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LETTER TO THE EDITOR

I wish to react to the article "Ministry Department: A Program Proposal" by Dave Warner and Chuck McAllister which appeared in the April issue of Opinion. As a graduate of Fuller (B.D. '63), and a pastor for nearly four years, I feel this article makes some excellent points which should be taken very seriously by the Ministry Department. A stated commitment of the Seminary is to "...excellence in graduate and professional education." A major product of this education should be effective pastors, men who are able to provide leadership in difficult days for the church. Authors Warner and McAllister suggest that a very real and important gap exists in the training of such men. The gap is a serious lack of integration between classroom instruction and the practical exigencies of parish life. While all graduate professional programs suffer somewhat from this lack of theoretical-practical integration, the situation in theological education, especially at Fuller, seems most acute. The reason for this state of affairs is that no meaningful, systematic effort at integrated, applied pastoral education has been attempted by the Seminary on a major scale as proposed by Warner and McAllister's program.

An unstructured and vague fieldwork program is not the solution, for most men tend to become isolated in one area of the church's life and never really are exposed to the total spectrum of a pastor's responsibilities. Nor does a simple fieldwork program provide regular, informed feedback and discussion so necessary for a student's struggle in creative problem-solving.

While most may agree that a solid intellectual foundation is a sine qua non for the effective pastor, it should not be overlooked that in the nitty-gritty of every day ministerial responsibilities, the pastor must be able to handle and creatively deal with "people-situations." This ability comes primarily through exposure and experience which Fuller students need and which Warner and McAllister's program would intensify. Furthermore, a program of this nature would help foster among students a more realistic view of the pastorate and would establish more effective dialogue between the Seminary and the churches.

The practical considerations for the implementation of such a program are numerous. The program itself, as the authors point out, is tentative and subject to modification. In spite of the obstacles I strongly urge that a program of applied pastoral education along the general guidelines set forth by Warner and McAllister be developed by the Ministry Department in the near future. It will be worth the effort!  

Robert C. Richard, Student
Graduate School of Psychology

AN EDITORIAL: STUDENT GOVERNMENT--WHO NEEDS IT?

by Marvin Erisman

Even if the world's most renowned optimist were asked, "Does Fuller Seminary need a representative body of the associated students?" I fear he would be forced to answer "No." I suspect that if a vote were taken tomorrow to decide the issue (being aware that only about 30% would cast votes) student government might easily be eliminated.

Several factors might speak in favor of its elimination. First, would be the financial reward gained by a negative vote. Since costs are sky-rocketing, the student may feel that by not paying student body fees each year, he could at least partially relieve the present administrative policy.
STUDENT GOVERNMENT: WHO NEEDS IT? (cont')

Secondly, what is student government doing anyway? Evidence can easily be called forth to illustrate that the system itself is sick and lethargic. For instance, much prayer, fasting and finger-crossing are necessary to ensure a quorum at student council meetings. Even these methods are no guarantee. Student council is apparently thought of as a sweep-em up, clean-em up crew that enjoys breakfast-in-the-square together once a week. Unfortunately, such an attitude toward student government cannot be limited to any one segment of the seminary, but prevails at virtually all levels. And perhaps not unjustly so.

Thirdly, the attempt to organize community is frowned upon by many as a degenerate form of spontaneity. Community, they say, should happen. If it does not happen, then most likely, it is not needed. The fallacies of this logic should be apparent to all. Like it or not, organization is integral to the success of any community.

Lastly, because of the diverse interests and involvements of the student body, no one feels the urgency of a well-oiled seminary community. Great gaps exist between students and these cannot be easily closed. Therefore, let us continue in like manner as we are, and if there are those interested in serving the seminary in student government, let them reign. No one will ever know or really care.

I take seriously the above arguments and their implications. For this reason I contend that we need to reconsider the necessity of student government. The student body itself must decide whether or not student representation and an organization of the associated student body is necessary. My position is as follows. A definite re-appraisal of student government is necessary, both formally and informally, on the part of each student and the student council itself.

In my opinion, student government is an asset to this seminary, contrary to popular opinion or the lack of it. Therefore, I propose the following steps:
1. The organization known as the Associated Student Body be retained intact.
2. Student government as such be abolished with only the president, vice president, and secretary-treasurer elected each year. They would have the sole power to distribute funds, make necessary appointments and vote legislation.
3. A Seminary Guard be appointed of three individuals, one from each class, to ensure that appointees serve adequately in their respective offices; to squelch disruptions which occur without the express sanction of the Triumvirate; to add fuel to proposed disruptions.

