4-27-1971

The Opinion - Vol. 10, No. 08

Fuller Theological Seminary

M. Bruce Dreon

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/fts-opinion

Recommended Citation
Fuller Theological Seminary and Dreon, M. Bruce, "The Opinion - Vol. 10, No. 08" (1971). The Opinion. 134.
https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/fts-opinion/134

This Periodical is brought to you for free and open access by the Fuller Seminary Publications at Digital Commons @ Fuller. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Opinion by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Fuller. For more information, please contact archives@fuller.edu.
CONTENTS

BLACK STUDIES AT FULLER SEMINARY? .......... Jack Irwin
PORNOGRAPHY AND PERSONHOOD .......... Dennis Nelson
THE RED SEA SCROLLS: A NEW PAPYRUS .... Reid Trulson
SERMON: "MR. PRESIDENT, THE JURY IS IN!" ... George F. Regas
REIFYING RADICAL RIGHTEOUSNESS: OR
WHO'S RIGHT DEPENDS ON WHO IS LEFT ... Doug Stevens

UNIVERSALISM, EVANGELISM, AND PREDESTINATION .... Larry Hicks
A MISSIONARY AND THE BIBLICAL LANGUAGES .... Sam Pittman

SEMINARY LIFE: A WIFE'S EYE VIEW ......... Char Warner

Editor-in Chief
M. Bruce Dreon
Managing Editor
Larry Hicks

Editorial Staff
Ted Dorman
Bill Spradlin
Thomas Provence
Stephen Wilburn

The Opinion is published thrice quarterly by the students
of Fuller Theological Seminary. Positions expressed herein
are those solely of the authors and are not to be construed
as the view of the Seminary, faculty, student council or
editors of The Opinion.
BLACK STUDIES AT FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY?
by Jack Irwin

"Fuller Seminary ought to be the place in this country which is signif­
icantly attempting to train black evangelical leadership. I don't know of
many seminaries in this country which have really good black studies pro­
grams. I don't know of any seminary in this country which has a better oppor­
tunity than this one to train black evangelical leadership. The authority
you have by virtue of you competence, by virtue of your history, by virtue
of what you are, ought to be directed toward, I think, a peculiar need,
that is, new black evangelical leadership production in this country." So
did Dr. Shelby Rooks underscore his address to trustees, students, and faculty
on 25 March. His message was prophetic and came from a quarter little heard
from by Fuller Seminary. Dr. Rooks is black and from the East. As Execu­
tive Director of the Fund for Theological Education and part-time employee
of the American Association of Theological Seminaries, the accrediting asso­
ciation for seminaries, he spoke from a wealth of expertise about theological
education and especially about black theological education.

At a time when the seminary seems yet unsure about what its commitmen­
t should be, Dr. Rooks outlined two alternatives for Fuller's movement into
black studies. The first alternative is the education of white ministers
about the black community. The second is the training of black ministers.
The first can be accomplished without doing the second, while the second has
the first as a by-product.

The first alternative of educating whites is necessary so that they will
be men better equipped to be ministers of reconciliation in our society.
White leaders, and particularly white ministers, need to understand what is
happening to society as a whole, and particularly to the black community,
said Rooks. A breakdown of America's segregated society is not foreseea­
able, and in fact, racial polarization is increasing. Even though we live in sep­
arate communities, he continued, we live too close not to understand each
other.

Rooks suggested three avenues to educate future white ministers: one,
hire a black professor, two, include black bibliography and black teaching
materials in all regular courses by all teachers; and three, provide experi­
ences which enable the white student to understand the black community. A
black faculty member is necessary for program development and dialogue within
the seminary community. Contrary to the belief of some, the black community
is not closed to whites. Dialogue through visiting lecturers, visits by
students to black community organizations, etc., can facilitate understanding.
The cost would be at the most $20,000, depending upon the professor's salary.

The first purpose can indeed by accomplished without a black student
presence at the seminary. The second purpose cannot, and this is the produc­
tion of black leaders to meet the needs of the black church and its commu­
nity.

There are several reasons underlying the need for a program to train
black ministers. First, there exists a deficiency of trained black leader­
ship. Second, there is a desperate lack of institutions which provide train­
ing for blacks. According to Dr. Rooks, 2% of black ministers in the U.S.
have no theological training. Patterns of segregation, consciously or
unconsciously, individual or institutional, have closed this sort of training
to blacks. Although they have few places to go, there are today black
young people interested in ministerial training. The respect for education by
black young people is rising, the number of black college graduates is in­
creasing, and there are blacks of evangelical beliefs, said Rooks.
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Dr. Rooks continued:

I know that there are young men and women out there willing to commit themselves to the service of Christ in this way, but I don't know of anybody in this country who is really at it—the task of seeking them and training them in any viable way.... There are plenty of liberal schools that are willing to train black students, you know. There are some evangelical students who go to these schools and become dissatisfied with what they receive in terms of their whole orientation, their faith, and all the rest of it. And they really don't have anywhere else to go because they don't think anybody else wants them from their own milieu.

