kenya. Eric observed that a large segment of Nairobi's student population ignored most traditional evangelistic approaches. At the same time these students were quite eager to listen to and to discuss pop music. As a result, Eric began meeting with students for record discussions: informal evenings of listening to the Beatles, Jimi Hendrix, Moody Blues, Vanilla Fudge and others, and discussing the lyrics of their songs. This atmosphere provided a unique opportunity to talk about Jesus Christ and His interest in those students' lives. As students continued to respond, Eric added a visual dimension to the discussions through the use of slide projectors, candid pictures and lighting effects. Yet this was not mere entertainment, for people were being confronted with Jesus Christ. In the following months several hundred students throughout Kenya committed their lives to Christ as a result of this presentation of the gospel. Rev. Tom Houston, pastor of the Nairobi Baptist Church, reported during a visit to Fuller last May, that Eric brought the program to the high school which their daughter attends, with the result that 113 students made decisions for Christ. Virtually all of these students are still involved in small group Bible studies.

After seven months in Kenya, Eric Miller was invited to the University of Cape Town in South Africa to direct the production of a second multi-media program. The Christian groups at the University of Cape Town presented the program at the conclusion of the University Arts Festival. The program was so well received that it was held over for four nights with overflow audiences each night. The program won a large hearing for the more formal lectures and symposia of the University
Mission held the following week. Since then, the program has toured the Cape Province, Johannesburg, the University in Durban, the teachers training college in Bulawayo, Rhodesia, and Wits University. Brad Stenberg, a native of Burbank who is working with the program in Africa, said of this showing, "The most obvious effect it had on the campus was that people were talking about Christianity." The presentation opened many people to considering "...the possibility that Jesus has something to do with this world we live in." Said Stenberg, reflecting on these presentations, "I have seen God work in a great way through this."

While this program was finding acceptance in Africa, Eric Miller returned to Fuller. There he gathered together a team from such varied sources as Fuller Theological Seminary, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and the Bullwinkle Show and produced a New American Version of the earlier African production. The work was done in conjunction with IVCF and Dr. Winter's Cross-cultural Ministries 305 class. The sequel, TWENTYONEHUNDRED, is most accurately called a multi-media communication, as it makes use of stereo-phonic music (folk, rock, soul), special lighting effects, slides, film, and tactile phenomenon. These are the elements which make up TWENTYONEHUNDRED. Yet an enumeration of its constituent parts is not a sufficient description of TWENTYONEHUNDRED any more than "wood and dye" is a sufficient description of Charmin. What, then, is the presentation like?

TWENTYONEHUNDRED begins as the lights fade out. The huge screens become a red chiaroscuro accompanied by the desperate ululu, "Oh no! Must be the season of the witch!" The first half of the presentation deals with the problems felt by modern man. The Beatles sing of loneliness in Eleanor Rigby:

"All the lonely people, where do they all come from?
All the lonely people, where do they all belong?"

The tribal-rock musical "Hair" asks questions about life's meaning:

"Where do I go? Follow the wind song.
Where do I go? Follow the sun...
Where is the something, where is the someone
That tells me why I live or die?"

The second part of the presentation is well described by Frank Bettger, staff writer for the Alhambra Post-Advocate: "The second half celebrates God's salvation of man. It zeroes in on the Cross and the resurrection, culminating in the celebration of God's promise of new life with the Negro spiritual 'Oh Happy Day'."

