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In the last issue of the *Opinion* I had an article in which I encouraged students to use the appropriate channels to voice student grievances and ideas and I attempted to show that, in a small way, the students are not a disenfranchised group at Fuller, that we do have significant connections with the powers that be. I have since thought further on the matter and other related topics and I wish to do two things in this essay: (1) to try to delineate my current thinking about the division of power at FTS and (2) to offer some suggestions about things which ought to be discussed about our life together. I am, admittedly, still in the process of thinking things through. I simply do not want to have to carry the process through in isolation; I need the feedback from the community.

First, let me remind you that through student initiative about 2-2½ years ago, we managed to get students seated on a number of the committees of the faculty (of theology) and the Board of Trustees. In particular we sit on the Academic Affairs Committee and three Ten-Year Planning Committees—Long-Range Academic Affairs, Development and Facilities. All of these committees are advisory committees. None of them have the power to determine policy. They can only recommend programs to the faculty and the Board of Trustees for their consideration. Hence, the final decision-making rests in the hands of the faculty and Board. Students are once-removed from the centers of power. One must, therefore, come to the conclusion that students do not have any effectual power. Theirs is only the power of persuasion, once-removed.

As I have thought about this phenomenon, it seems more and more incongruous to me that students continue to attempt to gain representation in a system that is basically totalitarian. It is a contradiction for them to seek representation as an end when the fundamental structure of the parties with whom students must deal are not representative bodies. We do not have a senate here. Rather, there are two power groups (faculty, trustees). To the committees of these groups the students may make overtures. We try to persuade the committee to present something to their group which is in our best interest. But when it comes to the actual decision-making rests in the hands of the faculty and Board. Students are once-removed from the centers of power. One must, therefore, come to the conclusion that students do not have any effectual power. Theirs is only the power of persuasion, once-removed.

Perhaps we need to become aware of the fact that we have been taught to think in a certain way about the educational power structure and about who should make the decisions in an educational institution. Thus far, it seems, we have abandoned our critical faculties when it comes to thinking about our own educational process. We need to redirect our critical perspicacity and apply all the canons of evaluative thinking that we have learned to this "party line" with which we have been indoctrinated for the first 14-16 years of our educational experience.

Maybe we should stop trying to infiltrate the existing power structure. Perhaps we should stop seeking representation before the committees of the centers of power. Probably what we need to do is to recognize our own effective power potential. We need to make the realization that we are an integral part of the educational process. We are so integral that the institution could not exist without us. We have a significant vested interest in what happens in the halls of academia. Not only our money is risked, but our very lives. We are the product. We are being molded and have a very great interest in how we turn out. We ought, therefore, to have some voice in the power center that determines what the processing will be.

Perhaps what we need as an alternative to the present set up is to force the other two factions—administration (inc. Trustees) and faculties—to recognize our unity as the studentry and to have them deal with us as we must deal with them
so that the outcome is mutual sharing of power, not representation. Of course, a student generation comes and a student generation goes, but the studentry is a continuing unit. At any given time we are here. We may have difficulty building a remembered tradition (as the continuing groups of faculty and administration do not), but that may be to our advantage. We will not be bound by traditional ways of thinking about things or traditional ways of doing things. I do not advocate the wholesale dismissal of history as irrelevant, but I do think that those portions of an institution which have longevity get into a status quo motif that is more harmful than the students' emphasis upon accomplishment NOW.

I cannot now say just how this rearrangement can come about, nor for sure what it would look like nor how it would function. I can, however, make some tentative suggestions. First among them is the proposition of equal sharing of power between the three groups of students, faculty and administration with regard to those decisions which would affect the lives of all three. Thus, for example, the matter of priorities about where the seminary is going in the next ten years with all the implications for physical plant, faculty size, student body size, degree programs, graduation requirements, financing, etc. would be a matter of joint discussion and decision. Similarly, matters that concerned two of the parties would be decided upon by the two concerned. So also each group could also make independent decisions in matters of policy that would bear solely on their contingent. Obviously this method would require some serious reevaluation of current spheres of influence. The kind of dialogue that such a reevaluation would engender would be a very useful prologue and preparation for a community guided by negotiation rather than fiat.