Evangelical blacks must almost always go to liberal seminaries. Seminary training for blacks is pitifully inadequate. There are only five black seminaries in the country, all in the East. A recent AATS study revealed that there are only 665 black students enrolled in AATS accredited and associate schools, while black churches run over 40,000 with membership exceeding 10,000,000.

Third, black ministerial leadership is necessary to carry out the witness of Christ in our urban and black communities. It is becoming increasingly difficult for the white to minister and witness to the urban communities: black, chico, or otherwise. Discrimination and memory of and continuing suffering which whites have inflicted upon blacks mediate against the acceptance of anything given by whites, including the gospel. Consequently, there must be trained leadership for the black church to carry on the gospel witness. God will raise up his own witnesses, but He may have to circumvent the avenue that creates church leadership through seminaries. Considering the increasing black population in urban areas, Rooks said, "Unless something drastic is done by seminaries to meet this situation much of white American protestant witness in the inner city...and perhaps Christian witness will be divorced forever from the urban setting."

Fourth and last, is the curious position of the black church in its community. Unlike the white church, the black church is the most viable and powerful institution in its own community. It has the people and power to influence and meet community needs, physical and spiritual. Rooks said that trained leadership which can assess and meet those needs through the church is necessary. I add here that increasingly black students are becoming aware that because of the black church's position, it can be used as an instrument of social change. Although many are not committed to Christ, they will fill the pastorates of black churches and will control that organization, unless seminaries such as Fuller produce leadership which is committed to Christ. In view of this fact, to do nothing is to sit back and give the enemy the black church.

The training of black ministers is a much larger commitment than the education of white students. Blacks should be trained in the same program as whites, so that there is no black enclave and so that the entire seminary benefits from the black presence. Neither should the program have two standards, one for whites and one for blacks, Rooks said, but helps must be provided for the black students which account for the student's background and which accelerate his learning. The black student body should number 15 to 20 students, so that there are enough to effect a sense of community and
identity among themselves and in relationship to the local black community. Scholarship help is imperative since blacks have far fewer financial resources than whites. New courses and the inclusion of black material in present courses and a black professor are required. This commitment would run upwards of $80,000, said Rooks.

Dr. Rooks was emphatic about the importance of black studies and black ministerial training to the church and the reconciliation of society. The real and hard question is whether Fuller Seminary will regard the issue of black studies urgent, timely and significant enough to make a commitment in a wholehearted way to either of these two alternatives: education of white ministers and training of black church leadership. For either purpose the first step is the hiring of a black professor. The seminary should regard this as an important enough priority to make a tangible commitment of $20,000 now at least to educate whites. This will continue the start made by the addition of Mr. Pannell to the trustees and the past presence of Mr. Bentley. The gospel should even move us on to the more difficult task of training black ministers, especially considering the task of witnessing in a segregated, pluralistic society.

Clearly, not to educate white ministers about the pluralistic culture of our land is to produce ministers who will be, except for their own individual efforts, crippled in their assessment and response to what is going on in society. Will this not influence the cause of Christ for years into the future? A student question echoes this concern: what can we as future white ministers do about racial discrimination and injustices? The seminary should commit in actions as well as in words of intent and character its resources to help them find the answer.

Even more striking is the impression from Dr. Rooks and others that not to train black church leadership which is committed to Christ, is to turn our backs forever on the witness of Christ in the inner city. Certainly, Fuller must decide whether the crisis in the lack of trained evangelical black leadership warrants that it is God's will that we do something about it now.

Either of these alternatives demands an evaluation and perhaps even a rearrangement of present priorities. Unless this is done, the opportunities now present will be ignored and may be lost. They may not wait while we attend to matters which at present seem more important, because they are ours naturally. Being white and suburbanite, we attend mostly to the matter of training ministers who staff churches in our own neighborhoods. Yet to continue our present pattern is not as good as we would like to think.

Some argue that these ideas are just salve on guilty white consciences, which we are inflicting on blacks regardless of their needs. I remind them that Dr. Rooks, a black himself and a leading authority on theological education, said that black studies can and should be done at Fuller. I rest my argument by quoting Dr. Rooks' final words, "For those of us who are black and who are thinking consciously about our own religious experience today believe that we have something to give you out of the stuff of our experience and our faith in Jesus Christ. We have something to give to you that may help to salvage Christianity for everybody in this nation."
"Pimping is not a sex game. It's a skull game." This apparently incongruous statement was made by Iceberg Slim, a former San Francisco pimp. Now certainly there is something out of joint (pun?) with a career like pimping. It is probably the lowest form of using women, and being successful requires an outright loathing for them. Slim goes on to say, "That's where the thrill was. In the absolute vilification, in the degradation. I had this intense hatred. To be a great pimp I think you've really got to hate your mother." But pimping is apparently not the only sex game which is actually a skull game. Behind pornography, in fact behind all sexual depravity, lies a similar misuse of what should be the most intimate and personal part of our lives.

