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Dear Sirs:

On behalf of Student Council I wish to express to you our thanks for having been invited to participate in your meetings of October 27 and 28, 1970. I use the word "participate" advisedly because you made it plain by your solicitations of our opinions and your attentiveness and interaction with us that you were seriously interested in our contribution. We are greatly encouraged by your disposition and wish to publicly commend you for it.

We are particularly encouraged by the suggestion of Mr. Stedman and Mr. Berry that more opportunities for trustee-student dialogue ought to be forthcoming. We agree that you should become acquainted with as many of the students of Fuller Seminary as possible. We also know that the amount of time that we, or anyone in the institution, can legitimately demand of you is limited. We would, however, make three suggestions. 1) Whenever you happen to have business in the immediate vicinity, please make every effort to visit with students. 2) When you meet corporately make an attempt, if you will, to allow at least half of a day, including one meal, to devote to informal, small group meetings with students. 3) We are not only an educational community. We are also members of the body of Christ. Therefore, when you are in town, please accept our invitation to worship with us.

Certainly it must be clear that from our point of view dialogue between trustees and students is healthy. We would encourage you to persevere with us in keeping direct lines of communication open. We look forward to seeing you again.

Sincerely,

Gary Tuttle
for Student Council

In this issue we asked an alumnus of Fuller Seminary, Paul Larsen, pastor of the Evangelical Covenant Church of Pasadena to give us some insights into his daily routine. We feel his thoughts will be worth remembering. Ed.

HOW I WORK
by Paul Larsen

To comment on "work" to future pastors, fills me with ambivalence. I really can't decide whether it should be a confession or a testimony. I will just have to be content to express a confusion of both, knowing that this is generally what happens in any form of self-description. The use of my time has been and continues to be a constantly changing and varying experience. There are, nonetheless, patterns emerging, in the twelve years of my Christian Ministry. In
HOW I WORK (con't)

general, I work a six-day week including Sundays. I also am occupied with work on no less than four and most generally five nights a week. It also involves about three breakfasts, three lunches, and one dinner. Yet I do not find the load excessive if other factors are kept in balance.

The largest portion of my time, approximately forty per cent, is allocated for study and preaching. I preach three times on Sunday, but find that teaching Sunday School is possible only in the most dire situations. I also speak Wednesday evening. All this opens a tremendous drain on creativity, but I discover that it is manageable. Additional speaking engagements must be curtailed because beyond that point, I am simply thinning the soup. I like to preach in series because it creates thought continuity between each message and automatically does much background preparation. I do not, however, shy from using the pericope texts during certain periods.

In preparation I generally have done my background work by Friday. I have also developed the intrinsic and extrinsic logic of my text and outline. Saturday the draft is made and the entire day is so given. My deadline is five p.m. I do not burn the midnight oil and Saturday night is reserved for my family. The Sunday evening sermon is developed roughly earlier in the week and cast finally on Sunday afternoon. It is more spontaneous, and the people enjoy it more. Sunday morning, however, is homiletically much better. Wednesday evening has moved from detailed exposition, to a short devotional and extensive group sharing. It just works better. I try to read extensively every chance I get, but must try to ration this somewhat from a domestic standpoint.

Another twenty per cent of my time is spent in administration. I naively assumed that a multiple-staff ministry would release me from this burden. But what time is saved from doing detail work is absorbed in co-ordination, planning, training and supervision. It is a necessary evil. Everyone, including the layman, would like to see it diminish, but it is not possible. Likewise, much time must be spent in communicating with and training lay leadership. I meet weekly with the church chairman for breakfast. One simply cannot ignore this side of pastoral leadership.

Another twenty per cent of my time is allocated to counseling. This is a problem-solving type of relationship. I am finally off the "Pastoral Counseling Kick." This was the disease of my years in seminary training. The game is to get secular justification for our role as pastors. Hence, we surround ourselves with a coterie of dependent, incurable neurotics to garnish and secure our identity. Here the availability of reliable psychotherapists has been a godsend. This leaves us much more time to spend in crisis and preventive counseling rather than simply in the incurable wardroom of our congregational neurotics.

