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"IS CHARLES E. FULLER'S DREAM A REALITY TODAY?"
by Paul W. Burroughs

What was Charles E. Fuller's dream? Like Charles G. Finney and Charles H. Spurgeon before him, Charles E. Fuller discovered that soul winning was the business of the people of God, and that preachers of the Gospel of Christ who are not soul winners are of all people to be most pitied. All three of these great soul winning preachers dreamed of reproducing themselves through the establishment of a school that would train God's ministers to be soul winners. Finney's dream came true in Oberlin College, Spurgeon's in Pastor's College, and Fuller's in Fuller Theological Seminary.

Are students at FTS now being trained in soul winning? How many of Fuller's graduates that are soul winners learned their discipline from FTS as it operates today? Could it be that the only men who leave Fuller as soul winners were already soul winners before they came to Fuller, and that any advancement received from FTS could just as well qualify them for a degree in pulling teeth?

If Fuller's dream is not a full blown reality at FTS today, then what are the reasons for this failure? First, let's look at the student body. How many students at FTS are called by God to be ministers of the Gospel? According to Spurgeon, if you are called, then you must be the following kind of man:

1. You must be born again.
2. You must be a mature and advanced believer, knowing the Scriptures, grounded in the basic doctrines of the faith, and settled as to your own beliefs.
3. You must be entirely holy, not given to any common failings. (In short, God's minister's must be the pick of all the Christian hosts; such men indeed, that if the nation wanted kings they could not do better than elevate them to the throne.)
4. You must have an intense, all-consuming desire for the ministry. If you can be content at any other profession or station in life, then swiftly run to it; the ministry is not for you.
5. You must be endowed with a degree of speaking ability, which you will cultivate and increase.
6. You must see a measure of conversion-work under your efforts. As a man to be set apart for the ministry, your commission is without seals until souls are won by your instrumentality. There must be some measure of conversion-work in your irregular labors before you can believe that preaching is to be your life-work.
7. Your preaching must be acceptable to the people of God.

This is the sort of men that we students are supposed to be when we apply for entrance to FTS. This is the sort of men that FTS should make sure that we are before we are allowed to enter. In so far as FTS has allowed draft dodgers and ambitious men to presume a call from God and mock his pulpits, it has failed to fulfill the dream of C. E. Fuller.

Second, let's look at the faculty. What sort of men would be qualified to instruct men called to the ministry? Obviously it takes soul winners to train soul winners. Faculty members must have the attributes listed above and be very well esteemed as soul winners. Otherwise the students would be more advanced than the faculty members. In so far as FTS hires faculty members that have not been exercised by the battle for souls, men who cannot preach and teach with the unction of God, it has failed to fulfill the dream of C. E. Fuller.

If we completely lose sight of the vision that started FTS, then we will be one more seminary on the already flooded list of seminaries that have lost their power.
A REPLY TO PAUL BURROUGHS
by Gary Klein

In the preceding article, Paul argues that FTS is being untrue to its heritage and is failing as a theological seminary, because it is not producing "soul winners". He does not define what he means by "soul winning", so one does not know exactly what his criticism implies. Is he thinking along the lines of that dualistic conception which cares only about the redemption of men's "souls", and not their "bodies"? But, given the nature of the biblical view of Creation, Man, and the Resurrection of the body, I do not see how one could so limit the redemption of Christ.

Of course, Paul might only mean that FTS is not producing students who have a burden, and the ability, for bringing men to a personal conversion to Christ. If this is the case, then I would agree with Paul's assessment that Fuller is failing. But, I do not think that this is the case; from what I see, Fuller is sending graduates into the world who are really committed to the prospect of bringing the gospel to all men. There are many graduates who are actively engaged in the work of missions, evangelism, and the pastorate.

But, herein is Fuller's greatness; it realizes that although all men are called to be witnesses of Christ, not all men are called to the same ministry. Some are pastors, some are evangelists, some are counselors, others are scholars and teachers. If all were trained to be "soul winners", then who would do the work of Christian nurture, who would work for social justice (reconciliation)?