Some people are audacious enough to defend pornography. Peter Michelson, in his book, The Aesthetics of Pornography, defines it as what excites other people. He claims even the ugliest pornography tells us something worth knowing about ourselves. However exploitative it may be, it reminds us of "the rhythm of expectation and frustration which marks our sexual lives".

Notice his use of the word "exploitative". What all X-rated films, all stag films, all pornographic literature have in common is that sex is used for exploiting another. Sex is not experienced as the epitome of the personal. Rather it is portrayed within the context of violence.

Hard core pornography, like Fanny Hill, reminds us of our animality, approves of it, and suggests what possibilities await it. Soft core, like The Adventurers, unlike the really dirty stuff, poses no real threat of moral anarchy but merely thrusts quantities of sex into silly stories, satisfying the reader's expectations. But both celebrate man's lust for wealth and power.

D. H. Lawrence has written a number of novels depicting the role of the power of the will within the sex drive. One of them, The Fox, was made into a motion picture about three years ago. Two lesbians are living in a secluded, woodland cottage. All is going well until a man appears who falls in love with one of them. Much of the novel is a portrayal of the power conflict between the man and one woman for the other woman. In the end the man wins by willing that a tree fall upon his competitor. Again, sex is not the occasion for being truly personal. Rather, it is the outward manifestation of a lust for power, control, and supremacy. In The Fox it was corrupted both in its heterosexual and in its perverted forms.

Hair is subtitled the "Tribal Rock Musical". But here we have a community based not upon love and humanness, but upon bestiality and animality. A community whose choreography is orgiastic in its passionate suggestiveness. A community where disregard for persons drives one more sensitive member to the despairing questions:

- How can people be so heartless?
- How can they ignore their friends?
- Easy to be hard,
- Easy to say No.
- Especially people who care about strangers,
- Why care about evil and social injustice.
- Do they only care about the bleeding crowds?
- How about a needing friend?
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I need a friend.
How can people have no feeling?
How can they ignore their friends?
Easy to be proud.
Easy to say No.

Pornography is a graphic perversion of personhood. Instead of saying we are persons made in the image of God, capable of relation, commitment, and faithfulness, it is capitalizing on man's need to conquer his companion. Visconti's recent film The Damned exposes what part the homosexual mind set had in shaping the Nazi mentality. Even artistic pornography, as that of Henry Miller, is merely a term we usefully apply to books coping with sex material that would be outrageous in another context.

Sure, pornography tells us something true about ourselves. Sure, as Milton has portrayed in Paradise Lost, a man's lustful desire to tyrannize a woman, even his wife, is an inevitable part of fallen sexuality. In contrast is the perfect love of the pre-fallen Adam and Eve, after eating the fruit of the forbidden tree

As with new wine intoxicated both,
They swim in mirth, and fancy that they feel
Divinity within them breeding wings
Wherewith to scorn the earth. But that false fruit
Far other operation first displayed,
Carnal desire inflaming. He on Eve
Began to cast lascivious eyes; she him
As wantonly repaid; in lust they burn.

(Book IX, lines 1008-1015)

Let us not excuse pornography as realism. Neither let us be prudish and condemn it as mere filth or as a mere silly, dirty story. Rather, let us realize that it is a perversion of the most personal. Let us see it as a corruption of the desire to give in to an insatiable demand to receive. Although it tells us about ourselves, it only causes more grief in an area already overburdened with misery.

THE RED SEA SCROLLS: A NEW PAPYRUS
by Reid Trulson

Editor's Note: A manuscript form Pharaoh's crypt was recently discovered. This antique shows in Trite-ish prose what history almost smothered.

And though, despite no copyright (and Eerdmans' flat refusal)
The questioned text is printed next for your detailed perusal:

The forest land was gray and bland
the animals were drear.
A morbid crew, were mouse and shrew
and skunk and fox and deer.
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For weeks on end their time they'd spend
just feeling really blah.
And nothing gay could make them say
or even think, "hoorah".

To the west there stood, close by the wood,
a cemetery lot.
And there a mole dwelt in a hole
down by the fuller plot.

This mole indeed had learned to read
(I heard this from the birds)
By studying hard, inside that yard,
those monumental words.

Then came the day, (the birds all say)
when Mole received a letter.
It made him blink, then stop and think
and then the mole felt better.

The note had come directly from:
some far-off foreign brothers.
He felt such joy, he cried, "Oh Boy!!!
I must go tell the others!"

Through forest glade his way he made
to spread the happy word.
He did his best and did not rest
till everyone had heard.

Then every beast, from west to east,
found all the blues had ended.
They lost their blues on hearing news
of what the mole intended.

The forest glen had joy again;
the skunks and mice were glad.
The toad and bear were happy there,
and Snake stopped acting bad.

They danced and sang. The forest rang
with such a merry sound.
In fun they basked, till beaver asked
why Mole was not around.

The friends of Mole went to his hole
and had a tunnel vision.
For there they found, deep underground,
Mole, working with precision.

Just packing sacks and stacking packs
and tucking things away,
And storing books and filling nooks
and locking cupboards gray.
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And when his hoard was safely stored
and all his rooms looked bare,
He turned around and sat right down
his satchel to repair.

