

MAR 22 1966

Table Talk

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

Vol. II No. 19

March 22, 1966

THE RESURRECTION OF THE RESURRECTION

Any evaluation of the discussion between Dr. Hefner and Dr. Loose on the "Nature of the Resurrection" must begin with a basic criticism. Because both men attempted to condense their statements into a short period of time, neither was able to clarify his position as well as he might have. I feel that in further sessions of the forum, the committee should seriously consider inviting only one man to speak. This would give the speaker more time to amplify his statements as well as make possible more dialogue between him and the audience. Unfortunately, we were unable to witness the later innings of this contest, which adjourned to the Gritsch home for another five hours.

Despite this basic limitation the discussion was quite successful, if only for the questions it raised. Both men acknowledged that the resurrection was, indeed, an historical "event." However, Dr. Hefner, by using the results of critical-historical scholarship, gave content to this "event." I Corinthians 15 and to a lesser extent, Mark 16 were the sources he cited (the other accounts being mostly unreliable according to the results of form criticism). On the other hand, Dr. Loose maintained that the diversity of the Biblical accounts makes any attempt to define the content of this "event" (described as a "resurrection") impossible. This position calls into question the validity of modern historical research into the Bible. In fact it implies a whole host of questions concerning the nature of history. What is history? What is an historical event? What is the relationship between an event and the account(s) of it? What is the goal of history? Dr. Hefner's use of Wolfhart Pannenberg (Cont'd on page 2, col. 1)

POLICE OBSERVATION

Those students interested in participating in the observation of the York police department are requested to meet briefly in the Coffee Shop during the coffee hour on Wednesday, March 23. If you can't make the meeting, please contact Fred Krautwurst.

LESS LETHARGY AND MORE INVOLVEMENT

Last Thursday the Seminary was fortunate to have as guest speakers Dr. Gayraud Wilmore, Executive Director of the Committee on Race Relations of the United Presbyterian Church, and Mr. David Mills, student director of the Special Committee for Social Action at Princeton Seminary. Aside from reiterating the ever familiar (perhaps all too familiar) racial issues, these two men, especially Dr. Wilmore, stressed two points that are worth noting: (1) the "moodebony"--indifference caused by failure to enforce the Civil Rights Law--that is now predominant in the Negro mind and (2) the present position of the white Protestant Church that seems to lend support to "institutional racism." Both of these phenomena have evolved from the attitude that since the laws are on the books the struggle is over. The Negro is well aware of this prevailing false sense of security and understanding and he has taken a negative slant in viewing the possibilities for future progress in his effort.

Dr. Wilmore emphasized that to help this lag in concern for and direct action upon the situation the Church must make an introspective survey of its own position. The institutional Church, this Seminary included, stands as a racial offender. Whether it is aware of this, (Cont'd on page 2, col. 2)

RESURRECTION (Cont'd from page 1)STAFF

and his method of "doing" history served to raise some of these questions. But the immediate question raised by the discussion was the use or non-use of the results of New Testament historical scholarship. Dr. Hefner did not support his use of it as Dr. Loose did not give reasons for his ignoring it. I think this question deserves more attention than it received.

Chaplain Vannorsdall noted the interesting fact that there was really very little difference between the two men, at least in what they presented. (It is important to note that neither man directly referred to the symbolic idea of "immortality"). For Dr. Hefner, the qualities of "hope" and "destiny" were founded in this event termed "Jesus' resurrection," although he was vague as to what these terms implied. Dr. Loose, while considering the nature of the resurrection irrelevant, saw liberated, creative existence as the value of Christian life. Rather than deal with "hope," he preferred to have faith that "Yahweh provides." But I cannot see how he could separate "hope" from this faith, for to trust in Yahweh is the supreme source of hope. Therefore, because neither man dealt explicitly with the symbolic term "immortality," their positions seemed very similar. (Rumor has it that here is where they may really differ). I think both men were trying to avoid a naive conception of after-life, and rightly so. But while Dr. Hefner implied a not so naive restatement of the symbol "immortality" in the terms "hope" and "destiny," Dr. Loose preferred to ignore the subject. (It is debatable whether or not he did, however). Nevertheless, what they did say differed very little.

Both acknowledged this "event" and the fact that it was described metaphorically; both saw its influence in our present life in this term "destiny," "hope" and "liberated, creative existence." If Dr. Hefner would have clarified what he meant by "destiny" and "hope" (Cont'd on page 3)

Managing Editor: Fred Krautwurst
 Junior Editor: John Woods
 Senior Editor: J. Paul Balas
 Typist: Carol Avery
 Printer: Kirk Bish

LESS LETHARGY... (Cont'd from page 1)

I do not know. For instance (and I do speak from a lack of knowledge concerning administrative affairs), I fail to find any effort at this Seminary to employ qualified Negroes. Even further, student response and, to an extent, faculty response to needs of the Negro community of Gettysburg has been negligible. Or rather--they may have been considered, but hardly acted upon. In fact, this is for the most part the typical attitude of our student body (the author included) in most situations and opportunities afforded us for consideration. We seem to take "fadistic" view (of which Mr. Wills spoke) toward the most important topics that appear upon the contemporary scene, be it Viet Nam, Race Relations, community needs, etc.

I would ask for a little less apathy and more involvement in something else beside ourselves. This is not a plea for social action for the sake of social action, but this is a real questioning of what our Christian faith has to do with today, with the now--what the author of Ephesians calls the kairos. I feel that it is not illustrated by words or half-hearted attempts, of which this essay could very well be a part.

I feel that the race problem is a little closer to home for most of us and easier with which to deal (although only easy in the sense of proximity). I know that there is much to be done in the way of education before action is taken, but I hope that there will be more dialogue on this campus aimed in the direction of action.

Anyone interested in venturing further in this attempt is asked to see me, Dr. Hefner, Dr. Gritsch, or attend the meeting in the Coffee Shop today at 10:30 A.M.

Bill Quail

RESURRECTION (Cont'd from page 2)

and if Dr. Loose would have been confronted with the implication of his essentially orthodox faith that "Yahweh provides," then, I think, the two men would still find their position quite close.

These points, I feel, are exceedingly important; and their amplification would perhaps have provided an answer to Dr. Folkemer's question as to the meaning of being "raised up with Christ." I am sure that Dr. Heffner would not mind being "collared" by those wishing clarification. And if this article should happen to come to the eyes of Dr. Loose, I would hope that he would feel free to place himself at our disposal again in his spare time (if Yahweh sees fit to provide him with such a commodity).

Robert Pielke

VIETNAM: SEMINARY LECTURE AND
DISCUSSION

"Vietnam: the Political and Human Problem," will be the topic of a lecture by Dr. Jean-Robert Leguey-Feilleux, instructor in the Department of International Relations, Law and Organization at Georgetown University. Dr. Leguey-Feilleux is a member of the Institute of World Polity and has just finished a study for the Defense Department on the topic of torture. He is an expert on Vietnam (Ph. D. dissertation), and lived in France and North Africa before he immigrated to the United States.

He is not committed to a particular political camp regarding the Vietnam debate. If you care for information on this vital issue and a reasonable debate, please participate in this event: WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 3-5 P.M. in the Aberly Room.

E.W.G.
Faculty Lecture Committee

CHANGE PENDING

Due to a conflict in scheduling, the date of the Student Association's Spring Dance is being changed. See the bulletin boards and coming issues of Table Talk for the new date.

This space is blank because you didn't write anything to print here. Have you nothing to say, dear reader?