As a corollary, I should add that with such a shift in emphasis, the students will be indirectly working toward student-centered education at all levels. After all as responsible individuals, is this not what we want?

THE STUDY AND THE STREET

by Kenneth Hamilton

I have been asked to share with you some thoughts about the relation of the Seminary to the Christian Ministry. This has come about, I suppose, because I have happened to have the experience of coming into theological teaching after a fairly extended period in the pastorate. My present position is one of being a dozen years within a university after fifteen in churches -- both in Canada and in Britain. That may indicate chiefly how much out of date will be anything I may say about the ministry. My memories of the parish are distant ones and growing dimmer. On the other hand, going by the rule that you can't teach an old dog new tricks, it may be that from the time of becoming a teacher I have always looked at my work from the pastoral angle. Sometimes I feel that I am not really a teacher at all. Instead, I am just a minister who went out to pay a pastoral call in a college setting and never got out again. Or, maybe, I went to take a refresher course at college and never finished it, so they
made me an instructor. However you slice this particular cake, I certainly am very certain that effective ministry and serious study have much to do with each other. My personal experience underlines that.

Of course life in the Seminary and life in the Ministry are very different things. This goes without saying. The study is not at all like the street. And the contrast epitomizes how the two life-styles diverge. In the study everything is (the vagaries of human nature being allowed for) under control. The student's task is limited to what he can dig out of books or lecture notes. His concern is with ideas. He seeks to separate the true from the false in his own mind with the guidance of other minds, living and dead. Pragmatically, the task is limited by time and resources at hand. Yet, in the most real sense, the man in the study does not recognize any limits at all in his search for truth. Like Robert Browning's grammarian he says, "Leave now for apes and dogs. Man has forever."

It's not like that in the street, where unless you know where you're going and pretty well how long you need to get there you'd better not start. And yet you never know what you are going to bump into, or whether you'll find yourself under the wheels of a passing car. You may have to change your plans altogether at a moment's notice. In any case, you won't be given more time. You plan, improvise, make quick decisions, and do what you can. You may lose your nerve and become a "failure." Or pull through, somehow, and be rated a "success."

The ministry is life in the street, living under the pressures of circumstance. Real life some people call it. And, because life in the Seminary is life in the study, removed from the existential stresses and pulsating joys and heartbreaks that are the stuff of individual existence, it is often considered to be artificial and restricting -- something to be got through, the sooner the better, so that we can begin the proper business of living our life.

I don't agree. Certainly, there is a difference between the study and the street, a big difference. But it is a living being who sits in the study. And it is an active intelligence who walks down the street. These two "moments" of our corporal existence are held together within the same person and both contribute to making him the kind of individual he is. These two aspects of ourselves have to come to terms with each other.

That is why I don't see the Seminary as being merely a place where professional training is given, enabling us then to get on with the job of real life. It is that, of course. But it is more than that. It is chiefly an opportunity to experience a dimension of existence that we need for every moment of our lives. We need to carry the study with us into the street. And, also, the urgency of the street needs to make itself felt even in the quiet timelessness of the study. That is what I learned when I returned to teaching in an academic environment after my years in the pastorate.

Baron von Hügel once wrote: "The Universal and Abiding does not move the will; what does move it is Individual and Evanescent." When what goes on in the Seminary seems remote and irrelevant that is because it doesn't make contact with our own urgent questions and concerns. But, after all, we are changeable and "evanescent" creatures. One of my surprises after leaving Seminary was that some of the professors whose lectures had excited and stimulated me quickly became mere memories. And much of the teaching that had seemed quite boring suddenly appeared extraordinarily urgent and important. The difference was in me, after exposure to "real life" had altered my sense of values. What Seminary life -- and the life of the study generally -- does is to expose us to the Universal and Abiding. But we only actually take hold of eternal truth as we are able to incorporate this into our experience in the street.

