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INTRODUCTION

by
Stephen Sallis Wilburn

It seems to me that this issue of The Opinion serves as a good introduction to those of you who are new students at Fuller Theological Seminary. It contains the sort of variety that the staff feels is good for such an organ of the student mind. On the other hand, this issue should not be considered as definitive—the only limit is your imagination.

I, myself, solicited only two of the articles that follow. The rest were submitted on the initiative of the respective authors (this I would like to applaud). Such response, I think, assures The Opinion a significant place in the life of Fuller Theological Seminary. Consequently, I would like to urge any of you who read this to articulate your convictions (Samuel Johnson’s dictum: "Writing maketh an exact man"), and submit them to us for publication. Articles should be typed (double-spaced), carefully considered and well written, and should not exceed 800 words. Also, any of us on the staff would greatly appreciate your comments on the content and format of any particular issue. Two more editions of The Opinion will come out this quarter, so there is plenty of room for additional articles. We look forward to your participation and your interest in making this a worthy publication.
A MODERN CHAPTER IN CHURCH HISTORY

Everett F. Harrison

The chapter in question is at least relatively modern. It has to do with the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy of the 1920's. That controversy centered around one man more than any other, namely, J. Gresham Machen, Assistant Professor of New Testament at Princeton Theological Seminary. We who were students at the seminary during the middle years of that decade were both spectators and participants in a great struggle which rocked the Presbyterian Church USA. We came to know and admire Dr. Machen, concurring in the appraisal of Dr. Francis Landey Patton, who had been president both of Princeton University and of Princeton Seminary, that he was "learned, logical, and eloquent". One could add that he was also honest and devout. As a teacher he was superb, but it was as a controversialist that he came into national prominence.

Machen was disturbed at the drift away from evangelical Christianity in the major denominations, especially in his own. World War I was scarcely over when he found himself embroiled in a struggle over the 1920 Plan of Union which was designed to create "The United Churches of Christ in America". He found the preamble much too vague. For example, the item regarding the Scriptures merely asserted that they contained God's revealed will. As it turned out, the Plan was rejected by the Presbyterian denomination and was abandoned. But the fact that two of his seminary colleagues favored and advocated the Union presaged further conflict.

While Machen's reputation as a scholar was firmly established by the publication of his Origin of Paul's Religion, his ability as an apologist for the Christian faith was due in the first instance to another work, Christianity and Liberalism. He realized that the disunity created by doctrinal differences cut right through all the major denominations. Characteristically, in Christianity and Liberalism, he prefaced his chapters on God and Man, the Bible, Christ, Salvation, and the Church by 37 pages on Doctrine. With him the issue was not simply adherence to this particular doctrine or that, but one's attitude toward the importance of doctrine as a whole. He wrote, "The Christian movement as its inception was not just a way of life in the modern sense, but a way of life founded upon a message. It was based, not upon mere feeling, not upon a program of work, but upon an account of facts. In other words it was based upon doctrine." His contention in the above-mentioned book as that Christianity and Liberalism were really two different religions. Although he did not like the term "Fundamentalist" and never used it of himself, he nevertheless recognized that what he shared with Fundamentalists was far more significant than any points of difference. He was quite averse to pietistic and anti-intellectual tendencies such as cropped up from time to time in the movement.

Interesting was the Unitarian reaction to this book. One review stated, "Dr. Machen's arguments are irrefutable. His logic, it seems to us, is impeccable. The issue does exist and does confront us. For the first time he has done us the great service of putting
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it in a clear-cut and definite form. You must be either a believer or an unbeliever, an evangelical or a liberal, you cannot be both at the same time." It should be noted in this connection that in the final chapter of the book Machen had been trenchant in exposing the dishonesty of men who remained in the church despite the fact that they were out of harmony with its theological foundations.

