Response to the first issue of the revived Opinion ran predominately favorable. I appreciated expressions of pleasure and encouragement. Notably several men students told me their wives really liked it as if to say they held some doubt about the worth of the issue. The one criticism I have received involves the lack of offsetting viewpoints. I did not accidentally omit these views. It occurred to me that the traditional schema of marriage and family including submission success stories have been so oft heard and repeated (inculcated) by the readership of the Opinion, that there was no need to recount them once more. Two articles in response have been included in this issue.

After the encouraging first round, the bell rang for round two and I began to experience the traditional pummeling of an Opinion Editor. Everyone asked to submit work including myself was busy and needed a delay if they could produce at all. (Have you ever considered how incredibly - insanely - busy all of us are at Fuller?) Finally all the articles trickled in and we moved the paper to print.

As announced this issue focuses on the "new look" Fuller, especially the issue of growth. Articles from administrators and students once again do not cover the subject. Untouched are questions regarding: community, a chaplain, relationship of the separate schools etc. But some significant issues are raised and should jog a thought or two. The position of the administration on growth is clearly captured in writing. Those agreeing or disagreeing now have a document with which to interact.

The next issue of the Opinion will move toward a more scholarly theme, discussing the interpretation of scripture with reference to the problem of faith/history and translation.

Bon Voyage

R. McD.
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Certainly no one has played a more important role in the development of Fuller than President Hubbard. In an interview he offered some of his thoughts on Fuller's past and present.

MAN AT THE HELM

Opinion: Dr. Hubbard many students know very little about you personally. Do you have a family?
Dr. Hubbard: Yes, I am married, my wife Ruth and I have a daughter Mary who will be 20 next month. Mary has completed two years at Westmont college and has recently returned from a semester of study in England. She plans to begin at Occidental next term.

Opinion: If I recall correctly one of your hobbies is the study of California missions.
Dr. Hubbard: I have an interest in the California mission movement and California history in general. I'm a Californian and very proud of our past.

Opinion: What was your hometown?
Dr. Hubbard: I was born in Stockton and raised in Oakland. All my education was in the public schools there. Also, my parents were missionaries in Puerto Rico, and I developed an interest in Spanish language and Spanish culture. The Mission movement, along with the Gold Rush are, I think, the two most influential single periods in our history; giving names to our towns, establishing architecture and culture, etc. Apart from these accomplishments, these were the first people to bring the Cross to California.

I guess if I had another hobby, I like to putter around the kitchen and cook. Ruthie would rather clean up than cook and I would rather cook than clean up. On the weekends I try to make big soups, hash or chili beans to ease the cooking load through the week.

Opinion: What boards or commissions do you serve other than those at Fuller?
Dr. Hubbard: I am a member of the Calif. State Board of Education, however I have informed the Superintendent of my intention to resign. The growth at Fuller, and our economic difficulty simply demand my time here. This plus the fact that I have certain scholarly goals that I want to reach in the next year or two. This is the only single decision that I could make to gain a good deal of time.

Opinion: This commitment has demanded considerable time?
Dr. Hubbard: Yes, thirty to thirty-five days a year, at least a tenth of every working month. It is time the seminary has offered that I might be involved in the public sector. I have been on the Board for three years and my appointment runs through 1973 but I just can not project myself that far. It has been a very satisfying experience, but I feel it is time for me to pull back and concentrate my effort.

I also serve on the Executive Committee of the Association of Theological Schools. This is the Accrediting Association for the U.S. and Canada. It accredits all Protestant, Catholic and Jewish Theological training institutions.

I am on the board of a new organization set up to strengthen campus ministries, called National Institute for Campus Ministries. The national board is comprised of many distinguished liberal churchmen and Jews. I am on the board in part to represent a more conservative viewpoint. The board realizes that many of the most successful campus ministries are functions of conservative evangelical groups, some of whom are prohibited by constituency pressures from being part of such a board. I felt my position at Fuller gave me the freedom to participate without giving an endorsement to any of these groups.