Paul attributes part of Fuller's failure to a student body which contains "draft dodgers", "ambitious men", and others who are not really called. He then suggests seven criteria by which to judge whether you are called or not, but these criteria seem to be more applicable to one who has already graduated from seminary and is entering the ordained ministry. Many of the prophets and apostles would not be able to meet these criteria. It seems to me, that (2) and (6) virtually eliminate the need for a seminary education. No one could meet (3), since no one is entirely holy in himself, we are only holy insofar as Christ's holiness has become ours. Jeremiah and Jonah would be eliminated by (4); and (5) would certainly leave Moses, and probably Paul, out of the picture.

The seventh requirement is the most objectionable. The preaching of Jeremiah, Amos, Hosea, and Paul was not always acceptable to the people of God. One could imagine Calvin trying to decide if he was called or not, by asking whether his preaching was always acceptable to the people. If you combine (7) with the dualistic disjunction between soul and body, you come up with that combination which has been so characteristic of American revivalism in the tradition of Finney, Sunday, and others. The American South is a perfect example of this. You can preach the Gospel of love and conversion (of souls) as long as you do not apply it to the material conditions in society. What does civil rights and social justice matter, if your souls are damned?

FTS does well to train its students in the task of "making disciples" (in all of its implications), teaching them to preach the Word in season and out of season.
VERMINORIA
(A Mock Heroic)
by Stephen S. Wilburn

O many-winged harbinger of day
Dawn's fiery spray cleansing all
Resoluting chords from misty dissonance emerge;
Even so, thou shimmering, lucid vermin
Begin thy journey 'neath junction of wall and floor.
Nothing fearing, the bold adventurer
Bearing the shield of the colorless cross
Gains impetus to transgress so bleak a wasteland.
With nothing to aid save celestial wisdom
'Gainst scarlet obstacles placed in array
The translucent warrior strides assurant
Into that barren country fraught with heresy.
There rises the arch-enemy; o'er the rest
Most horrible, most feared, deadly spews
It's lethal froth, smothering resplendent life;
Antipathy of righteousness, foil to probity.
Meritorious deeds, divine accompaniment only
Impart their empyreal emulation over evil.
Undaunted, the oft-legged crusader treads
Toward that eternal reward, the goal of his circuit.

Editors Note: This is the record of a debate which began on the Board of Declaration earlier this quarter.

AN OPEN LETTER TO BRUCE CRAPUCHETTES
by William Sanford LaSor

I was indeed sorry to see your letter. Someone has given you some very bad advice. You have been led to break both the law of God and the law of the State.

Paul makes it very clear that we are to "be subject to the governing authorities" (Rom. 13:1). This was written, I would remind you, when Nero was the Roman emperor. If there was ever a time in history when a Christian might have taken refuge behind the theory that "we are obligated not to support a bad government," that was the time. Yet Paul clearly requires support of that government. Specifically, he tells us to pay "taxes to whom taxes are due" (Rom. 13:7). We do not have a choice in determining which tax, or what part of the taxes, we may pay. We are obligated by the Word of God and by the law of our Nation to pay the taxes levied upon us.

The teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ makes the same points clear. "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's" clearly indicates that we as Christ's disciples have an obligation to the civil authority. Jesus also included the payment of taxes (Matt. 17:24-25). Granted that this refers to taxes of the Jewish state rather than the Empire, we must still recognize that in the words that follow Jesus sets forth a principle that would include any civil state (verses 25-27). If you think you can do it, you might try that trick of getting the tax-money from some fish's mouth. I haven't been successful at fishing.
AN OPEN LETTER TO BRUCE CRAPUCHETTES (con't)

I won't get into a discussion with you over what is a "just war." It is an academic question, and not, in my opinion, a Biblical distinction. The right of each individual to determine what is a "just war" is a questionable right—as is the right that some are claiming to distinguish between "good" and "bad" laws. Such individualism can only lead to anarchy—and anarchy is Satanic. In no way can a Christian claim Biblical authority for anarchy!

At Philippi, at Thessalonica, at Ephesus, and elsewhere, Paul refused to take any step that would make him a law-breaker. I can find no single instance in the New Testament where Christ or any of the members of the Early Church deliberately set out to act in defiance of civil law.

