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EDITORIAL
by Stephen Sallis Wilburn

In searching through the Opinion’s excuse for an office, I found the very first issue of the Opinion, dated March, 1962. With this new issue, a new staff takes over publishing the Opinion, and it may be significant that with this issue the paper begins a new decade of airing discussions of interest to the seminary community. That first issue is headed by a timely (both then and now) quote from John Milton: “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.” Once every ten years is not often enough to be reminded of this sage advice.

Since March, 1962, the school, the faculty, the student body, the attitudes of all concerned have been expressed in the Opinion, yet the content has not changed as radically as one might expect. Thus, we are reprinting an article from that issue by William Miller, a former student. Also in that issue, there was a call for support for a project in Africa manned by FTS students, a statement of Opinion policy, a strong reminder about chapel attendance in the face of apparent laxness in that regard at the time of the issue, and finally, a report on an Administration-Alumni-Student Council planning session. This last item was of special interest to me; the issues discussed bore a striking resemblance to the very ones under consideration at the just passed Trustees meeting (By what means are changes wrought?!) One news item from that issue: “It was suggested that someone be asked to teach Dr. Dan Fuller’s classes for the third quarter. Dr. Calvin R. Schoonhoven, a Fuller graduate, will do so.” Such are the inconspicuous beginnings of a grand career!

Hopefully, the next ten years will see no material shift in the editorial opinions of the Opinion. Of major concern at the present is not content, but the woefully inadequate format we labor under. But rather than announce such changes, we intend to let them be noticed of their own merits. Nevertheless, the Opinion staff has certain goals which might improve the content of this paper. We have long felt that one great need is that of truly creative writing efforts. The Opinion would gladly carry ideas dressed as pleasingly and compellingly as possible, poetry, (short) short stories, character sketches (fictitious or otherwise) or any sort of experimental literature that you can convince us is worthwhile. And we are pliable. In addition, we are convinced that this organ must be of value to all three schools here, and to that end, we intend to make every effort to aid both academic and de facto integration.

In what I hope will become a regular practice, one of our staff members is a full-time student in the School of Psychology. All this is by way of encouragement to every seminary student: do not hesitate to submit worthwhile articles. While there is some practical limit to the size of the Opinion, we are nowhere near that size yet.

Finally, this issue contains three articles that should be of special interest to the community. One is a movie review by Bill McIvor; the cinema has become a vast molder of public opinion and certainly deserves our regular attention. The Philotheans are quite busy these days and they have contributed a position paper which is quite a credit to their new activism. Finally, Larry Hicks—a senior student and former Opinion managing editor—has written something that each student should read carefully; it is expressive of an attitude that is becoming more and more influential among the married students at FTS.
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 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 devised with so little regard for ordinary efficiency. Batches of students are set to take imperfect notes of a probably 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 text book, which, obviously if 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 Germany 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 admirably 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.

A LETTER TO THE FULLER COMMUNITY CONCERNING A MAN AND A WOMAN

by Larry Hicks

Grace, Mercy, and Peace:

"This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh."

As a senior, seeing the end of my education at Fuller in sight and looking back over these three years here, I fear that the seminary has aided in separating this "one flesh," which God has joined together. In its concern for producing top-flight scholars and well-rounded ministers, it has overlooked the need for encouraging whole marriages.

Mr. President, I can still remember the new student banquet in the fall of 1969. I was impressed with your introduction of faculty wives, not as Mrs. so and so, but as Ruth, and Doris, and Arlene, etc. You all looked so happy, and I was looking forward to learning from you about marital happiness. But as I think back, I am perplexed, for that banquet came after you had just separated us in our first experience of the Fuller community, for the new student retreat had excluded wives. (Others had already experienced Fuller in the summer Greek program, getting a head start on the man-wife separation, which was only more structured on the retreat.)

Faculty members, you may not comprehend this, but there are other things in life besides scholarship. When you attended seminary, you were probably single, but try to understand our position. Would you simply laugh at us if we asked for grace concerning a late paper if our excuse was "spending time with our wives?" It is nice of you to invite us to your home for an evening, but will you also invite our wives? We are one--do not separate us. And if our wives are invited, do you not think that we could all talk together? Must we be divided, so men can talk theology, putting the women on the periphery of the "really important matters?" Who knows, but it just might be important to hear the way you and your wives have shared life together.

