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It is crucial, though, in treating a topic such as this to ascertain just what God's attitude toward culture is. Is God a cultural relativist? Or did he, as some seem to contend, (in Wright?) once create a model culture (Hebrew culture)? Or, as many seem to assume, is he in the process of developing a more and more "Christian culture" out of western "civilization"?

In a now classic statement of the relationships which western theologians have seemed to understand between Christ and Culture, H. Richard Niebuhr (1951) treats three basic positions: Christ against culture, Christ in culture and Christ above culture. In a similar vein one might designate at least five possible understandings of the relationship between God and culture: God in culture, God against culture, God endorsing a culture, God above and apart from culture and God above but interacting with man in terms of culture. Though each of these perspectives captures some truth with regard to God's relationship to culture, it is here maintained that only the last understanding is true both to the Bible (the theological source of our understanding of God and man) and to the insights of Anthropology.

Those who see God as contained in culture typically see him merely as the expression of a longing on the part of man to deify himself. "Man creates God in his own image," they say, and then bows down in reality not to someone who really exists but to a concept which man himself has created. In support of such a contention its advocates (including perhaps the majority of anthropologists) point to the widely differing culturally-defined perceptions of deity abroad in the world, maintaining that these differing perceptions have each developed wholly or largely as the result of the human quest for suprahuman sanction for the kind of life which a man's culture prescribes for him.

The Christian must, of course, reject this kind of complete relativization of God. He does, however, need to note the truth that the members of different cultures do perceive deity in quite different ways and that the differences in these perceptions are correlatable with the differences between the world views (including values, ideals and religion) of these societies. When, therefore, one focuses only on culture-bound perception it is not impossible to suggest that even Christians to a great extent "create God in their own image". Americans, for example, so focus on the love (as we idealize it) of God that we not only have difficulty interpreting Scriptural passages displaying the judgmental side of God but often fail miserably in understanding that God could ever condemn. Likewise early Hebrew culture, focused in as it was on the majesty and righteousness of God, while finding it relatively easy to understand his judgments, often failed to understand his love. In such ways, at the perceptual level only, man "creates" God.

The second view is of those that maintain that there is an absolute God but regard his as basically antagonistic toward culture. These often point to passages such as I John 2:15, 16 and 5:19 where Christians are enjoined against loving "the world" since the world "is in the power of the evil one", as indications that God is dead set against human culture since the latter is wholly under the power of Satan. To those who hold this view the essence of "culture" is the evil that they see around them and the way to holiness is escape from and condemnation of "the world".

This group, while rightly understanding that Satan makes use of human culture for his ends makes two very serious errors. First they equate the term "culture" with but one of the New Testament used of the word kosmos2, and secondly, they assume that because Satan has power over culture (by their definition) that, therefore, all culture (as broadly defined by others) is evil. They however, continue to live by and endorse the major part of their culture (broadly defined) even while con-

---

2The word, though frequently and prominently employed in this negative sense especially by John, is widely employed with less negative and technical connotations as well. In no case, as far as I can determine, may kosmos be interpreted as co-extensive with the term culture as used by anthropologists.
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denying and attempting to escape from that which they define as culture. Mean­
while, by seeking God's guidance in ways approved by their culture and Christian
subculture (e.g., they expect God to lead through prayerfully considered circum­
stances rather than, as Hebrew culture believed via visions and dreams), they demon­
strate that God as well as Satan is able to employ cultural forms to perform his
functions.

The third of these views of God's relationship to culture sees God as either
creating, developing or endorsing a given culture or subculture and ordaining that
all men everywhere if they are to be Christian be converted thereto. This concept
may take the form of an absolutization of some historical culture such as Hebrew, Greco-
Roman (often referred to in these contexts as "First Century Christian Culture" or New Testament culture") or, more often in the last few centuries, some form or modif­
ication of western "civilization". Or it may refer simply to "Christian Culture"
(which, insofar as it is defined at all, usually looks very western) or employ a
term like "Biblical Culture" (as if the Biblical records portrayed a cultural unity).
Quite often the recommended culture is conceived of in terms of a particular denomi­
national or cross-denominational (e.g. conservative or evangelical) subculture, at
least with regard to its theological, ethical and religious beliefs and practices.