Then Mousie, small, who'd watched it all
advanced and posed this query:
"Kind Mole, Dear Sir, why such a stir?
Why make yourself so weary?

Why lock your locks and stop your clocks?
Why tuck things under bed?"
"Why, don't you know? I'm going to go
out harvesting," he said.

"The crop, I've heard, has now matured.
The harvest all is white.
It's time to reap and save and keep.
I'll leave this very night!"

Then Dog remarked (in fact, he barked)
"And where's your bread for fare?"
The mole replied, all humble-eyed,
"You'll have to help me there."

"We first must know," said Turtle, slow,
"how you intend to travel.
Will't be by plain, or by terrain,
or walking on the gravel?"

But witness now the tragic row
when Mole replied, "By plain."
"That's bad!" "That's grave!" "Oh we must save!"
came back the quick refrain.

"Now wait! Now wait! Let's contemplate.
We're noble beasts," said Goat.
"We should not shout and shove about;
let's settle this by vote."

The tension rose while each one chose
to help or not to help.
And when at last the die was cast,
the verdict was.............

Editor's Note: The manuscript right here was ripped.
This fragment's all they found.
The current trend to guess the end
is textually unsound.

And though we've punned, and joked, and funned,
our mission isn't through.
The end, you see, in turn must be
contributed by you.
SERMON: "MR. PRESIDENT, THE JURY IS IN!"
by George F. Regas

The prophetic voice of George F. Regas, Rector of All Saints Episcopal Church in Pasadena has spoken to our community in his sermon, "Mr. President, The Jury is In!" The following condensed version of this sermon is reprinted in The Opinion for your prayerful consideration with the commendation of Fuller's Peace Section of the Social Concerns Committee.

In a nationwide televised press conference March 4th, President Nixon addressed himself to the extension of the Indochina War into Laos and Cambodia by South Vietnamese troops and American air power and called on the American people to stand behind him "while the jury is still out." He asked the people "not to harken to the drumbeat of television commentary which takes a pessimistic view of the war."

I respectfully say that the President is wrong. The jury is not still out. They rendered their verdict long ago and a majority of the country is pessimistic and conscience-sick about the Indochina War.

The jury has spoken in almost every corner of the globe and called the Vietnam War a colossal misadventure. Gunnar Myrdal, in his monumental study of Southeast Asia, *Asian Drama*, points out that we got into Vietnam originally because we sensed that Communism would fill the power vacuum left by French withdrawal, and that we believed we could show the Vietnamese a better way than Communism. We claimed to be the defenders of freedom, honoring our commitment to support a free nation against aggression from within and without. That is a generous interpretation of our initial involvement.

But now, as we look at what our presence has in fact accomplished over this last decade—looking at the monstrous results, many of us find it impossible to justify this kind of suffering and destruction in the name of democratic principles. Are the Vietnamese really better off dead than Red? And who made Americans the gods that should decide their fate?

Oh, the physical destruction and suffering of Vietnam. But there is also the death of the spirit and the erosion of conscience in this land of ours. Something has happened to America because of Vietnam, and our basic decency as a people can no longer be taken for granted.

Mr. President, the jury is in. The cost is too great; the suffering among the peoples of three of the poorest nations in the world and the continued loss of American lives can't possibly be justified.

Yet the war goes on. Death continues to reign and we are given assurance that an expansion of the war is really a de-escalation and a way to hasten the withdrawal of our troops. Seeing what we've done to Vietnam, looking straight at that ravaged land, we say bombing of Cambodia and Laos is necessary to protect freedom and safeguard Southeast Asia from Communism.

The jury is in! We won't listen to the same phony rhetoric America has heard for a decade from their leaders at every stage of this country's long, misguided plunge into the Southeast Asia morass. The contradiction between what is being said and what is being done has reached the point of sustained insult to the intelligence of the American people.

Surely the jury is in! Vietnam is a colossal mistake and a tragic commentary on America's belief in sacredness of every person in the sight of God and his right to self-determination.

Mr. President, if we are silent, it is not because we are waiting for the jury's return. It is only because the scandal of Vietnam no longer
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scandalizes us. We've heard that body count so frequently, watched the television's report of the suffering so long, and allowed the political rhetoric to mesmerize us that now we are numbed, anesthetized and silent. And that is not a mark of patriotism but of spiritual death—moral decay. How devastatingly cogent are those words of Jesus: "What does it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his own soul?"

In the name of all that is holy—all that is honorable—we must say, "Stop the war now!" No longer will we concur with the continuation of such massive violence. We must find ways to speak, for the Christian Church could make a stunning contribution to the world if it could say the right words.

The sin of "going along," when we could do otherwise, is costly to the Church in the sight of God, before the court of world opinion, and to those "little ones" who suffer in the bombed-out villages of Indochina.

Pastor Martin Niemoller's confession carries warning for us all: "In Germany, the Nazis came for the Communists, and I didn't speak up. Then for the Jews and I did not speak up because I was not a Jew. Then they came for the Trade Unionists and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Trade Unionist. Then they came for the Catholics and I was a Protestant so I didn't speak up. Then they came for me . . . by that time there was no one to speak up for anyone."

