EDITORIAL

"When there is much desire to learn, there of necessity must be much arguing, much writing, many opinions; for opinion in good men is but knowledge in the making."

—— John Milton

The opinion is being produced to provide students and faculty at Fuller Theological Seminary with a means of expression in matters relevant to the theological student and his seminary. To accomplish this end the opinion will be distributed to each member of the student body, staff, and faculty on the first Wednesday of each month.

Each issue of the opinion will contain articles, important news, a message from the student council president, a signed editorial, and letters to the editor. The articles will be solicited from students and faculty and will deal with topics relevant to the theological student. They will represent diverse viewpoints and are not to be understood as the view of the seminary, the student council, or the editors of the opinion. Articles are the private property of the authors and may not be reproduced without permission. Manuscripts and suggestions for future articles should be submitted to the opinion, Box 77.

Letters to the editor should be the most important part of future issues. Both students and faculty are free to express themselves on any topic relevant to seminary life and seminary education. As many letters as possible will be published; short, typed, signed letters will receive priority. Letters (150 word maximum) should be placed in Box 77 at least one week before distribution.

The opinion offers a new avenue of free expression to the students of Fuller Theological Seminary. This should be of help not only to the students but also to the seminary for, again in the words of John Milton, "he who freely magnifies what hath been nobly done and fears not to declare as freely what might be done better, gives ye the best covenant of his fidelity."

WAP

******

THE COMPLEAT EDUCATION

by William Miller

The only reasonable way to judge a seminary is not by the size of its campus or by the abundance of its financial resources or by the number of books in its library or even by the publications of its professors. The seminary is to be judged by the quality of its human product. The test of a successful seminary education is not to be found in the amount of knowledge which the graduates take away with them, most of which will be forgotten in any case, but rather by the appetite to know, by the determination to continue the educational process, and by
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the ability to think and act maturely as a man of God.

If the above statement is valid, the question is raised, "Is the quality of instruction which the Fuller Seminary student receives conducive to developing his mind and whetting his appetite to know?" From this question there arise three general areas which I want to pursue; areas which will determine to a large extent whether the seminary student receives the full benefit of his formal training. These three areas include: small and large classes, the lecture-discussion method of instruction, and the freedom of students in questioning their professors on academic matters.

Concerning large and small group instruction, a point frequently at issue is the extent to which teaching efficiency is influenced by class size. Earlier experimental studies concluded that under typical instruction, measurable achievement of subject matter is not adversely affected by large classes, certainly not to the extent commonly assumed. What these studies could not show is the effect of failing to meet individual needs and foster specialized aptitudes and interests. Obviously, instructors cannot get to know each student as well in a class of seventy as in a class of fifteen, although the instructor may present his subject as effectively and the resulting average achievement in subject matter may be as high.

If to educate is to help each student learn not only common subject matter, but also subject matter to some extent differentiated by his interests, then teaching a large group imposes a handicap on instructor and students.

To a degree the argument over large or small class instruction is theoretical. The typical university or seminary is apt to have both, not from professional choice but from financial and administrative necessity. The best that can be said for having some oversized classes is that within budgetary limitations the resulting economy makes possible the staffing of important courses with inherently unlimited enrollment, and the allocation of manpower to essential educational services. For example, it would not be sensible to insist on a maximum class size of twenty students if in doing so we were prevented by insufficiency of manpower from offering seminars in Christology or the theology of Bultmann to nine or ten students. Under these circumstances it is desirable that an instructor should be prepared to teach large as well as small sections, adapting his teaching method to the opportunities and limitations of class size.

With this latter statement, the question of lecture-discussion method of classroom instruction is raised. While the method of instruction which will be used depends a great deal on size of class, the lecture has been the most popular method of instruction in higher education, no matter how large the class.

The lecture has come under some sharp criticisms in the last twenty years. It has been attacked by educators and students alike. Hamilton Holt, a former president of Rollins College, said, "under the lecture system students are regarded as so many passive objects into which a professor pours information and then asks for certain amounts of it back in periodical exams. Neither professor nor student needs be more than half awake for the process to go on."

Alderton Pink, in his picture of the future of English university education, speaks of the lecture as a survival of mediaevalism. "And there is the teaching by means of lectures. As a method this was rendered obsolete as soon as books were rapidly and cheaply printed, and yet, whereas Oxford and Cambridge have long pursued a more excellent way, the new university has strangely revived and perpetuated the mediaeval practice. Surely no system of teaching can ever be divided with so little regard for ordinary efficiency. Batches of students are set to
take imperfect notes of a probable imperfectly delivered lecture by a man who has either taken his materials from books that they ought to read themselves, or is dictating what is really an original textbook, which, obviously in the interest of economy in time and labor, ought to be printed."