Events soon demonstrated that Liberalism was powerfully entrenched in the Presbyterian Church. In protest against the action on the General Assembly of 1923 which required the presbytery of New York to deal with Harry Emerson Fosdick, a liberal Baptist preacher who was occupying a Presbyterian pulpit in New York City, some 150 Presbyterian clergymen drew up what has become known as the Auburn Affirmation (eventually signed by 1150 more). It deplored the action of the Assembly, which, it claimed, "attempts to commit our church to certain theories concerning the inspiration of the Bible, and the incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, and the Continuing Life and Supernatural Power of our Lord Jesus Christ". In explanation of this language it should be noted that the General Assembly of 1923 had affirmed as essential "the infallibility of the Scriptures, the virgin birth of Christ, his substitutionary atonement, his bodily resurrection, and the miracles of Christ". In commenting on the Affirmation, Machen noted the use of the word "theories", and went on to say, "The redemptive events mentioned in the proclamation of the Assembly are not theories but facts upon which Christianity is based, and without which Christianity would fall". He deplored the plea for liberty to interpret creedal statements according to one's fancy when those statements were forthright and clear, warning that interpretation could go so far as to hold that the proposition, "the third day He rose again from the dead", is now taken to mean, "The third day he did not rise again from the dead".

Despite this heavy involvement in the theological struggle, Machen found time to do more writing. One of his books, The Virgin Birth of Christ, is considered by many to be his masterpiece. Its argument has never been answered. Lectures at Grove City College, issuing in the book, What is Faith, were attended by the editor of The British Weekly, who was so captivated by what he heard that when the book appeared he had eight distinguished Britishers review it in eight successive weeks as lead-articles in his paper.

Space will not permit the recital of the events which led to reorganization of Princeton Seminary and the ultimate withdrawal of Machen and certain of his colleagues to form Westminster Seminary and ultimately a new denomination. In the process he was denied by the General Assembly the right to accept the chair of Apologetics at Princeton, a post to which he had been duly elected by the Directors of the Seminary. He was defamed privately and in the press, but he bore his humiliation manfully.

It is only just to grant that in ecclesiastical matters Machen sometimes erred. The formation of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions is a case in point. "He was at his best in
THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND SIGMUND FREUD

Stephen G. Meyer

In the May 26th issue of The Opinion Dr. Tweedie wrote an article, "Thoughts on the Integration of Psychology and Theology", in which he reviewed the progress of the integration of theology and psychology at Fuller on several different levels. He expressed the feeling that the integration of psychology and theology was moving forward. I would like to aid that movement through contributing my current thoughts on the integration of theology with several of the basic disciplines within psychology. I hope that the discussion will stimulate others to contribute similar essays and that salient points will be made.

In this essay I have chosen to discuss my encounter with Sigmund Freud and the psychoanalytic movement primarily because of his secular popularity rather than because of any particular expertise. Later in the quarter I would like to present ideas related to the interaction of behaviorism as represented by B. F. Skinner and theology. First, I will share how I believe psychoanalytic theory can illuminate Scripture, second how the Christian attack on Freud has served the integration process, and third, how Christian faith goes beyond the psychoanalytic concept of man.

First, I have found that psychoanalytic ideas increase one's understanding of certain passages of Scripture. For example, Psalm 32:2 reads, "how blessed is the man to whom the Lord does not impute iniquity and in whose spirit there is no deceit". Freud's competence in observing deceit can hardly be denied. Hans H. Strupp wrote of him in the July issue of Psychology Today "unlike any man before him, he identified self-deception as a pervasive and universal human characteristic". In my mind the principle defense mechanisms of repression, projection, reaction formation, fixation, and regression are viable terms which describe man's attempts to cover his sins and weaknesses or refusal to face reality. Truly the man in whose spirit is no deceit, is blessed. Scripture has presented a truth but my application of it has been broadened through observation in the context of science.