TWENTYONEHUNDRED sometimes produces culture shock in those who are not pop music enthusiasts. This fact, more than anything else, indicated the depth of the division between the generation which screamed for the Beatles and one which wept for Rudy Vallee. One lady in Bel Air asked, "Why do you have to do all this weird stuff? Isn't Billy Graham enough?" The answer which the church has given in succeeding generations is that the good news of Christ's death and resurrection is enough, but this news can do no good until it is communicated. And the hard fact is that, for a large segment of today's students, traditional ways of proclaiming the gospel communicate with all the clarity and force of a Coolidge campaign speech. Paul found that he could best communicate to the men of Athens by quoting pagan Greek poets. By using cultural expressions which were meaningful to the Greeks, he was able to share with them God's love. The result was that "some men joined him and believed, among them Dionysius the Areopagite and a woman named Damaris and others with them." Acts 17:34. TWENTYONEHUNDRED is another example of the outworking of this same principle. In Eric's words, "We're convinced that Christ is relevant today and feel that presenting Him in a way that communicates to the youth is vital...Our goal is to communicate about Jesus Christ, about the importance of His life, death and resurrection to the individual. We want others to know Christ in a personal way because we feel He provides resources to solve a lot of problems that our contemporaries are struggling with."
OUT OF THE DARK CONTINENT (Con't)

Does TWENTYONEHUNDRED succeed in communication the gospel? A Pasadena City College coed who say the presentation this summer said, "No one came out to stuff and cram Christ down my throat...I saw the need for Christ as my personal savior through TWENTYONEHUNDRED." She was one of a number of students who made commitments to Christ during the summer showings. Other reactions to the presentation have come from a wide variety of people.

"(It) puts the problem and the answer in the computerized, multi-media vernacular used by today's youth." Wayne A. Clark, religion editor of the Arcadia Tribune.

"It's a shame that more than more faculty weren't here to see this." Dr. Kenneth Hamilton, Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Winnipeg, Canada.

"Is this a part of the Communist conspiracy?" A lady from Beverly Hills.

"Groovy." A girl from John Muir High School.

TWENTYONEHUNDRED is being presented at 736 S. Rosemead Blvd. in Pasadena through the month of October. Performances are Friday and Saturday nights at 7:45 p.m. and Sunday night at 8:45 p.m. $1 donation. Beginning November 1st, TWENTYONEHUNDRED will be touring west coast campuses. It is also scheduled to be shown twice daily at the Ninth Inter-Varsity Missionary Convention at the University of Illinois, (Urbana) Dec. 27-31. But if an army marches on its stomach, as Napoleon has said, it is no less true that TWENTYONEHUNDRED marches on its lightbulbs (9 of them) and its slides (over 2,000 of them). This requires a financial investment, and Eric Miller commiserates with Mark Twain who said, "Most money is twice tainted, tain't mine and tain't yours." Help is greatly needed to finance the project. There is also an opening for more students to be on the team which will take TWENTYONEHUNDRED on tour.

TWENTYONEHUNDRED. What more can be said?
"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Matthew 11:15
"You ain't heard nothin' yet, folks." Al Jolson, 1927.

DESPAIR AT 1 A.M.
by Kenneth H. Himes

Who hears the silent cryings of the heart
when God has turned a deaf ear?
Who feels the pangs of loneliness
when friends are out of touch?
Who cares to know the soul of another?

Each has gone his own way...

A quiet hand is extended,
But what is one among so many?
A voice whispers "Help!"
But freeways of noise on private thoroughfares...
(and it's gone)

An encounter! Hope!
But then despair
like a rumor of peace devoured by flames of war
And the inner turmoil goes on
Who will hear?
Who will feel?
Who will know?
Note: This article continues a series begun last spring. We hope these will grant helpful insights into the lives of various individuals connected with the Seminary. How do professors, pastors, etc. accomplish so much in the same twenty-four hour day allotted to us all. Each has his own secrets which he will attempt to share. Ed.

**HOW I WORK**

by William Sanford LaSor

*(written for The Opinion, by request)*

To the question, "How do you work?" I could write at least three different answers. I could describe how I used to work, when I was producing scholarly articles; or how I work now, with so many interruptions that I cannot keep a long train of thought on the track; or how I would like to work.