This parish must speak up and protest the war—our very soul depends on it. We are not at liberty to stick with safe and manageable subjects while the world convulses with violence and slaughter. And if the unity of this parish depends upon silence in the face of an extension of the war, then it is a church whose unity is spurious to begin with. Our oneness lies in a faithful obedience to the Jesus of love and mercy, not in a tacit agreement to keep everyone on board while waiting for a conflict-free consensus before raising our voice.

I ask you now to center your mind and heart in four aspects of my protest:

I

THE WAR HAS RAVAGED VIETNAM MERCILESSLY AND ERODED THE CONSCIENCE OF AMERICA.

It isn't necessary to visit Indochina to appreciate the horror of the war. The bare statistics will suffice. The tonnage of bombardment is now approaching three times the total bombs used by the American military in all theaters in World War II.

I won't go on into the endless horrors and atrocities caused by both sides. If only each of you would read just one book on the Vietnam War—any book—and realize all of this suffering comes from a war which the majority of Americans feel is a tragic error for our country.

And I grieve for all of us who have been brutalized and numbed by this war. I have found reading the news reports of Lt. Calley's trial for his part in the My Lai massacre a staggering experience.

"I was ordered to go in there and destroy the enemy. That was my job that day... I did not sit down and think in terms of men, women and children. They were all classified the same, and that was the classification that we dealt with—just as enemy soldiers.

I grieve for Lt. Calley because of what this war has done to his humanity. How could he say he never thought about it, just followed orders? I grieve for what war has done to us all. In Calley's painful story, it is the Vietnam War that stands revealed as the true monster. What that war is doing to many William Calleys growing up in America is immeasurable.
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In Houston, on October 27, 1967, Captain Eddie Rickenbacker said that "... peace demonstrators are a bunch of bums. The U.S. should bomb the ports, dams and population of North Vietnam. That's what airplanes are for. You're not fighting human beings over there—you're just fighting two-legged animals. The people are just slaves. That's all war is for is to kill and win, to destroy, to defeat the population of your enemy."

Surely, the words of Jesus shout to America: What does it profit a nation if it gains the whole world for democracy and loses its own soul? God have mercy on us for what the war is doing to the soul of a nation; for in many ways it is inflicting its dehumanizing shrapnel into all of our hearts.

The blind distortion of national priorities has produced deep estrangement and polarization in American society. How can we accept passively a society that now spends nearly 70% of its tax dollars on wars and their aftermath and the preparation for future wars? A committee report to Congress estimated the total cost of the Vietnam War if it ended in 1970 would be $350 billion. And the poor, hungry and oppressed around the globe cry out for a chance to live . . . .

One should understand why some of our citizens are so morally outraged at such a gross distortion of priorities. The case of the Berrigan brothers is an example. I know both Berrigan brothers personally and yet I am uncertain of their guilt in Hoover's conspiracy charges. We must await the trial. However, their actions of pouring homemade napalm on draft records at Catonsville, though grotesque to some and unacceptable to others, did one thing. Robert McAfee Brown of Stanford University says it dramatized, in unforgettable fashion, the grotesque moral priorities that have been erected in America and what has happened to the collective conscience of our nation: we are outraged when paper is burned at draft boards, and we are not outraged when children are burned in villages of Vietnam.

That statement is oversimplified, but it can't be dismissed without it tearing at your conscience.

Yet in spite of all this, Mr. Nixon says he will place no restraints on further bombing, except to rule out the use of nuclear weapons; that we will not be defeated in Indochina; and that he would not speculate on whether South Vietnamese would invade North Vietnam on their own!

The verdict is in! Will you remain silent?

IF THE CHURCH ATTEMPTS TO FOLLOW JESUS, IT WILL RAISE ITS VOICE IN MORAL OUTRAGE.

I am fully aware that I could be wrong in urging this parish to protest the war. I speak to you humbly acknowledging how often I have failed in my own discipleship. There are no easy solutions and there are no neat black and white distinctions on the morality of war. If we make the mistake of thinking there is all black on one side of the issue and all white on the other, we will be wrong nine out of ten times. I intend to reach out and put my arms around all who strongly disagree with this sermon, for we can live together in Christian love.

Yet we cannot allow this to immobilize us. The integrity of the Church's message depends on raising our voice against a war no one wants being allowed to destroy our soul.
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The Christian Faith says the jury is in . . . . We don't need to see how the devastation of Laos and Cambodia is going to affect the war; we believe that life is sacred everywhere. Everyone bears in his body the image of his membership in the human family and the image of the living God. How many Vietnamese is one American worth? One, five, forth, a thousand?

The Vietnam War is a sin against the human family; its dehumanization has left its scar on us all that will remain for years. The brutality of Indochina is reflected by the callousness in the streets of America. When life is cheap anywhere, it is cheap everywhere.

If this parish remains silent in the face of all that continues to brutalize us, what is there, then, to validate our Christian way of life?