I do not mean by this short essay that we should give up those few concessions that have been granted, that we should stop attending the committees upon which we have membership. We must continue working in the ways that are available to us right now while we are working to obtain new ways. We are substantially lobbyists as things are now set up. We have to continue to make the most efficient use of that method even though we may develop a new philosophy. We can work within the structure as it now exists while we are guided by new objectives. One thing that cannot happen is for communication to break down. One way we can assure that it does not is to participate in good faith, continually striving for a better community.

1 The Administrative Committee comes the closest to being the kind of negotiating body I am talking about. The students have a member on that committee who has full speaking and voting privileges. That committee does determine policy. Changes can come through it. However, it has but ONE student representative, five administrative representatives and three faculty representatives. It should have at least four student members. It is, however, one of those beginning points that we do not want to abandon, but expand. Similarly, students should be "seated" on the faculties as voting members, should be members, thereby, of joint faculty, should be on Faculty Senate, etc. Obviously the names presently given to those "committees" would have to be discarded—they are exclusive and do not represent the kind of composition of which I am speaking.
The following are some areas that need discussion at Fuller:

1. Guaranteed Tuition Plan: It seems to me that it would be in the spirit of the Nixon economic policy to institute a plan for guaranteed tuition by which the seminary would guarantee to a student that he would pay the same tuition charges throughout his degree program that he pays the year he enters. Thus, if I entered when the BD tuition was $17.50 per quarter hour, that is the tuition I would pay for all the hours that I take toward my BD degree. If during my senior year I take courses toward a ThM I would be charged at the rate that had been established for that degree program for the year in which I began it. So, if the ThM charge were $31.50 I would pay so much even though when I entered for the BD the ThM was only $23.50. In a three year program this plan would save the BD student some $260.00 provided that tuition increased regularly 10% per year. (As tuition increases, savings for any given student will also increase. Note also—over a three year period the average percentage increase of an annual 10% rise is 10.5%; over four years it is 11.3%.)

2. Seminary Housing: It might also be a good thing for the student population who must, or desire to, live in seminary housing to have a similar kind of arrangement—guaranteed rental for the duration of their stay. This plan would be especially desireable after new apartment facilities are built. Certainly the present housing could not justify further increases in rent.

3. Bookstore: A student owned and operated bookstore would also be an asset to the student pocketbook. Books are available from various distributors at a price quite a bit below what our bookstore must sell them for. This fact should be obvious when one realizes that the bookstore here is a source of income to the seminary. With the margin of profit and the overhead that must be sustained it is clear that the markup on books must be considerable. The students would run a bookstore on a non-profit basis. The management would have to be in the hands of student government and the store would be an enterprise offered as a service to the students. We have made a very fragile attempt in this matter by distributing the Blackwell's catalogues to all students. We are working on the possibilities that are inherent in that gesture.

4. An incidental item: A proposal goes to the trustees to change the nomenclature of the Bachelor of Divinity (B.D.) to the Master of Divinity (M.Div.). If the board approves this change of name, it would be a good time to relieve ourselves of the quaint but anachronistic practice of printing degrees in Latin. The new degree should be printed in English.