Nobody's individual experiences duplicates anybody else's. As the set of my personal outlook happens to be reflective rather than active, I suppose it was natural for me to gravitate again into the academic orbit even after I had left it and did not particularly think of returning to it. Fortunately, we are all of us distinctly peculiar mixtures, or this complex world we belong to would not continue to run. But
all of us need, in some proportion required for our individual make-up, exposure to
both the Abiding and the evanescent: that means, both the study and the street. And
we can't wait until we happen to feel like it to begin to seek out either the one or
the other.

The result is that the life of the study will often seem boring and irrelevant.
We will want to get it over and start living. But, if we put off until we are con-
scious of needing it our contact with the life of the intellect, it will be already
too late. Ours is a highly Intellectualized society where vocational training is
increasingly becoming, not a once-for-all early experience, but a lengthening period
of initial schooling followed by periodic up-dating courses continuing throughout our
working life. The mass media are making us conscious as never before of the complexi-
ties of the problems facing us and of the urgency of dealing with them. The life of
the street presses on us these days, till it seems like a nightmare threatening our
sanity. The life of the study, taking us back to the Universal and Abiding, is a
vital necessity so that we may realize that existence is not a mad rat race leading
nowhere, that the intelligence is more than a tool for manipulating destructive and
Inhuman techniques.

As Christians we believe that the Eternal and the Abiding is, finally, the love
of God revealed in Jesus Christ. And we believe that the Providence of God is not
limited to our internal, meditative existence but is abroad also in the life of the
street, however difficult it may be to read it there. At a time when the life of the
churches is reflecting so strongly the confusions of secular life, I am convinced
that we as Christians must be quite clear about both aspects of existence; the in-
volved and the withdrawn, the study and the street. These are not rivals; they are
complementary. The Seminary and the Ministry have never needed each other more.
The Ministry is the Seminary in the street. The Seminary is the Ministry in the study.
If we ever come to imagine that Christ belongs only in one of those places we shall have
ceased to acknowledge Him as Lord of all Life.

EXISTENTIAL REALIZATION OF THEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES
or
WHAT I LEARNED IN SUNDAY SCHOOL

by Bill Goff

I had a remarkable experience in church a few Sunday's back that chrystalized
years of theological study. The lesson for this particular Sunday was taken from the
Sermon on the Mount, in that section where Jesus talks about material things (Matt.
6:19-34). The leader that morning, a fellow seminarian and good friend of mine, was
doing a fine job of expounding the passage. He explained how earthly treasures like
cars eventually rust out, how it is impossible to serve God and mammon, and how If we
pursue God's kingdom he will take care of our material needs.

After some time I raised my hand to suggest an aspect of materialism that my
friend had not mentioned. I said that the point of not being materialistic is not
simply a way of getting heavenly treasures, because that could be very selfish. The
point is that we should use our wealth to help others. Jesus didn't simply tell the
rich young ruler to get rid of his possessions; he told him to sell what he had and give
to the poor. My friend agreed and made a brief comment on the fact that we are to share
our wealth.

Then, happy with my first contribution I ventured a further point in the form
of a statistic and a few questions: "Since America has only 6% of the world's popu-
lation and 51% of the world's wealth, what does that say to us as Christians? And what
does that say to the countries to which we send missionaries? Who are we really
serving?" I was really warming to the subject. I can't remember everything that
happened next, but it went something like this: First, partly in response to my remarks and partly in response to my friend's sermon one girl said, "You know, I think what really matters is your attitude toward riches. My girlfriends and I have lots of dresses, but we aren't hung up on our wardrobes. We even joke with each other about our clothes." Although I'd often heard this "what really matters is your attitude" from people like Billy Graham and my own minister, suddenly I realized what a pious sounding way this was of escaping obedience to Christ. So I said, "I really think that is a big cop out! You mean we can stash millions of dollars in the bank and as long as we have a detached attitude toward it we're ok? We can drop napalm on Vietnamese peasants as long as we love them as our neighbor?" (Those examples of the absurdity of her assertion weren't bad, but the one I wish I'd thought of at the time is adultery: We can sleep with whoever we want as long as our attitude is chaste!)

At that point a student sitting across the room came to the girl's defense: "But God looks on the heart and not the outward appearance." With that out-of-context-perversion of Scripture I became so exasperated that I threw out an overstatement: "God looks on your wallet, not your heart." What I had in mind was Jesus' remark, "for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." It seemed to me the student had reversed Christ's order. But before I got a chance to explain that, I was bombarded with questions and comments from all over the room.

