

Table Talk

News and Views of the Student Body of The Lutheran
Theological Seminary at Gettysburg.

No. 6

October 22, 1964

APPROACH TO CIVIL RIGHTS

The "long, hot summer" is about over. Jersey City and Rochester are relatively quiet. Now what? What city will next find itself the battleground of civil strife? In all honesty and sincerity, I pose to you, my colleagues, this question: Are we on the right track in our present campaign for civil rights? Is it possible that our "sit-ins," "stall-ins," "wade-ins," etc., may prove, over the course of a decade or two, to have had a deleterious effect on the struggle against prejudice, ignorance and discrimination? Is the "backlash" totally unjustified? Will a Cleveland pastor, killed by a bulldozer, be judged a martyr by the church if the next decade, or a well-meaning, dedicated man whose reason and sense of balance and timing was overcome by his zeal for the cause? (Are we necessarily anathetic if we don't join with those who long for the "good old days" of the Christian persecutions?)

Several years ago, before Little Rock, the prevalent approach to discrimination and prejudice was that education was the best cure for the disease, that by educating the discriminated and "educating" the discriminating (that is assuring them that Negroes are not bogey men), we would eventually be able to integrate society peacefully. Events have shown that this approach is inadequate, or, at least, too slow in effecting desirable changes. From this approach the pendulum has gone full swing to the opposite extreme--violence, bloodshed, heightened hostility and opposition

(Cont'd p. 4-column one)

AN ANSWER TO HASHERY

In the last issue of Table Talk Mr. Hans Goebel, an admired friend of this writer, expressed an idea loudly proclaimed and promoted by one of our major political organizations in an effort to swing those with animosities toward such radical groups as the John Birch Society, and the Klu Klux Klan away from their party in the voting booth on November 3. In so doing, Mr. Goebel publicly became the vehicle of what he himself termed (unjustifiably, he explained) "Political hash."

It is true that the party system in the United States has incorporated a wide range of political views although, contrary to Mr. Goebel's statement, the reason for its success lies not in expressed views, but in the phenomenal ability of more of the people to be correct in their judgement most of the time. The success of our entire system rests with the people governing themselves, at times in spite of the views of the party in office. But every party, every administration, every president elected to the leadership of American government has expressed political attitudes for which the people gave their expressed support, and while in office every administration has led the nation in definite ideological directions. The predominance of a direction within the party elected to leadership has become the prevalent direction of the nation during that administration.

Our first president, George Washington, was opposed to foreign entanglements and federal debt and felt his office should be considered

(cont'd. p. 6, Col. 1)

FEATURE EDITORIAL

by Ed Vogel song

The nexus of our intellectual life with our worship life has often been difficult to perceive, and despite the symbolic centrality and the actual integration of our chapel services with our academic schedule, there are still many students and some professors who fail to see the unity of seminary life that can be achieved only as we study and worship together. It is primarily with the sincere hope that a greater appreciation of the totality of the Christian student will arise, and not because of any liturgical leanings of the writer, that we hail the recent action of the faculty in approving the practice of weekly Communion for the seminary community.

No theological justification for a frequent celebration of the Eucharist should be necessary to a Lutheran community whose confessional and historical position has traditionally been one of appreciation and thanksgiving for the Sacrament. If each of us takes a close look at himself he will see that he stands in a peculiar and constantly recurring need for the saving grace of the Body and Blood of our Lord as it is channeled to us through the elements of the Lord's Supper. We who occupy the awe-full position of leader and shepherd need constantly to be strengthened and sustained with the inflowing grace of God. It is only as we receive our strength from Him that our lives can come to resemble both the sacramental and the sacrificial nature which are demanded of us as bearers of the Good News.

It is a constant temptation for us to become so engrossed in our daily routines that we fail to remind ourselves of our own spiritual needs and of the Savior who is our Lord. The pressures of academic deadlines, the demands of our social life, and our relationships with the parish all confront us with the temptation of setting aside the religious aspects of our lives. We need constantly to remind ourselves of Luther's statement that when his workload was so

(Cond't bottom next column)

STAFF OF TABLE TALK

Managing Editor: Dick Graefe
Junior Editor: Russ Siler
Senior Editor: Jim Munnert

Feature Editors:
Ed Vogel song Bob Richards
Dick Graf John Hagedorn
Fred Reisz Jr.

