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I found the discussion by Gary Tuttle of the greater need for power where it counts for the students extremely thought-provoking. It challenged me anew in the whole matter of the nature of theological education, on which I would very much like to see a convocation. I'm sure that all of us who are "employees" here need to be reminded that students are willing and able to wrestle with problems and evaluate what is going on in their experience of our institution. I must admit that I don't think all students are so inclined, but the energies and insights of those who are should be exploited, I'm sure.

Failure to understand this by faculty is a natural and sincere inadequacy. Since the students pay us, (for which we remain humbly grateful) it is not only natural, but conscientious to consider our task a kind of contract. The student looks us over, examines our products and processes, makes application, and when accepted invests his money and his energy in order to receive our instruction and the certification that goes with it. It is our responsibility to be sensitive to the standards of the church and of academia, to enlist qualified and capable instructors, provide a reasonably adequate environment, and properly recognize achievement.

It should be noted that all this is supposed to have taken place in some orderly fashion before any student gets here. He really doesn't want just a group of fellow-learners who will grope for some direction with him, even though the faculty in its finest moments is learning and forming with the student.

I think the ultimate conclusion of this thinking is obvious. There is no way that the student can assume the responsibility that has to rest squarely upon the faculty, but we will all agree that he can and should bring to bear upon institutional procedures the benefit of his previous educational experiences and, above all, a studied evaluation of his present experience in the seminary. Please note that he cannot speak significantly about how this learning will relate to his future experiences, but he can certainly speak loud and long about what is going on now. There are good and bad ways to do this speaking. The more it is truly collective, the more it is reinforced with appropriate evidence, the more it is dispassionately and discreetly offered, the greater its impact and result.

Let me just give a "for instance." I keep getting the feeling that there is a deep conviction among the students that a reasonably good scholar in our institution, taking an average load, and moderately active in a church, has placed upon him such a burden that a modicum of social grace, cultural enrichment, recreation or even exercise is a virtual impossibility. I think it would be a most interesting and enlightening study if student profiles could be accurately drawn. My own suspicion is that we are really not encouraging or allowing the quality of life that will make the seminary years an exciting, rewarding and encouraging period. I'm not certain that there is virtue in exhaustion or character in collapse.

I also would encourage continued constructive approaches to course evaluation. Such evaluations are needlessly cruel if made public under our circumstances, but they might prove more effective if they were known by someone other than the professor, perhaps the Dean or the department. This would help us all to take our students seriously.

I think there are other possibilities for change as a result of student involvement. There should be no pessimism as to such possibility. I know this place has changed; the complaints are different. Above all, I have great confidence in the good-will and vision of the faculty. I believe we are committed to excellence in theological education. I know we are constantly changing in our understanding of how that can best take place. We are in this boat together, and all who can supply plugs for the holes and rope to help get the sails into the wind are welcome. Perhaps we can even stop once in a while for some grog on the poop-deck.
I would like to offer a brief word of exhortation to the Fuller community, couched in terms of a personal concern. During my time here, now approaching three years, I have frequently sensed a lack of respect for conservatives and conservative scholarship, especially those of the fundamentalist or dispensational variety. This lack of respect has been expressed in a number of ways by both students and faculty alike—sometimes by disregarding their views, sometimes by caricaturing them. But most disturbing to me personally is the fact that sometimes fundamentalists or dispensationalists have been laughed at—vocally—in classrooms. This expresses a lack of Christian love for these brothers in Christ, and belies a certain haughtiness in us, thinking that we have the right answers to their problems. My concern is deepened by observing that we frequently give more respect to liberal theologians such as Bultmann or Robinson than we do to those who share more closely our views of Christ and the Scriptures. Granted, showing love for fundamentalists is tough, especially when they have many times been quick to judge or even attack Fuller Seminary. Certainly it is easier to love those who are more open, as liberals often are. But this does not reduce our obligation to love and respect conservatives as brothers in the Lord, even if we disagree with them on matters of doctrine. I would exhort you, my brothers and sisters of the Fuller community, to consider carefully your attitude toward this branch of Christ's body, and to think before you laugh. And perhaps some positive steps to mend and to strengthen our ties with them would not be out of order.
REVIVALISM AND RELATIONAL THEOLOGY
by Dr. Munger

The question has been asked "How is 'relational theology' different from and more constructive than the emotional revivalism of the nineteenth century?"