Other than the board of the Gospel broadcast this is the extent of my service.

Opinion: Shifting now to a more specific discussion of Fuller, who was President of Fuller prior to you?
Dr. Hubbard: Harold John Ockenga, in his second stint. Only three persons have been President of the school.

Opinion: It was Dr. Ockenga, Dr. Carnell, and Ockenga again.
Dr. Hubbard: That's the sequence.

Opinion: Dr. Carnell, like yourself was a teacher before assuming the Presidency. As I understand it, he received considerable opposition during his service as President.

Dr. Hubbard: Dr. Carnell made an outstanding contribution to the institution. We were accredited by A.T.S. during his tenure, in 1957. He was President from '55 to '59.
very great man, Carnell, tremendous vision and the basic academic standard which he set, the basic attitude toward the church which he embodied, our attempts to make contributions to mainline denominations and not be divisive or separative, his concern for social action, his cordial relationship with Christians even where there were doctrinal differences. These things contributed to the basic tone of the institution.

When I came in 1963 I felt I entered a rich heritage. Dr. Fuller was still alive of course and it was encouraging to receive the love and support of the Founder, Dr. Fuller, Co-Founder, Dr. Ockenga, and past President, Dr. Carnell. My task was much easier because of this continuity.

Opinion: The things you mentioned about Dr. Carnell, willing to fellowship across doctrinal lines, social action, etc. Aren't these the things for which he received much criticism and was eventually driven from the Presidency?

Dr. Hubbard: I am sure that the pressures that he took, the reactions to some of his books, the criticism that the Seminary bore during those years, all of this contributed. He was a very sensitive and complex man personally, and had much more the temperament of a scholar and teacher than he did an administrator. Some faculty members who are no longer here opposed him on crucial matters right at the beginning of his term. This hurt him badly. All of these things worked together, contributing to the suffering he experienced.

Opinion: Why did you accept the job as President?

Dr. Hubbard: I had no ambition to be an administrator, I saw myself as a scholar and teacher. I had turned down overtures about administration up till that time. It was not the Presidency which attracted me, it was the Presidency of Fuller, feeling that this was one of the most important institutions in the life of the church. The opportunity to make a contribution here would multiply whatever gifts and talents I had more rapidly and widely.

Opinion: Have these expectations panned out?

Dr. Hubbard: Oh yes, I don't think there is any question about it. The office itself bequeathes a lot of that. The first day you walk in this office you inherit a certain strength and reputation, the grandeur of your colleagues. So the position itself gives a person a vantage point to see things in the church, to make a contribution that as a private citizen is harder to make.

Opinion: You mentioned scholarship goals earlier, has your scholarship suffered from the administrative load?

Dr. Hubbard: I think that is the one area in my life in which I experience continuing frustration. My ratio of satisfaction to frustration is very favorable. I was 34 when appointed, 35 when I took office and only six years out of graduate school. I had accomplished certain things but not all I would like to. I have done certain things since, articles, Tyndale lectures so forth. I do look forward at some point, to some time on the other end of my ministry.

Opinion: What things around Fuller now are the result of your early intentions?

Dr. Hubbard: Well, I think the diversity of the program was something I was concerned with. I mentioned earlier that I felt the basic direction of the seminary was right. I did not feel at that point the Seminary had the momentum to make an effective contribution as it could. I felt there was a need to move along, to speed up the pace at which the Seminary was moving, our influence could be widened, greater attention of students and the public. I felt that the way the Lord seemed to be opening up was through diversification in terms of the School of World Mission and School of Psychology. The School of Psychology was already being planned when I came, the plans were partly formed. The SWM had not been started.

Some milestones we can be grateful for as an institution: More recognition rather than opposition on the part of the United Presbyterian Church, particularly the local Presbyteries.