Such views though correctly seeing that there are major cultural differences
between Christians and non-Christians fail to properly distinguish between Christians
operating the forms of a given culture to serve Christian functions and a culture
(or subculture) the forms of which may be labeled "Christian" (whatever this would
mean). Even slavery, for example, as counter to Christianity as we feel this cul­
tural form to be, was operable by Christians with a maximum of Christian considerate­
ness and, therefore, employable to Christian ends (functions). Likewise dictator­
ship, warfare (as in the Old Testament), death (e.g., martyrdom), secularism, etc.,
etc. (though not, apparently, murder, stealing, covetousness, adultery, etc.).

It is the functions, though, that are Christian and this in spite of the "counter-
Christianness" of the forms. Similarly, cultural forms that might be designated as
"more Christian" than any of these are continually operated both by non-Christians
and (often unconsciously) by Christians to serve functions that are completely
counter to Christianity. Even the cultural forms of "Christian" charity, church
organization, evangelism, etc., as we know it too well, are often operated in very
unchristian ways.

The fourth of these views is that of Deism and much popular thinking within
western culture and of many African cultures as well. It holds that God is above and
outside of culture and no longer really concerned with the affairs of men. He
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may be regarded as having programmed the whole thing before he left or as having started something which he is no longer able to control but he is gone and virtually unreachable and it is useless for us to waste time calling to him for he no longer listens or cares.

Except for the truth of God's transcendence which this position appears to have carried too far, it is difficult to say anything positive about such a perspective. It cannot, of course, be reconciled with the Biblical portrayal of a concerned and communicating God and, in fact, appears to have so little to offer by way of insight into the God-culture-man relationship (which it denies) that it seems pointless to discuss it further here.

The God-above-but-through-culture understanding of this relationship, however, appears to put it all together and will be the view assumed throughout this paper. This view sees God as transcendent and absolute, completely beyond and outside of any culture but so concerned with man and desirous of interacting with him that he chooses the cultural milieu in which man is immersed as the arena of his interaction with man. Thus when he speaks to Adam or Abraham or Moses or the disciples or us he does so whether directly or indirectly by employing human, not divine language—language which participates in human culture with both its strengths and its weaknesses, its heights and its dents, its glories and its sinfulness, its facilitating of communication and its limiting of it and encompassed by its finiteness, its relativity and its assured misperception of infinity.

Yet when God sought to communicate with Hebrews he did not first demand that they learn a language and culture that allowed them, for example, to better understand his lovingness. He employed Hebrew linguistic and cultural forms in spite of their inadequacy in this respect, even to the extent of endorsing (for them, though obviously not for everyone at all times) at least major portions of Hebrew culture, even though he knew that their culturally conditioned fear (terror?) of him would constitute a rather serious impediment to his getting across to Hebrews his lovingness. Likewise, though Jesus and the disciples operated in terms of Aramaic culture and language (God showing his willingness to employ that culture for the sake of those immersed in it), when the events of the New Testament were recorded it was for a Greek audience and, therefore, Greek was employed. And this in spite of the well-known difficulties (including both losses and gains in information) inherent in the process of translation. God, however, appears from the Biblical record determined to communicate himself to people within their own linguistic and cultural framework. That is, God chooses to work in terms of human language and culture to interact with man. More of the implications of this choice on God's part will be developed below.

3 Which may account for the fact that God chose to work with Hebrews in terms of a culturally known covenant relationship which may have been the closest they could come to the God-man relationship that the New Testament sees as grounded in love. Hebrew culture, at least at the time of the earlier Old Testament writings, may not have been able to comprehend "love as a pure expression of psychical reality apart from legality" (Kittel on Love, p. 11) — the legality of a covenant.

(This has been excerpted from a paper by Dr. Kraft entitled "God, Man, Culture and The Cross-Cultural Communication of the Gospel)
HE WAS AND STILL IS  
by Randy Tremba

He was a man of little truth,  
so he gestured wildly.  

He was a man of little hope,  
so he laughed loudly.  

He was a man of little love,  
so he slapped backs.  

He was selling envelopes  
when the big fact passed by.  

He was and still is.

RESPONSE TO "AN INTERVIEW WITH SOME FULLER WIVES"  
by Roberta Fort

As a wife who is not used to the "automatic put down" I have a few comments to make after reading the interview in the Nov. 29 issue of The Opinion.