I understand 'relational theology' to be that known through the ministry and writings of the late Sam Shoemaker and such contemporaries as Keith Miller, Bruce Larson, and those associated with the Faith at Work movement and magazine. Both appear to hold many basic beliefs in common such as a centrality in Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord, the good news of God's saving grace offered freely to all men through Him and the importance of a personal response, "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." However there are some marked contrasts. Nineteenth Century revivalism was directed toward large groupings of people, "mass evangelism." As suggested by the question, it was at times highly emotional, manipulative, and imposed strong pressures upon the individual. Though it stressed a personal relationship with Christ, revivalism often was highly impersonal and insensitive to individuals in its method.

That which is called relational theology is, at its best, strongly personal both in relationship with God and with man. It takes people seriously as unique personalities, endeavoring through small groups, retreats, and extended personal conversations to provide an atmosphere of acceptance and love where, in the light of the gospel, there is released a free and authentic response to God. Although emotions inevitably are present, the verbalizing of thought and feelings with others encourages an objectivity not present in mass movements and avoids the rationalizations present in individual thought. The relational and the emotional are not to be confused.

The term "relational theology" lacks adequate definition. Rather than a new theological formulation, I understand it to refer to the recovery of certain neglected biblical truths. It is an emphasis rather than a distinct system of thought. "Relational theology" does not stand by itself or over against "conceptual theology." Rather it is the application of Biblical principles within the larger framework of evangelical theology. Some emphases are:

I. The personal nature of God revealed in scripture calls for personal relationship with Him.

   At the heart of all that is not a power but a Person who cares, one who addresses us as "thou" and whom we may address "Father". Since "God is Love", His purpose in our redemption is not only that we hold correct thoughts about Him but that we enjoy a relationship with Him. Through the centuries a persistent distortion has tended to reduce Christian experience to non-personal levels, treating God as "It" rather than "Thou", as Object rather than Subject. When this depersonalization occurs, Christianity hardens into rules, regulations and contracts rather than the relationship of trust and love. Faith becomes knowledge and belief, an intellectual activity confined to the self rather than trust involving two persons—the self and God. Relational theology stresses faith as a personal response to a personal deity.

II. The Great Commandment confronts us with the importance of the relational with one another.

   We are to love the Lord our God "with all our mind," and also "with all our heart and strength." We are to love our neighbor as ourselves" and our brother "even as Christ has loved us." That carries us out of the conceptual into the relational. When I reflect on that which is the "greatest and most important commandment" in the mind of Christ, the essence of all we are to be and do, I marvel at our indifference to his explicit concerns, the establishing of our own priorities even on a seminary campus. We are being trained to learn. Are we being trained to love?
III. Relational theology understands the quickening of new life and Christian growth and maturity to be supported by the means of grace and by the sharing of life together in Christ.

The apostle Paul is quite clear on the matter, "speaking the truth in love, we are to grow up in every way into Him who is the Head, into Christ, from whom the whole body joined and knit together by every joint with which it is supplied, when each part is working properly, makes bodily growth and upbuilds itself in love." (Eph. 4:15-16). Our strongly verbal, evangelical sub-culture seems to have missed the full force of the familiar words, "If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. And if I have prophetic powers, and understand all the mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love I am nothing." (I Cor. 13:1-2).