I think that the ministry department has been strengthened immeasurably. I had felt in the days that I was a student and I felt also when I came that there was a lot to be done. The department was a lot smaller, more in the shadow of Biblical studies. Addition and changes in personnel together with pastors degree, faith renewal team, better internships, stronger homiletics and speech instruction, all those things have changed remarkably.
At an orientation week meeting last year, you were responding to questions and I remember someone mentioned fearing that Fuller had cut loose the moorings and was adrift on a sea of liberalism. You responded that Fuller was not drifting anywhere, but the ship of state was well manned and steering a steady course. How would you describe the doctrinal position of Fuller?

Dr. Hubbard: Well, I think we are plugged in as solidly as an institution can be to the spirit, intent and doctrinal mood of the Reformation and through the Reformation into the bedrock of Scripture. If I used the metaphor “cut loose from the moorings” or supported it in any way, I was referring specifically to the feeling that evangelical institutions must hold to a very precise view of the inerrancy of Scripture as expressed by scholars like B.B. Warfield and I was intending to say that I feel Warfield’s way of defending Scriptural authority was more philosophical than exegetical and from that standpoint the way in which our statement of faith is now worded with its emphasis on the revelation of God in history, and the revelatory character of the Scripture, the trustworthiness of the Scripture as revelation, the fact that it is the only infallible rule for faith and practice, the power of Scripture, the hermeneutical statement in our present statement of faith that Scripture is to be interpreted in terms of its context, it’s setting and so forth, all of these are stronger more Biblical ways to talk about the inspiration of Scripture than the somewhat more traditional ways, ways that have been traditional within American fundamentalism.

Are these frictions contributing to our current financial difficulty?

Dr. Hubbard: I don’t think so, most people upset by any stand we have taken left our company and withdrew support earlier. We did go through lots of moving and shaking in the first years and several times since then. We could face difficulty again if some member of our faculty began to swing wildly and say foolish things, not being charitable, wise and discreet. As our faculty gains stature they must be even more guarded in their expression.

Are these frictions contributing to our current financial difficulty?

Dr. Hubbard: I don’t think so, most people upset by any stand we have taken left our company and withdrew support earlier. We did go through lots of moving and shaking in the first years and several times since then. We could face difficulty again if some member of our faculty began to swing wildly and say foolish things, not being charitable, wise and discreet. As our faculty gains stature they must be even more guarded in their expression.

We have experienced remarkable growth. Myself and other students have wondered if the expansion hasn’t, to put it baldly, been more to enhance the reputation of Fuller than to equip men and women for service.

Dr. Hubbard: The first point I would make is this, that growth contributes to quality. The broader the base of an institution the greater variety and quality possible. I think that though we are large as far as seminaries go, if you set us beside Harvard Law School, Harvard School of Business Administration, Hastings Law School, there are a number of professional schools which handle student bodies the size of ours. Now I am not saying we are handling it well, I am only saying that the problem is not just size. To try to have the enrichment and variety and quality that we have without size is very difficult.

The second thing is, what is the Lord saying to us and the church with the increasing pressure of applicants, are there signals being sent? Can we say alright Lord you are sending us these people who feel called and have the need for training in huge numbers but we will not take them. Is there any obligation for us to try and respond to what seems to be the tide of God?

Thirdly, we’re quite convinced
that at Fuller we have something special to give our men and women and they in turn have something special to give the church. We feel that we have special kinds of people. I am more proud and humbled at the same time by the quality of the person who comes to Fuller Seminary at this stage. We have a magnificent group.

People who are concerned about our growth, students tend to be saying close the door after me but not before. They usually feel that there is something here they really want but that they are being partly compromised because it is spread around too much and I guess that is a compromise that we all need to live with. Faculty are making a compromise by serving this many people. I think students make in part a compromise because they do not get as much personal attention but I think that as long as we can deal with the questions of space and keep class size from becoming horrendous so forth that we will have all in all a better program by some kind of monitored growth than we would if we tried to cut it off.

