Paper Read at Nazarene Educator's Conference, Kansas City, Missouri, June 18, 1960.

TEACHING IN A NAZARENE COLLEGE

W. T. PURKISER

It was with the utmost reluctance that this assignment was accepted. I feel about it somewhat as a man ridden out of town on a rail, who when asked his reaction said, "If it wasn't for the honor, I'd just as soon have walked."

In part this reluctance is because I know far less about the subject than my experience would indicate. It has been my privilege to spend more than a quarter of a centruy in the classrooms and on the campuses of holiness schools, filling almost every position--except cook and dean of women--from janitor down to president. But these years have all but unfitted me for the strong and sweeping generalizations such a topic as this seems to invite. It is still apt to be true that those who know the most about raising children never have had any.

I

The schools of the Church of the Nazarene have been an essential part of its program from the earliest days. Church history has witnessed the rise of many religious movements based on a profound suspicion of education and culture. The modern holiness movement is not one of these. Dr. Timothy Smith in a forthcoming book is pointing out the essential differences between the holiness movement and what may be called the left-wing sects in modern American church life. His findings indicate that while the Muelder-Clark sociological theory of sect-church development may to some extent be true of these left-wing groups, such as the various Pentecostal churches, it is certainly not true of the groups from which our church has sprung. And one of the leading differentia between the holiness movement

and the groups on the left is that the best leadership of the holiness movement has always been dedicated to cause of Christian higher education.

It is helpful to recall occasionally that we are not now running stepped-up Bible schools. We are operating trimmed-down universities. It is necessary only to remember Central Holiness University, Illinois Holiness University, Nazarene University or Pasadena University, and Texas Holiness University, to see that this is true. The founding fathers were willing to settle for nothing less than the best or lower than the highest. It has been my privilege to study rather intensively the beginnings of one of our colleges. Among the treasures in the archives are the blueprints of the original campus plan, complete with the location of projected buildings, and drawn up under the leadership of Dr. P. F. Bresee in 1910. The plant would readily house a thriving university of 3,000 or more students. After a half century this particular institution has not outgrown its founder's vision. Rather, it has lagged far behind, for it does not yet have the athletic field projected fifty years ago.

And the instincts of the founding fathers were sound. The ideal of the Christian life was expressed long ago in the prologue to John's gospel: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth. . . For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John 1:14, 17). It is the conjunction of "grace and truth" which is noteworthy here. Not grace alone, nor truth alone, but grace and truth. The order, of course, is the correct one. There is a priority to grace. But grace without truth may lead to one-sidedness and bigotry, just as truth without grace leads to formalism and abstraction. As the Quaker poet, John Greenleaf Whittier, expressed it:

> It need not fear the sceptic's puny hand
> While near the school the church shall stand;
> Nor fear the blinded bigot's rule,
> While near the church shall stand the school.

That the sons of the founding fathers have not varied from this pattern of concern is also clear. The ever-increasing levels of support being given our schools is evidence of this. For example, in the quadrennium 1948-1951, the church put $1,670,000 into the ministry of holiness higher education. In 1952-1955, the figure was $2,380,000; while in the quadrennium now ending, it stands at "2,760,000. In terms of ratio to total church giving, these figures represent an average increase of 6% during the 12 year interval.

Capital expansion tells the same story. Granted, some capital funds have come to some of our institutions outside the channels of the church. It is still true that the majority of the dollars that have built and equipped the campuses now carried on the books at nearly $12 million have come out of Nazarene pockets.

Every bit as significant as the financial support is the unfailing and constantly growing supply of students, among them the finest young people in the world. At least 85% of our students are from our own church, and another 5% from sister holiness denominations. In addition, there is a vast reservoir of intangible assets in the traditions, prayers, and genuine good will and interest of preachers and people throughout the church.

All of this adds up to the fact that the church has expressed, through more than half a century, its conviction of the necessity of holiness higher education, and its basic confidence in the men and women who are carrying on this phase of its ministry.

II

This does not mean that there have not been, and will not continue to be, some tensions in the long process of working out balance and mutual relations between church and school. The reason, of course, is rather obvious. Religion and education represent two broad and swift streams in human culture which in the last two centuries have tended more and more

to pull apart. The colleges of our church stand in the intersection of currents moving in different directions. This situation is the product of historical developments which have their beginnings in the Renaissance, but which have been augmented tremendously by the secularism and scientism of the twentieth century.