Question: "You mean we aren't supposed to earn money?"
Answer: "No, I'm talking about how we use money."

Statement from behind me: "But the kingdom of God is within you."
Answer (emphatic): "No it's not! It's in your midst."

To my horror I realized that the questioner failed completely to appreciate this distinction and that I wasn't prepared to explain it. But before I could even try, another girl said, "Well, Job was a rich man and God rewarded him because of his righteousness." I was nearly in shock by this time and said, "Job sinned and cursed the day he was born and God blessed Job out of grace not because he earned it."

"No," she said, "you're wrong. God rewarded Job because he was a good man."

I replied, "That's not what the Bible says."

It was evident that we had deadlocked over the question of Job. At that point my friend stepped in and called the meeting to a hasty conclusion (about fifteen minutes before it usually ends). He concluded by saying, "Bill will be here if there are more questions." About six people surrounded me afterwards and I had time to explain myself a little better. But I never convinced the girl about Job. She even told me I didn't understand what Jesus was all about. As I was leaving and feeling very frustrated and alone, my friend brushed by and said, "Don't you know anything about communicating? Haven't you gotten anything out of Mei White's classes?" I didn't even try to reply.

I left church feeling very angry and frustrated. However, the more I reflected on this experience the more I realized I had experientially discovered some real secrets of the ministry. One thing I learned was that no matter what you preach from Scripture unless you break through the idea that attitudes are what really matter you will produce only people who are hearers of the Word and not doers. The great tragedy of contemporary Christianity is that so many people have reduced the radical demands of Scripture to mere propositions -- to ideas that may influence attitudes but don't change actions. No wonder the church is so deeply implicated in all the social evils of our time. Mr. Mr. Morgan had often said last quarter that the real enemy of faith is not no faith but bad faith. That's what I experienced that morning. I really believe it is easier to confront pagans with their materialism than to confront Christians who can quote the Scriptures which they have conveniently and probably unconsciously domesticated.

After much reflection I also realized that those who argued so strongly against me really had a valid principle in mind which they were defending. It is true, as they contended, that God looks on the heart rather than the outward appearance.
Jesus had to say that again and again to the Pharisees who maintained meticulous religious practices but had cold hearts. Christians always need to beware of having a form of godliness but not its power. If I had been sensitive enough to recognize this as the thought behind what I justly labeled as a cop out I could have acknowledged their point and been in a better position to explain how it was only a half truth because God is concerned with our actions as well as our attitudes. He wants us to be doers of the Word and not hearers only.

Finally I think my friend was wrong about communication. It seems to me that real communication and learning occur when there is conflict, disagreement, argument, not when everyone is happily agreeing. Communication thrives on conflict. Think how much of Jesus' teaching came out of heated conversations with his opponents. Paul argued with the Jews in the synagogue all the time. Why should Christ's ministers think they can preach and teach without upsetting anyone?

I WALK ALONE
by Marvin Erisman

I walk alone.
Through days of future past,
In moments smeared
with elements of fate,
Through years which endlessly,
relessly
heap coals upon my head,
I walk alone.

But... not always.

Times have been when arms have held
And misty lights have traced
dim shadows
along river's banks.

Many times have been when I,
the one who walks alone
have parted with myself,
To spend with someone else
or something else
few precious grains of time
too hastily abandoned.

I must admit,
I seldom walk alone.

I crowd my life with allies.
Sometimes... even with God.

by Jim Ramsey

As a graduate student in psychology, I have appreciated my theological classes during the past three years. Although trying to study psychology and theology at the same time can at times be very frustrating, it does have its rewards. I feel that I have had more opportunity to work toward a personal integration between the two fields through this means than I would have had I received my theological degree first and then entered a graduate program in psychology.

Maybe I should explain what I mean by a "personal integration." Here I am referring to my emerging world view or philosophy of life. To me, this involves decisions in priorities and the establishing of a hierarchy of values. For instance, I have to decide whether theology is indeed the "queen of the sciences" under which psychology is relegated, or whether psychology is my most important concern, with an
Article by Jim Ramsey (con't)

attempt to come up with a theology which is appropriate to the 20th Century and which can be integrated into my system as a scientist and psychologist. It seems easy for some psychology students to look at persons holding to a conservative Biblical Theology as "hung up" or "rigid", whereas some theology students may at times feel constrained to hold a prayer meeting for the conversion of some of the brethren across the street. The question I have to work through in my life is "where do I stand as a theology-psychology student?"