James 1:14,15 reads, "but each one is tempted when he is carried away and enticed by his own lust. Then when lust has conceived, it gives birth to sin; and when sin is accomplished it brings forth,
death". Freud speaks of the impulses of the id (mainly sexual and aggressive in character) and identifies the ego with the activity of searching out a suitable object to satisfy the need. The super-ego either approves or disapproves and thus renders life or death as verdicts on the completed act. It is seen that the schemes are not contradictory and to a certain degree they are compatible. Lust as motivation can be compared with the id, the search for an object with the work of the ego, and the verdict of death with the superego. The difference is mainly in the context of the warfare, but the mechanics are the same. In integration it is best to consider phenomena rather than words alone.

Despite his helpful insights Freud is frequently attacked as the great antagonist of the Christian faith. This attack was motivated by Freud's attack on God's existence and assertions concerning the motivational basis of man's existence. The attack has pointed out a key weakness in Freudian theory and served to illuminate Christian distinctives regarding man's nature.

Freud claimed that God was merely the projection of one's father image in order to achieve a feeling of security lost in the growth process. However, Gordon Allport, former president of the American Psychological Association, realized that it was just as plausible that atheism was a projection of antagonistic feelings towards one's father. It is just as valid within Freudian theory to argue that atheism is caused by attempts to avoid condemnation as theism is caused by attempts to maintain security. The proof of god, if there is one, is not decided within Freudian analysis but in the annals of historical event. Likewise, the validity of Freudian theory must be based on objective events in the client's life not on the projections of the therapist.

Freud is also attacked because of his subjection of all motivation to the id instincts. In the strict form of 19th century determinism any taint of the spiritual was precluded. Actions were never altruistic or truly performed in the service of God or man. There terms were only disguises conceived by the ego in order to fend off the superego. This approach, of course, nullified any concept of the new birth and motivation from regeneration by the Holy Spirit. However, it should be remember that the Scriptures assert that there is no righteous man. Even the Christian is said to be in the continual process of casting off the old man and of putting on the new man. Freud here is rejected for being inadequate (not wrong) and the scriptural assertion of spiritual motivation distinguished.

In my mind it is the biblical concept of "spirit" which separates theology from psychoanalysis. I would like to define "spirit" as the affection which provides the basic motivation behind an individual's behavior. The question is one of whether man generates his action for his own self glorification and preservation or for the honor and glory of Jesus Christ. Freud only admitted the first part. Man was always selfish in his scheme. Socialization was only the containment of id impulses into constructive behavior. Therapy was for redirection not regeneration of instinctual impulses.
THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND SIGMUND FREUD (Continued)

But in the Christian life Jesus Christ puts an end to the id. In conversion, death is accepted as a just verdict not to be defended against. The defense mechanisms are disarmed for the war has been terminated. New life begins through regeneration by the Holy Spirit. The transformation, however, is not complete. And this is what perfection is all about. It is the progressive acceptance of death to the old desires and the utilization of new life. Thus, Christian therapy with the Christian can go beyond the restructuring of id impulses by utilizing the new affection which comes from the cross. There is deep therapy in Romans 12:1,2 provided the spiritual base is present.

In conclusion then I've found that my Christian faith provides a dimension which subsumes psychological categories. I do not deny that I am a human being, that I have what are called id impulses, that my spirit (overall sense) has its deceitful elements and that these factors influence my daily action. But I do assert that in my midst there is the Holy Spirit of God waging war with the flesh that I may in turn set my affections on things above and with the life which is mine in Jesus Christ. With respect to integration, I see that elements of psychoanalysis can supplement Scripture, that the demonstration of God's existence is apart from psychoanalysis, that in integration one best focus on the phenomena behind words rather than words themselves, and that the Scriptural concept of man goes beyond the analytic concept rather than eliminating it.

SI SE PUEDE!

Art Chartier

Msgr. Francis Maurovich from the Roman Catholic Diocese of Oakland, California writes: "As I was ordering lunch with a priest friend of mine recently, the waitress asked us what kind of dressing we wanted on our salad. I answered, 'Thousand Island', but my friend quietly asked, 'Do you serve Union lettuce?' The startled waitress said she did not know, but she would find out. She returned in a moment to say no. 'Then I'll skip the lettuce, but please tell the manager,' the priest said, adding, 'the farm workers need all the help they can get.' Somewhat sheepishly, I cancelled my salad order, too."