III
WHAT CAN AMERICA DO IF IT IS NOT TO LOSE ITS SOUL?

First, America must repent. I think Senator Fulbright was wrong when he said the great society of America has become a sick society. Eric Fromm says that this is another way of excusing ourselves since sickness is something that happens to one involuntarily and for which one cannot be held accountable. Fromm asserts that American society is not sick but immoral. Our sickness is really sin. I believe he is right.

What is called for is not guilt but repentance. So long as we try to justify the horrors perpetuated in Indochina, so long as we continue to talk about saving face and keeping our honor, so long as we figure the cost of the war is a little too much and perhaps it was a mistake to get in so deep—the soul of the nation will continue to be eroded within the grip of death.

There is one way left that leads to new life—repentance. The word of God judges this nation; and it can bring healing, too. What a rebirth could come to the greatest, most powerful nation in the history of the world if she said—I was wrong! God have mercy! The death of pride would be the rebirth of integrity.

Second, we should protect the lives of our soldiers but we must come home immediately. Let the President set a clear time table of withdrawal. We will leave Southeast Asia and if the Thieu-Ky regime can't stand on its own, then let it fall. Integrity won't allow us to keep Thieu-Ky government in power through American guns and dollars.

Third, we must pay the price for peace. Everyone wants peace—but so seldom have we been willing to use the great reservoirs of this nation for healing. "And nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." To have that vision and pay the cost of its fulfillment—what a great moment that would be in the history of civilization.

IV
THE CHURCH SHOULD MOBILIZE ITS RESOURCES TO END THE WAR.

In a recent "Peanuts" cartoon, the setting is a baseball game. Charlie Brown is about to pitch when his teammate, Lucy, suggests that he aim to hit the batter. Charlie reacts violently: "It wouldn't be right . . . ." There follows a long discussion with all Charlie's teammates joining in. Everything under the sun comes into the debate: "What about the children's
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crusade? Was that moral? What about those awful movie ads you see nowadays? Define morality . . . . Finally, in despair, Charlie Brown says, "We never win any ballgames, but we sure have some interesting discussions!"

We've talked enough. I call upon this great parish of All Saints to take a step larger than we ever thought we would. I ask for a massive mobilization of the parish by establishing a "Peace Operation Center."

The protests of young radicals have made their mark but fallen short of any major reformation of the war system. My hope is to radicalize the establishment—myself being one of them—and take middle America and give their good will and their desire to build a world of peace clearer focus and more effective power.

Each must decide in his own conscience what to do. Each must define for himself what Jesus, the Prince of Peace, means in the midst of the Indochina War. Each must formulate his judgments on America and how to change it. And we must respect each other's conclusions.

But given the opportunity at this late hour of our nation's history, I'm confident many of you will want to share corporately in this ministry of life and healing.

This parish is small against the magnitude of the problem; yet I believe profoundly in the power of just a few who have caught the vision of a peaceful world.

I am confident that there are thousands in Pasadena and Los Angeles today willing to contribute their lives to the healing of the world. One of the high marks of the '60s was the response given to the Peace Corps. The late President Kennedy proposed a corps organized to bring light and knowledge to the underdeveloped nations of the world. Hardly had the announcement of the Peace Corps come from the lips of President Kennedy than there were four times the number of volunteers as could be sent. Find all the faults you wish with the Peace Corps; but it still means this: Americans have a hunger to do something with hope and heart and love in it, something more than animal. We shall seek to provide the channel.

REIFYING RADICAL RIGHTEOUSNESS: OR WHO'S RIGHT DEPENDS ON WHO IS LEFT by Doug Stevens

(A J. Edgar Agnew Sing-along: from a 10th c. Gregorian chant)

Its Phase I
Drop the Bomb
On North Vietnam
Facilitating a speedy withdrawal.
The Viet Cong
Will never get along
Without some friendly assistance (assistants).
Off the gooks
You'll get some dirth looks
But saving face is the name of the game (salvation of the face?).
Its Phase II
After Lieutenant Calley
The war's a dead-end alley
Even Dick doesn't need a weatherman (reign, reign).
Peace on earth, good will towards dao (bing-bong, anyone?)
Stop asking how? just get out now! (don't think twice, it's alright)
Before they apply for statehood.
Laos, Cambodia
This kind of grows on ya
(Patton or McArthur would be in Mongolia).
Uncle Ho's Trail
And the Holy Grail
Tend to be a little elusive—illusive? ("We're on the trail's trail now, sir.")

Its Phase III
You know peace won't come to Asian lands
Just because we pull out upon demand
The feud just might keep on (just might).
But when we're gone (Right On! and on)
From the hamlets and cities and air bases and paddies and valleys and mountains and fire bases and rivers and deltas and beaches of Viet Nam (such nostalgia can really get to you after 15 or more memorable years) maybe,
Everyone will realize that it just ain't the same old bluddy War without us (U.S. absconditus).