5. Another area that requires imporvement involves the wives of students at FTS. It seems to me that the wives, when they come here, frequently lose their individuality. They lose their independence as persons and are included in the community, if at all, solely because their husbands go to Fuller. In other words, there seems to be little interest in the women except insofaras they foot the bill for their student-husband's education and living expenses. I should think that any number of things could be done to aid in the nurture and maturation of the wives as members of this community. If there is anything that would turn a woman sour on being a pastor's wife it would be her experience at FTS as sort of a non-entity whose sole identity is that she is attached to the "pastor"—a little extra that is automatically included, assumed in the negotiations of a man with a church. She is a bargain. Clearly, we belie our theology when we treat our wives or even think of them in this object-ive way. This area needs thorough investigation and student council will take steps to determine what can be done on our part to ameliorate the abuse of seminary wives.
6. A sixth area involves a number of things, each of which could profitably be considered separately—maybe in future issues. These matters include (1) the immediate need for a fully developed field work system, (2) the need for an expanded Old Testament department, (3) the need for the new Dean of the Theology Faculty to have a free hand to exercise his innovative impulses to the fullest measure, (4) the need to look at the product of FTS in terms of the church which he will encounter to see if his education is fitting him to lead that church (a cry, of necessity, for currency and relevance in education), (5) for a black presence on the campus, (6) for a more personalized education and an education with more personality (i.e. more intimate and sustained faculty-student-administration contact), and not least of these, (7) the need for reduced size of classes and flexibility in programming.

None of these things can be changed, updated, or even investigated without maintaining an open mind and communications channels. It seems to me that in the past the administration and faculty of this institution have not been very zealous to communicate what is going on to the students. Priorities and policies are determined and then the students are not informed of them, (e.g. the language department policy about qualifying exams was not communicated—even to TA's. We found out by an embarrassment before the Trustees.) Or the students participate in the development of an idea and a model and the response from the administration is inadequate, if audible (e.g. the black student recruitment, education program of last year). This general failure to communicate seems to me to indicate one of three things—(1) the students are not thought of as being an integral part of the seminary educational complex, (witness the total lack of students in the evaluative process in preparation for the W.A.S.C. accreditation visit), (2) that the powers that be have a fear that their priorities and policies could not endure the scrutiny of the student eye, (3) the lack of communication is a put-down to the students, as if to say, "You cannot handle these things, they are too wonderful for you."

These are some of the areas that we must be discussing during the year. Of course I fully expect to hear the statement that we want too much too fast, that we are always concerned about NOW, that we haven't any staying power, no vision of the future, and no patience. I maintain that if this is thought, then there truly is very little communication between the three aspects of our community: faculties, administration—trustees, students—wives. Of course we are urgent about our demands; we have been too long without them. If we have no vision of the future (which is not the case) it is because we have not been sold on the "accepted" view of the future, the one that all these projects around here support. Lastly, I think that a case can be made for the fact that an emphasis upon the NOW is less damaging than an adherence to the status quo. The latter wants history to be the instructor, but because history must always be written after the fact, the institution is therefore always behind the times.
Loving Anger: A Christian Possibility?
by Ted Dorman

The Christian Church has not always painted a pretty picture to the rest of the world in terms of being united for the cause of Christ. The sin of anger has been all too prominent in the history of the Church and in the lives of individual Christians, including those of us here at Fuller who are being called upon to be leaders in the Body of Christ. In light of this responsibility we must come to terms with the nature of anger (wrath) and whether or not it is ever a justifiable part of Christian love, and if so, under what circumstances?

Our approach will in a large part determine the nature of our answer. Where we begin our inquiry, then, is of utmost importance. Since as believers in Christ we are sons (children—sorry gals!) of God by adoption through the Atonement of our Lord Jesus, an appropriate starting-point would seem to be the relationship of God's anger (wrath) to His love in Scripture.

Kittel's TWNT, in its word study on the Biblical concept of both divine and human anger, affirms that anger cannot be totally removed from the realm of righteousness a priori. "A purely negative judgment, as in Stoicism, is not possible wherever the wrath of God is taken seriously. For if anger is ruled out a limine, what is said about God's wrath has to be explained away...The New Testament recognizes a holy anger which hates what God hates and which is seen above all in Jesus himself (Mt. 3:5; cf. John 11:33, 38)." (TWNT, vol. V, p. 419).