The last twenty percent of my time is committed to personal outreach and social involvement. I have to relate as a Christian to the non-Christian outside of my parish. I must do this to be honest with my Christian understanding of vocation; I need it as a training example to my laity; I need it as a safety-valve and relief from inhaled pressure in my congregation; I need it because I enjoy it; I need it because the people and the community need it. One must, of course, be careful because these demands readily become an insatiable whirlpool of involvement. I work with the Human Relations Committee of the city, several civic committees, and am a director for NAACP. I dine during my spare lunches with the affluent pagans of the University Club and there bear witness to Christ.
HOW I WORK (con't)

This leaves, of course, the question of leisure. There is not a great deal of time for this. I have slowly learned, however, that quality is more important than quantity. I vociferously defend my day off and Saturday night. Additionally I exercise no qualms of conscience if I get disgusted and decide to take the afternoon off to be with my family. After all, involuntary servitude has been abolished for a century. I take my month's vacation with gusto and delight. I take two of the weeks in fall and spring respectively in Palm Springs to break the routine. Here I read, play, recover and enjoy my family as well as during the summer two weeks traveling or at the beach. I have concluded that while Christ has priority, my family comes before my profession and my church. Without that commitment I am neither a good Christian or good Pastor. May God forgive me for my slowness in seeing this and grant that it may be seen more consistently in the future.

A FURTHER NOTE REGARDING REMEDIAL LANGUAGE:
by Gary Tuttle

In my article in the Opinion of October 20, 1970, entitled, "The Language Program Revisited," I made the statement, "Perhaps six remedial courses for one student is the extreme, but I think the Registrar could testify to the fact that there are currently a substantial number of Middlers and Seniors (perhaps as many as 15) who have already completed three or four tutorials." I have since talked with the Registrar, Mrs. Lansing, and she was gracious enough to provide me with accurate figures which I wish to pass on to you. Including this current quarter, two students have completed three remedial language courses each and one student has completed four. After Winter quarter four more students will have completed three tutorials, bringing the assured total to seven. In addition there are five students who have completed two remedial language courses each. Of those students only two are seniors. Hence it is quite possible that the number of students currently enrolled who will have taken at least three tutorials before graduating will reach ten or twelve. I consider that number substantial--i.e. enough so that we should seriously reconsider at least our pedagogy if not, our goals.

SELF-MADE MEN?
by George Eldon Ladd

I was deeply distressed by certain emphases in Gary Tuttle's article in the last Opinion, for if he is right, my philosophy of teaching both exegesis and New Testament Theology is on the wrong track. I discussed my reactions with him in some detail, and he suggested that I ventilate them through the Opinion.

May I take as my text his words: "I do not think that the wrangling western concept of the self-made man is a valid program for the theologian. The self-made theologian who trusts no one and judges all is surely to be avoided." I am frankly surprised at this statement, especially from Gary, for I don't think it reflects the kind of man he really is. Since his article deals primarily with the language program, I will limit my remarks to the teaching of exegesis.
SELF-MADE MEN? (con't)

The knowledge of Greek is only a tool, not an end in itself. We learn Greek in order that we may better understand the Word of God. This is not a theological but an academic statement. In any area of mature study, one must always work with primary sources; no translation is finally adequate. I was recently reading an article in the English Kittel (Geoffrey, please forgive me) and the translation didn't communicate to me. I turned to the German and found an expression which is really untranslatable. It has to be read in German to be understood. This principle is even more true of Greek than of German.

Exegesis involves two steps: a knowledge of the facts of the language, and the application of these facts to interpretation. Certainly there are no "self-made men" so far as the factual data of a language are concerned. Here one must rely upon the best authorities--lexicons, grammars, etc., and engage in the onerous task of learning facts. However, even in the simplest application of these facts, judgment is demanded.

Illustration A: "The love of Christ controls us" (II Cor. 5:14). Grammatical facts: subjective genitive--Christ's love for me; objective genitive--my love for Christ. Problem: which is it? I must make a decision before I can preach intelligently from this text.