Typist: Carolyn Buechner
Publisher: Chuck Hartbauer

EDITOR'S CORNER

I am glad to see this week that Table Talk is really becoming a news and views publication. This week we have articles and comments on politics, civil rights, and sports, in one way or another triggered by previous articles in this and other publications. This is as it should be. If Table Talk ever becomes merely a news-letter, I hope it will be replaced by a "bulletin" board somewhere on campus. But if Table Talk continues the spirit it has shown this week, then it will serve the purpose for which it has been started, to spark worthwhile discussion within the community around its tables. Who knows, maybe it will even boost sales in the coffee shop.

R.F.G.

Feature Editorial Cond't

heavy he would have to increase his daily prayer life by an hour in order to accomplish his work. Similarly, we need constantly to be reminded of our Lord's words and to participate in the Sacrament which He commanded: "This is my body which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me... This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." "As often--in remembrance;" let us all avail ourselves of the opportunity to receive regularly the Holy Communion of our Lord as a reminder both of our sinfulness and of his freely given grace.

Score one for our side. In response to an article of several weeks ago, we subtly expressed the opinion that readers should be informed clearly as to the authors of articles (particularly opinionated ones), and last issue every article was signed with a name or initialed by an editor whose name appeared elsewhere in the paper. While not a stated policy of the paper, this writer believes unsigned opinion is not an honest form of journalism.

An editorial in the Mr. Airy SEMINARIAN commenting on their recent trip to Gettysburg stated, "This exchange was primarily planned to break the ice between our supposedly sister seminaries". In the same paper a sports page ridiculed our playing field where an afternoon football game between the two schools took place, burlesqued the fine spontaneous musical efforts of some of our students and attacked our players' attitudes as being insolent and exclusive. (This same page also referred to a Mr. Tyce intercepting a Gettysburg "ariel" - an ariel is an African gazelle foreign even to Gettysburgers!) In order to further a right spirit of brotherhood between our two institutions, this writer applauds the idea of exchange voiced in that editorial and recommends that, since even winning inter-seminary competition in athletics produces such irresponsible antagonism from those preoccupied with winning, any plans for future competition be dropped. This writer looks forward to visiting Mr. Airy and meeting fellow seminarians; even that sports writer who would attach even to a Theological seminary the slogan, "Football Uber Alles!"

Have you noticed the similarities between the TV images of the presidential candidates and recent TV commercials? One evening we have L.B.J. as "Mr. Clean" and the next evening Barry Goldwater as the "White Tornado".

(Cont'd p. 7 column one)

(Reprinted from a note to S. Trout)

Dear Stan,

Through you, as president of the Student Association, my husband and I most warmly say, "Thank you for the party." For us it was a complete surprise, I assure you, and a very heart-warming expression of friendship, loyalty and concern from the entire seminary community here on our "Hill." The next day the theme song of the party was with me in everything I did!

Will you please express our enthusiastic appreciation to the representatives of the classes who entertained us and made our hearts feel young and gay -- in spite of my husband's remarks about the first line of Old Black Joe? The monologist, our own Victor Borge, that inevitable chorus line -- and yes, the ever willing K.P. workers.

Never have we had a party like the one given us on October thirteenth.

Thank you for the lovely festive bowl, which has not yet gone to Philadelphia. It seems so at home here, but I promise to take it to our "second" home as directed.

You have given us memories to warm our hearts for a long, long time.

Most cordially,
Mary Heiges

October 18th

BAAL BOB SO BOUNDED

The Student Association will sponsor a "Baal Bob" at the Refectory, October 30, 1964. It is hoped that some of those planning to attend will come dressed representing any character they want to portray. It doesn't have to be elaborate, the simpler the better. It is possible that some outside entertainment will be on hand as an added feature of the evening. Lets make this a real success, come costume or not.

Paul Henry

Approach to Civil Rights
(cont'd from p.1)

to change. The question now is: Has this approach been sufficiently more productive, or must it, too, be rejected?