The interview never defined what was meant by the "traditional Biblical interpretation of the woman's role," though it sounded as if some of the girls interviewed were ready to reject it. This may sound traditional but the Bible says to me that the husband is the head of the family and the wife is in submission to the head.

In this day of liberation, the word submission has negative overtones. Why is submission so unacceptable? For one thing, submission suggests that we might lose something. To some submission means annihilation. Webster says submission is "...surrender of person and power to the control of another." No one wants to lose control. We often fail to submit because our ego will not let us. Perhaps we do not have submission because we do not experience open, genuine love in the one or group to whom submission is due. Ephesians 5:21 states that we are to be subject to one another. This passage goes on to say that wives are to submit to their husbands in everything; and that the husbands response is loving as Christ loved the church. How can we begin to know about submitting to Christ if we never experience submitting to one another?

What about submission by the wife where the husband does not have a deep loving response? Does she still submit? Peter would say yes. (1 Peter 3:1 "Likewise you wives, be submissive to your husbands, so that some though they do not obey the word, may be won without a word by the behavior of their wives.")

The attitude of submission differs greatly from the attitude of "demanding equality in your marriage" as mentioned in the interview. First. Demanding is a threatening matter and in my experience usually brings a poor response. Second, equality seems to be something unattainable, because one is male the other female. Equality is not the point. We are to be complimentary by our differences in abilities, ideals, temperaments, etc. The quality we should desire is each partners total submission to Christ.

Now to the practical problem of staying intellectually stimulated. I believe it is the wife's responsibility to keep herself on board intellectually. Why go to college for four years to become stagnant later? Why expect your husband or anyone else to keep you intellectually stimulated? Opportunities are available. Both Fuller and Pasadena City College have free courses to residents. Fuller wives with children
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could surely get together to hire a baby sitter so they could attend a class. The Pasadena city library has numerous lectures plus current reading all at no cost to residents! Have you tried Fuller's Social Concerns class on Thursday evening? Type your husbands term papers (if you're not already), at least you'll know what he is thinking! And get him to discuss the paper with you. Of course this will take extra effort, but then it takes anyone extra effort to keep up intellectually.

Today's woman has many freedoms and opportunities which if rightly used will enable her to be that "suitable helper" her husband needs. I like the way Sandra Parks put it, "God intended originally for woman to be man's constant reminder of his relationship with Christ...not in word, but in position which is her ministry."

A MODEST PROPOSAL
for the Use of the Facilities and Personnel of Fuller Theological Seminary in Order that They Might Better Fulfill the True Purposes of a Seminary by Tom Provence

It is sometimes disturbing to those who are involved in the functioning of this Institution that they do not fully understand their role in fulfilling the purposes and goals of a Theological Seminary. I was myself a victim of such confusion only recently when a professor confessed that he would rather spend an hour reading and writing in his office than spend a similar period teaching in a classroom. As I have said, I was confused and disturbed. After all, I reasoned, is not the purpose of a Theological Seminary to teach men Theology? to train them for ministry? to help them relate the Scriptures to everyday life?

However, the faultiness of my own reasoning was made painfully clear to me when someone (I have forgotten the name of the saint who is responsible for my enlightenment, much to my shame) reminded me that the noun "Seminary" comes from the Latin word for seedbed. This thought prompted me to look up the definition of "Seminary" in Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. The primary meaning for "seminary" given there is "an environment in which something originates and from which it is propagated." In the case of a Theological Seminary the "something" of the definition is "Theology." As I considered this definition, the great truth which I had missed for so long came crashing in upon me. The primary goal of a Theological Seminary is not to teach but to originate and propagate Theology. In other words, the professor had a better grasp of the purpose of a Seminary than I did because he understood that reading and thinking are the origin and writing the propagation of Theology.

Therefore, in the interest of achieving the goals of a Theological Seminary I have been lead to put forth a plan to achieve those goals. Other plans have been offered in past issues of The Opinion for restructuring Fuller Seminary but these plans were based upon the false presupposition that a Seminary's purpose is teaching and learning. The present plan, however, has the distinct advantage of having a proper basis, viz. a correct understanding of the purpose of a Seminary.