Noting that Jesus was indeed angry under certain circumstances, and that Paul commands us "Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ" (1 Cor. 11:1), the obvious conclusion would seem to be that under certain circumstances a Christian can be justifiably angry. This may be underscored by Paul's statement in Ephesians 4:26, "Be angry, but do not sin," which apparently allows for the possibility of, or even encourages, sinless anger.
LOVING ANGER: A CHRISTIAN POSSIBILITY? (cont'd)

Such a syllogistic approach may be appropriate in formal logic, but when portions of Biblical revelation are abstracted from the whole and linked together in such a manner, the conclusions are not necessarily valid. It would behoove us therefore to examine with care the indictments against anger which abound in Scripture (especially in Proverbs and the Epistles).

First of all, we must in all fairness note some further observations from Kittel. With regard to human anger he states that while anger is right for God and Jesus in the New Testament, it is not so for man. "God's love includes wrath, but love and anger are mutually exclusive in man." (op. cit. p. 420). The ultimate example of this latter type of anger is Satan himself (Rev. 12:12; cf. Isa. 14:12-14).

Second, it should be observed that in Eph. 4:26 Paul is quoting Psalms 4:4. Paul quotes the LXX, and in this context the verb is not given the full force of the imperative. Thus Paul's intended meaning is better translated "If you are angry, be careful not to sin." Anger is not called sin here, but there lies in the background the idea that when one is angry sin crouches at the door (cf. Kittel, op. cit. p. 421).

In light of these observations it is difficult to give facile assent to any purportedly righteous indignation. However, in at least one instance Jesus Himself commands Christians for hating the deeds of certain people, whose deeds He also hates (Rev. 2:6). It is safe to assume that anger was involved in this hate, but it should be noted that the deeds of the Nicolaitans, and not the Nicolaitans themselves, were objects of this hate. Perhaps the old adage of "hate the sin, but love the sinner" has some validity after all.

Lack of time and space detain us from further inquiry here. Let us conclude this prolegomena to an admittedly difficult topic by saying that while the "imperative" of Eph. 4:26 cannot be regarded as the justifying mandate for a Christian's being angry, neither can one brush aside the fact that through the Atonement we are reconciled to God, and that in some cases the anger of a Christian towards the deeds of another person (not that person himself) may be godly, and not merely human, anger. Further, it may be consistent with Christian love, even as God's wrath and His chastening of His beloved are consistent with His love. Let us not make this last statement a sweeping justification for anger (inward or expressed) on the part of Christians, however, whether our anger be directed towards the deeds of the world or of a brother in the Body of Christ. We must prayerfully, painfully come to grips with each specific situation, seeking the guidance of God's Spirit and questioning not only the actions of the other party, but our own actions and motives also. Seeing that "the wrath of men does not work the righteousness of God" (James 1:20), let us as sons of the Most High be like our heavenly Father--"slow to anger, and plentiful in mercy" (Ps. 103:8).

A NEW SOCIAL GOSPEL?
by Ron Wells

There is a cry going out today in the evangelical world for vital Christian involvement in the crucial social problems of our day. As we nervously shift our weight from foot to foot and ponder the possible repercussions of what might be viewed as a "social gospel," the world moves on in its search for a crutch or even a possible remedy. Why has the evangelical world, to a great extent, failed to face the social issues of its day?

I feel that there are two basic reasons for this. First, we are still suffering "emotionally" from the shattering Fundamentalist-Liberalist Controversy of the past several decades (dead bodies have a way of leaving old bones behind). Much
of our present stance on social issues is the result of a position taken years ago in over-reaction to an opposite position—such things often occur in heated debate. The other reason is more fundamental: We have no definite theological base from which to speak to the social issues of our day. The social implications of the Gospel have not been written into a systematic structure that is capable of being Christian and speaking to social issues at the same time.

An overlooked attempt to write a systematic theology for the "social gospel" was advanced by Walter Rauschenbusch in 1917 (A Theology for the Social Gospel). It is my hope that the positive presentation of some of his thoughts will spur us on to develop a theology which will speak to our culture and society in a meaningful way.

A major contribution of Rauschenbusch lies in his emphasis on community. He would say that we seldom sin against God alone.