Lights fade. Drum roll, into "The Rabble, Him and the Republic".
Give me a P ...
UNIVERSALISM, EVANGELISM, AND PREDESTINATION (con't)

This is utter nonsense! Did not Paul ask the questions: "How can they be saved unless they hear? And how can they hear without a preacher?" We must assert that in God's sovereign plan, he willed that we would be used to carry out his election. We are the instruments to lead God's elect to himself. In a sense, through our witness to Christ, we lead the elect to salvation. The doctrine of predestination does not rule out evangelism. It would be unbiblical and absurd to say that it does. God has predestined his saved ones, but we are told to be witnesses to the ends of the earth to lead men to salvation. We have the awesome privilege of participating in God's sovereign decree of election. He uses us sinful human beings to bring the elect to himself.

Now, we can draw an analogy between universalism and predistination in relation to evangelism. If God did predestine our salvation, and who here would deny that he did, then we were saved by God, not by man. But God used man to bring us to salvation, so evangelism was essential. If universalism is accepted, evangelism is necessary, just as if we accept predistination. For God's command to witness would still be relevant for us, just as his command to witness is relevant for the predestinarian. Although the predestinarian knows that all the elect will be called to salvation, he still tells the good news because God has so commanded, and he desires to have a part in God's plan. Although the universalist believes that all will be saved, he still tells the good news, for he too has been commanded to witness and he wants to participate in God's sovereign plan. Therefore, if the predestinarian must practice evangelism, so must the universalist.

It might be objected that the predestinarian knows that only some will be saved, and as he witnesses, he cannot know in advance who will be of the elect or of the nonelect, so he has a motive to preach the gospel to all. While on the other hand, the universalist knows that all will be saved anyway, so he would have no motive to witness. We must put up a red flag here and ask the question: but what is our motive for witnessing? Is it not that God commands us to do so? Even if we believe that in the long run all will be saved, we still must practice evangelism! For God has commanded us to preach the gospel, and to be truly satisfied in him, we must do what he says. Our motive for evangelism is not to be able to add up the number of brands we have plucked from the fire, but it is to follow the command of God, because he loves us and we love him. This holds true for both universalists and predestinarians. Human reasoning from both schools of thought could theorize the preaching of the gospel as unnecessary, but God's command to witness is as binding on one as it is on the other.

Editors Note: This is the first of a series of articles written by Fuller alumni on the use of biblical languages in their ministry. Mr. Pittman is a CBFMS missionary to Pakistan. He is presently studying at Fuller in the D. Min. program.

A MISSIONARY AND THE BIBLICAL LANGUAGES
by Sam Pittman

My experience represents only one from among thousands of missionaries, but here it is--for whatever it may (or may not) be worth.

I have not used Hebrew in any direct way at all since leaving Fuller in 1952. I think it did serve as valuable background to a later course in
A MISSIONARY AND THE BIBLICAL LANGUAGES (con't)

Arabic, however, which in turn proved to be profitable in my learning and understanding of Urdu. But the connection with Urdu is really quite remote. I never particularly enjoyed the study of Hebrew nor found it exciting as a language. I labored as a missionary with a sense of relief that I never had the necessity for using it. Regretfully, I have only made occasional use of Greek in spite of the fact that I have always been very fond of it, having taken two years of classical Greek in college plus a number of seminary courses in Biblical exegesis.

My limited usage of the languages, however, does not reflect opinions as to their value, or as to requirements for their study in seminary. First, with respect to Hebrew, I am thankful for the two years (required by Fuller in the early 50's) which I took. If nothing else, the discipline was profitable, and I do not consider Hebrew to have been a waste of time, in spite of its non-usage since. However, it is doubtful that the discipline of Hebrew study, though valuable as far as I am concerned, is sufficient warrant to make it a requirement for everyone. Indeed some students who have such obviously great difficulty with it may spend more time in study than is commensurate with even the valuable discipline required.

Without entering into the debate over requirements, I can only look with shame upon the limited usage I have made of Greek, especially considering my background in and liking for the language. Yet when I did on occasion refer to Greek I was most thankful for the fact I knew something about it. I could (and should) have done far more with it than I did. Specifically, there were several opportunities to utilize the Greek language:

1) In sermon preparation (for English-speaking audiences) I was able to make use of commentaries and know what they meant when they used Greek terms. I could (and did) refer to the original language in my messages and do it with confidence. My English-speaking congregation (representing about ten countries) also knew I had studied Greek and respected my references to it--this in contrast to one of my colleagues who liked to refer to the Greek although both he and the congregation knew that he had never studied it.

2) One young man in our congregation, a layman in the British High Commission had lived and worked in Greece. Prior to that he had exhibited a keen interest in Greek language and culture which he had studied in the university. He himself read the Greek New Testament. A preacher or pastor seldom runs across such laymen, but when he does, it is a pretty good feeling for the pastor himself also to know some Greek. In fact, I would have been pretty embarrassed if I had never studied it. Imagine being a minister without any knowledge of Greek trying to teach and preach the New Testament to a layman who does! That could have been my situation. Thankfully it wasn't.