Illustration B: "he did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped" (Phil. 2:6). Philological fact: harpagmon can mean either "a thing to be grasped" or "a thing to be held on to." Problem: which is it?

The easy way to preach the Word is to use the King James Version of 1611, read one commentary, such as Matthew Henry, and wait for the illumination of the Spirit to grasp the meaning of Scripture. The trouble is, this method does not grasp the Word of God but only the understanding of the Word of God a group of scholars had over three hundred years ago. The aim of our language program is not to make every student into an independent scholar. It does have the aim of teaching you the fundamentals of Greek, the principles by which the language is understood, and a knowledge of the tools by which one can at least understand what the alternatives are in interpreting a given passage. Thus you will be in a much better position to make up your own mind as to the meaning of the Word of God. Granted: at many points you will be able to make no more than a tentative conclusion and may change your mind after further study. The only alternative is not to think--to read only one book--to believe everything your teacher tells you. While the Bible is the inspired, infallible Word of God, translation and interpretation are human disciplines requiring both knowledge and judgment. A proper methodology will free you from a blind dogmatism which assumes that all of your opinions are ipso facto the mind of God, that your interpretation is as inspired as the Scripture itself; and it will keep you humble. Yet it will enable you to enter far more deeply and intelligently into the Word of God than any English text can do.

I have an image of the "ideal Fuller graduate." He is not a man with opinions and a theology just like every other Fuller man--like a chain of theological sausages. He is, however, a man committed to the Word of God as the authoritative record of divine revelation, who knows how to study it, who holds his theological opinions with conviction but with humility, and who can proclaim the redemptive acts of God to our generation with clarity and relevance.
THE LANGUAGE PROGRAM REVISITED: A POSTSCRIPT
by Paul King Jewett

In the last issue of The Opinion, Gary Tuttle wrote a discerning article on the language program at Fuller in which he highlighted the burden that the student, who is not gifted linguistically, must bear. As one who shares his misgivings, I thought I should add a professorial postscript.

It has always been difficult to accept the thought that such an all important subject as Dogmatics (all profs describe their contribution to the curriculum with superlatives) should have to take second place to Hebrew vocabulary cards and diagrammed Greek sentences in the student's daily study routine.

With the new program (ably coordinated by Dr. LaSor, amply funded by the Dean's discretionary fund, duly implemented by faculty action and obviously blessed by the highest echelons of administrative authority) now underway, those students whose talents in language free them to give priority to some other subject while at Seminary have been retained to tutor those who lack this talent. The net result is that the biblical languages get the lion’s share of just about everybody’s time; those who are language experts and those who are trying to be.

It would be an interesting experiment to counter this emphasis by making the student’s grade in Dogmatics depend on some daily accounting in terms of recitation or written assignment. But this does not appear to be the "more merciful and beneficial" way. I would, therefore, vote for a first-class language program for those who have the aptitude to benefit from such a program and something much more modest for those who have other aptitudes. But one vote can’t beat "the system."

A WALK WITHOUT A SHADOW
by Terry Lindvall

"I am simple,"
I said in passing
thinking more or less outloud.
"No!" they cried
"You are part of an esoteric coterie;
you are an erudite seminarian;
you are the essence of being of truth and life."
"Okay," I winked
and left their libraries
to build a sandcastle.
Then they cursed me
and proclaimed:
"You are simple!"
and I smiled as the wave overwhelmed my sandcastle.

ON THE POSSIBILITY OF SAYING
"I Love You, but I Don't Like You"
by John Piper

In the fall of 1967 when winter was about to make its entry into northern Illinois I received a revelation that "Love is not liking." The prophet was Joseph Fletcher, the medium was Situation Ethics, and the words--I remember how they came with all their self-authenticating power: "Love is not not something we have or are, it is something we do."
ON THE POSSIBILITY OF SAYING
"I Love You but I Don't Like You" (con't)

But that was three years ago. And self-authenticating revelations have a way of petering out on you. In fact I have decided that this revelation was not from heaven, and that its self-authenticating power was directly proportional to the number of people I disliked. In short, I have come to disagree with the statement, "Love is not liking." There is a valid distinction here in that we should act lovingly toward those we dislike, and this is possible up to a point. But I no longer believe that the Biblical command to love stops short of the command to like. (By "liking" I mean feeling a positive disposition toward another person in which you find it natural and enjoyable to treat him lovingly). There are two reasons why I now reject Mr. Fletcher's dictum; one is theological, the other is practical.