The simplest answer is to say that I respond to stimuli. Press the button and I work. Allegro makes fantastic statements about the Dead Sea Scrolls, and I am compelled to reply. An editor asks for an article (or a book) on a subject, and I start on it. If there is a pressing deadline, I sometimes make it, but often I do not. If the pressure is great enough, I work around the clock. (Once, I worked through one entire night, slept for about three hours on the second night, and with about 65 hours of work in three days, made the deadline.)

Given my present age and breadth of interests, I rarely enter into work in an entirely strange field. This means that I have some idea of representative bibliography and of the major problems before I start on the task. As a result, I can organize my reading, search for references that I have in fuzzy compartments in the back of my mind, do the necessary detail-work of research, etc., without too much spinning of the wheels. When I was much younger, I often wasted time running up blind alleys—but this is part of scholarship.

My methodology is familiar to all who have taken courses with me. I am principally an inductive scholar. Sitting around and "thinking" is not my cup of tea. I don't mean this disparagingly, for thinkers are necessary. But so are men who work from the empirical data. It's not always thrilling work, but I enjoy running down the number of times Isaiah uses a particular word, particularly when my results clearly contradict a glib statement of some scholar who has expressed a "hunch" or perhaps voiced a prejudice. Early in my scholarly career, I was impressed with the saying, "Never argue with facts." The search for objectivity—for facts, facts, and more facts—has been my joyful pilgrimage.

But these facts must be relevant: relevant to the word of God and to contemporary needs. The accumulation of mere facts does not interest me. I could never get interested in how many words are in the Bible, or that Zephaniah 3:8 contains all the letters of the Hebrew alphabet. (Of course, when I came across this latter fact, I realized its usefulness for testing the beginner's knowledge of the Hebrew alphabet, hence its relevance!) But above and beyond all else, I want to discover the facts that make God's revealed word as clear and meaningful to our day as I possibly can.

Then I try to organize my material into a clear outline, one that has some artistic structure, but more important, one that has progress form the introduction to the conclusion.

And I try to be simple. For about forty years I have been convinced that no scholar is compelled to make his work difficult to comprehend. If he truly understands what he is writing about, he should be able to say it so others can understand. There is a cult of snobbery, of writing to be obscure, of impressing
men by saying simple truth in incomprehensible termiology, of determined obfuscation. I abominate it, and I delight in sticking pins in such scholars. Are they trying to instruct men in truth, or are they trying to build their own glory?

I have been writing for many years—many, many courses in composition in high school and college, sports editor, articles for papers, sermon manuscripts, news reporting, editor of a station paper in the Navy, scholarly articles, syllabi, language handbooks, translations of books and articles from other languages—you name it, and I probably have written it. The only way to learn to write is to write, and the only way to learn to think clearly is to write what you think and revise it. As a result of much writing, I write easily, and sometimes quickly. My thoughts are worked out in statements, revised, reworded, often in my mind, as I type them. Dictionary and encyclopedia articles are then revised several times, boiled down until I can find no unnecessary word or statement. For books and articles, I try to write with precision, but in a somewhat more relaxed style. Years ago I learned that I cannot simply dictate any serious writing, for I become needlessly verbose. (I think this is true of most writers—even those who think they are not verbose!)

Most of all, I try to think of writing in terms of stewardship: I am writing for God. My faithfulness to Him and His word is the ultimate criterion of judgment; not what men think of my work. Of course, what men think of it may be an indication of what God thinks of it, so I cannot ignore what they say. But the judgments of men do not upset me; they merely send me back to see whether I have been faithful to God's revealed word. The rest I commit to Him.

DEVOTION, CRITICISM AND THE BIBLE

by John Piper

I was paging through the Princeton Seminary Catalogue the other day and ran across a very interesting course being offered there next year. The title is NT 02 The Bible and the Devotional Life. The description of the course goes like this:

The Scriptures as a sourcebook in the development of the devotional life. The relation of the devotional use of the Bible to its scientific study. Analysis of selected passages from the Old and New Testaments . . .