It must first of all be recognized that students are secondary to the purposes of a Seminary. This is no reflection upon the quality of the students at Fuller
Seminary—after all I am a student myself—but rather a recognition that the goals of a Seminary can be better accomplished without students. There are however two secondary tasks, described below, in which students may contribute to the purposes of a Seminary. Nevertheless it is wrong for the students to demand that professors spend time with them in classrooms; for creative thinking and writing can not take place in this sort of an atmosphere.

Rather the faculty of the Seminary must be provided with time, an office and resources for originating and propagating Theology. Therefore, the professors should have no time-consuming classes or office hours to hinder creative thinking. They must also have full access to the books in the library to stimulate their thinking. This means, of course, that students will not be allowed to check out books from the library since nothing can halt creative thinking faster than not being able to find a particular book.

Since classes would no longer be held, classrooms would be converted into offices to house faculty who are presently forced to occupy inferior quarters. Any classrooms which remain could be converted to luxury apartments which the Seminary Business Office might rent out to provide additional financial support for the Seminary. The Ten Year Plan must be modified so that more apartments may be built to bring in further monies to the Seminary. These apartments must be built since there will be an inevitable loss of tuition from those students who are so self-centered and immature as to think that they "should be taught something in Seminary."

A great deal of money would be saved by cutting out the practically oriented departments of the Seminary. It must be obvious that the ministry department in the Theology section of the Seminary does not contribute much to the origination and propagation of Theology. The professors in this department must be allowed to choose between being released by the Seminary or turning their attention to Theology. The Field Education Director, long-awaited under the old priorities, will not be hired. The resulting loss of faculty, not to mention the elimination of such practically oriented services as the field work office, would save the Seminary thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars per year.

The President of the Seminary, who would function as a Public Relations man, will raise further financial support. His primary purpose under this new plan will be to solicit funds for the Institution from prominent churchmen in America who are concerned about the origination and propagation of Theology.

The present Schools of World Mission and Psychology pose a great problem to the new plan. Neither School is presently concerned about the origination and propagation of Theology. The School of World Mission may be attempting to propagate the gospel; but it is one thing to propagate the gospel and quite another to propagate Theology. Obviously a Theological Seminary can be concerned only with the latter. Both Schools seem to be patently immature in their theological development. There is presently the danger that these schools with their immature Theology might subvert the true goals and purposes of a Theological Seminary. Thus I suggest that the two Schools be placed on probation as associates of the School of Theology. If the Theology of these two schools shows sufficient growth over a five year period, they should be absorbed into the Theological Seminary. If, on the other hand, the professors in these two schools persist in their lack of concern for the accomplishment of the true goals of a Theological Seminary, the schools must be eliminated from the structure of the Institution. It is important to remember here that these two schools are a part of Fuller Theological Seminary and they must, therefore, attempt to achieve the goals of a Theological Seminary.

As was stated before, students would serve a secondary role under the priorities of the new plan. As a result there will be no need for faculty meetings or
daily worship in the chapel. However, students would have a place in the functioning of the Seminary. Since the faculty will be producing volume after volume of Theology, someone must be available to do proofreading. Thus the students could contribute to the propagation of Theology by reading the first drafts of the books and correcting typographical, grammatical and spelling errors. It would then be the duty of student assistants to collate the corrections and return them to the professors. The assistants would be chosen because of their skill in proofreading. This plan has the added advantage of allowing students to read the ideas of the faculty thus permitting them to learn even without forcing the professors to spend valuable time in the classroom. Students will also be able to purchase the final products of the faculty in the bookstore and will therefore be beneficiaries of the propagation of Theology so central to the purposes of a Theological Seminary.

Another more important function of the students at Fuller Seminary has to do with the financial support of the Institution. Naturally as long as the students are in residence they pay tuition and thus support the faculty. But the value of a student to the Seminary increases once he graduates. However, since there are no classes in this plan a new criterion for graduation must be established. The most convenient and least time-consuming (for the faculty) criterion for allowing a student to graduate will be the number of faculty publications a student has proofread. This can be easily tabulated by the student assistants. The value of an alumnus lies first of all in his own support of the Institution. He will probably send a check of his own to the Seminary. He will probably also continue to buy the latest faculty publications. Second, and most important, he is in a position to influence others. He can encourage his Church to support Fuller and he will probably be in a position to influence at least one wealthy person to give to the Seminary. Also he will be able to encourage prospective students to come to Fuller who in turn, will support the Institution.