There is an enormous waste of energy in some lectures. It would be well if instructors did not know so much, but rather knew how to tell better what they do know. American college students would like to subscribe to that widely known line from Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's parody on Walt Whitman: "Behold, I am not one that goes to lectures or the pow-wow of professors."

Because of the mass movement of Americans to German in the latter part of the 19th century to study in the German universities, it is the German lecture system which has prevailed in the U.S. and not the French or English lecture. Some criticism of the German lecture system include: many German lectures were given to pronouncing ex cathedra judgments, lectures tend to be verbose, forgetting that by the omission of minor points, limitations and exceptions, they could make their major contentions stand out all the more; many of the German lecturers laboriously read their manuscripts, thus weakening the normal effect of a vigorous personality.

Those interested in teaching would do well to read about Mark Hopkins, a past president of Williams College. It was said of him, that his great forte, whether as a lecturer or simply teacher in class discussion or private conference, was his personal influence on students. The man was more than his method. James A. Garfield said of him: "I'd rather dwell six months in a tent with Mark Hopkins and live on bread and water, than take a six year course in the greatest brick and mortar university on this continent."

One must not conclude, of course that discussion is not presently used in college teaching. Successful seminars and honors courses are used in many universities. Nevertheless, many professors who would like to employ discussion have not acquired the requisite skill. Others have tried from time to time to enliven classes with this form of student participation but do not feel as secure in the role of discussion leader as they do when they are in firm charge, ladling out wisdom and conducting recitations. And still others carry on what they assume to be discussion in an atmosphere so dictatorial that students respond only when specifically called upon and give back only what is obviously expected.

Finally we have slipped into the last area of discussion, the freedom of the student in questioning his professors on academic matters. If the student is not encouraged to express his doubts and ideas, if he is expected merely to accept and to reproduce the arguments and conclusions of the instructor, then the latter is imposing the same academic straight jacket on his student that he would repudiate if it were imposed on himself. The duty of the genuine teacher is to recognize and to stimulate whatever intellectual capacities the student possesses. He can then with more hope of success point out to the student the flaws, false inferences, unsound generalities or other defects he may find in a doctrine advanced by students.

The academic freedom of student fits admirable into the academic freedom of instructor. If the instructor's freedom of thought or expression is curtailed this affects his students. The more thoughtful and better students become uneasily aware that the instructor is not a free man and lose their respect for him and their trust in the honesty of his teaching. They become more sceptical—even cynical—and are often inclined to believe that the suppressed doctrine must have virtue in it. Thus interaction between faculty and students is to be encouraged. Only in such freedom is the student able to complete the education of the whole man.

*****
NEWS OF THE DAY

On Thursday, February 15, 1962, the Administrative Committee met with the Alumni Cabinet and Student Council for an all-day planning meeting. Approximately 30 people were present. Here are a few brief highlights of the session:

One of the committees formed at the Santa Barbara Conference is investigating the possibility of drawing up various curriculum requirements for students intent on following different fields. There would be a selection of core subjects and suggested electives to prepare for the specific career: teacher, pastor, missionary, or other.

Four suggestions were made concerning curriculum changes: 1) cut down the number of required courses (or hours of courses) and set up a list of suggested electives according to field of interest, 2) investigate the purpose and content of all courses to avoid duplication, 3) use syllabi in courses to increase dialogue and decrease lecturing of factual material, and 4) investigate the idea of majors.

Since service is as important as study at the seminary, the idea of required and supervised field work was discussed. Many other seminars place a great deal of emphasis on this area.

Because the chapel period is not used exclusively for worship (it is used for educational purposes also) and since it is the only time that the Student Body convenes as a whole, attendance is very important. Rather than requiring compulsory attendance students may be asked in the future to record number of absences on the monthly field work report.

To increase faculty-student interchange, there is a possibility that faculty members will be given one meal a week in the seminary refectory. Next year a student lounge in the spot now occupied by our library may also provide an informal atmosphere where faculty and students may meet.

A program for a visiting professor in missions each quarter was discussed and enthusiastically received. Also mention was made of the idea of "Middle Year in Missions" and granting academic credit for such a program. A course in linguistics will be offered 3rd quarter under the department of missions. It will be taught by Dr. John Waterman, head of the department of Germanics and a member of the graduate school of linguistics at U.S.C.

Dr. Roddy will have three local pastors helping him in the homiletics department next year. In this way, students will have more preaching opportunities while in seminary.

It was suggested that someone be asked to teach Dr. Dan Fuller's classes for the 3rd quarter. Dr. Calvin R. Schoonhoven, a Fuller graduate, will do so. (Dr. Fuller will return in September and have one assistant in the English Bible department.)

