

The SEMINARIAN

Volume XXI May 8 1980 Issue 18

Response to an Editorial:

In reading your editorial, directed primarily to me, in last week's issue of the Seminarian, my first reaction was to leave it be, to make no response. However, after rethinking that course of action and the circumstances involved I determined a responsible reply on my part was in order.

I would like to thank you for coming forward with an admission and apology for the 'few words' as you called them in an earlier issue. I believe I called them a 'literary threat', I suppose it's all in your interpretation. Anyway, thank you for that act, though I can assure you it was not the traumatic or tribulating experience for me as you might have feared.

Also, I sincerely hope you've been honest with yourself as to how you originally responded to the poem. I was rather surprised to read that you were struck by the humor of it when I reflect in the light of all the occurring dynamics which came in response to that poem. I only suggest, be true to yourself and your feelings.

I would conclude here with thanks again, however, you made several points besides your apology which I also feel a responsibility to respond to, if for no other reason than to more clearly define certain gray areas.

We've raised a very interesting issue here concerning the notion of the Seminarian being a professional publication. In my earlier letter I made several statements referring to the professional responsibility of the Seminarian and I still hold to that notion. I totally agree with your point that what you print is not necessarily professional in nature, however, by the very fact that you do collect, edit, organize, lay out, print and distribute ~~thaa~~ material makes the Seminarian, as the voice of the Lancaster Theological Seminary community, a professional publication and it should be handled in like manner.

I would like to add here, in looking over this last issue, I can see a more professional attitude reflected in the paper. Keep up the good work, it is appreciated. Let me also inject here that I, along with the rest of the Seminary community, are well aware of the work and time you the staff contribute, again, thanks.

Now to another gray area; concerning the question of the use of your initials, you misunderstood my point. I was not objecting to your use of anyone else's use of initials as the authorship of an article. My point of concern was over the fact that I wanted my poem authored with an initial and not my spelled out name. This fact was ignored by the staff and thus my name was spelled out; thus my indignation, thus my reference to the use of your initials, not that I'm opposed to initialed articles but that my initialed article was changed without my permission. This again gets back to the notion of the professionalism of the publication; not the professionalism of the

(continued page 2)

(RESPONSE CONT.)

material contained therein but rather the professionalism as to how that material is handled. I hope that clarifies the question of the initials, please return RMV IF you so desire, just allow me the right to sign my articles SMS if I so desire.

To my next area of concern; you made a very valid point concerning the writers responsibility for his written word. In this area I must admit, I was perhaps a bit negligent, for I never intended nor expected the enraged responses I recieved from a few mwmbers of the Seminary community. I had pretested my product by reading it to a number of different people I recieved only positive feedback from those preliminary readings and so it was submitted for publication.

I agree with your point that, minus the notion of humor, the words of my poem are rather harsh, however, I would be willing to say they were not near as harsh as many of the graphic metaphors in your poetry. The difference though I can see is that you interpreted those harsh terms as direct attacks to yourself, personally. You did not and probably couldn't separate the poetry from the poet and thus, the feeling of direct attack and the equal return of harsh salvo's on your part in reference to me as, "narrow eyed", "lacking a nose", "lacking emotion", "being a fool" and "possessing an empty soul". I hope we have passed that point.

Another point: I have empathy with your feeling disturbed when you suspect someone to be telling you how to be you. That is the role of 'big brother', not your big brother in Christ.

In looking over the last few paragraphs of your letter I see again the issue or perhaps misunderstanding over the professionalism of the Seminarian. It is an interesting question. Perhaps we can discuss it sometime at more length in person and not further burden the Seminary community with our dialogue.

I hope and believe this whole experience has been a growing one for all involved. Again, thank you for the letter and if your publisher prints that poem I want my share of the royalties.

Is all this letter writing how Erasmus got started?

Scott M. Sanders

THE CONTINUING STORY OF
REV. SIDNEY SPELLING
SUPER PASTOR
CHAPTER 7

Remorse set in. Deep powerful tear wrenching feelings began to spasm through my body. Fighting to get a grip on myself, I pulled over to the side of the street, my hands trembling about in jerks, frantically searching for my handkerchief. Lord knows what tears and sniffles can do to stain a ten-dollar tie. Over and over again I said to myself, "why Mr. Jenkins? Why he and not I?" Immediately recognizing the symptoms of a serious problem, God led me to see myself in stark reality; a sniveling, drizzling mess of confused humanity; a mere shadow of the man who only 2 hours ago had miraculously healed a contrary printing press. Daubing at my eyes, my blurred vision became clear, as if I could see not only my surroundings but twenty, thirty and even forty miles down the road. I didn't need to look more than 4 ft however, as when I had come to a stop, my right front bumper was resting snugly against a large wooden sign, which had been invisible to my former blind self.

DOCTOR MADGE MINDBENDER, MD, PhD,
PSYCHIATRIST

Piece by piece, I inched to the door, half pushing, half dragging my shattered psyche. Gathering my last bit of strength, I burst through the door into the waiting room. My voice squeaked

(CONT PAGE 3)

THE BEST OF THE SEMINARIAN
1986

(SIDNEY CONT.)