Our lonely impersonal society is desperately seeking authentic relationships yet many Christian congregations are failing to offer God's gracious provision; the Christian "Koinonia". The matter is critical. Without the recovery of true community in Christ the congregations will decline and die. Meanwhile, an exciting movement of spiritual awakening and renewal is occurring both without and within the organized church, taking many forms and expressions. Almost without exception they may be characterized by the emergence of Relational Christianity. In my judgement personal relationship with Christ and with one another is not optional, but essential for vital Christian life both in the Church and in our campus community. Let us maintain the primacy of "growing--in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" and our emphasis on the academic. But let us not minimize the importance or the power of the personal.

THE PROPER PERSPECTIVE
by Chuck VanEngen

I was very frustrated, and a little discouraged. I was being forced to remember details which I had little interest in. It didn't matter to me much who proposed what theory over the authorship of the Gospel of Matthew—or Mark, or Luke. I was little interested in whether a Proto-Luke once existed, or whether Theophilus was an elder in the Roman church or someone else. Yet I knew that these are important facts in the area of Biblical analysis and scholarship. I was frustrated.

But I became even more frustrated when I sat for a week in Pentateuch and listened to a long, extended, and (it seemed to me) endless argument over the nature of the Genesis material. I knew in my head that "eventness" is a very important attribute to assign the Genesis material, an attribute which I would not want to try to explain away. Yet I was frustrated with the discussion.

The feeling, however, got worse before it was to get better. I had to preach a sermon on Genesis 3:15. So I began that process—which almost becomes habitual sometimes—of translating the passage, doing word-studies on the appropriate words, exegeting the passage as much as I could on my own, then going to the commentaries—only to find them wrestling with the same problems I had come up with. And I was terribly frustrated. Was I to spend all my time trying to resolve whether this passage was a Messianic reference, or was I going to spend the bulk of my time thinking and rejoicing over the fact that one day, as the seed of the woman, I would fatally bruise the head of evil? And it was at this time that suddenly I was reminded of something which I should have realized all along, and which resolved much of the frustration I had been feeling. I was allowing two
things to become separated which should always be kept together, in dynamic inter-relatedness. I had lost the proper perspective which is needed for Biblical study.

I'm sure most of you reading this have already guessed what I'm going to say. It is nothing new. It is just that we so often forget, that we must continue to remind ourselves of it. Often we sit at our desk at home, our wives having gone to sleep about half the night before, doing our exegesis by the light of a flickering florescent desk lamp, ruining our eyes, our handwriting, and our health.

But often we are at the same time ruining our spiritual health as well, for we so often forget to do all of our exegesis UNDER THE ILLUMINATION OF SALVATION. What I mean is, we read the parable of the Prodigal Son, and analyze exactly what the parable was intended to convey to the Pharisees, what the words meant, why the redactor phrased the parable as he did, and WE COMPLETELY FORGET THAT ONCE WE CAME CRAWLING, SMELLING OF PIGS, HAVING SPENT ALL THAT WE HAD, ASHAMED-EVEN TO LOOK AT OUR HEAVENLY FATHER, and He put His arms around us, clothed us with the coat of royalty, put on the ring of sonship and, Halleluiah, reinstated us as His children! And whatever else it means, it does tell us what we have to celebrate in Jesus!

In other words, we spend more time exegeting, than praising the Lord! Besides, we even concentrate more when we translate than when we are talking to our Heavenly Father in prayer! We are more remorseful over a few questions missed in our New Testament quizzes, than we are when we have sinned against Almighty God by our pride, selfishness, self-sufficiency, and lack of love. Brothers, let's not forget that our ultimate goal in all this minutia of Biblical analysis is primarily to KNOW HIM AND THE POWER OF HIS RESURRECTION. Let us do our study, always with the proper perspective. Let's do our exegesis UNDER THE ILLUMINATION OF SALVATION. And when we differ with each other, we ought to differ as BROTHERS, not as two warring minds which cannot stand the stupidity of the other.

Let's not let familiarity with this subtle evil, cause us to hold it in contempt. If we do not exegete in the proper perspective, we will die spiritually, and rigor mortis will set in, precisely through the channel of Life, the Word of God.