Now the real growth problem as I see it, is if we built buildings and appointed more full time, tenured faculty on the basis of our growth. And then we find that what we have is a wave rolling through rather than a trend that will continue indefinitely. I don't know what the Lord has in mind for Fuller ten years from now or what he will be saying to us in student applications, we just have to respond to what we see the needs to be now as maturely as we can, but not put ourselves in a position where the future can hurt us badly if things change.

Adjunct professors have been important supports in the growing structure of Fuller. Ann Tumcok raises the question:

TOO MUCH OF A GOOD THING?

Adjunct professors are a good thing. Through them Fuller can utilize the special knowledge and skills that they bring to their teaching. John Holland, actor, brings the expertise of much professional use of the voice to classes in reading and speech. Ed Dayton knows more than virtually anyone about time management. Some adjunct professors have years of specialized study behind the courses they teach. Students also benefit by contact with people who are in the pastorate right now, or who work in secular professions.

However, adjunct professors must not become a substitute for increasing the number of full-time faculty to meet the needs of a growing student body. In the past couple of years many new students have come to Fuller, but very few professors have been added to the faculty. The latest seminary catalogue lists only 23 full-time professors in the School of Theology. With a student body of 647 in that school there is a student/faculty ratio of 28/1. If every two of the 30 adjunct professors are lumped together as the "equivalent" of one full-time professor, the student/faculty ratio becomes a more respectable 19/1.

But are two adjunct professors really the equivalent of a full-time professor? True, they may teach two or even three full-time classes. But where are they when you need to ask them about an assignment? Most of them are on campus for only two or three hours a week. Worse yet, most adjunct professors are almost totally unavailable for consultation about matters not directly related to classwork.

We do not ask the administration to curtail the use of adjunct professors, but to recognize them for what they are - a supplement to a full-time faculty large enough to deal adequately with the needs of the student body.

Dr. Barker has been a catalyst for amazing changes at Fuller, especially in the area of curriculum revision. He responded to written questions about these efforts.

THE PROVOST'S PERSPECTIVE

I have been asked by the Opinion editors if I would respond to the following six questions put to me regarding growth and curricular revision at Fuller. I am delighted to do so because I realize that the students have a concern for improving communication within the institution, and the Opinion is one of the vital links in that process. May I say that I appreciate the interest of students regarding academic concerns at Fuller, and personally would love to see the students
sponsor a number of open forums that would enable the whole Fuller community to discuss questions such as these.

What was the committee's mandate for curriculum revision?
The mandate came directly from the students, but was strongly supported by alumni and faculty. There was widespread agreement that Fuller had achieved a significant degree of excellence in its major offerings, and there was unanimity that these gains of the past be retained. The modifications that were desired included allowances for the various levels of language aptitude present in the student body, increased flexibility in the offerings, more options for the students, more varied approaches to the same subject area, more concern for professional training, more points of view to be represented from the instructional side, and greater depth and breadth in course offerings.

What was the relation between the curriculum revision and growth?
Actually, the commitment to revise the curriculum was made before our recent growth was experienced or anticipated. I do believe however, that the changes in the curriculum, because they were so warmly received by the students and the alumni, resulted in many more applications for admission to Fuller.

In any instance, we have experienced a new growth in the student body which has enabled us to press toward excellence in a way that otherwise would not have been possible. Excellence in most educational activities, and especially among professional schools, is not achieved by perpetuating smallness. The great law schools, the great medical schools, the great business schools, are usually among the larger institutions of their type. It is not their size, of course, that has made them the distinguished institutions which they are--that depends on many other factors--but without it they would not have achieved the excellence they possess.

Size is instrumental, however, in effecting the visibility which is necessary if one desires to attract the best students throughout the world. It is a prerequisite for supporting breadth and depth in course offerings; it does supply the base which supports graduate research and programs; it does determine the number of faculty that may be properly utilized; it does provide sufficient numbers of graduates to impact significantly the particular professional field represented.

The ATS, sometime ago, made a study of what excellence would require in a theology school. The report concluded that it would take a student body of 600-800 to support a program that would compare favorably in quality with the kind of training provided by other professional schools. I would have to admit that most of the things said at that time by ATS have proven true in my experience.