First we may look at the reason Fletcher thinks it is true that "Love is not liking." His argument may be put in a simple syllogism.

Premise: Feelings cannot be commanded. He quotes Buber for support: "One cannot command that one feel love for a person, but only that one deal lovingly with him" (p. 109).

Premise: Love is commanded.

Conclusion: Therefore love does not include feelings.

I totally disagree with the initial premise. The reasoning behind this premise is that our feelings cannot be determined by our will; but commandments appeal to the will; therefore, feelings cannot be commanded.

There are two problems with this reasoning. On the one hand it overlooks the real connection there is between willing and feeling. If we will something consistently enough we can change our feelings positively or negatively. Thus with concentrated effort one can develop a deep appreciation and liking for classical music by willing to learn something about it and practicing listening.

On the other hand this reasoning ignores the supernatural power of the Holy Spirit to change our most basic feelings, even below the level of consciousness. In other words Fletcher bypasses the theological truth that God commands of man what only He by his Spirit can accomplish (e.g. Faith, Eph. 2:8). With man perhaps it is impossible to change some of his dislikes, but with God nothing is impossible. Therefore an impossible command to love may be given to cause us to fall back hard on the sanctifying grace of God.

The second reason I have changed my mind about Fletcher's dictum, "Love is not liking," is this: you cannot love consistently unless you like. If we could consciously consider every one of our actions and words and gestures and glances before doing them, we might conceivably be able to will the loving thing at every given moment. But that is not the way we live. Most of the time the way we are responding to other people is not at all present to our consciousness. If it were we would go crazy with self-concern.

But this means that our response to others flows mainly from the heart (or, as our psychologists say, from the "feeling level"). If we dislike another person it will be impossible to consistently will the loving thing for that person. Sometimes we will simply forget to restrain our feelings and other times when we think we have willed the loving thing, our dislike will have sneaked in through a patronizing tone of voice or a depreciating glance. We cannot love consistently if we do not like.

In the light of this, if we say that the Biblical command to love has only to do with the will and not the feelings, we make it a very narrow and somewhat insipid command since it has little, then, to do with the usual way of relating to other people. I think, rather, that the command to love is a call to the deepest and most thoroughgoing sanctification. The call is not merely to the will but to the stuff
ON THE POSSIBILITY OF SAYING 
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which fills the unconscious. It is a call for a transformation which only God Himself can accomplish. And it is not accomplished overnight. We move from one degree of glory to another. But we should not try to squirm out of the totality of the call because we fail so badly. That is part of the process: our failure is to throw us back onto the only one who can accomplish our salvation now and in the future.

FROM THE WINDMILLS OF MY MIND
by Lee Stoltzfus

After attending the recent Fuller convocation on the race issue, several things stood out in my thinking. First, it became quite evident that each individual student who is deeply concerned about the racial tensions in our country must get involved in his own way as soon as possible. We cannot just sit back and tell the seminary administration that it is primarily their problem, and that they must get us involved. Such a position is naive and untenable. The time for waiting is past; action is needed now.

Even if we do get involved on our own, however, it is not enough. It seems apparent that if the Fuller administration and faculty are to be at all relevant and responsible, they must grapple with us in this area of Christian concern, as well as confront those students who could care less about racial prejudice and inequality. I think the concern and involvement that Dr. Hubbard and many other faculty members have shown in this area is indeed admirable and encouraging. But it is not enough. This concern and involvement must be stimulated in each student via specific courses, programs and exposure experiences.