He (God) works through humanity to realize his purposes, and our sins block and destroy the Reign of God in which he might fully reveal and realize himself. Therefore our sins against the least of our fellow-men in the last resort concern God. Therefore when we retard the progress of mankind, we retard the revelation of the glory of God. (p. 49)

Along with the Redemptive Mandate which runs like a golden thread through Scripture, there is a Cultural Mandate as well. It begins with the command of God to "be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and rule..." (Gen. 1:28).

The last point I would like to make is one which deals with repentance—both individual and social.

In personal religion the first requirement is to repent and believe in the gospel. Social religion, too, demands repentance and faith: repentance for our social sins; faith in the possibility of a new social order. As long as a man sees in our present society only a few inevitable abuses and recognizes no sin and evil deep-seated in the very constitution of the present order, he is still in a state of moral blindness and without conviction of sin. Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 349.

Our duty as Christians is not to place redeemed men in corrupt society as silent sentinels for God, but to use our personal faith to change the very structure of society. To Christianize the social order is to bring it into harmony with the ethical convictions which we identify with Christ.

James, though "right strawy", declares: "Faith without works is dead" (2:20).

Rauschenbusch made a positive theological attempt to combine faith and works into a viable Christian system. It remains for us not only to accept or reject his thought, but to formulate a theological base from which we can begin to work as evangelicals.
POOR WORLD
by Bruce Dreon

Poor World, groaning demanding—
imitates its lords. . .despoilers.

Impoverished to self-indulgence withdrawing
its promise to each.

Taut crust, seething, revealing
the raging lava of hate.

Hopeless to explosive abandon wasting
the mind of all.

Feast! Feed! the love
for free, redeeming, conferring.

Peaceful in the climate of grace radiating
from the wealth of One.

NEGATIVE FEELINGS
by Marty Shoemaker

Just recently an event occurred in our community which started my head buzzing, and from what I can discern the symptoms are not mine alone. In the last issue of the Opinion, Bruce Dreon expressed honest criticism and negative feelings about Dr. Hubbard's lack of interest in our student publication. The implications were many and go far beyond the Opinion and its staff to the issue of presidential priorities expressed both in Dr. Hubbard's absence from campus and an overall neglect of communication.

The point of this article, however, is not a discussion of presidential priorities, as valuable as that may be, but the mistaken notion of some that Bruce and those who concur with him have done a grave disservice to our president by criticizing him so openly. The crux of their disagreement seems to say that "loving" Christians are above negative criticism and feelings and that Dr. Hubbard must be supported in all his actions as the leader of the seminary.

Basic to all of this is the assumption by some of my brothers that a caring relationship is exclusive of confronting criticism or angry feelings. In my opinion, nothing could be further from the truth and as potentially destructive.

A poet may speak of life as a rose garden full of beautiful blossoms symbolic of joy and happiness. They are quick to point out, however, that among these blossoms the thorny reality of anger, depression, and sadness is also present. Everything nor everyone in our personal universe does not radiate positive ideas or feelings and to live like they do is both immature and irresponsible. To deny the roughness of human interaction removes the abrasive quality so desperately needed to bring brilliance and value to a relationship.

In the context of the present discussion, I have heard it said that an article like Bruce's is judgmental, harsh, and lacking in understanding. First of all, I believe that honest, spontaneous feeling or criticism can be less judgmental, if acted upon constructively, than later frustration and resentment. Suppressed feelings tend to filter one's perceptions so thoroughly that only a lower level of authenticity is possible. That's how the most becomes a blinding beam. Secondly, to understand someone, the relationship must be maintained and to not express
NEGATIVE FEELINGS (cont'd)

negative feedback is to deny the fullest level of reciprocity. I can never hope to gain understanding by withdrawing from conflict. By doing so, one uses inappropriate behavior to ease hurt or anxiety. The result is that no healing or understanding will be forthcoming, because the door is shut.

In my opinion, a real service has been rendered to our President, Dr. Hubbard, by maintaining contact with him through creative criticism and the expression of displeasure. I think we all acknowledge our need for his noble leadership and Bruce's article was honest and forthright enough to say so.

I wonder if this is what they meant by "dangerous tendencies" at FIS?