At Fuller, for example, because of our student body of 600 theological students, we have been able to increase the number and variety of our course offerings, secure additional faculty, afford special adjuncts to enrich our program, launch a full scale graduate program, offer multiple professional tracks, provide education for Hispanic and Black pastors, and increase significantly our professional training program.

Have we watered down our academic standards?
I would like to think that if anything, we have strengthened them. One test of academic excellence is quality control in admissions. The minimum GPA requirement for the Th.D. is 3.5; the M.A. 3.0; the D.Min. 3.0; the M.Div., 2.5. We do accept some highly recommended students whose GPA is below the requirement, but only on probation. Except for the Th.D., these represent higher admissions levels than those used in past years. In addition, because the ministry requires far more than excellence in academics, we have completely revised our questionnaires to those who are supporting a candidate's admission. We are now requiring that a student score above 3.0 on the personality and Christian experience questions; no less than 3.0 on his professional capabilities score.

But even more important than this is the fact that the increased number of applications (last year over 600--this year we expect about 800) requires us to be even more selective in our admission process. Several of the senior faculty, even this year, have commented upon the high quality of work being accomplished by students both in exams and papers. The report of grades assigned in the School of Theology certainly seems to support that observation.
Has the new curriculum really spread the students out? Are not the core courses still too large?

Both are true. The students have spread out over the curriculum. In fall 1972 and winter 1973 we had seven courses with enrollment over 80. This fall and winter, with the larger student body and many more courses, we still had only seven courses over 80. Nonetheless, many "core" and other courses are perceived as being important. Students desire to hear a professor in his strength. Many agree with the dictum of the Dean of Stanford University when he said, "the good student would rather sit in the 50th row under a great professor than on the knee of a mediocre one." We do recognize that some of our classes are large, but in most instances that is to the credit of the professor. We offer options and open competitive courses, but inevitably some professors are going to have large classes just because they are great teachers.

Are we crowding the school with bodies?

I hope not. "Bodies" sounds terribly impersonal to me. I even dislike talking about "full-time equivalents", but sometimes this is required to present an accurate picture. I would prefer to talk about men and women whom God has called to His service and who are convinced that, at Fuller, they will receive the preparation that will fit them best for that task. Frankly, I agree with their appraisal, and because of that I feel that we should strive to function at full capacity. With our present resources, that means for us a top of about 800 theology students. I regret to say that it will probably mean that there will be times when some inconvenience is suffered by us all. But, I believe we can live with inconvenience as long as we are convinced that the quality of the training is not sacrificed or impaired.

What is the size of the school going to be next year?

Next year our student body will probably achieve close to the maximum size we can handle with our present facilities and size of our staff. We expect to matriculate another entering class of 300. However, to offset this, we will graduate the largest class in the history of the Seminary. We project that the enrollment of the School of Theology will balance out at about 400 FTE in the M.Div. program, 100 FTE in the M.A. program, 50 in the Th.M. and Th.D. programs, and 50 in the D.Min. program.

Let it be understood at the outset that I solicited an article of this persuasion from several other people. For various reasons each begged off and the buck stopped on the Editor's desk. Thus it befell me to take up the cudgels of a free press because

RAINDROPS KEEP FALLING...

From the time I matriculated in the Fall of '73 the forecast for the Fuller flotilla has been clear skies, smooth seas and the very wind of God in the sails. I take no particular delight in sighting a squall but raindrops keep falling out of a purportedly clear sky and risking the charge of mutiny I think it time to enter this phenomena in the log.

I understood it to be an academic axiom that the greater the student teacher ratio, the smaller the educational caliber. But the rationale given for expansion is that growth enhances quality. Ostensibly it provides a larger budget which in turn makes possible the hiring of more professors, greater curriculum variety etc. It is an open question whether these benefits have resulted.

Apart from the Professorship of Bill Pannell we have the same faculty which once taught 300, 400, 500 and now over 600 students. This cloud is usually blown away with the breath of adjunct professors. (cf "Too Much") These teachers are well equipped and much appreciated but they are no substitute for faculty growth at least remotely commensurate with enrollment.