It was my distinct feeling after attending Tuesday's convocation that the Fuller community had begun to wrestle with its responsibility regarding the amelioration of racial strife in America, but it was possible that little action would result. Two black trustees by the end of the year will be a much needed step in the right direction, but that is all it will be—one step. It seems that the Fuller administration must plan with greater long range vision and act with greater swiftness. Therefore, I would like to make the following suggestions:

1. Fuller should either divert funds from the present building fund or immediately initiate a program to raise sufficient monies to put the following proposals into action.

2. Fuller should set specific goals and objectives regarding the recruitment of minority groups. This should include the recruitment of a specific number of minority peoples for the administration, faculty and student body by the fall of 1972.

3. The appointment of a full time administrator to implement these plans and supervise their updating.

4. The appointment of a full time faculty member to direct field education which would include programs dealing with race, poverty, war and other social problems confronting the church today.

I was encouraged by the large attendance at Tuesday's convocation. This is a positive sign. I believe it is only as we become more involved, initiate new programs, and commit our time and money to this urgent problem, that we will see significant change at Fuller Seminary and within the church of Jesus Christ.
Due primarily to lack of time, there were several issues which were not discussed in the otherwise valuable convocation on October 29th (Fuller Seminary and Black Students). Among those are two which I feel it is of particular importance that the seminary and its students consider.

First, will an active (and admittedly difficult and expensive) recruitment of black students to attend Fuller only benefit these students? I was left with the feeling, after the convocation was over, that many thought the whole recruitment policy would be one-sidedly advantageous for the black students (just as about 99% of the whites think that school integration overwhelmingly benefits the "disadvantaged" blacks). Have any considered how much a sizeable number of black students on campus would add to the Fuller community? Ironically, I find the same arguments which applied in favor of Pasadena school integration also apply here: integration helps prepare the whites (in this case, ministers) for a world which is made up of people from diverse social, economic and cultural backgrounds. It breaks down preconceptions built out of artificial isolation, leading to harmony rather than fearful, and at times hostile, distrust. It exposes whites to a group of people who have a much more profound understnading of human motivations than whites usually do. Most sociologists agree that a person brought up in a ghetto, who often has to survive by his ability to outguess another is much more able to distinguish sham from sincerity, verbalism from commitment. Every community, and especially a seminary, can benefit from people who can see beyond externals to what really is present in interpersonal relations (a quality badly lacking in much of white society).

Secondly, I did not sense that most people present at the convocation felt the urgency (time-wise) of substantial integration at Fuller. The situation would perhaps be less pressing if other conservative seminaries were admitting a sizeable number of blacks every year. But the fact is that every conservative seminary is as segregated as Fuller, the only exception to my knowledge being Gordon-Conwell Divinity School with its campus in Philadelphia. Thus, every year conservative seminaries neglect graduating ministers committed to the gospel who are representative of 15% of the nation's population. Every year that Fuller does not graduate a class which is 15% black (or even 5% black—the 15% figure is obviously an arbitrary ideal goal), the chances of the true gospel being heard in the ghettos decreases geometrically (since every graduate affects many people). Unless we realize the exigency of integration at Fuller, it may be too late when we finally actively attempt to recruit black students.

Obviously, much more could be said on this whole compelling issue, just as much was said in chapel on October 29th. But if we realize that integration is not just a one-sided affair and that it clamors for immediate attention, I feel the seminary community will respond in a way which reflects its commitment to the truth.

HOW TO BLEED A BOOK
by Terry Lindvall

the child ran into the book
so fast
that he stubbed his toe
on the table of contents
and skinned his knee
on the back cover,
but he had read Adler last week
and knew what he was supposed to do.
but when you just don't feel like it,
you just don't do it.
KANT AND "RADICAL" EVIL
by Jim Bradley

In "Book One" of Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone, Kant gives the appellation "radical" to the word evil. By this one might be led to think that he understood evil in a biblical sense. What follows is an attempt to discern some ways in which it is clear that Kant's view of evil is not the Christian view.