The need for a chair of Christian Social Ethics at Fuller was brought out and will be considered in the light of present finances.

Finally, finances and ways of fund-raising were discussed. This is an ever-present problem at all educational institutions.

It was a profitable time of exchange, and as new policies or changes are put into effect, they will be announced through official channels.
With hesitation lest I be accused of flogging the African horse to death, I take this opportunity to put forth a genuine request for your prayers for an unusual evangelistic opportunity this summer. We need prayer more acutely than it is comfortable to admit, for if this endeavour is a fiasco then the doors for further such efforts in needy South Africa will close with a depressing finality. Yet if successful this mission will have far-reaching repercussions in that country.

As many of you know, Ed Gregory and I travelled around Africa last summer to explore the needs of this great continent. Our interest was focused primarily on (a) determining ways and means of penetrating the political circles for Christ, (b) ascertaining the possibilities for Christian radio in the southern part of the continent, and (c) exploring evangelistic opportunities.

While Ed and I were in Nigeria I began to experience a heavy burden for one particular city in South Africa called Pietermaritzburg. It has 150,000 people and is the capital of the Province of Natal. Moreover, it is not only a strategic educational center with a very fine university and dozens of schools, but its inter-racial climate ranks among the most promising in the country. It seemed significant to me therefore, that a spiritual concern should develop for this particular city. So acute did the burden become that I felt constrained to ask the Lord for the chance to minister there sometime after leaving Seminary. However, the Lord had planned for something to develop sooner than that.

While in South Africa, Ed and I were scheduled for a meeting at Natal University in Pietermaritzburg. Several days before the meeting I was overcome with a nervousness and fear which neither prayer nor Scripture nor Dr. Lantz's affirmations would dispel. This led me to conclude that the Lord was going to do something special and so instead of fleeing for Tarshish we remained for the meeting. The long and short of it is that out of that meeting has emerged an invitation from the Ministers' Fraternal for a city-wide campaign there next August.

To my knowledge, an effort exactly like this has never been undertaken before in troubled South Africa. This makes us both fearful and excited. We are fearful, primarily, I suppose, of failure. Not one of the team (Paul Birch, Dick Peace, Chris Smith, Don Ehat, Mike Cassidy) has done anything like this before. I have never preached three nights in a row, let alone, three weeks, and the questions which keep bobbing up as to my experience are a source of rather painful embarrassment. Yet in the almost ridiculous nature of the situation is our hope, for the Lord can prove that He is able to work in spite of the frailest human instruments, and the glory and praise will be to Him alone.

We hope the meetings will be both inter-racial and interdenomina-tional, and this in the South African context will be noteworthy. However, as our meetings will be in English, a factor which will re-strict our outreach, we are also planning to set up two other series of meetings, the first using an Indian preacher to reach the Hindu population (26,000) and the second using a Zulu preacher to make some inroads amongst the 80,000 Bantu of the city.

Another encouraging factor is that there is a good possibility
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that the Dutch Reformed Church will work alongside of the Anglicans (and other denominations) in the mission. In view of the almost electric tension in the country between Afrikaans and the British it will be a great blessing to see Christians from both these ethnic groups uniting in an endeavour for their common Lord.

While this undertaking is significant for us as individuals, it is also significant to Fuller Seminary. All the team are Fuller men (Don Ehat, '59, will bear the brunt of setting up the whole campaign), and in South Africa this summer, Fuller Seminary will become either respected or notorious. Which it will be could depend upon your prayers. We trust you will stand with us for His Sake.

THE COUNCIL CORNER  "A Word To The Wise"

"Chapel is held each morning Tuesday through Friday. All students are expected to be there."

--Student Handbook

In this short statement on chapel attendance appearing in the Student Handbook, the word required has been purposely omitted to leave room for a certain amount of flexibility and a spirit of cooperation on the part of the students.

I have been informed that the liberty we now enjoy with regard to chapel attendance is in grave danger due to a lack of personal responsibility being exercised by large numbers of students.

When the Handbook says we are expected to attend chapel, it does not mean that we are free to take a coffee break, or go and study if we don't like the speaker, or if we can find one thing about chapel which doesn't appeal to our taste we are free to cut.

The word expected means that your presence is expected. When you don't attend you are missed, and all too many have been missed too often.

On the other hand, the word expected was used instead of required because it leaves room for those times, and they should be rare, when it is necessary for a student to miss chapel.

Unless there is an immediate and radical change in daily chapel and assembly attendance we may expect compulsory chapel attendance as the official policy next fall. Educate yourself in the discipline of daily chapel attendance or the Seminary will again assume the role of educator in this matter. I hope this word will be sufficient.

Richard Anderson