You have been badly advised, and as your elder in the faith I urge you to repent of this act.

A RESPONSE TO DR. LASOR
by Bruce Crapuchettes

In regard to my stand as a tax resister you quoted the verse, "render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's." But you did not finish the verse which says, "... and unto God that which is God's." I feel Jesus is here making both a general statement, and a statement for his own day. The general statement is: God and Caesar both have a legitimate realm and legitimate claims on us. Here Jesus parts company with the anarchist who believes that the State has no legitimate claim on us. Of course, I agree to this. There is a legitimate claim that the State has. But Jesus and all the Jews of his day were very aware of how the State constantly trespassed onto God's realm. In fact, when the Jews asked Jesus the question about the taxes they were expecting him to encourage tax resistance. They were trying to trap Jesus and get him arrested. There was a large movement among the Jews in that day of total non-cooperation with the Romans. Almost all Jews sympathized with this movement which was started by Judas the Gaulonite in the year A.D. 6, when Jesus was about 10 years old. Judas had organized a revolt against Quirinius, a Roman governor whose annual census was the means for enforcing a head tax upon all Jews occupied by Rome. In return for the exercise of temple worship (the only licensing by Rome of religion other than emperor-worship) Jewish leaders agreed to assist in tax collection for the Romans. As the tension between the Jews and their Roman oppressors increased, Jesus found himself in the midst of an enormous struggle. A system of double taxation was going on—the collection of religious dues for the Temple and the various taxes of the Romans. It is estimated that taxation on the Jews for these two purposes reached nearly fifty percent of the worker's earnings.

So, the question put to Jesus by the Temple authorities was truly a trap. The scribes tried to trick Jesus into a position where he could be arrested on the spot by Rome for tax refusal. They expected him to call for tax resistance, for they probably felt that he was a sympathizer of the movement. But Jesus went deeper. He dealt with the question whether or not any loyalty is due to the State. This was the real issue of his day. Most people of his day felt no loyalty whatsoever was due to the State. Paul was dealing with this same issue in the passages that you quote by him: "be subject to the governing authorities" (Rom. 13:1) and pay "taxes to whom taxes are due" (Rom. 13:7). This question of whether or not any loyalty is due to the State is a totally different question than we are dealing with today. Our situation now is just the opposite. We generally give total loyalty to the State and are now wondering if there are any times we should withhold it.
A RESPONSE TO DR. LASOR

So again, the general statement of Jesus (and of Paul) was: Yes, the State, along with God, does have a legitimate claim on our lives. The particular statement of Jesus was: the tax paid by Caesar's money was in Jesus' time a legitimate claim of the State. Some of the tax went to support the Roman army in Palestine. By the Roman conquest, the Roman army was all the administration that existed in Palestine. It was fighting no war. Its power could be called police power.

But Jesus went on to say, "Render unto God that which belongs to God." And by saying this he was standing firmly beside all those in his day and in ours who resist the State when it makes claims on what in fact belongs to God. Jesus looked at the image of Caesar on the coin and spoke of Caesar's legitimate claims on us. He also looked at the image of God in the people standing around him and spoke of God's legitimate claims on us. Both have legitimate claims. Jesus was only talking about the legitimate claims. Those of his day did not believe that Caesar had any legitimate claims. Jesus and Paul disagreed with them. And so do I.

But I am convinced that if Jesus felt that Caesar was in fact claiming what belonged to God, he would be the first to resist! "Render unto God (not Caesar) that which is God's."

I feel the State today is claiming something for itself which does not rightfully belong to it. Caesar today is claiming what belongs to God. I cannot go along with it!

Near the end of your letter you say, "At Philippi, at Thessalonica, at Ephesus, and elsewhere, Paul refused to take any step that would make him a law-breaker. I can find no single instance in the New Testament where Christ or any of the members of the Early Church deliberately set out to act in defiance of civil law."

Let me try to understand what you are really saying here. Do you mean that you would never break a law out of Christian conscience no matter how immoral you thought it to be? If the law said that you could no longer proclaim the name of Jesus, would you comply? (Peter and John went to jail obeying God rather than men—Acts 5:29). If the law said that you must worship Caesar, would you comply? (Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, was burned at the stake in A.D. 156 for not saying, "Caesar is Lord.") If the law said that you must turn in all the Jews you know so that they could be slaughtered, would you do it? (Many Christian Germans went to concentration camps during WWII for hiding Jews.)