Juniors and Middlers, do not fall into the trap of putting everything else ahead of your wives. What value will you place on those high grades when your marriage falls apart? Will your busy church life fulfill you if your wife is unhappy? Our wives work
A LETTER TO THE FULLER COMMUNITY (cont)

during the day, we study evenings and Saturdays, work in the church on Sundays, and spend time with our wives if nothing else of 'importance' is pressing us. Can you imagine the damage that can result from living this way for three years? It will take many years to repair the relationships, that is, if they are not irreparable. You can change now. You and your wives are one. Do not let seminary and church pressures separate you any longer.

Wives, forgive us men. We have been deluded by the demon of success. Some of us have sought success in the church, and others in scholarship. The system has molded our minds, and it is difficult to break free. Help us in this struggle to find ourselves. Some of us will no doubt find ourselves in scholarship, others in the ministry, others in secular areas, but we cannot find ourselves apart from you, for we are one. We want to be whole people, and to be successful in any of these areas is a disgrace if we are not whole husbands. Forgive us, and may God help us.

A POSITION PAPER

by Nancy Pavelsky and Lottie Haswell

Since there seems to be some confusion and misunderstanding about Philotheans, it seems advisable to make a statement concerning its nature, structure, and present status. The following is not definitive, but it is representative of some of the ideas shared by those presently in leadership roles in Philotheans.

Nature

Philotheans is a loosely structured organization of the women who are married to the men who attend Fuller. Primarily, we have organized because we recognize that for a few years we are in the peculiar situation which allows us to fellowship with many other women with whom we hold much in common, e.g., age, educational background, family structure, economic condition. Besides recognizing our similarities, we acknowledge our many differences as unique persons. Our similarities seem to give us a bond which allows us to accept and learn from our differences. Secondly, we have organized because we want to use our indirect relationship to Fuller to its greatest advantage. As indirect as it may be, our relationship to Fuller affects us in several ways. Obviously, Fuller affects us financially: Our budgets constantly must be revised as Fuller's loan and tuition policy is revised. Many of us have a second economic connection because we live in student housing. Fuller also affects our time and energy budgets. Since Fuller brings about changes in our lives, we want to help determine what those changes will be or at least to feedback responses to those changes. Another way we can profit from our indirect relationship to Fuller is by using Fuller: We can audit classes, meet with professors, use the library, and use the plant. Most of us feel that we would want to use any learning institution that made itself available to us, and presently, that is Fuller.

Philotheans is organized to take advantage of our peculiar situation. We meet to help satisfy the needs and pursue the interest of women who make their needs or interests known. The two words, 'need' and 'interest', are the key words for our organization: We are whatever interested women express a need for. The women who are presently active, although they have many things in common, have diverse philosophical outlooks. Perhaps this is best evidenced by the fact that half of the leaders chose to take the women's lib class and the other half chose not to take it. Although we may endorse various roles for women, we are drawn to-
gether by our common interests and needs: social needs, educational needs, spiritual needs, and practical needs.

Structure

"Need" and "interest" are also the key words for our structure. There are presently five groups, being led by ten women, with two women serving as co-ordinators; all of these women lead because of their interest. Any woman who wants to lead has only to make her wish known. Women are arbitrarily assigned to groups just so they will all be contacted. Each group tries to decide what its members would find most satisfying and to pursue that. Any woman may attend any group whose interests are congruent with her own. If a woman is interested in leading or participating in a bible study, Philotheans will say, "Great! Why don't we work together to get one going," If another is interested in social concerns, Philotheans will say, "Great! Why...". The point is that we want to see women work together to satisfy the needs of their sisters here at Fuller. Women who have gifts, training, education, experience, and skills which they might want to share with other women, have only to step forward and make themselves available and they will be used.

Present Status

Presently, Philotheans is a dynamic organization, open and eager to change. It is trying to provide small groups in which women can pursue interests and meet needs. It is also trying to make better use of the facilities by planning activities. We are trying to create situations in which the knowledge of the professors of the three schools will be available to the women of the Fuller community. Finally, Philotheans is trying to become more influential.

As optimistic as we are about our present effectiveness and our future possibilities, we recognize our shortcomings: We have failed to assess many women's needs; we have not offered enough services; we have allowed ourselves to look foolish, we have failed to adequately publicize the many options available through Philotheans.

To overcome these and other shortcomings, let us unite to make Philotheans the kind of organization that we would find the most beneficial. Let us come together and work to be included in decision making committees (We already have a wife attending student council and will have one as a voting member very soon.); let us work to find ways to use the resource persons of the three schools (We had lectures from Dr. Clement and Dr. Larson during the winter quarter.); let us work to share in the spiritual life of the school (We will be leading a chapel service in March.); let us work to fulfill our social needs (We sponsored an all school picnic in March.); let us work to fulfill our educational needs (We plan to present a program with a controversial speaker during the spring quarter.); let us come together in God's love and love one another!