It is certain from the outset that Kant's understanding of evil is not total; that is, man is not either good or evil—he is both at once. There is a "natural basis of goodness in man". He is endowed partly with a good and partly with an evil predisposition. The foundation of this view is ultimately Kant's Pelagianism; there are both tendencies in man because man is free. Neither action is grounded in anything but the choice of man. For Kant the most important conclusion to be drawn from this is that the possibility of man acting consistently in accord with the moral law is entertained. It is clear that his understanding of freedom determines everything he has to say about "radical" evil.

No past evil act makes any difference with regard to one's present disposition. Each adoption of the evil maxim is regarded as a direct fall from innocence. This is to say that the determining ground of the adoption of evil maxims cannot be temporal. If this were so, subsequent evil would have a basis other than freedom, and, thus being unfree, it could not be imputed to us. Therefore, past sins have no binding effect. A clean slate is available at any time. The idea of "inherited sin" is effectively undermined at this point. Once again his understanding of freedom determines his view of evil.

Kant believes that one does not need any help from outside oneself to overcome this radical evil. Its grip upon man is not such that he cannot overcome it by dint of his own will. Man himself can make himself into what he is going to be. Because he ought to be good, he can be. Concomitant to this is the obvious conclusion that such evil does not need pardon. (Or if ultimately we are pardoned, it is because we earn this pardon.) Evil is not of the nature that it costs a person anything, much less does it cost God. If Kant were to admit that the cost of evil was death, then the idea of vicarious atonement might have made some sense, for otherwise there would be no chance of reconciliation between God and man. But because for Kant evil could not be that costly, the thought of vicarious suffering and death was absurd.

Finally, Kant conceives of evil as the breach of the moral law by the adoption of evil maxims by the will. But again, this is not as serious a matter as the breach of a covenant between a loving God and His people. At least in one of its aspects, evil is rebellion, and this is against a person rather than against a moral code (although it is in the code that the exceeding sinfulness of our sin is exposed). That it is the innate moral law and not God that is opposed by the evil will simply points up again the real lack of depth in Kant's concept.

It seems that even experience should have dictated to Kant that evil in man has a cumulative effect. This is perhaps the weakest link in his chain. Small breaches of the moral law have a way of entangling one's feet, and even the non-believer can discern the fact that "he who does sin is a slave to it." But more serious is the fact that Kant has failed to grasp the distinction that Scripture makes between common and special grace. I am fully aware that he insists that he is dealing with only those things which are available to reason—precisely this is his error. For under common grace man can carry on a moral life. But morality and conformity to its law is not what the Gospel asks. Its standard is much higher.

First we must be free from the bondage of sin (at a price which we cannot pay), then we must walk in the Spirit, and only then do we please Him. God does not ask morality; He asks conformity to the image of His Son. To assert that we should keep the moral law at the incentive of the moral law alone is more than even God asks of us. God enables us to overcome sin by His indwelling power.
KANT AND "RADICAL" EVIL (con't)

The dimension of spiritual sin and rebellion is not even touched by Kant. But the question of a new creation is the issue. Men can be moral, but God asks more. Yet, what He asks, He gives. With Kant all that is needed is here. It is all in history. He failed to see that if sin is really "radical," a breaking into history by God is necessary. God has done this, and He continues to do so in order to remake His creation, a creation which without this inbreaking is irreparable. Schlegel rightly said of his age that it was far too inclined to interfuse the sublime and the lowly, the divine and the profane, and which then moves forward unsteadily and in a constant vacillation, unable in any matter to come to the point of laying hold determinedly of the right and cleaving to it with a steadfast fidelity.

We thought this would be of interest to students here because Bill is confronting many unique situations in his environment. As his letters reflect this uniqueness, we will print those we consider to be beneficial. Ed.

A LETTER FROM AN ALUMNUS

Dear Fuller Friends,

As I begin this letter I'm sitting in the Student Union of the World Campus Alfaat aboard the S. S. Ryndam six days out of New York. The gentle music of the Beatle's "Abby Road" is playing over the loudspeakers. Outside the windows I can watch the blue horizon of the Atlantic slowly moving up and down as our 503 foot ship sails toward London. Scattered around the room are little clusters of students talking, smoking, studying.

