

2P
52

THE SEMINARIAN

A PUBLICATION OF THE SEMINARY COMMUNITY COUNCIL
PHILIPCASTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE U.C.C.
Louise Kellogg and Elmer Scofield, Editors-To-Be

VOL. 28 NO. 9

JAN 3 1977

JESUS LOVES YOU!!!

DECEMBER 17, 1976

LIBRARY

YOU WON'T HAVE SCOFIELD (ALONE) TO KICK AROUND ANYMORE!!!

...that is, if I have anything to say about it!!! Here's the scoop. About a month ago, I decided that if no volunteers came forward to help in the production of this newspaper (or whatever it is), I would call a press conference and announce my resignation.

Well, much time passed, and still I spent each week in solitude in the SEMINARIAN office, waiting for help-mates...but to no avail.

I told a friend (Ms. Louise Kellogg of Connecticut, Esq.) about my plans to "throw in the typewriter." She was astonished by my sudden revelation, (almost driven to the verge of tears...it was really a moving scene...you would agree!) and begged and pleaded with me to stay on as editor-in-chief. I coldly refused.

She then earned herself the title, "The Great Compromiser.?!". She suggested that I resign as editor...then we would both approach the Seminary Community Council, asking that we be named "co-editors." That seemed agreeable to me. She made the further suggestion that the SEMINARIAN be published once every two weeks, and that each issue be devoted to some theme, issue or subject of relevance to the community. This, too, suited me fine.

In all candor, I felt I had to tell her that it would be really difficult for me to adjust to a situation in which I was to work on an equal level with a woman...at this, she cringed, but only until I completed my thought..."Mainly because," I said, "I have worked in the Office of Development and Communication for over two years, a position in which the Rev. Ms. Dorothy Book has served as my immediate superior." I laughed roly-pollyingly as I watched the reaction on her face. It was a gas, a riot, a belly-buster!!! You should have been there.

Getting back to the point at hand...We went to the last scheduled S.C.C. meeting, hoping to present our ploy to the esteemed members of that corrupt institution. But ("What if they gave a meeting and nobody came?") a half-hour after the session was slated to start, it still hadn't. It never did. So, I couldn't officially resign, and we couldn't officially be appointed co-editors.

Well, that's just too bad. I accept my resignation. Lulu does, too. And we here and now appoint and annoint and ordain ourselves as the co-editors. Heresy? Maybe. Opportunistic? That is a possibility. Not Kosher? That's an understatement. But answer this one...if we didn't work on the SEMINARIAN, who would? Does anyone really care? We'll see. Or at least we'll wait.

MERRY CHRISTMAS AND HAPPY NEW YEAR, FROM ELMER AND LOUISE, AND THE CAST OF DOZENS WHO HAVE MADE THIS PAPER GREAT (?)!!!

TOTAL RESPONSE AND/OR PRACTICE WHAT YOU PREACH

One of the dynamics which causes me to rebel and express indifference towards my stay here revolves around a discussion which takes place in every aspect of my educational and communal experience. It is an old discussion, but one which is ignored because we tend to take refuge in the safety of one extreme or the other. I'm talking about a reality of human experience to which we apply the general term of emotion. There are two extremes: complete recognition of religious experience as an extension of emotional stimulation and the complete recognition of religious experience as an extension of intellectual stimulation. A part of my "suffering" comes from my cultural development; one where emotions play an active role in religious experience. Here I find a much different orientation, that is one reason I am here; i.e. to enter intellectual dialogue because of the injustices of emotionalism.

Now I note an inherent problem. We denounce conversion through emotionalism but we teach "get in touch with your feelings." That is, we separate emotion and mind in our thinking and forget the total being. We teach love but through definition. If God and love are compatible, then so are intellect and emotion. A case: A conversion through an altar call. Result: An emotional response; but caused by a verbal and systematic argument on the part of the preacher.

My point is to support neither, but both. The person who comes forward, comes forward filled with emotion, emotion invoked not without argumentation or rationale. The danger here is the extent to which you polarize this argument. I do not deny at times I cry out to God, although when I express this on paper it reads, Why would God let injustices occur? We can deny neither or else ignore our total being which we commit to God. I close with a quote from a fellow seminarian: "Yet to admit that we are emotional creatures requires us to be emotional - that's hard!" And for those concerned, my conversion was not Southern Baptist style, but at the hands of a very bland Presbyterian minister, after I had been Southern Baptist the first seven years of my human experience. Can we deny ourselves and thus deny the emotional structure which God also intended to create?

- Al Mann

+++++

ST. MARY'S AND LTS:

LTS BEER & BOOGIE!!!

Let's get something going with our sister Seminary in Baltimore!

It could be a tremendous experience to combine efforts in conducting a worship service and fellowship evening.

Anyone interested in helping develop this idea into a reality please contact Richard Luh (Richards Hall 102) or Dr. Hartley soon.

Thank you for your cooperation in this endeavor.

- R. Luh

Dance away those due date blues! Wet your whistle while listening to the best of Lancaster rock!

Friday, Dec. 17th, we are invading "Grandma's Attic" down on Route 30, past Dutch Wonderland and all that. No cover charge! And great over-stuffed couches to sit on, or sleep on, depending on how your day went.

So truck on down with us - all and everyone in the community is urged to celebrate! We'll see you around 10:00!

Questions? ask Elmer, Lulu