'But what business is it of ours what a couple of priests in Oakland do with their salads? Perhaps the answer can be found in I John 3:17-19. "But if someone who is supposed to be a Christian has money enough to live well, and sees a brother in need, and won't help him—how can God's love be within him? Little children, let us stop saying we love people; let us really love them; and show it by our actions. Then we will know for sure, by our actions, that we are on God's side, and our consciences will be clear, even when we stand before the Lord." (Living Bible) For those of you who would like some further scriptural insight on this question, you might
read Matthew 25:31-40.

The issue, then, is: Are the farmworkers our brothers? Are the farmworkers in need? Is the Union really helping the farmworkers? Jesus tells us that whoever does the will of God is his brother (Mt. 12:50, Mk. 3:35, Lk. 8:21). As Christians, therefore, whoever does the will of God is our brother in Christ. Many of the farmworkers are devout Roman Catholics and as such are seeking to do God's will. As Christians we are linked to these men and women as brothers and sisters in Christ. On the other hand, there are those among the farmworkers, just as there are in any community, who could care less about God's will for their lives. We are left, then, with the conclusion that some of the farmworkers are our brothers in Christ and some are not. To try to determine who is and who is not is an impossible task, which ultimately is left to God anyhow. The important point is that many of our brothers and sisters are farmworkers.

But are our brothers and sisters who are farmworkers in need? YES! Three-quarters of all farmworkers earn less that federally established poverty-level wages. Two-thirds of all farmworkers are not covered by $1.30 minimum wage law. Farmworkers average 8.6 years of school. Life expectancy for farmworkers is 49 years. The accident rate for farmworkers is 300% higher than the national rate. Pesticides caused an estimated 75,000 acute poisonings annually to farmworkers. Farmworkers families (6.4 ave. members) were housed in an average of 1.9 rooms in 1969 - 18% had no indoor electricity; 90% had no sink; 96% had no tubs or showers. But these are only numbers and do not describe the physical pain and suffering of our brothers and sisters who are farmworkers. The concerned Christian must spend time with these people, see their homes and talk with their children, he must go to the fields with them at 5 A.M. and then work beside them through the day as the sun rises and beats down on them.

More specifically, the migrancy, the pace of the work, and the sheer physical demands make lettuce work the destroyer of men. Generally in his twenties or early thirties, the worker can perform lettuce work only during the peak of his physical development. Lettuce work is done in wet fields, in a bent over position at inhuman pace. The average worker spends six months in the lettuce fields every year. On that schedule he will last only 6 to 10 years before he is "quemado", burned out, and condemned to low hourly work with the short handle hoe. Those working 11 months of the year can not last longer than 5 years. The workers' life is further shortened when company foremen induce him to take "pingos" (pills) to withstand the physical pain of the work and increase the work pace - the resulting problems of addiction leave many workers virtually unemployable. Six hours in a lettuce field is a full day, yet entire crews are pushed to 10 and 12 hour days to meet sales orders. It is common place for the company and labor contractors to supply the workers with pills and beer to keep them going. Each lettuce cutter will cut up to 4.6 tons of lettuce in one day, and each loader will lift onto the field truck up to 42 tons of lettuce daily. And what
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does our brother who is a lettuce worker get paid? At current price rates, each individual lettuce cutter is paid less than one-half (½) of a cent for each head of lettuce he cuts. In fact, the entire cost of farmworker labor--thinning, hoeing, irrigating, tractor driving and harvesting comes to 2.4 cents per head of lettuce. How much did you pay for your last head of lettuce? Where did the difference go?

For decades seasonal and migrant farmworkers have harvested the food we eat and then barely had enough food left for their own families. In 1962, Cesar Chavez began organizing farmworkers in the hope that together they could overcome their powerlessness and build a new future for themselves and their children. It has not been easy. There have been a lot of sacrifices and hard work. There have been setbacks and frustration. Some have died along the way. But the United Farmworkers have kept at their task. Committed to a policy of nonviolence, they have overcome what seemed to be impossible obstacles.