These tensions are experienced in greater or lesser degree by every teacher in the colleges and seminary of the Church of the Nazarene. On the one hand, we are committed Christians. We are Nazarenes by conviction, and not by convenience. We have experienced the redeeming and sanctifying grace of the Lord Jesus Christ in our own hearts and lives. We could not, if we would, fool the young people we teach. They listen to our words, they watch our actions, but they intuit our attitudes. We full well know there can be more damage to the sensitive spirits of college students by a cynical shrug than by months of forthright opposition in doctrine or creed. We are always conscious of the truth of Arthur Guiterman's lines:

> No printed word nor spoken plea
> Can tell young hearts what men should be,
> Not all the books on all the shelves;
> But what the teachers are, themselves.

On the other hand, we are also teachers, members of a professional class, trained in the rigid techniques of scientific method, disciplined to objectivity, schooled to open-mindedness and the reservation of judgment. All of our graduate training has been directed toward cooling our natural enthusiasms and making it easier for us to outline the various theories than to say, "Here I stand--so help me, God."

III

It is in resolving these tensions that I see our major task in the years ahead. I do not mean to ignore the many practical and immediate problems--problems of bulging enrollments, of inadequate budgets; and the ever-present problem, as Dr. S. T. Ludwig has said, of the one student who

shows the spark of genius, and the nine who have ignition trouble; or, in another's words, of the few who come to drink at the fountain of learning, and the many who are content merely to gargle. But underlying the practical and the immediate is always the basic theory and the ultimate. To meet our problems on the plane of the practical and the immediate, without reference to the theoretical and the ultimate, is sooner or later to fall into action by expedience rather than action by principle.

For one thing, we stand committed to a task which many would quickly say involves the impossible. As Roger Hazelton recently noted, we live in

> a shaken and a shaking time, when props are gone and guards are down, leaving no place on which to stand or stay. How indeed can anyone take the true measure of our age without reckoning with this vacuum of conviction, this homelessness and rootlessness, this windswept barrenness of soul? A late-autumnal mood is upon us, and the leaves of old and new faith are falling fast. (On Proving God, pp. 24-25).

This condition is due in large part to the fact that our civilization has erected a real, if largely unconscious, impasse between religion and science, faith and reason, belief and knowledge, piety and efficiency. Albert C. Outler speaks of the choice many seem convinced they must make between a "Christian anti-intellectualism and an anti-Christian intellectualism," or between "the savants and the saints." He notes that very few have "steadfastly maintained that sort of Christian intellectualism which can be genuinely humane without being a whit less faithful to evangelical truth," and quotes John Wesley's long-forgotten injunction to

> Unite the pair so long disjoined:
> Knowledge and vital piety;
> Learning and holiness. . .
> Truth and love. . .
> ("Quid est Veritas"--address at the Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities, Kansas City, Mo., January 5-6, 1959).

To break down this dichotomy between faith and reason is, from the standpoint of educational philosophy, one of the major challenges we face. We must tirelessly point out that believing and thinking are not mutually exclusive activities of the human mind. The issue basically is not faith or reason, but faithful or faithless reason. It was the Lord Jesus Christ Himself who added "mind" to the historic "Shema" of His people, and where Moses said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deut. 6:5) Jesus said "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength" (Mark 12:30.

In another book, Hazelton again has said it well:

> Hence all our reasoning, particualrly as it touches upon truth and wisdom, is fraught with immense ambiguity and grave risk, since it is at the same time prone to sin and capable of being redeemed. It may cause us to rebel against God or bring us more nearly into His presence and purpose. There is a difference between reason on its knees and reason in the seat of final judgment. There is a difference between reason wanting to be a law to itself and reason wishing to learn its law from God. (Renewing the Mind, p. 126).

In a slightly different frame of reference, but expressing the same idea, are the twin sayings Dr. P. F. Bresee used to have the chapel congregation at Pasadena repeat after him: "Earnestly desiring to know all truth," and "Loyal to the truth as I see it." (Dr. H. Orton Wiley, as quoted in J. Proctor Knott, History of Pasadena College, p. 36). The desire to know all truth is the quest of reason. The loyalty to the truth as I see it is the commitment of faith. Again we have here not the antagonistic, or the mutually exclusive, but the complementary and inclusive.

It must, of course, be confessed that not all of the existing division between faith and reason has been created by the proponents of reason. The partisans of faith have many times been every bit as

guilty. Faith has seemed safer when enshrined in a glass case and guarded by a sign, "Do not touch." That such faith is less than Christian, and that true faith is a far cry from easy gullibility are propositions which do not have to be argued before this company. There are really two sidetracks to the truth-seeking mind--the mind that is closed to the claims of belief, and the one that is wide open to any and every faith.