Some people have questioned the motives of the Lutheran Church in America in taking the position of giving approval to acts of "civil disobedience." Did this stance grow out of a genuine concern, reflecting intelligent thought, prayerful meditation and deep soul-searching on the part of every convention delegate, or were the emotional zeal of some and the need "to say something" (implied in "Editorial Opinion," The Lutheran, August 12 issue?) prime factors in eliciting this response by the church? Is the church providing determined, responsible leaders and dedicated workers who have prayerfully and thoughtfully come to the conclusion that it is their Christian duty to put down injustice, to destroy prejudice and ignorance? Or is the church merely "pouring oil on troubled waters" by suggesting to its people that this, indeed, is the way to witness in the area of civil rights?

A further question presents itself to me when someone speaks of "civil rights" and "race relations" -- Is the civil rights movement seeking the same ends for all men and for all groups who are discriminated against, or is it predominantly (if not wholly) a "Negro-rights" movement? Are all minorities being aided, or are some facing the same discrimination, prejudice and ignorance that the movement professes to be combatting? Do the leaders of the movement seek equality for all men "regardless of race, color, creed or national origin," or is that phrase little more than a respectable campaign slogan?

In all good conscience we cannot fail to act against the outrages we see around us. Every one of us is under an obligation to do all within our power and the scope (cont'd. top next column)

Approach to Civil Rights (cont'd.)

of our talents to fight prejudice, ignorance and discrimination. It hardly seems reasonable, however, to pursue any course of action short of that most effective. Are we now pursuing such a lesser course? The best course is not always the simplest or the easiest. To fight an enemy as powerful and deeply-entrenched as racial bigotry and hatred with only one weapon is folly; to deny the validity of other weapons is unreasonable. It seems that one has not "done his part" unless he has been arrested on a Freedom Ride or participated in several "sit-ins," etc. Are those whose contributions to mutual understanding and cooperation are less dramatic and news-worthy necessarily "apocrites"? How easy it is to denounce someone who shies away from "sit-ins," etc., as apathetic, or bigoted or hypocritical.

It seems to me that the best possible course of action is that which realizes the value of various approaches to the problem and integrates them into a comprehensive strategy, maintaining a meaningful tension between the several courses available, and using that approach most suitable to the particular situation. This is certainly more difficult than "the easy way out" mentioned above, since each case must be judged in each particular as an individual and somewhat unique situation. This, in turn, demands alertness, clarity of perception and rationality of thought on the part of those who seek to lead us in the battle. It demands insight, flexibility, and the ability to adapt our means to subtle changes in every situation. But with the stakes so high, how can we do less? It is my fear that we are doing just that.

George Buechner

by Robert Richards

Of late, Barry Goldwater has seemed to vacillate in his views from those held during one Republican National Convention at San Francisco. This could be for many reasons but the main reason could be to accommodate the more liberal elements of the party. Indeed, we are perplexed over his once unyielding stance on all issues that involved principles and his present accommodation. Also, the Democratic National Committee, through precise and biting political advertisements in the news media, has given a negative view of Goldwater's positions -- for example, the tearing of the Social Security card, the nuclear explosion, and the latest, the flashing signal on a telephone, the red one, with a terse comment for each of these episodes. How true are each of these advertisements?

In order to clarify the position enunciated by Goldwater and company, the Forum Committee has contacted an avid supporter of the G.O.P. candidates in the person of Mr. Robert Gillespie. He is an instructor in Political Science at Gettysburg College. Mr. Gillespie will speak on the "Key Alternatives Offered by the Goldwater Ticket." The speaker has received the M.A. degree from the University of Rhode Island and is now a doctoral candidate at George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C.

Professor Leigh Jordahl will present a rebuttal to the Gillespie presentation with a final rebuttal by the speaker. The audience will then have the opportunity to direct questions to either speaker.

Mr. Hans Goebel will serve as the moderator for the forum.

Coffee will be served at the conclusion of the forum.

The Forum Committee hopes that the student body will set aside Wednesday evening, October 20th for this first forum. The forum will begin at 7:15 P.M.

The Forum Committee

Due to my illness, I was unable to comment on the Chapel contributions of October 5-9. However, I have heard good reports that have convinced me of the continuing value of our worship together. Let us now proceed to last week's experiences.

In his usual learned and convincing style, Dr. Myers aroused the mind and the spirit to the meaning of "He who hath the Father hath life" from I John 5:12. He spoke of passionate devotion to something as the motivating force that makes and moves history. His point was that each person must realize his own personal vitality which reflects a dynamic commitment to "the Father." We can not honestly escape our responsibility by saying, "It's the devil's fault." With sharp and penetrating concern, Dr. Myers awakened his hearers to the full weight of the Gospel.