Cesar Chavez, himself, provides the model for other Union workers. He and his wife and children live in a small, 2-bedroom house at Union headquarters in LaPaz, California. Like all of those who work for the Union, he received sustenance wages: room, board, and $5.00 per week. The dedication and sacrifice of those who work at La Paz is astonishing. People work all day long and into the night until their work is finished. Men and women, married and single, some members of religious orders, all take on seemingly impossible tasks with SI SE PUEDE! (Yes, it can be done!) foremost in their minds. There is no work for "impossible" at La Paz. This contagious atmosphere soon permeated all who visit or stay at La Paz.

But while we may sympathize with the farmworker's plight, most of us have been called to serve Christ elsewhere. What can we do?

First, in the consumer boycott, the United Farmworkers have found one of their most effective tools for making progress. In their efforts to improve the life of the lettuce worker, the United Farmworkers are asking each of us to support the boycott of California-Arizona head (or iceberg) lettuce. Tell your friends about the lettuce boycott and purchase only Union lettuce (identified by the Aztec Eagle on the packing case). If you are in doubt, they would ask you to do without lettuce (less than 15% of California-Arizona lettuce is Union lettuce).

Second, after the farmworkers have at last found a way to struggle nonviolently, the agricultural industry is attempting to destroy the boycott. Arizona has already passed a law that makes it illegal to say "Boycott Lettuce". The people of California will vote on a similar measure November 7, 1972. Both measures promise representative elections but take the vote away from almost all migrant and seasonal farmworkers. If passed, this measure would effectively cripple the efforts of the Union on behalf of the farmworker. The United Farmworkers urge you to VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 22.

In response to the question, "What can the Church do?" Cesar Chavez has replied, "We don't ask for cathedrals. We don't ask for bigger churches or fine gifts. We ask for its presence with us,
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beside us, Christ among us. We ask for the church to sacrifice with the people for social change, for justice, and for love of brother. We don't ask for words; we ask for deeds. We don't ask for paternalism; we ask for servanthood.

HOW WORDS MEAN

Dick Price

(Brown hair; brown eyes; glasses; beard; 165 pounds; 26 years old; 5'10" tall; Anglo-Saxon ancestry--a more or less average looking American.)

I am of the opinion that words do not convey an exact meaning, but that they only serve to delimit meaning. They act as a clue to the meaning intended by the author, but not as an exact definition. The more ways an author tries to express his thoughts, the more his listener or reader is able to narrow down the ideas he is trying to convey. Even at best, however, words are effective in shaping meaning only to the extent that they point toward something in common between the author and his audience, whether it is language convention, common experience, or something else. Even an audience which is fortunate enough to share much of this sort of commonality with the author must still realize that the author himself is limited by the very nature of language in his attempts to formulate and express his intended meaning.

Let me illustrate my point. When you looked at this paper, the first thing you say was the title. Since it bears only my name and a brief description of myself, I think its effect should be somewhat similar to what you would experience if I were introduced as a sneaker at a meeting to which you (not knowing the topic of my speech or even that I would be sneaking) had come. As I step up to the rostrum, you have no soundly based idea as to the meaning I intend to convey. All possibilities are open. Suppose I begin by announcing the topic of my speech. This should help you a great deal. You still don't know what I am thinking, but you are now able to limit the possibilities immensely. Let's further suppose that in my first sentence I state the thesis on which my speech is based--although, in reality, I would probably begin with a joke or a personal story to let you know me better, to let me see how you respond to me, and to thereby use our commonality to establish a degree of rapport which would ease the burden of language in conveying my message. At this point I have already made known to you the distilled essence of my thoughts on the subject at hand. Yet I hardly think you can fully understand what I mean, even though I have just made the best effort of which I am capable to tell you exactly what I do mean. If, in fact, you do understand what I mean, I would do better to sit down now and not to confuse you by related ramblings. However, I feel that an explanation of some sort would be essential to your arriving at an approximate understanding of the
meaning I was trying to convey in my thesis sentence. In a similar fashion, I believe the language of the sentence with which I began this paper is inadequate to fully express the meaning I intended when I wrote that sentence. For this reason, I continued writing in an attempt to further delimit the possibilities inherent in that sentence. To carry the point further, I could stop the explanation here . . ., but in so doing I would deprive myself of the opportunity to make several additional attempts to refine the expression of my meaning and hopefully your understanding. Note that I do not hope that by virtue of additional explanation you will fully understand my meaning, nevertheless I must use that as my goal. This is important to what I am trying to say.