I am sure that there are some important difficulties which must be overcome under this proposal; but I believe that it is a plan which truly reflects the purpose of a Theological Seminary. Let someone accuse me of offering this proposal for my own benefit, I should remind him that I am a student, not a faculty member. Furthermore, I find it very difficult to spot typographical errors in manuscripts. I have nothing to gain but a feeling that I have contributed to the accomplishment of the goals of Fuller Theological Seminary.
THE 23rd SOLEMN
by Paul W. Burroughs

The Seminary is my shepherd; I shall not want more than nine seminars.
She maketh me to sit down and read all day long: she leadeth
me beside ping-pong and pool.
She restoreth my college environment: she leadeth me in the
paths of scholarship for her reputation's sake.
Yea, though I study Finney in the shadow of Protestant Theology,
I will fear no heresy: for her orthodoxy is with me: her
Calvin and her Barth they program me.
But thou, Oh Lord, preparest an escape for me in the presence of
theological imperialism: thou anointest my schedule with
relevant seminars; my mind runneth over with new discoveries.
Surely the concepts of Church Growth and "cultural incarnation"
shall follow me all the days of my ministry: and my wit-
ness shall be relevant from culture to culture.

ELECTIONS AND AMENDMENTS
by Gary Tuttle

The election of Student Body officers will take place during the second week
of Spring Quarter on Wednesday, March 29, 1972. (Naturally this election, like any
other in a well-ordered western society, presupposes sufficient candidates for
the available positions.) At present there are two pretenders to the presidential
throne—Bob Pavelsky, a third year student in the School of Psychology and Dave
Toycen who is a middler in the Theology School. In addition Bill McIvor, currently
Student Body Treasurer, is seeking reelection. No one has yet put his hat or her
bonnet in the ring for Vice-president or Secretary.

It should be noted that being a student council executive officer is not wholly
a matter of gratuitous service. Each position carries a scholarship—Secretary and
Treasurer, $300 per year; Vice-president, $400 per year and President, $1,000 per
year. That amounts in each case to some .00000095 million dollars per hour! (Now
the ugly motivation for desiring to "serve" the students comes forth!)

Perhaps (in addition to not knowing how lucrative the position is) the reason
no one has declared for President of Vice is because the duties of the office
have never been clearly articulated. That intellectual lesion has now been sutured
since Council, last Wednesday, pinpointed the major responsibilities. In future
the Vice-president will be responsible for the New Student Retreat, Church in Mission
program, the Fuller Fund (internship), Talent Night, Spring Banquet and Running
Elections. That is not to say he must, himself, implement each program, but that
he is responsible for securing the manpower effectively to carry out the program and
must oversee each enterprise. CIM will undoubtedly consume the lion's share of his
time and offers the greatest opportunity for creative innovation in programming.
This challenging position requires responsible, mature leadership. And number of s
students could handle the job, perhaps you could do it best. Consider it.

It is probably as well at this juncture that no one has declared for the position
of Secretary, for an amendment to the constitution has been proposed by Council
for your consideration, viz. to eliminate the position of Secretary as an elective
office and make it an appointment of the President, subject to the ratification of
Council. Such a change would preclude the possibility of obtaining a person in the position without secretarial skills. It is hoped the same person who is appointed secretary would also serve as typist for The Opinion with appropriate additional pay. A Constitutional Election will be held during the ninth week of this quarter at which time students may vote on this amendment and the two which follow.

A second amendment of the Student Council Constitution would provide for two women (not necessarily students) being appointed to Student Council, one of whom should be from the Philothean organization. This amendment is motivated by the fact that the wives of seminarians are the only members of the community who are disenfranchised and without advocate. Council hopes this amendment is a step toward rectifying that inequity.

The third amendment calls for the elimination of the class officers known as Vice-president and Secretary-treasurer. The amendment is motivated by two facts. 1) There is no need for a Secretary since classes do not keep minutes. Nor is there need of a Treasurer since the Student Body Treasurer tends all accounts, including those of the individual classes. 2) No one seems to wish to run for a class vice-presidency (perhaps it sounds the death knell for future political activity—witness Spiro) and that is understandable because there is nothing for him to do (since class presidents seem always to be in extraordinarily good health).

The complete statement of these amendments (and any others which may be proposed in the interim) will be made available to you by Friday of next week. Please give them your careful consideration.