St. Paul was called to live a life that was dedicated completely to God in Christ. This kind of life required discipline and careful stewardship of time and talent. His mission was realized only by the total realization of his gifts as they were vitalized by God's own presence. St. Paul is a lesson for seminarians. We too must depend on God for our strength, but at the same time must strive consciously to develop our gifts. And we must avoid the dangers of being "hypnotized by the requirement for performance" and "reliance on our own abilities." As Mr. Hobbes stated, like St. Paul we too are called to live a life dedicated and disciplined to the task which God bestows.

A beautiful responsory prayer was included as part of the Matins Service by Mr. Kapler with the assistance of Mr. Hobbes. It was based on the famous prayer of St. Francis of Assisi and was prayed in a dialogue fashion by the officiants who knelt on opposite side of the chancel. Any variation in the Matins service is always appreciated, especially one that showed such good taste as did this one.

(Cont'd p. 6 Column two)

AN ANSWER TO HASKERY
(cont'd. from p. 1)

the voice of the aristocracy, a direction continued by John Adams. This direction was abruptly reversed by Thomas Jefferson who opposed the class ideas of the Federalists and supported power of government remaining primarily with the states rather than in a strong central government. Prior to Jefferson there was no "two-party system" of any consequence.

James Monroe brought a world view to the nation and demonstrated his power of office. The unpolished radicalism of Andrew Jackson furthered presidential power. Then direction changed again with the retreat from involvement in national affairs by Van Buren and Harrison.

With the intensifying dispute over slavery, attention was again turned to internal affairs. John Tyler was a states-righter, Zachary Taylor supported a strong Union. Fillmore upheld slavery, James Buchanan took no stand, and, of course, Abe Lincoln backed with military might the abolition of slavery and preservation of the Union.

Theodore Roosevelt swung his "big stick" at the world, publicized America as a world power, and personified Liberalism at the turn of the century. Warren G. Harding's election again reversed political direction. Coolidge and Hoover continued the move back to a national Conservatism.

Perhaps the most dramatic reversal of direction since Jefferson came with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt to the presidency. His "New Deal" must be termed Socialistic Liberalism. While Dwight Eisenhower did not change the government's direction, his administration did not greatly advance it.

In 1960 the Democrats and the Republicans had candidates so similar in political philosophy that only a little over 100,000 votes separated them. The direction and

(cont'd bottom next column)

CHAPEL CONFR, Cond't from p.5

With dignified and humble demeanor, Dr. Zinner exposed Jesus' parable of the sowers. Essentially the parable deals with the miracle of life. In the sower is seen the purposive activity of the creator who not only sows, but looks toward the harvest of that which he sows. Each seed has the dynamic vitality of life that overcomes thorns and weeds which threaten its growth. The parable lacks religious vocabulary, but its intent is clearly religious. God is active as the creator and bestower of life. He offers life to all, though some receive it not. In the same way the pastor offers life as the Word of God in his ministry. We must consider very seriously what it means to sow the seed of God.

From the ninth chapter of John, Dr. Klaassen spoke on the problem of good and evil. Why does a loving God send destruction and despair? A man is born blind. Why? To ask this question does not mean that there is an answer. We cannot explain all that occurs. Some events are filled with mystery. For the Christian, there remains only faith that God realizes his creative purpose in both constructive and destructive events. The life of a Christian is not an easy one.

Viewed in retrospect, this week's Chapel services have added to the nurturing of God's people. Such events lend continuity and richness to our community.

AN ANSWER TO HASKERY (cont'd. from column 1)

was unchanged and has continued to be unchanged under Lyndon Johnson.

Now, once again, voters have a choice of direction. They will decide on November 3 whether to continue the Liberal philosophy of F.D.R., Truman and Johnson or once again to change direction with more Conservative ideas of Barry Goldwater.

But Dr. Goebel sees Goldwater as "inflexible, non-compromising and utterly rigid...operating at

(cont'd. p. 3 col.)

UNDER THE TABLE

(Cond't from p. 3)

Some Sobering Thoughts Cond't

It may surprise the reader, but no comment will be made in this column about Mr. Hagedorn's recent comment in Dr. Hale's Sociology class regarding "Fruit of the Loom."