We will be meeting during the spring quarter to plan what Philotheans will be and do next year. The time and place will be announced in the Semi. If you have needs that are not being met or interests that are not being pursued or if you are interested in your relationship to Fuller or the other women here, plan to meet with us.
STRAW DOGS: AUDIENCE BRUTALITY
by Bill McIvor

(This review was to have been used in the last issue. But due to considerations of length it could not be included. Although now it is not so timely the review is included anticipating that it will have some 'socially redeeming value.'--Ed.)

Sam Peckinpah's Straw Dogs is a story about David Sumner (Dustin Hoffman), an American mathematician, who is working on a research grant at a small farm in the English countryside. He is mild mannered, intellectual and by intention, uninvolved. His wife Amy (Susan George) is quite the opposite, being tempestuous and sensual. Their marriage, though apparently steady, has a strong undercurrent of discontent. He is involved with himself and his work; she is unfulfilled and bored.

Some of the nearby town's local brutes are repairing their garage (in lieu of any mechanical aptitude on David's part) and Amy is rebelliously attracted to them. Of course, on the pure sex level they feel the same. They lead David off on a wild goose chase (Peckinpah uses game hens) while they go back and rape Amy which she half wants anyway. Yet she is contemptuous of David for not being more of a man, blaming him for what happened. They attend a church social, but because her rapists are also present, she wants to leave. Driving home through a dense fog, they appear to be on the verge of working out their problems. But David runs into the village idiot who after being provoked and molesting a girl is trying to avoid the same town hoodlums. David takes him home. The brutes find out his whereabouts and in a drunken spree soon lay siege to the house. But David has been pushed far enough. In defense of his home and the idiot, he manages to kill his would be murderers in a climactic orgy of gore and violence.

But these may be only thematic variations to keep up our interest. After all, times have changed, and we're not as innocent as we used to be. But all in all, it could be the old familiar plot we expect and love, with some nicely done gore and a little sex for the box office.

It could be. But it's not. Straw Dogs is a brutal film. Its theme of sex/violence is brandished like a broadsword and the audience is brutalized. The issue of Straw Dogs is not violence on the screen (many films have more gruesome and sickening scenes—Catch-22 for one) but violence to the audience. Technically brilliant, it nonetheless shows utter contempt for its viewers. The audience is cinematically raped at its every screening; few if any will avoid its assault.

People who see Straw Dogs are the typical theatre group. But their responses seem to divide them into three types. These are not definitive categories (one person could conceivably belong to all three especially in terms of other films) but are useful in approaching Peckinpah's work. Most everyone who normally sees films and some who don't, because of heavy publicity, will see Straw Dogs. But some people shouldn't. They are Type I's. When I saw it a small boy (with his parents) was sitting several rows behind me. He could not have been over ten. I could hear his innocent and comical remarks about some of the sexual allusions of the film's opening scenes. But as the violent mood became apparent he became more quiet until after the first overt violence when the pub owner's hand is cut on a glass. He was completely silent. I'm not sure if his parents took him out. I hope they did. If not, he was literally brutalized into silence and his life and emotions were likely permanently altered—I doubt for the better.
STRAW DOGS: AUDIENCE BRUTALITY (cont)

This boy typifies Type 1's, yet it is not a chronological description. Being a Type 1 has nothing to do with age. Some people, regardless of how old they are, should not see Straw Dogs. Its brutality could well do permanent damage. Amy's rape intercut in a Freudian way with the violence of hunting and the final orgy of carnage and death may not only frighten but leave lasting and damaging mental associations. I do not favor censorship but I respect the power of film enough to believe that some people shouldn't see some films. There is no embarrassment in being a Type 1. We all have somethings about which we are or should be a Type 1. We should have enough self respect to avoid them. I realize that one of the surest ways to get people to see something is to tell them not to. But if you suspect you are a Type 1 about film, I urge you not to see Straw Dogs. If you don't know, it isn't worth seeing to find out.

Straw Dogs also violates a Type 2 audience. These are those who see the film, or at least try to, on its most obvious level. Judging from when I saw it, Type 2's are the great majority. We cheer wildly as David breaks out of his lethargic irresponsibility and with ingenuity and a little luck maims and kills the thugs. That they are his wife's rapists make us cheer all the more. For riven with all the faults in Amy's character, she is sexy and attractive and we can't help but like her. So David is not only defending his home and an ostensibly innocent man, but is also vindicating Amy's violated honor.