SONG TO THE SAD AT HEART
by Gerald H. Wilson

Oh, I have walked the neon littered streets of cobblestone
And I have known you--
Known you of the sad eyes and the haggard heart.
Unwanted gift, you have given all to anyone who asked
Or had the eyes to stare,
What will you give to those who really care?

You live today, avoid the past and never dare to look ahead.
What you've nothing left but emptiness and sorrow?
Oh, I could tell you in a moment if you'd only lend an ear,
But since Love's a word you fear
You only laugh at me and sneer.

So fare thee well, and I must leave
And I'll admit that I'm not sad
It isn't me behind your sad eyes and your haggard heart.
AN INTERVIEW WITH SOME FULLER WIVES
by Dave Toycen

Dave Toycen—Whenever something is phrased like "learning to be a good minister's wife" I've noticed you all kind of flinch. Why?

Joy Jacobsen—It seems to me the emphasis should be on learning to be a person instead of learning to be a minister's wife. There is no such thing as a perfect minister's wife, just as there is no such thing as the typical American. Being a minister's wife carries with it all the implications of what a good minister's wife should do and I refuse to impose those traditional roles on myself.

Dave—What do you think is the difference between being a person and being a "good minister's wife"?

Joy—Churches often expect the wife to be in there to teach the Sunday School classes, play the piano, and sing in the choir, take care of the nursery and lead the ladies' missionary society. If the wife doesn't fit this role, she is a misfit in the eyes of much of the congregation. She may be accused of not having her husband's work at heart.

Char Warner—I haven't experienced that, exactly. What I have felt would be asked of me is to agree with my husband. Yet, I might not always agree with him, in fact often I don't agree with him and I can't see myself pretending to agree.

Joy—You are really viewed as a unit, aren't you?

Char—We are not allowed to be individuals.

Janice Tuttle—Yes, and as you learn that, to always be agreeing with your husband, you are learning to stop thinking for yourself.

Dave—In my opinion, there are not too many women who are willing to articulate what you have been feeling. What do you think of this?

Char—I think it is because they are afraid that their expressions will not be received well. The argument will come from fellows who are experienced writers and can articulate well. Many women fear criticism about the way they have expressed themselves rather than the content. I really had those feelings when I wrote that article last Spring. (Opinion, Spring, "71")

Janice—One of the things I feel is that if I were to write a statement or article, it would appear "dumb" because of inferior verbal expression. I feel that I would be causing trouble for other women by appearing to be some "dingbat" wife, which is just what I don't want to do.

Dave—So you feel like there are quite a few women who agree with you?

All—Yes.

Janice—But women are so used to the automatic put down.

Char—I read some of the arguments back and forth in the Opinion and to think that my little article might be attacked by those fellows who can really say what they mean is a scary thing.
AN INTERVIEW WITH SOME FULLER WIVES (Cont'd)

Joy—They have had the opportunity to put their thoughts into writing, but it is not accepted as a meaningful thing for us to do.

Char—There is the assumption at the Seminary that one must approach a problem from an intellectual and rational direction. You can't approach problems with your feelings, because men in the seminary are dealing logically and rationally with theology. When a woman comes along with her feelings, there is no place for it (I don't think a place is made for the man's feelings either.) This puts women at a particular disadvantage.

Dave—Do you feel women function on a feeling level?

Joy—I think we have been culturally conditioned to function more on a feeling level. Not only that, but the men have developed a rapport with one another. They see each other in and out of class, discuss issues which are relevant, and here comes a wife from out of nowhere to tell people what she feels. One way or the other, it seems to me she's got to be very brave or very stupid.

Dave—What is your response then, to the traditional Biblical interpretation of the woman's role? In becoming liberated, do you wish to toss the Bible out?

All—No!