We study now between the times of student expansion and faculty growth. The administration intends to avoid commitment to full-time faculty lest Fuller be caught overstaffed should the present application and enrollment level be only temporarily inflated. This intent shows great seamanship for it is highly probable that we are blown by the zephyr of the Jesus movement and a return to many things conservative throughout society. Still we are afloat now without enough professional ballast.

Variety has been introduced through curriculum revision and the core course options but the bulk of concerned students continue to take what were previously core courses. Variety has not eliminated the problem of vast class size.
Further growth mitigates against campus community life. Recreation, study and dormitory space is increasingly crowded out. Inevitable depersonalization results when the numbers within an institution increase. Despite pleasantly accommodating physical renovation, campus is a decreasingly hospitable environ.

Increased enrollment is said to alleviate the need for sharp tuition increases. I am not an accountant or an economist but it seems this wind blows two ways. Every expansion leads to new costs and vice versa. (eg. Increased enrollment means an increase in parking needs hence investment in land for parking and the need for more money to replenish liquid reserves.) I wonder if we are in a cost-expansion typhoon, sailing furiously but always in a spiral.

Of course in all our voyages we set course by the Lord's leading. I find the Lord's leading a veritable Moby Dick, ever illusive, but it is generally said to be found in the virtual tidal wave of applications. What is God saying to us with a flood of applications? I assume he is saying that there are a lot of people who would like to attend school here but this says nothing about how many we should admit. The operative question must be how many students can be given quality training? This ought to be the number we admit regardless of how many apply. Moreover what is the Lord saying to us through those faculty and students who express reservations about growth? Is their voice muted by a stack of applications? Tempted by the sirens of national recognition and financial need bearings may be lost. A sharp eye must be kept on the needs of present students as well as those yet to board.

Upon airing such feelings I am often asked why I simply don't just jump ship if I don't like it. I find this the most heinous reply imaginable. It ranks with America, love it or leave it. Fuller launches out on an unparalleled voyage; I would give my allegiance to no other vessel. I express these concerns because I love being here. I don't feel we are in dire straits but I assume I was accepted at Fuller not only for what I could receive but what I could give as well.

This leads to the second oft asked question - what do you propose to do about it? I offer this proposal. I think students must become sensitive to their potential influence. It was largely student pressure which initiated curriculum revision. Student pressure could have a similar effect on current situations if students were organized.

There are numerous cliques throughout the Student Body. What if these groups began to see themselves as caucii, developing a consensus amongst their members and other groups? The result would be a student lobby that could make it's influence felt. Incoming President, Gail Tocen has announced that she would like to serve as an advocate to this kind of consensus!

We have received three articles in response to the last edition of the Opinion and wish they could all be printed. However, that was not feasible in this issue, so this article by Keith Griffin was chosen because it offered the most contrast to the previous articles.

The Dangers of Radical-Chic

I felt compelled to write an opinion for the Opinion, knowing that to do so concerning the questions I will touch upon, will at once garner me labels from all those committed to their own causes and crusades. But this opinion is not meant to be an exercise in anti-rhetoric, polarizing instead of reconciling. I had hoped that the Opinion would put out an edition on feminism, but that it would be more representative or at least more balanced than the one that appeared.

What motivated me to speak has been the great zealousness with which promoters of feminism have avidly pursued their aims within the Church—to those feminists who are among "those that are without" I have no words but the good news. I also will not seek to debate in this opinion the various alternatives in exegeting those passages in Scripture directly concerned with marriage and the family; that would require a thesis in itself (though there are deficiencies in some of the expositions I've read, I would make no claim to being a Greek exegete). What I will rather do is pose some questions, paint a picture, and ask those Christian wives who feel strongly about feminist issues to go after them but to pursue them in the manner the Apostle Peter commends in I Peter 3:1-9.
Let me say first that I come from an evangelical-charismatic background, and before I came to Fuller was "warned" about the hermeneutic at this institution. It was supposed to degrade the high view of Scripture that was held by my associates almost as sacred as the Holy Spirit Himself. I now assume that such warnings came from those obtaining a somewhat garbled or prejudiced account of Dr. Fuller's version of limited inerrancy. I myself after wrestling with the issue, have accepted such a hermeneutic principle as the only rational approach to interpreting Scripture—the only result being that I work harder and pray more before teaching the Word.