But Type 2's, though unaware, are violated even as she. Peckinpah manipulates us with the film's genre. David is the classic hero, mild mannered and even inept, but when pushed too far by the big bullies, strikes back in effective and righteous wrath. Hours of film and TV viewing have conditioned our response. It is as automatic as breathing. This myth is part of the American Dream: the small man victoriously subduing the enemies arrayed against him in the face of terrible odds. Charles Atlas made a fortune exploiting this one.

But Straw Dogs isn't about this at all. Peckinpah uses a familiar genre to make us cheer what would normally appall us. Straw Dogs has no alternative but violence (and its concomitant sexual implications). We may agree that violence is sometimes necessary. But Peckinpah isn't content with that. He subdues us with his own Hemingway-like concept of violence: it is essential to manhood and therefore to life. (He often seems to equate them.) We are forced to cheer this while thinking we cheer David's courage. This is a violent brutalization of our integrity. Type 2's may feel no ill effects from Straw Dogs. It may seem like only another innocuous western-thriller-epic-war flick. But it isn't, and if we think otherwise we have without knowing it been cinematically violated.

Type 3's are equally bad off. They are able to stick with Straw Dogs to seriously examine the truth of its statement and themes. We are unlikely to cheer the carnage and brutality, for we are shocked, not at Type 1's, but because we recognize ourselves on the screen. We see our own propensity for violence and our own crazy mixed up and chauvinistic notions of sex. This is the secret of great art (Peckinpah is an artist whether we like it or not) that in it we see ourselves. Watching Straw Dogs we know our own evil to be every bit as real as the film portrays. No problem so far.

But here Peckinpah abandons our serious efforts to understand the film and ourselves. He has said that he rubs our noses in violence so that we may recognize its real horror. That would be a worthy goal; "violence is horrible" is a worthy statement. But Peckinpah doesn't say that. Instead he violates his audience by making no statement. On the one hand, he implies that David became a man through violence. David enjoyed the killing, "Jesus, I killed them all," he says somewhat exultantly. He himself feels no horror. Type 3's want to feel horror but can't since if we don't identify with David we must identify with the brutes, and they are too repulsive. Peckinpah has pulled off a good trick. He makes us
think that we are opposed to violence and then leads us to the opposite conclusion. But he goes even further.

After the killing is over, David returning the idiot to the town, drives off into the fog. He is slyly smiling. He is the righteous victor and we are being forced to agree. That is bad enough. Then the fool says, "I don't know my way home." David replies, still smiling, "I don't either." We have been dragged one way and then kicked violently in another. David is certainly not saying he doesn't know where the idiot lives; and if "home" is that place or idea over which he just killed five men, and he can't find it, then everything becomes absurd. Either David's violence is defensible (he was justified and better off for defending his home) or it is indefensible (it wasn't worth doing). But *Straw Dogs* says both. We are forced into an absurd world where David enjoyed his killing but doesn't give a damn about why; an absurd world where violence is inevitable but makes no difference. Nietzsche was right. And we may as well throw in the towel.

*Straw Dogs* violates Type 3's because there is no resolution. We have been manipulated for manipulation's sake. We are not asking for happy endings or even less violent ones. Shakespeare doesn't give us many happy endings and his plays often end violently with bodies strewn about the stage, even if with a little less gore. But there is always a moral statement. Insight may be too late; but hindsight is better than no sight. *Straw Dogs* draws us along by the reality of its theme and the force of its technique. We are given a resolution then told it doesn't matter, led one way then pushed another. We've been had. If Sam Peckinpah doesn't really feel this way and actually is saying something different, there isn't a frame of cinematic evidence to support him. *Straw Dogs* brutalizes its audiences. They either shouldn't see it, for they are hurt unawares or raped by its final absurdity.

It is unfortunate that the audience is violated by *Straw Dogs* and films like it when ideally their purpose, I suppose, is to sensitize us to the sexual/violent perversions in ourselves. But in fact we are now desensitized by even the "good" films let alone the make-a-buck pot-boilers that are so common. Yet it is ironic that should there be more censorship, or should our cultural mood or box office tastes change, we may well return to the pulpish Pollyanna pictures which in their own way do just as much violence and desensitize us to real world. What this means to those of us who would be spiritually intentional is that we view films with an open mind but also an open and critical eye. We avoid or ignore film at our peril. But to uncritically let it shape either our self image or our world image is equally perilous. Go to the movies, but take along a spiritual and intellectual hat pin to ward off those who whether by intention or misconception would be your rapists. You might keep this in mind if you see *Straw Dogs*. 