I wonder if the problem which gives rise to a course like this could not use more discussion this year at Fuller. Instead of offering a course perhaps there could simply be a more liberal sharing of insights.

Surely the faculty have wrestled with this problem; and I know such effort has not been in vain. So I ask not for a new course, but that in every course the wisdom of the years as well as the knowledge be shared.

And there are students who have come to insight in this matter of the critical vs. devotional uses of the Bible. Don't put that kind of light under a bushel. Others of us need to see it.

The presence of such a course in Princeton's catalogue was enlightening as to the extent and importance of this problem. What really impressed me, though, was that it was being taught by the foremost American authority in textual criticism, Dr. Bruce Metzger. Now you would think a man of his stature has more important things to do than lend a hand to meager B.D. candidates struggling with the relation between critical and devotional approaches to the Bible. But apparently not.
Francis Schaeffer's book *The God Who Is There* has greatly stimulated evangelical Christians, especially at the university level. Its analysis of the presuppositions underlying various forms of thinking have forced many Christians to examine their faith from a challenging new perspective, and in numerous cases it has led them to radically alter their approach in communication the gospel.

Dr. Schaeffer criticizes several forms of twentieth century epistemology by tracing their historical development. As he sees it, the decisive change in Western epistemology occurred in the field of philosophy through the writings of Friedrich Hegel. This early nineteenth century-German philosopher took the previously accepted mode of thinking, thesis-antithesis, and added to it the concept of synthesis. Either/or reasoning was replaced by a type of reasoning (dialectic) which sought to juxtapose opposed ideas and to resolve the conflict between them by synthesis (a form of reasoning which destroys absolutes). Schaeffer concludes, "...Hegel has removed the straight line of previous thought and in its place has substituted a triangle".

The next step in the process which produced modern thinking was the idea of the "leap of faith", introduced by Soren Kierkegaard. Kierkegaard concluded, unlike Hegel, that you could not arrive at synthesis by reason. Thus, he argued, the only way to resolve the important issues which the process of synthesis was supposed to resolve was to take a "leap of faith". Again, Schaeffer points out the importance of this new concept, "So he (Kierkegaard) separated absolutely the rational and logical from faith. The reasonable and faith bear no relationship to each other..." From this moment on, thinkers in the Western world have either implicitly or explicitly accepted the idea of a divided field of knowledge. In those areas which especially distinguish man from the animals such as morals, purpose, significance, validity of love etc... man must make a leap of faith to attain significance. Merely rational and logical thought cannot exist in this realm, since it only produces "synthetic" meaninglessness. Thus, wherever you find a twentieth century man arguing that his life is meaningful, a "leap of faith" has been introduced somewhere in his thinking.

By being aware of this schizophrenia in the field of knowledge, the Christian can force any person to reach the point where his system can no longer be proven. This can be done by defining the problem and applying the two generally accepted proof stages: 1) The theory must be non-contradictory and must give an answer to the phenomena in question; 2) The person must be able to live consistently with his theory. When different world views are examined in this light, the only view which can be "proven" correct is Biblical Christianity. For details on this and a much more comprehensive view of Schaeffer's approach, read *The God Who Is There of Escape from Reason*.