But I have found here something far more disturbing, something far more dangerous, something I think has become the "wax-nose" of modern theological studies, of greatest use for those discomfited by the seemingly archaic, scandalous, and rigid, demands, patterns, and guidelines of Scripture. This wax nose has often been asked upon by feminist zealots in questing although the feminist issue elicited this opinion, it is only secondary to a greater concern. The wax nose is the battle cry or bugaboo; depending on your stance, of "cultural conditioning".

I have talked with not a few of the Fuller community about the place of cultural conditioning in approaching Scripture, but not one has offered me the briefest of criteria, the slimmest of a methodology for applying the epithet of "culturally conditioned" to any section of the Word, be it concerned with marriage or not. So, one of my questions may actually be a plea: if any professor, student or staff can help me with this hermeneutical problem, please get it to me on paper! On the other hand, I warn students and professors alike that try to stuff down my theological throat any ethic, doctrine, or exegesis that relies upon a cut-and-paste, cultural-conditioning hermeneutic, I will either ignore it as not worthy of attention, or bluntly confront them in that moment with the airiness of their argument. (Take the Cross; and apply 'culturally conditioned' to it.) That cultural conditioning exists is trivial; how to deal with it will determine many of our ethics.

One of the most important to me at this point is the question of husband-wife relations, and the structure of the family. It has been suggested that Christians ought to adopt the "cooperative" model of marriage. I'm apprehensive of that model, quite aside from the exegetical problems with it, for the following reason. How children perceive their parents, especially the father and father-mother relations, to a great extent determine how they perceive God. I am anxious that God as the Authority, as Sovereign, will be ignored or only vaguely accepted by succeeding generations of Christians if all they have is the cooperative model before them. Without a strong knowledge (in the biblical sense of that word) of authority and discipline in a hierarchy, I fear that new generations of Christians will see God as their Cooperating God and not as their Lord and Master. Thus as a second questbn, I guess I'll let the psych students investigate this; to what extent will the cooperative model of marriage compromise in the minds of Christian children, the image of God as their Sovereign Authority? I agree wholeheartedly with those that dwell on the symbolic language of Scripture as conditioning our thinking about God and ourselves. But to those that would say that God is represented as masculine only because the Scriptures arose in patriarchal societies, I would reverse that to say (in my new found freedom to reject culturally conditioned arguments), God chose patriarchal societies by which to reveal Himself in Scripture because He wished to be represented as masculine, and to condition us to accept a certain definition of what masculinity should be (including those characteristics we associate with femininity), for our own role playing while on this earth. He could have chosen the homosexual or lesbian Greek cultures or some matriarchy in central Africa if He'd wished to condition us in another way. I guess what I'm arguing against is an over-emphasis on human-ness of Scripture at the expense of its God-breathed-ness; a history of religion approach instead of the "only rule of faith and practice" approach.

The word picture I see in Scripture and my own experience follows.

God is so Masculine, that I, a human male, am Feminine by comparison. He is the Initiator, the Seeker. He is Masculine; I am Feminine. I long to be loved by HIm, to be caressed and moved by Him. I, as Feminine, can only receive and respond to His love because I lack the capability to effect our union. I yearn to be used by Him, to
be impregnated by Him with the Seed of His Word, so as to bring forth life from my inward parts. I desire to nurse the offspring He gives me in Christ. He is Masculine; I, Feminine. I obey and submit to Him for He is my Head, and I am His joy; He rules my life by grace and love, and if needs be, disciplining.