But I think that I can guess your answer to these questions. If you really believed a law to be absolutely immoral with devastating consequences you, out of Christian conscience, would probably break it. And I would further guess, knowing your devotion and strength, that you would not only break it but would break it publicly so that your witness would be clear and visible—maybe you would even encourage others to follow your example.

So, the issue is not whether or not to break a law out of conscience, but whether this issue of the Vietnam war is really of that same level. Now it seems to me that as far as my conscience is concerned it is only that can determine that. From what you have said in your letter I assume that you do not feel that this war is immoral, or at least, not that immoral. OK, I can accept that. I would like to persuade you otherwise, but I do not condemn you for what you believe. So also, I wish you would not condemn me for what I believe. I believe this war is immoral. I am not a pacifist. So far
A RESPONSE TO DR. LASOR (con't)

I still believe in the "just war theory." I would probably have joined Dietrich Bonhoeffer in the plot against Hitler's life. But as far as this war is concerned, I see it as immoral. You may think that I am brainwashed, or naive; but nevertheless that is what I believe. And it seems to me that if in fact I do believe that this war is grossly immoral and vastly destructive, it is not only a good idea to be a tax resister, but I must be a tax resister. I can no longer willingly give my money to buy napalm, and bullets, and jets, and all sorts of destructive machinery in order to destroy these people. My participation so far pains me immensely. I have marched, spoken to people, written letters to government, and have done all that I could think of. I have come to the conclusion that the protest movement is not being effective. I, along with Mahatma Gandhi, feel that civil disobedience should be only a last resort method. I see my participation in tax resistance to be just that. My wife and I are willing to take the consequences.

On June 7, 1568, the National Council of Churches made a fine statement concerning civil disobedience. I would like to end this letter with a quote from it.

"In the tradition which shaped the American political system, it is generally agreed that the function of government is to secure justice, peace and freedom for its citizens, and to maintain order, not as an end in itself, but as a condition necessary for the existence of justice, peace and freedom. Christians find this tradition generally compatible with their understanding of the divinely-ordained function of the state.

"When, however, a particular government fails to provide justice, peace or freedom, it is not maintaining true order, and Christians should remain faithful to their understanding of what order ought to be, even at the cost of disobeying that government. In such circumstances, it is the government which has become insubordinate to God's order, and not those who disobey that government. Rather, they show their genuine respect for rightful "governing authority" by criticizing, resisting or opposing the current misusers of that authority.

"Although Christians recognize the importance of order for human society, in every period of history there has been a Christian witness against giving absolute or unquestioning obedience to any civil authority. The first allegiance of Christians is to God, and when earthly rulers command what is contrary to the will of God, Christians reply as did Peter and John, "We must obey God rather than men." (Acts 5:29). Whatever the penalty for disobedience to human law, it has not deterred some Christian martyrs in every age from pointing by their death beyond man's order to God's order."

Dr. LaSor, I do not believe this passage is speaking of nor encouraging anarchy. It is speaking of responsible Christian living.

DR. LASOR REPLIES

First, let me thank the editors of The Opinion for letting me have a copy of Bruce's letter (with his permission) and giving me a chance to reply. I wish also to thank Bruce most sincerely for the fine spirit evident in his letter to me replying to my open letter to him. His letter clearly and fully sets forth his position, and I believe my "open letter" sets forth mine, so there is no reason here for an extended reply.
DR. LASOR REPLIES (con't)

I would simply say that I am more concerned with understanding what the Bible has to say on these and other matters than I am in what Polycarp, Bonhoeffer, Gandhi, or the National Council of Churches might have said. The Bible is authoritative. Men (including myself) are only fallible illustrations of the Bible's intent.

If I have led my friends here to examine their convictions more carefully in the light of God's revealed truth, I have achieved my purpose. And if Bruce, having obviously done just that, is still convinced that his action can stand in the light of such judgment—and obviously he is—then I bow before that conviction. May God, who seems to be willing to bless us when we are wrong as well as when we are right, lead us all into a more perfect knowledge of His will!