It is my opinion that Fuller's emphasis upon getting my theology from scripture itself and allowing this theology to be authoritative for my life is an important emphasis. I am glad that this school subjects its psychology to the rigorous theological study and discipline that it does. This is not to say, however, that there should not be more room in the curriculum for theological electives which would aid the psychology student in his attempt to integrate.

In my study of Church history I was required to write a paper on Schleiermacher. While preparing this paper, I became acutely aware of a danger facing each of us as psychology students. I feel a real tendency to move in the same direction that Schleiermacher did. It is easy to become so impressed with the latest psychological theories that one finds himself bending his theology to fit his "20th Century scientific perspectives." Schleiermacher was first a "modern man" and secondly a Christian. I learned from Schleiermacher the fallacy of tying my theology to the current and changing philosophical and psychological fads. I am convinced that in my integration my first task is to learn what the Bible has to say and then integrate my psychology to conform to my Biblical theology. For this reason I feel that Fuller Seminary has done me a service by requiring me to spend three years in diligent study of theology as part of my psychology PhD program. I feel that there is plenty of room for curriculum revision and improvement in the months and years ahead, but I feel that Fuller's underlying philosophy that each psychology student should be thoroughly established in theology is a very sound policy.

THE POVERTY OF THEOLOGICAL VOCABULARY

BY John Piper

The poverty of theological vocabulary results from the fact that most theologians are not full-fledged citizens of what Wordsworth called "the mighty world of eye and ear." They do not speak a "language of the sense." Theological vocabulary is the vocabulary of conception not perception.

Take from your shelf any commentary, introduction, history or systematic theology and look for words with some tactile, olfactory, visual, sonorous or saporous quality. They just aren't there. Theological vocabulary does not include honeysuckle, orange, shady, giggle, juicy, willow, brine, mud, clover, concrete, feathery, pudding, chimney and the like.

Someone may suggest that theological language is poor for not using the "language of the sense" only insofar as a steam engine is poor for not using gasoline. Indeed, perhaps the "language of the sense" is for poets, and the other kind of language is for theologians. Personally, I am not ready to concede that theology must be done in the desert while poetry roams through forests, mountains, and meadows.

But even if theological vocabulary must remain poor, the point I want to make is this. "The mighty world of eye and ear" is always there-for-us. It is very sad when anyone passes through life oblivious to the joys this world can quicken—like that joyful motion in your chest when from atop Mount Wilson you see the sun boil its way into the Pacific; or like the quiet gladness of rising before the sun and smog to join the happy birds in welcoming the day.

There is an intimate relationship, however, between our power to enjoy a sensuous experience and our capacity to describe it with words. In "Lines Composed Above Tintern Abbey" Wordsworth is not taken up nearly so much with the joy of revisiting
THE POVERTY OF THEOLOGICAL VOCABULARY (con't)

the banks of the Wye as he is with the pleasure this moment will bring him in the coming years "recollected in tranquility."

To put it simply, without a full and rich "language of the sense" we will lose the enduring quality of our sensuous joys, and, what's worse, with the atrophy of our descriptive capacities the power of all our enjoyment languishes. When you cease to use the word "tree" in your vocabulary, you have probably ceased to look at trees.

The relation this has to theological vocabulary is this. The fastest and easiest way to obliterate the "language of the sense" and the power of the senses is to read only poverty stricken theology. If we in seminary do not stretch ourselves beyond the pages of our dogmatics we shall all be dead by graduation day. And that evening, diploma in hand, we may lament with Samuel Coleridge,

All this long eve so balmy and serene
Have I been gazing on the Western Sky
And its peculiar tint of yellow green
And still I gaze--and with how blank an eye!