About a year ago I was reading the letters of my sister Susan as she told about her experience on the WCA. I guess that was when I first started thinking about the remote possibility of being chaplain on the ship. To make a long story short I applied in November, was accepted in April and given a contract with Chapman College (the sponsor of WCA) to be the "Visiting Protestant Chaplain". After graduating from Fuller in June I sought ordination in the Presbyterian Church. My candidates committee, thinking that the call of the sea shouldn't be confused with a call to a church, rejected my request for ordination. It looked like my dreams were crushed. However, the next day I appealed the committee's decision at the Presbytery meeting and to my surprise and delight it was reversed. So I was ordained July 5 in my home church—the First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood.

Before I left Fuller Marv Erisman asked me to write my reflections on my semester at sea for the Opinion. Rather than giving a travelogue of all the places I visit I'll try to concentrate more on the unique experiences I'm having and try to give comment in particular on experiences that have special theological significance.

Sunday morning October 11, at eight o'clock the Ryndam sailed out of New York, glided slowly by the Statue of Liberty and out in the open sea. At eleven A.M. we had our first Protestant worship in the Student Union. About fifty people gathered in a semicircle. Around the perimeter of the room there were other students who only vaguely realized what was happening. Everyone including myself were dressed informally. The singing at the start of the worship was outstanding. I told them a little about myself and admitted that I felt scared since this was my first full time work as a minister and also my first communion service. After that I felt more relaxed and felt good in preaching. The communion was the high point of the worship. We had a simple loaf of bread and wine in a ceramic chalice. Some kids told me later that it was the first time they had had wine in communion and they really liked it. After the worship about six kids came up to volunteer to help plan the worship services and also to start a Bible study.
A LETTER FROM AN ALUMNUS (con't)

I really like all the students on the ship. There are about 325 in all from all over the states: California, Texas, Oregon, Arkansas, New York, and even Alaska and Hawaii. They are energetic and friendly. The main difference between this student body and most is the sex ratio. There are about two and a half girls for every boy. Perhaps four years in seminary has done something to my judgment, but most of the girls are simply beautiful—and friendly and intelligent, etc.

The first Monday night I had the first meeting of the "Agnostics Club". I thought up the idea to give non-Christians an opportunity to question the Christian faith in a non-threatening atmosphere. About fourteen students showed up and we talked for three hours. I was distressed with the dogmatism of many of the students who insisted that they weren't interested in examining the evidences for Christianity. They felt that since Christianity was exclusive (any way to God isn't allowed) it simply did not merit further consideration. This relativism which has spawned the "do your own thing" philosophy is a deeply rooted assumption of this student generation. This is at least what I confronted rather than any questions on science and the Bible or even the church and social issues. These students are all theists of some sort and all openly syncretistic (Jesus was a great teacher) or eclectic (there's good in all religions) in their approach to religion. For this reason I was very happy that I had done a study of non-Christian religions on my own this summer. I would strongly suggest that in our study of apologetics we at least familiarize ourselves with non-Christian religions. This seems to be a serious gap in our current curricula at Fuller.

Of course I have been talking about the non-Christian students. There are also many warm Christian students and faculty on the ship. The biology professor who is something of an ecology whiz is a mature Christian. And most of the non-Christians are very friendly toward me. In fact I feel much more accepted here than at any church I've ever been associated with.

Sunday October 18, was a beautiful, clear, warm, sunny day on the North Atlantic. So we had the Protestant Worship outside on the fantail (the extreme rear deck area of the stern) of the ship. About twenty of the Indonesian crew and several ship officers came in addition to students, faculty, and staff. Someone said there were about sixty in all. With the beautiful deep blue Atlantic as a background and a warm sun overhead I preached a sermon called "The Polluted Garden: A Theology of Ecology".

Tomorrow we arrive in London and our in-port experiences begin. I hope you are all having an exciting time of learning together.

Yours in Christ,

Bill Goff