Char—I don't have as much trouble with it as I used to when I rejected it totally. But it is mainly because I have learned a lot this past year from Sue Ellen Porter (Fuller '70). She gave me insights on the regard for women expressed by writers of the Old and New Testaments. She explained how much their cultural contexts come into play.

Dave—Then you are saying that a lot of what is written in the Bible is culturally conditioned?

Char—that's true, but I think also that traditionally being interpreted by men, and expounded upon by men, much of the support for women being persons has been overlooked. I think Paul was not the chauvinist that at first glance he would appear to be. In his relationship with women, Jesus encountered them with respect, and always recognized their personhood.

Dave—are you saying that it is not so much the cultural conditioning of the Old and New Testaments, as how men of today interpret what has been written?

Char—I would agree with that.

Janice—it is not just the men, but also the women of today who interpret it that way.

Joy—Here is an important reason for giving women some theological tools. To be able to know where and how to go to the text for something, we are dependent to a large degree upon our husband's knowledge. We need to be taught to be systematic and thorough in our study of the Bible. Just a few simple things would help us so much to deal with our husband's work.
AN INTERVIEW WITH SOME FULLER WIVES (Cont'd)

Dave—What do you think the school could do?

Joy—I definitely think courses are needed for women who have not had Greek and Hebrew. These courses should stimulate wife's theological perspective.

Char—Fred Bush gave a series of classes at our church last January on the first 11 chapters of Genesis. It was very much on the lay person's level and it was fantastic.

Dave—Do you think there would be enough women interested at Fuller?

Janice—I would think so. Especially the wives who have been here for awhile. You have been to college for four years and then for one, two or even three years you get nothing intellectual. After awhile, you begin to feel mentally stagnant.

Joy—It is even worse for the wives who have been putting their husbands through school longer than that. It can seem like forever! As their husbands continue to grow intellectually, the wives feel like they are slowly starting to fall off. They have less and less in common with their husbands during his school years.

Dave—What have you found to be the most challenging part of your experience when you began to work through the traditional concept of women?

Char—I think the real excitement lies in having the freedom to research and grapple with a problem and then come to a conclusion that is really your own, and not something you have taken from your husband.

Joy—I think one of the most exciting things is to be able to disagree, with conviction—to be able to state positively what "I know" and to stand on it. For so long we have been in the shadow of our husbands' preparation for life. His preparation has become our preparation together, instead of our separate preparations coming together to make a fuller and richer experience for both of us. As I become more knowledgeable of myself, and search out how I feel about things, and acting upon my convictions, I find that our marriage is a better one.

Dave—So you see the beginning for yourself and maybe for others, too, as to stand your ground?

Janice—It is very threatening...at least that is the way I've felt when I finally did what I knew was probably taking our marriage in my own hands. I would either make it or break it. That is no small thing.

Joy—that's right. When you demand equalness in your marriage, even if you have an understanding husband, it is very hard. I came to the decision that I would rather be a person and divorced, than a parrot and married. For two people to have a meaningful marriage, each must give the best there is to offer and this never means that one person is always in the submissive role. There can be no doubt, that struggling with these concepts in reality, can be a painful experience.

Janice—I think that Fuller could offer some classes where women could get together, so that when you are going through this you are not completely by yourself.
AN INTERVIEW WITH SOME FULLER WIVES (Cont'd)

Dave--As you have struggled with your own personhood, what have you discovered anew in your relationship with God?

Joy--I felt I was realizing what humanness was for the first time. I was discovering why I needed to be redeemed and what the gift of grace really means to me as a person. As you come to an awareness of your whole self, it is then that you realize your need for grace. Until you are honest before yourself, your husband, and God, you don't really understand humanness.

Char--In my experience with the Bible, I cannot believe that God wants me to be what women have become. I cannot accept the traditional interpretation of the woman's place, but I know God and believe that the Bible is imperative for the growth of my faith. There must be a point where these come together, and I want to find it.

Graffiti: Overheard in the library; one male, chauvinist pig to another, "You don't really think we should let our wives read this stuff, do you?"