That's right folks, it's that time again. So let's get your act together, and get down on your hands and knees and pull out the old Seminarian's from this year from under your bed, or dresser or wherever you threw them after you read them. For the judges have handed down their verdict and here is the Best, I mean very best, of what was published this year in our proud publication.

(due to the volume of material received this year there may be a few categories that didn't appear last year. Fear not, we want to give credit where credit is due.)

Best Series of Articles: There was a tight race between Tyson Frey for his profound work on "Evangelism" (beginning in the Nov. 5, 1979 issue) and Father Ed for his enlightening work "Some Basic Principals of the Spiritual Life." After due consideration, we chose Tyson Frey as the victor. After all, it was you that dropped that 10 spot in our editorial box, wasn't it Ty?

Best article: This unanimously went to the in-depth reporting of E.G. Shaffer on the findings of "The LTS Community." This bright new anthropologist is sure to make it big in his field. The article can be found in the October 29 edition of the Seminarian or in the Oct. 26, 1981 edition of The Journal of the Earth's Religions, (which ever comes first).

Best Editorial: This award was a rough one. But we decided to give it to Jim Haas for his work, "To the Editor". While the title isn't too creative, his honesty and ability to make us think was indeed impressive. This work can be found in the February 29, edition. Thanks Jim. (You see, we do appreciate you Presbyterians.)

Best Recipe: This award unanimously goes to Sem n' Arian for his delicious work

out through my teeth as if my mouth was lined with sound proofing, my words echoing and pounding in my head until I was convinced that more noise was escaping through my ears and nose than my larynx. "Help me!" was all I could manage before I lapsed into a realm of total blackness. Has Sidney Spelling finally lost it? Will Dr. Mindbender be able to save him? Wait till next year and see.

I was so tempted to create a cartoon of this hysterical event but the baby came since last Monday night.

"Seven Seminarians called" for proof of age

..... all but Korpik.
(wonder why)



(it was the stork, ...wasn't it ??)

BEST OF....

"Old Fashioned Schism Cookies."

Accepting the award for Mr. Arian is John Dalles. As you probably remember, this creative piece was put into circulation in the November 19 issue.

Best Reporting: Again there was heavy competition in this field. Steve Fair almost won it for his fine work in "Dateline Lancaster" found in the early issues. As well, Jeff Dick almost won for his informative work in the articles on the inside working of the SCC and the Executive Cabinet. However, after due consideration, we gave the award to the Soda Machine for it's highly creative work on keeping us posted on the really important things, such as the price of the soda pop in the PRC. These articles can be found in the Oct. 22 and Nov. 12 issues.

Best Short Story: The award went to our ever greatly talented editor for his work "A Short Story" found in the Dec. 17 issue. Well Don, While the title lacks a bit, the story was fantastic. Thanks for sharing it with us.

Best Play: There was only one, so the choice was easy enough. The award goes to Ern   Schaffer for his well remembered work, "In A Jerusalem Tavern" published in the March 21, 1980 issue. Thanks Ernie.

Best Poem; This award goes to Mike Vaughan for the memorial poem entitled "There Was One" found in the Dec. 17, 1979 issue.

Best Fictional Series; This award goes to the creators of the run-on story of "Rev. Sidney Spelling, Super Pastor". The staff of the Seminarian, who worked hard and long to bring you this combined effort deserves the applause. (boooo hisssssssss)

Best Cartoon; This award goes to the incomparable Todd Fennell for his humorous yet realistic portrayal of the energy crunch's effect on Christmas found in the Dec. 17, 1979 edition of

the Seminarian. Good work Todd.

Best Plea for Support; Again the Editor is awarded for his fine begging ability found in the "Second Straight Weekly Appeal" in the February 15, 1980 issue. With such honest whimpering, it's hard to understand how we got such strange response.

Best Filler; This effort was perhaps the most astounding, yet creative work the Seminarian has published. Creative in that it fell under the category of Editorial Staff. Astounding in that it was true. The award goes to Don and Judy for the announcement of their marriage. Some Filler!!!! (March 21, 1980)

There are two SPECIAL AWARDS this year. First, the award for the best all around performance on these pages, better known as the triple crown, is given to Ron Parks, who's poetry, short story, and cute little announcement/articles earned him the big title. Gr-r-rreat Job Ron!!! We really appreciate your stuff. Keep it coming.

The other special award is for the most persistent/least appreciated work of the year. As you probably remember, Marc Wessels won it last year. This year, the award goes to the entire staff of the Seminarian who's persistence through out this entire year, in spite of a brief respite in the post Easter period, brought you this fine publication through the onslaught of tests, physical distance, and at times physical ailment, while remaining the least appreciated group of staff persons on campus. We take this time to pat ourselves on the back. (pat pat pat)

So there you have it gang. The very best of the Seminarian. Please excuse the lateness of this edition and the various references to dates that happened over a month ago. We were wet back a bit with some academic responsibility.