IV

The tensions we feel and the task we face, then, tend to grow out of the two-fold demand placed upon us--that we find and maintain a balance between warm hearts and cool heads, deep devotion and high professional ideals, the life of the Spirit and the culture of the mind, all that is involved in the beautiful name "Nazarene" and all that is implied in the term "college teaching."

At risk of elaborating the obvious, permit me to observe that with us spiritual fervor and professional competence cannot be separated. "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." A false dichotomy here inevitably leads to fanaticism on the one hand or rationalism on the other, and I refuse to debate which is worse. There is little advantage in missing the treacherous crags of Scylla if one is to be swallowed up in the whirling depths of Charybdis.

This is to say that ours is not a lesser but a greater task than that which falls to the hands of those in secular education. Our vision is education with an indispensible plus. This applies even, or perhaps I should say, particularly in the realm of the professional. As Nazarene teachers, we cannot be inferior to other teachers. If we are basically honest, we will do all in our power to see that our performance in the classroom is professionally the best of which we are capable. It is not permitted to us to substitute piety, however genuine, for competence. I often think of a want ad I once read: "Wanted, a housekeeper; no

objection to a Christian, if she can cook." It is not too hard to read behind these lines the record of someone who substituted piety for efficiency, who read the Bible when she should have read the cookbook, and who prayed while she should have been peeling potatoes. The Christian housekeeper has not an easier task than others, but a more difficult one. She must read the Bible and pray, but she must also know how to cook and be willing to peel potatoes. In fact, the tendency is to expect better cooking and quicker readiness to peel potatoes because she is a Christian.

However wild the analogy, the application is not far to seek. The Christian teacher, to be really Christian, must be a competent teacher. Otherwise, he is sailing under false colors. The Christian college, to be genuinely Christian, must be a good college. Otherwise it would better leave the precious adjective from its title.

This means the sacrificial discipline involved in the pursuit and attainment of graduate degrees. Frankly, I share with many the misgiving that traditional programs of graduate study leading to the doctorate are not the best possible training for classroom teaching. But the fact remains that the doctorate has been and is the widely recognized credential of scholarship. That some have carried the credential without that for which it stands is undebatable. That many have been genuine scholars without receiving the credential is also undebatable. If one must decide between the two, this at least is a point at which no educational statesman will hesitate--the vote will always be for the substance rather than the form. It is by all odds better to have capable, dynamic classroom teachers than bearers of degrees lacking either the gifts or the vision for the classroom, or both. But it should not be necessary to decide. One of the unsolved practical and immediate problems to which we alluded earlier that should be taken to heart by every educational administrator in the church is to

find ways and means whereby dedicated young scholars on our faculties may be given time and financial ability to complete their formal preparation for college teaching.

But professional competence depends upon much more than a Ph. D. It depends upon an alert and growing mind, an undying willingness to keep learning, and the ability to fight off methodological petrification. None of us will be able to forget, as much as we try, the occasional professor who kept reading the lectures of twenty-five years before, apparently blissfully unaware of the water that had gone under the bridge and the bridges that had gone under the water in that quarter of a century.

Implied here also is the cultivated capabity to keep young in heart. One has remarked that the way to keep young is to be with young people, but the way to grow old in a hurry is to try to keep up with them. I know the freshmen seem to be and act a little younger every year. But Charles W. Eliot, long-time president of Harvard University, said in his inaugural address a century ago, "Two kinds of men make good teachers--young men, and men who never grow old." We can't do much about chronological age. Time sees to that. But we can do something to keep a flexible, youthful outlook, mentally young and growing.

V

Without taking back one word of what has been said about the need for the highest level of professional competence in training, in real scholarship, and in classroom performance, let me go on to say that this is only half the picture as far as the teacher in the Nazarene school is concerned. The other half is less readily defined, but more vitally real. We must find ways to supplement knowledge with wisdom, efficiency with devotion, objectivity with the commitment of faith.

One of our greatest needs is to come to grips personally with the place and implications of the subject matter we teach in and for the

Christian faith we profess. Many times young scholars, personally devout, do themselves and others great harm because they lack the ability to integrate the presuppositions of their subject field with the axioms of evangelical Christianity. One may be almost brainwashed by years of constant exposure to basic assumptions in subject matter and method which are actually fundamentally irreconcilable with the Christian faith. To cite but a single example from a field with which I happen to be somewhat familiar, one highly schooled in the logical positivism underlying the bulk of graduate teaching in the social sciences may have great agony of soul trying to square what he has been taught as a scholar and what he believes as a Christian.