I believe that the roles of husband/masculine/male and wife/feminine/female are defined by analogy in Scripture to be like that which is described above, and I know that I seek in my wife what the Lord analogously seeks in me. This far transcends (indeed, is a mystery) whether women can be ordained in the institutionalized Church, which partner has the greater degree or income, etc.—in short, that which is culturally conditioned—and I believe it is much more consistent with Scripture and truly more beautiful.

I would be glad to discuss in greater depth any of the issues touched on above with anyone. My only condition for doing so will be to engage each other "in fear and trembling".

We also received this refreshing article from Min Griffen.

THE GREAT THAW

I write this article with the confession that I have been frozen and recently have been experiencing a thaw. Part of the reason for my frozen state lies in the fact that in past years I have lacked enough security in myself to venture from the depths of the freezer, even though parts of me wanted desperately to experience coming alive.

What do I mean? What specifically am I talking about?

In recent months especially, but throughout the three years my husband, Karn and I have been at Fuller Seminary, I have had some of my "sure foundations" shaken by ideas presented in lectures, Bible teaching and classes. Coupled with these has been a personal inner search for my identity as a woman and for what that implies in my roles as wife, mother, and child of God within the Body of Christ.

The adventure began with the Faith Renewal Team. Scared, I had decided I could contribute little or nothing in that body, or through it to anyone else. I discovered the great joy in being me, where I was, and ministering in love. This may sound like an ambiguous statement. Alright, I discovered I did not need to be perfect nor put forth a perfect image in order to love others and bring a ray of hope to their lives where the struggle was, albeit similar to mine. Something about, "All we like sheep have gone astray."

After our team experience I felt terror and anger. What difference would that discovery make now? Karn would continue his theological pursuits. He would continue to grow and learn, and I would resign myself to fulfillment in washing the toilet bowls. I felt a combination of being left behind and obediently (as a submissive wife) walking 20 paces behind Karn. I kept hearing from others I needed to "praise the Lord" and raise false joy regarding my predicament. I did not. I suffered, and in suffering touched places within myself I hadn't known existed. I thank God for that. I thank God for the people who quietly modeled for me then.

I hadn't finished college, although I'd talked about 'going back' incessantly over the years. Now, it became a decision, concrete beyond the talking stage. Karn threw a few stones. "What difference will a degree make in the way you feel about yourself?" "What will you do with a degree?" (It sounded like "What can you possibly do with a degree?") And most vehemently, "I never married a career woman!" He remained adamant, and we had bitter discussions until he began to understand that the college degree was not going to fulfill my search but that perhaps it could be a path to some discoveries about myself within that search. We didn't know they would be important for Karn. We didn't know what they would be — we are still learning.

Let me share a few of the discoveries with you. Strange as it may seem, I found, to my great surprise, I could think. I could assimilate, digest, and make fair grades! Other people knew my capabilities but I needed to find out for myself.

Will it surprise you to hear that my husband had and has some male chauvinistic ideas? Once when we were going through a particularly rough crisis, Karn decided it was all his fault. (This feeling came from some prevalent teaching to which we had been subjected. A female
friend countered with, "What makes you think you are so all-fired important? In that situation Karn relagated me to a helpless, depersonalized wife with no resources within myself to rally, while his ego was boosted because of his importance in "God's scheme of marriage", as "answerable to God," and "my head". It was one of the worst times we have weathered.

Will it shock you when I share that Karn and I are committed to the Lord, and to the discovery of what 'becoming one' means? Christian marriage as we have experienced it through eighteen years, is not one above the other, or one behind the other, but two, committed to God and each other in love, respecting God-given individualities and recognizing that where there is growth there is also pain.

I've been a student for a year and a half. Karn became a staunch ally as it became apparent that he wasn't being replaced. He has made beds, washed dishes, chauffeured the children, hung the clothes on the line, put our son to bed, and pursued his studies. He has encouraged, cajoled, changed some of his directions, and thawed for me. Now we are searching and growing together. Isn't that great?