MEANDERINGS
by Stephen S. Wilburn

There is, I'm told, a man
Whom I respect; I can
Regard his values as my own
He leans to that which I am prone.

If I perceive that man I am
And tremble at the man I am
Then when in time I'm called to live
I'll fear a fear that begs forgive.

*

We often pursue a morning mist
Which cools a nonetheless cool morning.
Our concentration, our rising sun
At mid-morning chases pursuant meaning
Beyond our senses. The very fleeting nature
That draws, sucks our souls
As flame wants water, serves
Merely in proper quantity to quench.

*

My nation and faith
Is much too sure that
Pragmatically speaking
The Idea Must Work
If It is indeed True.
And God looketh not on the heart.
But as a man acts
So is he.
And what he eats
He will be.
I work with one of those so-designated "extra-Church" organizations (although I much prefer Dr. Winter's "Protestant Orders" which does not imply a second-thought appendage to the Body) that is committed to youth evangelism. We run into the typical problem of all such organizations—how to incorporate the kids we work with into a local, worshipping congregation? Of course, there is much more involved than merely telling them that they need church or that they ought to go. I am committed to the Church. I cannot make it without the Church, and the kids to whom I minister cannot make it without the nurture and fellowship of Christ's Body. But, getting kids from non-church backgrounds into a church for worship, fellowship and service is no easy matter. Recently I have become aware of an added dimension to this quandary. Most of our evangelical churches are culturally establishment—middle-class in thought, dress, speech patterns, music forms and world view. There is however a growing anti-establishment subculture that I will call the youth culture. It is not limited to teenagers; in fact, not all teenagers are part of it. It is not necessarily "grown out of" at a certain age for it includes responsible, family-rearing, job-holding adults. It is definitely a distinct sub-culture characterized by both material traits (long hair, beards, mod clothing) and non-material (a value system and life style that is best summed up as "anti-establishment"). On this basis it deserves to be considered as a distinct culture.

He who would evangelize the American youth culture must do much the same as a white, Western missionary would do in Africa. He must take an "incarnational" approach which includes understanding and identifying with the culture and speaking the gospel in terms relevant to that culture. A missionary's goal—following good Biblical and SWM principles, in that order—is to establish an indigenous church able to meet the spiritual needs of the people, and which expresses itself in relevant cultural forms. An indigenous church in India does not have the same form as an indigenous church in Bolivia, although their respective functions will be the same. If the missionary's goal is not an indigenous church, he will end up demanding not only spiritual conversion but also a cultural conversion to "westernism" which can lead to bizarre cultural anomalies—like an organ for a people who live their music (African tribes), but who have never seen a keyboard. This "need" is rationalized by the missionary: "You cannot worship without hymns and you cannot sing hymns without an organ!" What he really means is Western hymns and instruments. No wonder missions is faced with difficult apologetics when it encounters a mindset that sees Christianity as "Western man's religion."

In the U.S. we would expect different worship forms for different cultures. Yet, we find this only to a small degree. There are many establishment churches, but very few youth-culture churches. It is interesting that there is aversion on the part of both cultures on the other's forms ("they're too rigid," or, "that should never be allowed in a church."). This should not be seen as a theological issue, for each culture will express theological truth differently. Neither is it an issue of which one is "better" than the other nor of authorizing one and outlawing the other. It is a question of what is appropriate for a given culture.

We of the establishment church demand cultural conversion of the youth culture if they wish to be part of our church—everything from "cut your hair" to "we don't mix politics and religion." The result is that some are converted, but a great many cannot "stomach" such demands. They then drop out of the institutional church and start underground house churches, or go to one of the few indigenous youth culture churches (either evangelical, like Calvary Chapel, or a syncretistic theological menagerie like Glide Methodist in San Francisco).
THE POSSIBILITY OF THE CHURCH AND THE YOUTH CULTURE (con’t)

Where can the youth culture fit in the Church? This problem offers many creative possibilities for the establishment church, if it is not afraid to work with a different culture or social strata rather than against it. What I propose is an indigenous church for the youth culture. A contemporary worship service is a step in the right direction, but why not go a step further and view the youth culture for what it is—a distinct cultural sub-group that needs an indigenous church? This would not be a church of only teenagers and college-age people (thus exclusive according to age) but one which includes people in their thirties and forties (or any age!) and their children. Thus, it would be all-inclusive within the particular culture it represents. This church would not divide the Body of Christ any more than an establishment church sponsoring a Spanish-speaking congregation divides the Body.