Let's leave this analogy for a moment to think about how the process of understanding an author's meaning is related to the concept I have been discussing above. I think the goal of complete understanding should be employed as a working hypothesis when attempting to determine an author's meaning. However, I am firmly convinced we should keep in mind the limited nature of language and the approximate manner in which words mean. In other words, while I believe it is important to study an author's words with every scientific method at our disposal, I also feel we must be constantly aware that the goal of complete understanding is an ideal which we hope to approach, but which we are unable to realize.

Returning to the point of view of an author, please consider the limitations he faces in terms of time and space. Speeches can't continue forever, or can a book (or can a paper like this one, a fact which should give you some encouragement). You may be thinking that some authors, especially the good ones, are capable of exhausting their subjects within the limits appointed to them. That is to say that through explanation they are able to adequately express their intended meaning in full (which, incidently, still leaves the considerable problem of understanding that meaning). To a degree, I think this is true. If Mark Twain, Ralph Waldo Emerson, or the Apostle Paul had wanted to express the idea I am expressing, I am certain they could have done it much more effectively and with much less difficulty. However, I do not think that Paul would have been incensed if a reader of one of his letters had later met him and asked him a question about the meaning of some portion of the letter. I don't think he would have told the person to read the letter again, insisting that he had already stated to the best of his ability exactly what he meant. Instead, I think he would have reacted as most persons do in such situations, realizing the limitations of language and the approximate nature of the way words mean, by attempting to find another word grouping that would more closely convey to that person the meaning he originally intended.

I have tried in almost every way I can to convey to you my meaning; however, I have no assurance that even now you fully understand my thesis. I realize our facility with language has a bearing on our use and understanding of it, but I believe the basic hindrance to complete understanding is the way words mean. I don't
intend to further belabor the point, but I do want to make one application of this thesis in an area that is important to me.

I have faith that the Bible is significant. For this reason, I believe it is important to study the content of the Bible and to do so with every tool at our disposal. I believe this endeavor will reap rich harvests for the one who undertakes it. However, I believe that there is a certain danger involved if one approaches this task with the assumption that words mean in an exact way. If I had to name the danger I've mentioned, I think I would call it legalism. Legalism based on data which is couched in language is a stance I find incompatible with the thesis I stated above. To me, language alone is incapable of conveying the complete meaning of the Bible. This position requires that I be dependent on God to inspire my understanding of the Bible. It also requires that I approach Biblical interpretation with humility, which—all else aside—seems to be a good way to approach it. I do hope you understand.

WHO REPRESENTS US

Dave Toycen

Student government at Fuller is attempting to provide student input at all the levels of decisionmaking. Most of the major faculty and trustee committees accept a limited number of students as full participants. In matters of finance, academics and spiritual formation we have a voice. If you check the situation carefully, you will discover that you have a colleague who is eager and willing to serve as your advocate whatever the problem or suggestion. Forceful, conscientious representation requires continuous feedback. If student government is succeeding with its task, then the frustration level in our community should be minimal.

The committees and various personnel are listed so that you may have this resource list for the coming year. I urge you to share your complaints or suggestions with one of the student representatives. Much of the fragmentation and dissonance at Fuller occurs because there is a failure to express a minor, yet significant negative experience. Allow those of us in student government to be your servants.
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