A plea was recently made to all members of the seminary family to respond to the call of the "Chancel Players". This writer echoes that plea knowing the fine plans of the Players this year. There will be a meeting this and every Monday night in the old building at 8:30 P.M. You are invited to attend.

As a closing thought, remember, it is better to keep one's mouth closed and be thought a fool, than to open it and remove all doubt.

Pax.

SOME SOBERING THOUGHTS

by John A. Kessler

The following has been submitted by the unanimous consent of the Seminary Conservatives, a group organized for the purpose of exposing the Conservative viewpoint.

Until several weeks ago, I tried to keep my political feelings somewhat covered up. For many supporting Sen. Goldwater and the Conservative movement this seems to be the case. I found out, however, that I can not remain silent for several reasons. The first is the belief of the encroachment of Federal power upon myself and the second, which is closely related to the first, is the belief that I am part of a mass manipulation program.

To the charge that the Republican Party has experienced a complete take-over by certain extreme and right wing elements, I can only reply, "tom yrot." You sir, have been a victim of the press. In this election the press can claim no merit of objectivity and, what is worse, can claim no merit of honesty. If one would care for an example of this "factual dishonesty" I call your attention to the October 9 issue of Time as an illustration.

(cond't top of next column)

Time states that Sen. Goldwater is using bad politics because of his morality charges against the Johnson Administration and yet when Sen. Humphry resorts to similar tactics in his campaigning Time gives not a word of reproach but words of praise. One is to conclude that Sen. Goldwater has not brought out one issue in this campaign. But what is not included in this conclusion is that the Republican candidate has on numerous occasions challenged the incumbent President to a debate of issues --- a challenge that has yet to be answered. Why can't our President debate issues and answer the charges that have been placed against him. He owes at least this to the American people.

But let us return to "extreme Barry" and his complete take over the Republican party. On hearing this I am reminded of the news commentator I heard last week who stated that Sen. Goldwater has received more financial contributions from the grass root source than any other Presidential candidate in the history of the U.S. As of last week he had received close to two million separate donations. These are not from corporation heads or newspaper men. These are from Americans like you and like myself who have nothing personally to gain other than the satisfaction of unwavering support for their candidate. Upon hearing this I am reminded also of the primaries where Goldwater received over 750 of the required delegates before the convention from the fifty states, delegates legally and morally behind Goldwater because of his grass root support in their state. If there has been a take-over of the Republican party it has been taken over by the Republicans themselves. It has been taken over by those who register Republican and vote in the primaries. Let us keep in mind to have a take-over of anything, power must be wrested from those who legally and morally have that power. According to my views (continued on page 6, col. 1)

SOME SOBERING THOUGHTS

Cont'd from p. 7

this power and control of the Republican party is not vested in the kingmakers on Wall Street. In our objectivity we should look past the press.

And the Church publications of the Protestant denominations have given us no greater insight. Almost every publication has come out against Sen. Goldwater for the simple reason that he did not vote for the Civil Rights Bill. At this point let me state that the issue was not whether the colored man should have his rights along with his white brother. This point is uncontested by Goldwater. Goldwater contested the Civil Rights Bill on the grounds that it enforced these rights contrary to the framework of the Constitution and contrary to States Rights. The issue is not the black man or the white man but the black man and the white man and the Constitution that governs them both, and if this can not be preserved for the protection of all then all minority groups had better be on guard, for a dangerous precedent has been set. If we can not be compatible with the Constitution then we must amend it or "abolish it on the grounds that we can not live up to an ideal."

But lest us return to "extreme Barry" and his statement of "extremism in the defence of Liberty." Space limits me to fully explain my understanding; but let me draw a parallel. You see a middle class man with a wife and child living in a middle class home. You also notice one night a prowler outside this man's home. He knows what he will do but we know that he has promised to destroy the home of our friend. Wait we see our friend coming out and talking to this man. He is trying everything within his power to befriend the stranger. But alas ... every attempt is to no avail. The prowler still prowls night after night. In what way do we criticise him for not protecting his family after all attempts to reason have proved

(Cont'd next column)

SOME SOBERING THOUGHTS Cont'd

fruitless. Wouldn't we expect him to protect his wife and child with means other than talk. In other words how offensive is defensive policy. To do other than provide full protection makes him less than a man.