Thus, Schaeffer has come full circle, returning us to the pre-Hegelian epistemology. On this point he is quite clear: "Christianity turns upon antithesis, not as some abstract concept of truth, but in the fact that God exists, and in personal justification", and further, "...if we get caught up on the other methodology, we have really blasphemed, discredited and dishonored Him, for the greatest antithesis of all is that He exists as opposed to His not existing. He is the God who is there." If twentieth-century epistemology does follow the post-Kierkegaard pattern of a divided field of knowledge as Schaeffer claims it does, it is inevitable that twentieth-century world views will fall when examined by pre-Hegelian categories of thinking (thesis-antithesis, a unified field of knowledge).
The crucial question is whether non-Christians will be willing to argue on the terms which Schaeffer sets up. If it were true that the great philosophers alone determine our world view, it would not be difficult for us to convince a person to change his epistemology from, say, an existential world view to a logical, rational self-examination. Unfortunately, epistemological changes do not occur in a vacuum, but are conditioned by changes in the world. For example, one reason Hegel decided that thesis-antithesis thinking was no longer adequate was that the world he lived in was becoming increasingly complex. As the world shrunk through travel in the 19th century, thinkers were being confronted with more and more viewpoints and cultures. The lines between truth and falsity became increasingly blurred as the number and variety of systems claiming authority multiplied. Instead of having to face the question of whether the bible was true (thesis) or untrue (antithesis), thinkers had to decide the validity of the bible vis-a-vis the Koran, the Bhagavad-Gita, the writings of Lao-Tzu, etc. As education spread from an aristocratic intellectual elite to a wider variety of social classes, the issues a philosopher faced became increasingly heterogeneous. In retrospect, it seems almost inevitable that a thinker would loosen the rigid thesis/antithesis categories to accommodate a wider variety of views.

The question of whether this epistemological change was beneficial or not is not as important as the fact that this change did not occur in a void but as a result of a changing world. Thus, Schaeffer's assertion that "...when Hegel propounded this idea he changed the world" is false, for it grossly overestimates the importance of the intellectual in shaping the world (a fallacious way of seeing reality which, curiously enough, intellectuals are prone to; Fuller students, beware!). A rephrasing of Dr. Schaeffer's statement in the following way more accurately describes what happened in the early 19th century: "The world was changing, leading Hegel to propound his idea".

Thus, it is difficult to get non-Christians (and even many Christians) to accept Schaeffer's categories of thought, even if these categories best describe reality in an ultimate sense. As the mass media barrage us with a seemingly endless chaos of world events, it is almost impossible to view reality in absolute terms. Suzanne de Dietrich, in The Witnessing Community, describes how difficult it is for modern man to believe in God's concrete action in history: "He (modern man -EB) knows about the complexities of nature and history; he cannot relate all events to a single transcendent cause". The idea that God's will is operating in the world today is almost impossible for the non-Christian to accept, not only because thought patterns have changed, but much more importantly because the world has changed.

The task of evangelism is more difficult than one might think after reading Schaeffer, due to these radical changes during the past 150 years. This fact points out the necessity for Christians to not only argue a new reality as Schaeffer does, but to create it in their midst. If we can exhibit lives which have order, purpose, clear standards of right and wrong, meaningful love, etc... in an age of relativism, non-Christians will have a concrete life style to compare their world with. To show that such a life style is possible in the twentieth century is much more difficult than to prove logically that such a life style is possible in this century. However, it is only by radically living as if "God is there" and "man is created in his image" (and hence significant in God's eyes) that we can begin to argue for an alternative which seems to be denied by the fast-moving, chaotic century we live in. When Christian communities begin to live according to the exciting Christian presuppositions that Schaeffer outlines, we will then no longer be presenting an irrelevant, anachronistic thought
form in a vacuum. The spirit-filled reality which we demonstrate should be such an exciting alternative to the views the twentieth century has put forth that non-believers will not only want to accept the "methodology" by which we arrived at the truth but (and this is obviously crucial) the authority behind our truth. Just as Hegel was forced to change his mode of thinking by the changing world around him, we should compel the desperate twentieth century man to reexamine his thinking by the Christocentric life style we reflect. Only in such a way can we ever hope to find listeners when we claim that God is there.

THE TRACK MEET

by Joe Bettridge

The Human race having been one,
A long time ago
By a Non-Competitive Carpenter;
A stranger was kept in Silence as he watched
The Crowd, cheer for Victories.

Later, after the games were over,
The numerous winners and losers
Were indistinguishable in the home-bound
Darkness.