ANOTHER LOOK AT MARIJUANA AND MONASTICISM

by Howard Loewen

The central point of the somewhat abstruse article - Marijuana and the Monastic System - in the last issue of The Opinion appears to be that the prohibition of the use of drugs can best be defended on the grounds that the use of hallucinatory substances lead to a preoccupation with sensual experiences, which, in turn leads to the "basic orientation" of introversion. This introspective orientation eventually results in a "total lack of concern for anything external", thereby effecting an insipid inactivity. To defend this "thesis" Mr. Nelson appeals (at least in principle) to the parallelism between the effects of monasticism and those of the use of drugs upon society. With regard to the former, he cites, as examples, the activities of the nation of Israel, the Beatle's music, Medieval Monasticism, the philosophy of the International Society for Krishna Consciousness, and the temperament of Eastern societies in general. Mr. Nelson contends that these examples illustrate the tendency toward, or reflect the mood of, excessive introversion, which, if implemented on a large scale, would breed a society that in the face of reality, would merely say: "There will be answer/Let it be" (Beatles, 1970). Similarly, condoning the use of drugs would tend to produce such a society which eventually would become "stagnant", with no "concern for changing other men and the world." Thus Mr. Nelson maintains that we have a "decisive argument" against the use of marijuana and other hallucinatory drugs." If in fact this reconstruction of the argument represents Mr. Nelson's intention, I must disagree with him at three points.

The first pertains to the matter of definition. Mr. Nelson, on the one hand, has taken time to carefully define for us how he is using the term "marijuana," namely to illustrate the use of drugs." However, on the other hand, he seriously fails to provide an adequate definition for his other important concept - monasticism - other than general, negative implications. The examples which are cited to illustrate the monastic philosophy obscure rather than clarify the issue - not because any one example is in itself false, but because, taken together, they leave one wondering as to what the author meant by monasticism. It is apparent that by these examples he means to illustrate the negative effects of excessive introversion. But that only retards the problem one step: For what is the meaning of "excessive introversion?" Does not excessive introversion mean something different with regard to the nation of Israel than it does with regard to the medieval monastic system, or with regard to the International Society for Krishna Consciousness? What is introversion for one
does not necessarily mean that for the other. Both the nation of Israel and Medieval Monasticism tended to be physically isolated from the rest of society. But the physical isolation of Monasticism, which at times could rightly be criticized as a destructive form of introversion, cannot be applied to the chosen Israel, whose introversion lay not in her physical isolation but in her spiritual pride of being an elect people, thereby producing spiritual complacency. (One may even call into question whether Israel's situation can be referred to as "excessive introversion"). Nor can the manner of life of the Society for Krishna Consciousness be considered introverted in the same sense as Israel or Medieval Monasticism. Although their philosophy tends to focus attention on the individual consciousness, their activities certainly do not. Whether they are chanting on Hollywood Blvd., or passing out literature (and chanting) on the Berkeley campus (I had a brief encounter with this group at Berkeley), they are publicly bearing witness to their belief, and to that extent they are not an introverted group. Possibly the extrovert Christian has something to learn from these groups.

Thus the concept of excessive introversion is multiphasic, and the citing of these various examples, as illustration of introversion, has not in the least clarified what Mr. Nelson means by monasticism or introversion. And not having clarified either he fails to adequately illustrate what he means by the fact that the use of drugs leads to "excessive introversion." In fact Mr. Nelson says very little about "marijuana" in this article. He spends most of his time summoning evidence from other areas of life to establish the fact that extreme introspection leads to a lack of concern for externals: that is, concern for other men and the world as such, but allots only one short paragraph to tell us (not cite evidence) that the use of drugs also leads to a "total lack of concern for anything external."

This leads me to my second criticism: namely, that the argument breaks down at the point of logic. To say that one is opposed to "excessive introversion" with regard to monasticism (Israel, Medieval Monasticism, Krishna Consciousness, etc.) does not necessarily imply that one must be opposed to the use of drugs as such merely because they also (assuming they do) lead to introversion. For just as what Medieval Monasticism stood for was by no means all bad, likewise (if we follow the argument the way it has been set up in the last article) neither is the usage of drugs always bad. Thus all that Mr. Nelson's argument can imply is that the excessive use of drugs is bad, not the use of drugs as such. However, this is not what he intends to say, for he concludes his article by saying that, "then we have a significant and decisive (underlining mine) argument against the use of marijuana and other hallucinatory drugs." Hence the premises of his argument falsify his conclusion. One cannot move from the particular (some) in one area to argue for the general (all) in another.