An unsatisfactory, and inevitably temporary, solution is to compartmentalize one's intellectual life, keeping scholarship and religion carefully isolated. This always breaks down sooner or later, and usually sooner. Here, I feel, is a point where local faculties can work out ways and means whereby the younger scholars are enabled to converse freely with older men who have lived with these problems across the years and have come to the personal syntheses which have made them effective teachers.

VI

Possibly this is as good a place as any other to underline one of the occupational hazards of the scholar. Because he must consciously develop the ability to suspend judgment, there is always some risk of paralysis of the capacity for commitment. The atmosphere of the typical graduate school is permeated with the assumption that to be intelledtually respectable one should be committed to nothing except the proposition that there is nothing to which to be committed. The only permissible conclusion is the conclusion that no conclusions are possible. One is reminded betimes of Gilbert Chesterton's remark that there are two kinds of people in the world, those who believe in dogma and know it; and those

who believe in dogma and don't know it. For dogmas are conclusions, and in Chesterton's own words, "The human brain is a machine for coming to conclusions; if it cannot come to conclusions, it is rusty. . . trees have no dogmas. Turnips are singularly broad-minded." (Heretics, pp. 285-286). John Masefield put it more elegantly in The Everlasting Mercy:

> The trained mind outs the upright soul,
> As Jesus said the trained mind might,
> Being wiser than the sons of light.
> For trained men's minds are spread so thin,
> They let all kinds of darkness in.
> Whatever light men find, they doubt it,
> They love not light but talk about it.

Edmund de La Cherbonnier in his classic volume, Hardness of Heart, quotes Oliver C. Carmichael, president of the Carnegie Foundation:

> Higher learning has fallen for the "cult of objectivity," (which) has resulted in a generation of irresponsible intellectuals, of men without convictions. . . Education which takes a detached view of life and society, that never leads students to face issues . . . tends to produce men and women who are spectators rather than actors. . . Surely the effective citizen must be willing to stand up and be counted, to make a commitment, to throw his weight on the side of truth. . . .
>
> Pursuit of the truth is undoubtedly the highest function of the university, but that is not synonymous with scientific research. It refers to search for reality, for meaning, for ultimate answers. . . Commitment to certain basic assumptions is a necessary starting point in the quest for truth. (pp. 158-9)

In his book on preaching published last year, Dean Roy Pearson of Andover-Newton points out what many of us have learned to our sorrow, that there are none so narrow as the resolutely broad-minded. He says:

> In his illegitimate incarnation the liberal man is bigoted beyond all other men. Constantly on the defensive, he is incapable of the tolerance he preaches. Believing that belief is vain, he excels the faithful by his faith in faithlessness, and assuming that his own position is the only attitude acceptable to rational beings, he reverses God's creative act, fashions a new deity in his own image, and in the name of tolerance intolerantly demands that all men worship at his own little shrine. (p. 41).

Now the solution to the problem of wrong thinking is not to stop thinking, but to supplement and balance intellect with the insights of faith. Our danger is not that we shall be too professional, but that we shall

not be spiritual enough. To have only a cool head would freeze out the spiritual life. To keep a warm heart brings all things into focus. A positive, radiant personal testimony is the solvent in which intellectual paradox melts away.

No scholar would question that truth is a high value. But every scholar needs to be reminded on occasion that ultimately rational truth, belief, is instrumental and practical. It must find its issue in life, and be validated in experience. Ultimately, the logic par excellence of the Christian faith, if logic it may be called, is that of Philip facing the scornful sophistication of Nathanael--"Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" The truth of the matter is, historically Nathanael was right. Nothing much had come out of Nazareth. Philip's answer was the only one: "Come and see." Or consider the poor fellow in the temple, with the keen doctors of the law poking barbs at his Christology: whether He be just a human being, I can't argue--"But this one thing I know, whereas I was blind, now ~~if~~ see."

Here we must ever keep central the rightful place of our denominational loyalty. Our church has been across the years, remarkably free from sectarian spirit. We have recognized that ours is but one of many denominational organizations which comprise the visible Church of the Lord Jesus Christ in the World. Dr. P. F. Bresee gave his last chapel talk forty-five years ago this coming September, only ten weeks before his death in his seventy-sixth year. He took for his text II Timothy 3:17, "That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." He said:

> These are not the groves of sectarianism. Any students, or others, who may be of any church, will we trust, find no effort here to proselyte, but to help each of them to be "A man of God, perfect, throughly furnished unto every good work."
>
> But we mean that there shall be a strong, pure, healthy denominationalism. We have no sympathy with the twaddle which attempts to express the desire that all people be of one denomination. We believe that such is neither providential

nor desirable. We are lovingly, earnestly, intensely denominational. If any one wishes to criticize his own denomination, this is a poor place for him to do it.