The youth culture needs theologically-trained and spiritually-sensitive "missionaries" who will draw from the rich resources of the establishment church and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit establish new, indigenous churches among the millions of the unevangelized American youth culture. The result would be a viable, indigenous expression of Christ's Body. Oh yes, one more thing: it would sure make it easier for some of us "extra-church" guys to get some of our kids to go to church!

STUDIA BIBLICA ET THEOLOGICAL OR NOT STUDIA BIBLICA ET THEOLOGICA: THAT IS THE QUESTION

by Eric Behrens

No, this is not an article about the name of the student theological journal. It concerns the very existence of the journal next year. As its potential editor, I want feedback on whether it should be continued at all.

The balance sheet does not come out strongly on either side. In favor of continuing the journal are such facts as: 1) As a result of it, Howard Loewen has been asked by Dr. Thomas F. Torrance for permission to reprint his article, "Karl Barth’s Doctrine of Scripture", in the Scottish Journal of Theology. 2) In this light, it has more than fulfilled one of its original intents: "... to serve as a stimulus, for those who are interested, to break into print". 3) The quality of the first volume indicates that outstanding scholarship is being produced at Fuller on the student level. This fact should become increasingly recognized by seminaries in this country, since the journal has been sent to all the seminaries in the American Association of Theological Schools.

Such facts as the following suggest that the journal should be discontinued: 1) The high cost of the journal (which brings up the whole question of "priorities"). 2) The limited response to the first journal, implying that it only caters to a small segment of the seminary community (neither Jim nor I have been overwhelmed by student or faculty response to the first journal). 3) Although I have already received some excellent papers for next year's journal, I know that there are many other first rate papers around which I have yet to see. If next year's journal does not contain the very best student papers from Fuller, it will not be worth publishing.

So, I welcome your responses and reactions. In the final analysis, I think my decision on whether to continue the journal will be heavily (though not exclusively) based on the quality of the material which is submitted to me. This has a slightly undemocratic ring to it, for it gives most of the "voting
power" to the students who write (and submit) the best papers, and to the faculty members who show their interest by notifying me of such papers. Nevertheless, I see this criterion as the most valid way to determine the future of the journal, for it exists primarily to present superlative student essays. Any reactions to this, in the form of comments or submitted student essays (!), will be greatly appreciated.

AFTER THREE YEARS:
A WORD OF THANKS TO DR. FULLER
by John Piper

How can you tell when you've stumbled into a goldmine? It is a mistake to look for glitter on the walls. The only way to tell is to dig deep and test the ore.

It is impossible to work all the mines at Fuller Seminary, so I picked out one, and struck it rich. For three years I have dug into the mind and heart of Dr. Fuller. From B11 to B33 with 22 hours of his electives between, I have carried away the ore to test in my study and my church. Inasmuch as my own mind and experience can assay, it is priceless. Because of this, I want to make public my great appreciation to Dr. Fuller and to our Lord.

From the very first something strange was happening. The things I began to learn from Dr. Fuller persistently, and even unintentionally, kept affecting my prayers. My spiritual existence was continually called into question and often indicted by his teaching. I believe the reason for this is that there are moral implications very close beneath the surface of everything Dr. Fuller teaches. They are not implications for later on in ministry or out there in the world, but for right now, in this classroom, in this very moment in which we argue.

For example, if Dr. Fuller asserts in class that fear of unbelief is a necessary part of the Christian's life to keep him from making shipwreck of faith, and a student in the class disagrees and begins to argue, then only the most ethereal of theoreticians could fail to see the glaring moral implications of that very argument. If Dr. Fuller is right, that student in this very class is in mortal danger of rejecting one of the means of grace God has given to him for his own perseverance. This can make for a tense classroom. But praise God for classrooms where ultimate issues are discussed with something like ultimate concern, and where the zeal which we are supposed to produce upon graduation is not watered down, but intensified, by theological discussion.