EVANGELISM FOR THE MAN ON THE STREET

by Jeff Cotter

Street evangelism isn't a new creation just now bursting into existence on our scene. It's as old as soap-box preaching and Salvation Army Marching Bands. Maybe older. Rescue Missions, nestled deep within the Skid Row area streets of big cities have served the addicts of the older generation's drugs and alcohol for years. Inner-city ministry, reaching out to black ghetto youth, has gone on for a good ten years.

Within the last three years, however, street evangelism has grown its most radical branch. It is reaching out to a completely new and very youthful culture called the Drug-Rock Culture. This group is composed of aware, very sensitive, and extremely mobile youth who have dropped out of anything hinting of Establishment. They are the Doomsday Prophets of a society they see "mouth-tripping" the old norms rather than living out their implications. Freedom and Love become watch words for Action. The idea is to do with your Body, Mind, and Soul what you please. To use an already exhausted phrase, it is to do your own thing and let everybody else do theirs without hassle. Dropping out becomes an effort to create anew what had been intended, yet had been bungled by society. Thus the intense search for open, free communal living with people who are really "getting it together". Quoting from Woodstock, "We've got to get back to the Garden".

Part of dropping out is accomplished through the use of harsh drugs that literally "blow the mind". Everybody is into drugs, and the drugs are into every body you see. One user, discontent with what he sees around him wants the drug to thrust him into other worlds of imagination, sensation, hyper-active speed, or limboed, dulled dormancy. Another, knowing that answers must come
from within not without, wants the drug to plunge him back into himself. Thus
the drug becomes an inroad to the mysterious inner man. Other motives for drug
use are not so esoteric. Some seek a high; many others are slaves of the high.

The medium of expression for this culture is its music, called Rock music.
Deafening in its delivery, primitive and tribal in its concepts, its words and
musical styles and its unique performers embody the values of the group.

These were the people our team spent their summer with. Now, before you dis-
miss all this as being interesting (hopefully) but irrelevent, let me say that
whether or not you feel called to this culture, you should understand what it's
doing. I say this because the Drug-Rock Culture currently sets all the trends
for every other level of society. This is especially true of youth. If you
want a clear index of what's happening with youth and where its going, look
to the Drug-Rock Culture. Further, qualifications for work in this area are
not so radical as you might think. Some people brand me as "un-conventional"
or "un-establishment" and therefore especially suited for street work. Such is
not the case. Neither my team nor myself would stand out in a crowd. We're
as conventional as they come, and were even more so before our summer started.
Its not a matter of appearance or special anointing of the spirit. We're
simply Conservative-Radicals, like every Christian ought to be. Technically,
our team was in no way "qualified" for the street. But I have always believed
the only qualification for a man in God's Mission is Availability. Either you
are available for God or you're not. If you are, he will use you and give you
the tools for accomplishing the job. Give God an inch and he will take it and
use it for his glory. The second inch comes easier. We were available and he
used us.

Our program was simple on paper but difficult to carry out: Love in action.
At the risk of sounding presumptuous, we attempted to administer the total ex-
perience of the Gospel to the people in the street. All I mean is, to the best
of our abilities, we tried to offer Christ to the people, endeavoring at every:
turn to meet both physical and spiritual needs. We had all been victims at
one time or another of "hit and run" evangeleism. We felt this method of
communication inadequate. What with this culture's previous (and most times
tragic) experience with the church, their extreme sensitivity, their sense
of failure and rejection so strong, together with their present experience
with condemnation-oriented "Hell-Fire" Christian groups, we felt we had to
tread softly. Our message of Christ's love was what the people wanted and
needed to hear. Yet, we felt dishonest telling someone on the street about
the Gospel, some even to the point of conversion, and then cutting the rela-
tionship off coldly to retreat home. If we couldn't take the people home,
our love was mostly words. Plus, we needed a reference point of sustained
contact with the street. A location had to be established in the minds of the
people of a house with open doors where a community existed that could love
them. To accomplish these goals, we rented two houses, one for girls, one
for guys, opened our doors and began our "Commune". It all worked together.
The street people found Christ to be their answer, and his Body, the Christian
community, to be the "together" commune they had been looking for.