3) In teaching Pakistani boys in Bible school I could confidently refer to the Greek when necessary, although the level of teaching and the background and ability of the students did not often require it. Yet just the fact that I had studied and could refer to the Greek elicited great respect from the Pakistani students.

4) Shortly before we left for furlough an invitation came to take part in a new translation of the Scriptures into the Urdu language. I was specifically asked because of my background in Greek. I did not feel adequate to the task, however, for I had not kept up my Greek as I should. Nevertheless opportunity for its use was there had I been prepared.
A MISSIONARY AND THE BIBLICAL LANGUAGES (con't)

I was forced to do an in-depth study of Greek once again to prepare for my D. Min. reading requirement. My preparation once again reminded me of the devotional and spiritual value of just reading the New Testament in Greek. I have resolved never again to neglect (as I have done in the past) the greatest book ever written—the Greek New Testament.

SEMINARY LIFE: A WIFE'S EYE VIEW
by Char Warner

Recently a few particularly sensitive and perceptive male students at Fuller began to wonder how the wife of a student experiences seminary life and the relationship with her husband while working to support him and perhaps children. Since I am the wife of a third year theology student, I have been asked by The Opinion staff to share the ways in which I experience seminary life and to express my feelings about working to support my family while my husband attends Fuller.

We have been married for five years and have a four-year-old son. I began working for the first time when my husband entered Fuller three years ago. Neither of us really wanted me to go to work, particularly because our son was so young (he was not quite two years-old) but saw it as the only way we were going to make it through seminary without incurring large debts. I was additionally anxious about employment because of my limited skills and lack of experience. I finally went to work, however, as a switchboard operator for a counseling clinic some distance from home. The greatest adjustment I had to make to this new arrangement was getting used seeing my son for only a half hour in the morning and two to three hours at night. I think I spent many hours crying over all the experiences he would have that I wouldn't be able to share; all the questions he would ask that I wouldn't be there to answer; and all the care and love he would need which I felt only his mother could give him. Fortunately we found an excellent babysitter caring for other children our son's age. We also tried to arrange my husband's schedule in such a way that he would have no obligations in the afternoon and could care for our son at home. This relieved my anxiety to a large extent, but I must confess that I have continually experienced guilt feelings because I have had to be away from my child.

I had worked at the switchboard for seven months when I accepted another job as office secretary for a mission board located one block from home. This position entailed much more responsibility than the previous one and was in this way more challenging and interesting for me. The greatest advantage, however, was the close proximity to the seminary and our home on Ford Place. I was able to have lunch at home with my family every day, and often met my husband for chapel or coffee. Generally I came to feel more in touch with my husband's life at the seminary. I changed jobs two more times after this; one position was a rather bad experience, and the other was particularly good, contributing in many and various ways to my growth as a person.

Another difficulty in my working has been especially evident during periods when I have been unhappy with my job or struggling with some problem involving relationships with co-workers. At these times my husband has felt somewhat guilty that it was necessary for me to work at all. I think he has always wished that I could remain at home as wife and mother and that he would be able to support us adequately himself while going to school at the same time. But this was not possible.
The picture I have painted thus far is pretty much a negative one, and I want to share with you the positive sides also. I feel that the advantages of my experience as a "working wife" have far out weighed the disadvantages. First, I am pleased with the way in which my son has developed into such an independent and secure little person. I think this is in many ways the result of the time he has spent with his father and the subsequent strong relationship which has developed between them. My husband, I find, has been able to do for our son all that I thought only a mother could do.

Second, I think my working has increased the necessity for teamwork in my relationship with my husband. We have had to share schedules, housekeeping and child care, thus eliminating the tendency toward putting ourselves or each other into the traditional, stifling roles of "breadwinner" and "homemaker." Because of this each of us tends to look upon the other as an autonomous rather than seeing the other as an extension of the self with "complementary" functions.

The third positive outcome of this arrangement has been the discovery or, perhaps, establishment, of my own personhood. Through the jobs I have held, I have been exposed to a wide variety of people and ideas and experiences. I have discovered how I function in my uniqueness as a person, and how I relate to and come across to other people. I have also learned much about how other people affect me and why. The greatest part of this is that I no longer define myself as "Dave's wife" or "Mike's mother," but rather as myself, a person, who happens to have a special relationship with Dave and Mike... and relationships with many other persons as well.

I have said little here concerning how I experience seminary life as the wife of a student. This is probably because I do not experience seminary life in this way, and cannot. I have had a relationship of my own to the seminary through employment for the last year, and through living in seminary housing for the last three years. This has been relatively positive. But I see my husband's relationship to Fuller as his own and separate from mine. As he shared with me what is happening in classes or between other seminary-related persons and himself, I experience him--not Fuller Seminary. I suggest that no wife without her own relationship to the seminary can experience in any way the life of the seminary student. She can only experience the seminary's effects upon her husband--whether his own relationship with the school is stimulating to growth as a person and as a Christian or whether he is being stifled in these areas.

Editor's Note: It is our hope that all the Fuller community will find something of value in The Opinion. This article has been written by a seminarian's wife to be of interest to other wives. We welcome a response from another.