Dr. Fuller's concern for the truth is equaled by his concern for the student. I think it was Erich Fromm who said rightly, "To love is to spend time with." This is how Dr. Fuller has shown me he cares. It has been normal in his electives that after a two-hour class session he would sit down and field our questions for another hour or more. I count these times as one of the greatest privileges of my seminary life. A teacher who can not merely tolerate, but even relish, such a barrage of questions (even when we students lack a similar graciousness) is a precious discovery, which I think God I was privileged to make.

Vying for priority with the intangible benefits of studying with Dr. Fuller are the very tangible skills that he teaches. I have often thought that trying to convince the uninitiated of the profit there is in arching would be like trying to explain to an eight-year-old little leaguer the pleasures of sexual intercourse. But all understatements aside, arching is a gift that I will treasure
AFTER THREE YEARS: A WORD OF THANKS TO DR. FULLER (con't)

for the rest of my ministry. Along with Greek and Hebrew, it is the most practical tool I have gotten at Fuller. The mind of Paul has come alive through the science of Arc-ology. It has been a tremendous help in teaching through Mark and Galatians in a young-marrieds' Sunday School class.

To be sure, the little ship called "arcing" encounters some pretty rough seas as it chugs along through Philippians, Romans and Galatians, but the joys that follow in the wake make the effort worthwhile. One of these is the ever-growing appreciation for the Bible as a source book for theology. It is utterly amazing how much the apostles and prophets actually know about God. In fact, a close examination of the Biblical text can even become habit-forming to the extent that secondary sources seem quite blah. One must be careful in taking courses from Dr. Fuller because he might wind up spending a disproportionate amount of time studying the Bible itself.

Of course Dr. Fuller is not against secondary sources. After all, what are we but a lot of little secondary sources? In fact, how to use secondary sources is another of those tangible skills I learned from Dr. Fuller. Through Mortimer Adler (How to Read a Book) and E. D. Hirsch (Validity in Interpretation) and Dr. Fuller, I have begun to learn how to read. I will never forget some of the tips he has dropped along the way. For example, the insight that commentaries aren't worth a hill of beans (paraphrase) for their conclusions, but only for their arguments. Or a corollary of this: truth is not determined by counting noses (i.e., stacking footnotes). And perhaps most important: you must be able to state a man's position to his own satisfaction before you have a right to criticize him.

Learning how to read, vis a vis Adler, is valuable because it is the best way to carry on extension education. If a pastor can read, the whole theological enterprise is at his disposal. Dialogue with the most fruitful and stimulating minds in the world is as near as the bookshelf. Many thanks to Dr. Fuller for helping impart this permanently useful skill.

Finally, the greatest blessing of all is that through the ministry of Dr. Fuller many of us have been built up in the faith. We have learned and felt in the bottom of our hearts that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. I am positive that Dr. Fuller would consider all the qualities mentioned above as mere sham if they did not give rise to faith. Therefore, the most important thing that can be said is this: Dr. Fuller has helped many of us to confess, "Far be it from me to glory except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

A NEW LOOK AT A GOLDEN OLDIE
by Ted Dorman

"Therefore whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them, for this is the law and the prophets" - Matt. 7:12.

"And so as you wish that men would do to you, do so to them" - Lk. 6:31.

Among the Bible verses given to memory by aspiring Sunday school students, perhaps none is better known than the "Golden Rule." This is no doubt an appropriate endeavor for the child of a Christian family. After all, Jesus described this maxim as being equivalent to the law and the prophets.
In one form or another, the Golden Rule has been a key part of almost every major religion of the world. Confucius, Buddha, Rabbi Hillel and other great religious leaders all quoted it. What was it that made it so popular, and continues to make it an almost universal proverb?

At first glance the answer appears rather obvious. We all want to be treated well—at least most of us do. So the idea of treating others the way we want to be treated seems to follow logically from this. Treat others in the same way as you yourself would be treated, and you will do right. Or as Rabbi Hillel put it, when asked to recite the whole Law while standing on one leg, "Do not do to others that which you would not wish done to you. This is the whole law; all the rest is commentary."