I haven't said anything in this article about the church (yes, Institutional!)
that backed us completely with money and prayers. I have said little of the
team who committed themsleves to Christ and to each other and then to their
world in ways I had never before experienced in a group. For if our commune
satisfied the communal need of the street people mentioned above, that pro-
found sense of Community had to happen with us first. Our love, then, in
whatever form was merely an outgrowth of what we had already experienced with
each other.
EVANGELISM FOR THE MAN ON THE STREET (Con't)

I learned many things, of course. I learned that Christian service is full time. It is also very simple. Our work was called successful. The results were life-changing. Nothing is greater than that. This was the Lord's work, even though we felt at times he'd forgotten us. He should be praised. What worked for the street people, as well as the two high schools (we were not exclusively street—we hit the summer school crowd) will work for anybody. With slight modification, all levels of society are about the same. The problems transcend the levels. The content is always the same, although the forms change. It is just a matter of opening the Door. It is the door to your heart, the door to your home, the door to your wallet, the door that is opened to a needy world. It is making all that theology stand up and live for the man in the street.

THE PHILOSOPHER'S CONVENTION AND THE MOUNTAIN

by Joe Bettridge

Having heard their noises before
The Mountain sighed,
And thought of Patience.

THE GOOD NEWS OR THE BAD ADVICE?

by Wayne Grudem

If our efforts at evangelism seem frustrating it is probably because we are telling men something other than the "good news" of the Gospel. Anyone who wants to know what "the Gospel" is should read I Corinthians 15:1-11. Paul says (v.1), "Now, I would remind you, brethren, in what terms I preached to you the gospel..." Then comes his summary (vs, 3-4): "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures." Then he gives some evidences and concludes by saying (v.11), "...so we preached and so you believed."

Now why is that good news? For most people, it is not. They have no concept of sin in their heads. When a Christian says "Christ died for our sins..." they say (if they are candid), "So what?"

For the past 150 years, well-meaning Christians have tried to improve this situation by distorting the Good News and making it the Bad Advice. It has come out-sounding like this:

"If you want to solve your problems..."
"If you want to be happy..."
"If you want meaning in life..."
"If you are afraid of dying..."
"If you would like to know and experience God's love and plan for our life..."

"...then you should believe that Christ died for our sins..." Now that is a non sequitur. The two halves are unrelated. The "if" clause says nothing about sin, and the "then" clause has a method for dealing with sin. To all this, the non-Christian again says (if he is candid), "So what?"
THE GOOD NEWS OR THE BAD ADVICE? (Con't)

If that were the end of the story, the situation might not be so tragic. The non-Christian might leave us and search until he could find someone to tell him the "Good News." But what usually happens is that the non-Christian notices something about our distorted Gospel. It is not in the form of a news story ("Christ died for our sins..."). It is in the form of advice. It says, "You should do something." "You should believe that Christ died for our sins."

So the non-Christian says, "How do I do it?" "How do I have faith?" We answer with our Bad Advice, "You should believe that Christ died for our sins..." Again and again he says, in various forms, "How do I believe?" Again and again we say, in various forms, "You should believe that Christ died for our sins..."

By this point, it should dawn on us that this kind of merry-go-round is completely foreign to the Bible, and that perhaps something is wrong with the whole scene. Instead we go further astray. We devise steps to "help" him believe. "Commit your life," we say. "Make a decision for Christ." "It has to be an act of the will." "Come forward and make a public profession of faith." "Pray and ask Christ into your heart." "Ask him to forgive your sins." These are things to "do" if a person wants to save himself.

Bewildered and confused, the non-Christian (if he can still be candid) does not see how these things apply to his problems. But we seem so sincere that he thinks it must be worth trying. Frequently, there is intense emotional pressure on him. Frequently also, there is genuine spiritual unease brought about by the Holy Spirit. Under all this pressure he comes forward, or commits his life, or prays, whatever we may ask.