There is however, a third point which mitigates against the self-affirmed conclusiveness of Mr. Nelson's argument: that is the matter of empirical evidence. It is no accident that Mr. Nelson has not provided any examples in which the use of drugs inevitably leads a person or group of persons to becoming excessive introverts. The fact is that such an effect is no more conclusive than "that of drugs being physically harmful or leading to the use of harder addictive drugs." Mr. Nelson attempts to overcome this problem in his argument (either consciously or unconsciously) by appealing to a more absolute and concrete example outside of the realm of drug usage, namely, to "the general mood of the Eastern mind." He contends that "the Eastern mind says much about the legitimacy of the use of this drug (‘grass’)." And because the Eastern mind breeds stagnant societies, the use of drugs will tend to do the same. But here again we encounter a contradiction. To say that the Eastern mind is introverted and contemplative and thereby says much about the legitimacy of drugs, does not necessarily imply that the use of drugs leads to excessive introspection. In fact this makes excessive introversion the cause of the use of drugs instead of the effect, a conclusion which Mr. Nelson himself would not want to admit after he has already told us that "the use of 'grass' cannot be traced back to the Eastern (introverted - parentheses
ANOTHER LOOK AT MARIJUANA AND MONASTICISM (con't)

mine) cultures." (Also, the point of his article was to demonstrate that drugs ought to be avoided because of their tendency to affect introversion, not vice versa.) Besides by whose criteria do we judge Eastern societies to be "stagnant?" Thus in no way can one cite sufficient empirical evidence (if any at all) to make the claim that on the basis of excessive introversion we have a "decisive argument" against the use of drugs.

On the basis of the above three reasons, I therefore, cannot accept Mr. Nelson's argument against the use of drugs. The prohibition of the use of drugs must be argued for on different grounds.

EVALUATION OF THE "ATTITUDES TOWARD THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION" -- A QUESTIONNAIRE

by Philip Mark & Lee Stoltzfus

In early March of this year a questionnaire "to assess student attitudes toward their theological educational experience at Fuller Theological Seminary" was distributed to all students. Response to this survey from the School of Theology was 21%, from the School of Psychology, 17%, and from the School of World Missions, 20%. The following are compilations of the mean scores from the three bi-polar scales which comprise Section I (where a score of ±3.0 would represent extremes) and the most representative attitudes toward 'further theological education' which comprised the focus of Section II:

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
I. Evaluation of present educational experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Meaningful</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
<td>+1.07</td>
<td>+0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Relevant</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Satisfactory</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
<td>+1.30</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Prevalent attitude regarding further theological education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Alternative &quot;5&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative &quot;6&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Alternative "5": Considering a transfer to another seminary but have no definite plans yet.
Alternative "6": Definitely planning to continue in the program at Fuller.)

SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY
I. Evaluation of present educational experience.
(All Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Meaningful</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Relevant</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Satisfactory</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Prevalent attitude regarding further education in School of Psy.
(No. of students)

| * Alternative "5" | 5 |
| Alternative "6"  | 6 |

SCHOOL OF WORLD MISSIONS
I. Evaluation of present educational experience.
(All students: either on furlough or in degree program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Meaningful</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Relevant</td>
<td>+2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Satisfactory</td>
<td>+2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Prevalent attitude regarding further education in the School of Missions.
(No. of students)

| *Alternative "2" | 4 |
| Alternative "6"  | 3 |

*(Alternative "2": Planning to take an 'indefinite break' with the intention of returning to Fuller in the future.)
Several observations may be made about the above data:

1) Married students (especially in the School of Theology) seem to be relatively more satisfied and happy with their educational experience at Fuller than single students.

2) In the School of Theology, the 'Middlers' (single and married) seem relatively less enthusiastic about their educational experience as compared with the 'Juniors' and/or 'Seniors.'

3) Students in the Schools of Psychology and World Mission appear to be quite satisfied with the Psychology and Missions curriculum.

4) Although the majority of those who responded to the questionnaire from the School of Theology indicated that they were 'definitely planning to continue in the program at Fuller,' the variations in the mean scores in Section I, as well as specific comments from those students would indicate degrees of satisfaction with each individual.

Several areas of concern were manifest (frequently mentioned) in the specific comments made. Surprisingly or unsurprisingly, these included:

1) The emotional-psychological dilemma of seemingly 'just working for grades.'

2) The adverse effect which a heavily scholastic atmosphere may have upon the development of personal relationships between fellow students, between students and faculty, and between faculty members themselves.

3) The apparent lack of homiletical content in the B.D. curriculum.

4) The need for an explicitly defined integration of 'field work' and academics as part of the B.D. degree program.