I feel well within the mark saying that this is the way most of us thought of the Golden Rule when we first heard it. And perhaps we still do. This is why it has been so popular for so long—it is based on almost every man's desire to be treated justly by his fellow man. If we treat others badly, we will be judged for it, if not by men, then most certainly by God. Jesus makes this clear in Matthew 7:1-2. Therefore, we ought to "do unto others as we would have them do unto us."

I submit that this is wrong. Most men may have thought of the Golden Rule in this way, but it is most certainly not the meaning Jesus intended. A quick look at the two passages where it occurs will show that His basis for uttering this proverb was more than mere pragmatism.

Matthew 7:12 begins with the word therefore. Thus the Golden Rule is an inference from some previous statement. One could jump back to 7:1-2 and argue that Jesus's statement in 7:12 follows from His admonition about judging others. It is much more sound exegetically, however, to go to the closest possible verse (the source of my hermeneutical bias here should be obvious!) Thus, we look at verse 11 and find that Jesus is emphasizing God's love and His willingness to give good things to those who desire them. Therefore, we ought to treat others as we would be treated not because we will thereby be treated as we wish, (there is no such promise here) but because as new creatures in Christ we are called to be like our heavenly Father.

Luke 6:31 reiterates the Golden Rule in a similar context. Here the key passage is 6:35—"Be merciful, as your Father in heaven is merciful." Here, as in Matthew 7:12, the basis for our behavior is God's gracious love towards us. As the Father treats us, so we ought to treat others.

This sheds a whole new light on the "Golden Oldie" we have cherished for so long. To interpret this nugget of wisdom apart from the intent of its Author, as has been done all too often, is to reduce the Word of God to homespun pragmatism. If we treat others well merely in order to receive like treatment, our motives are self-centered; we are no better than the sinners who so the same (Luke 6:32-34). If we "do unto others as we would have them do unto us" because we know that we shall be "judged by the measure with which we judge," we act from fear of retribution, not from love. The Golden Rule thus becomes as a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal, for it has not love.

Most people we know would claim to live by the Golden Rule. As we have seen, however, this claim is probably untrue in most cases. It is most certainly untrue if one is a professed non-Christian. To detach this famous verse from its Author is to shift the center of attention from God to man. Only as we receive and fully appreciate the merciful love of the heavenly Father...
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can we be truly free to follow this commandment as Jesus meant us to do. If we act out of mere pragmatism, and not out of love for Christ, it is because we feel we have been forgiven little (cf. Luke 7:47). And if we feel we have been forgiven little, our error is double, for we lift up our own righteousness and ignore the greatness of God's mercy. He died for us while we were yet sinners; He gives to us though we are evil. Only as we realize this will the tarnish disappear from the Golden Rule, so it may become for us the "Golden Oldie" it was meant to be.

MY OPINION ON STUDIA BIBLICA ET THEOLOGICA
by Gary Tuttle

Eric Behrens' article makes note of an initial fulfillment of one purpose of SBET in the acceptance of Howard's article for publication in SJT. A second purpose, concerning the recruitment of new students may find some small fulfillment as the following portion of a letter from Trustee Max De Pree of Jim Bradley indicates:

I thought you might especially enjoy the response from Henry Baat, one of the key pastors in the Reformed Church in America and the radio minister for Temple Time:

"Thanks very much for sending me the booklet by the Fuller students. This is indeed a real forward step and the articles are excellent. If the fly leaf didn't tell you that it was students, you would think it was written by professors. My son, Tom, is at present a middler at Western but it looks now like he will be doing graduate work for a doctorate. I am doing everything I can to direct him to Fuller."

We have also received some encouragement from Christian Scholar's Review:

"Inasmuch as our purposes are to provide a journal of the arts and sciences, I believe that the CSR and the SBET will complement one another... Congratulations on your good work."

A third purpose which we had hoped the journal would serve was as a ministry of those who published to the rest of the community in the continuing dialogue of the theological enterprise. The potential is there, but depends upon whether the journal is read. I have found it very interesting and stimulating and I am very much in favor of its continuance.