This is supposed to make him a Christian. If he ever doubts his salvation he can look back to this experience and be reassured. He is supposed to act like a Christian, too, but that is not too hard. He only has to adjust his outward behavior a little - stop swearing in public and start going to church on Sunday morning perhaps.

The probable result is that the evangelical, conservative, Protestant church has one more unconverted member. The Good News ("that Christ died for our sins...") still has no meaning for him. Everybody tells him he is a Christian, he acts like one, he thinks he is a Christian, but he is not.

So when people complain that the church is dead, they are not far from the truth. Trying to revive some people in the church is as hopeless as trying to revive a dead man. Many people in the church are unconverted, spiritually dead. The tragedy is that they do not even know it.

Now let us look again at the Good News. It says that Christ died for our sins, and was raised so that we might have new life with Him. Christianity is not primarily a means of getting meaning in life or being happy or anything else like that. God may use these things to attract us to Him, but these are not the Gospel. Christianity is a means of dealing with sin. Unless a man first realizes that he is a sinner, the Good News has no meaning for him. Without repentance there is no faith.

So the right approach when people do not understand the Good News is not to distort the Good News and make it the Bad Advice. It is rather to help people understand the Good News as God wrote it. But before people can understand the Good News, they must understand what sin is: not the doctrine of sin, not the principle that everybody is a sinner, not a mental awareness that man is separated from God or that man is in rebellion against God, but my sin. In order to understand the Good News, I must first see my sin. I must see it in terms of God's righteousness. I must truly repent.
Jesus saves us from our sins. But he does not save us in our sins. Conversion means turning; turning from our sins to Christ who saves us. Much of the evangelism done in the past century has tried to do the impossible. It has tried to bring unrepentant men to Christ. It has packaged Christianity in an attractive wrapping and tried to sell it to men in true Madison Avenue style. It has told unbelievers, "Seek first an abundant life, and the kingdom of God and his righteousness will be added unto you."

Because it seems a distasteful and unpopular task to bring men through repentance, down the hard and narrow way to life, we lead them down the wide and easy way to destruction. There has been no repentance, so there has been no faith. Indeed, Jesus said, "I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." (Luke 5:32).

Christianity is not for men who want a happy life and think they can earn it from God by praying or committing their life or making a decision. Christianity is for sinners who have no hope in anything but Christ's death and resurrection to save them. Christianity is not for men who think, "The wages of sin is death, but the wages of committing my life to Christ is eternal life."

Christianity is for sinners who know that "The wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Romans 6:23).

Our task, then, is first to preach about sin and righteousness and judgment, and then to preach the Gospel. We can do our part with confidence if we preach God's Word, because (1) God's Word has power (cf. Heb. 4:12, Is. 55:11); (2) men know in their hearts that they are sinners against the holy, living God (cf. Rom. 1:32); and (3) the Holy Spirit is at work to awaken this knowledge in them (cf. John 16:8-11).

When God brings a man to repent, he feels his burden of sin so heavily that he knows how sin and sin alone is his problem. It has separated him from God (Is. 59:2), without whom he cannot live. He sees how hateful is his sin, and how just is God's sentence of condemnation (Ps. 51:4). He would do anything to be rid of his sin, but he cannot escape. He can do nothing but cry out in despair. He is dead in trespasses and sins (cf. Eph. 2:1).

Then when we tell him, "Christ died for our sins..." no longer does he wonder from his mind, "How do I believe?" instead, from the depth of his heart he shouts, "Hallelujah! Christ died for my sins! I have new life through his resurrection!" Then he understands the Good News. He hates his old sins and will have nothing to do with them; he believes that Christ died for those sins; he has been converted. He knows that the Gospel really is "the power of God for salvation." (Rom. 1:16).

Now the point is this: How about you? Are you converted? Or has someone given you the Bad Advice?