The cry of the Christian nations and of Christian men has never been peace alone. It always has been peace with the freedom for the nature of man's dignity under the governance of God. If we fail in the fight for liberty, who is left to carry on our campaign? Let me hang my flag with that extremist who said, "Give me liberty or give me death."

AN ANSWER TO E. SMERY

Cont'd from p. 7

the exclusion of all other points of view." He sees him not as a Conservative, but as a radical Right winger, an irresponsible fanatic, perhaps a "Bircher" or a representative of the Klu Klux Klan (no consideration is given for his being a major general in the Air Force Reserve, a past member of the N.A.A.C.P. and present member of the Urban League, much less a voice in our federal government for over ten years.)

It is not the intention of this writer to support Goldwaterism here, however it is evident that Mr. Goebel is relegating it to a "kiss of death" for the G.O. . . either uninformedly misunderstands the Senator's Conservatism, has been biased by party propaganda against any Conservative opposition or has allowed his own thinking to become narrow and exclusive, holding that American politics now only has room for the Liberal or radical Liberal. It is also evident that Mr. Goebel does not understand the vote as an expression of choice and decision for political direction by the people as they govern themselves. For these reasons it is felt Mr. Goebel's expressed opinion must be publicly refuted.

(Cont'd p. 9 Col. 1)

For years Conservatism has been defended against a Liberal majority and much has been written on the subject. It is recommended that Mr. Goebel lay aside his L.B.J. literature, his books supporting radical "Right" organizations and societies and his misunderstandings of American political history and investigate past administrations (starting with Washington, not F.D.R.) and modern Conservatism as expressed by the supporters of and in the expressions and record of Senator Goldwater. He may well decide this is not the best direction for America, as will millions, and thus express himself with his vote on November 3, but his intelligence will release him from the very "fraternal brotherhood" of "narrow exclusivism" his misunderstandings seem to have led him into and he will be able to use that intelligence in support of his choice of direction, principal and personality rather than as an amplification for "political hash."

Dick Graf

HIGHLIGHTS FROM LECTURES

Dr. Asirvatham, Student-Faculty Lecturer who spoke here yesterday, presented an incisive analysis of the world scene and the task of Christians today. Much of what he said, although applying directly to India, nevertheless suggested by implication a wider relevance to our own Christian task and the role of our own country in world affairs.

One of the themes he dealt with at length was "the conditions necessary for Christianity to survive as a vital factor" in India, and by implication, in any country. Those are the conditions he listed: (1) "A first-hand belief in and experience of Christ's power." The two questions the Hindu asks today are, "Have you found God?" and "If so, can you help me find him?" If Christians cannot answer yes to these questions, the Church has no future in India. (2) "Getting rid of dead timber." Nominal Christians do more harm than good.
(Continued top of next column)

To really fulfill Christ's commission the Church cannot merely exist as a closed community of "rice Christians", interested only in material gain and self-perpetuation, but must be truly evangelical. (3) "Rooting and grounding of the Church in Indian Soil" by a process of "indigenization". Indian Christian art, music, and architecture must mold a truly Indian Church, lest the Christian faith in India become a borrowed rather than a first-hand faith. But as this rooting and grounding takes place, the universality of the Church must also not be neglected; a Christian should be "a good nationalist but a better internationalist." (4) A healing of denominational disunity on trivial issues.

With regard to the world scene Dr. Asirvatham spoke openly on both the fortes and failings of his country. India's policy of non-alignment under Nehru, he pointed out, when truly followed did not mean a neutrality with regard to right and wrong, but rather a legitimate neutrality of non-involvement in the petty hates and schemes of self-aggrandizement of other nations. Yet there is a point at which any nation must take a stand, and part of the reason for India's fall from the position of leader of the non-aligned powers is her failure to do just this. But India's failure in this respect is only characteristic of a worldwide collapse of true non-alignment.

Perhaps Dr. Asirvatham's most significant observation on the world scene, a statement which is truly worthy of being called a "quotable quote", was his comment on foreign policy, India's in particular, but applicable to any nation: "If a country tolerates injustice abroad it eventually comes to roost in her own territory."

Dick Graefe

JOKE OF THE WEEK

RDH: "Now today we are going to study the teaching values of the miracles in the Bible. First of all, what does the story of Jonah and the whale teach?"

EUOTB Student: "It teaches that you can't keep a good man down."