I call attention to the phrase, "a strong, pure, healthy denominationalism." We can settle for nothing less. This is not a limitation on our freedom, but its highest possible expression. The church is a voluntary association of believers who are convinced, not that theirs is the only possible way, but that this is the truth as God has given them to see the truth, and this is the channel through which they may make the greatest possible impact upon their generation.

Obviously any association which is voluntary, denominational or otherwise, demands some areas of agreement, both intellectual and practical. God's ancient prophet asked, "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" It is still a good question. Both fellowship and effective service demand the sharing of some commitments to which all are wholeheartedly dedicated.

Doctrinally, we have published to the world our conviction:

1. That there is one God--the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.
2. That the Old and New Testament Scriptures, given by plenary inspiration, contain all truth necessary to faith and Christian living.
3. That man is born with a fallen nature, and is, therefore, inclined to evil, and that continually.
4. That the finally impenitent are hopelessly and eternally lost.
5. That the atonement through Jesus Christ is for the whole human race; and that whosoever repents and believes on the Lord Jesus Christ is justified and regenerated and saved from the dominion of sin.
6. That believers are to be sanctified wholly, subsequent to regeneration, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.
7. That the Holy Spirit bears witness to the new birth, and also to the entire sanctification of believers.
8. That our Lord will return, the dead will be raised, and the final judgment will take place.

Now, we would not say that this is the only possible formulation of the Christian faith; but it is our formulation. To it we are wholeheartedly dedicated, both officially and individually. These are not matters of debate among us. They are our fixed stars, by which we chart our course over the shifting seas of human understanding. To change the figure: these are our meridian and base line, which give us our orientation in the religious world.

We cannot fail in the task of indoctrination. I realize that educated people have a conditioned reflex against this term, probably as a result of exposure to years of very effective negative indoctrination. Few of us seem fully to have grasped the implications of our statistics. Since 1948, over 281,000 people have come into the Church of the Nazarene, the majority on profession of faith, but a few from other denominations. This is 90% of our present membership. To make it more proximate to this moment: of the 311,300 members we now have, 93,819 have joined the church in the last four years - or about 30%.

This means we cannot assume that those who sit before us know the doctrinal commitments for which we stand. By assuming more knowledge than our students have, we may lose by default much of what is most valuable in our heritage and which can only be perpetuated by careful, consistent, and conscientious indoctrination in classroom,chapel, and on the campus.

Even more difficult of definition, but equally important, are those areas of agreement in the practical realm of Christian life and work. For example, we have always held that Christian experience involves both crisis and process, and that each is essential. Because none of our colleges attempt admission requirements as far as Christian experience is concerned, it is vitally important that each young person be challenged as strongly as possible, personally and by public preaching, to an

individual life-commitment to Jesus Christ and all He represents. We have not only an evangelical responsibility to make the saving truth known as a matter of faith, but an evangelistic responsibility to bring about conditions in which there shall be a personal acceptance of that saving faith and an introception of the ideals of holy living which grow out of it.

At all times, but especially in times of revival, all of us must have the pastor's heart. All of us must feel the burning urgency of this phase of our task. Not all may be able to preach, but each should be a personal evangelist, witnessing and working to bring about the conversion and entire sanctification of each of our young people. This is another area in which the holiness college demands not less of its faculty than the secular institution, but infinitely more.

With regard to our ethical ideas, we find increasing difficulty of definition, not only by reason of the collapse of moral standards in general, but by reason of the very complexity of the problems involved. These are matters which are not readily amenable to legislation. They embody ideals which cannot be imposed, but which must be shared. Ideals and the atmosphere of the spirit, the aroma which beautifies Christian life. And young people are extremely sensitive in this area. They have an almost unfailing instinct which detects insincerity and lipservice. They are tragically susceptible to the contagious disease of cynicism, and unfortunately this is a world in which sickness spreads by contagion while health never does.

This, it seems to me, is why legalism and loyalty oaths are particularly futile. We cannot depend upon them, but on the good faith and transparent sincerily of all who work with us. Only the group as a whole can safeguard its own integrity. Only as the group as a whole is willing to accept this responsibility will the rule of good faith be possible and effective.

I have the highest respect for intellectual integrity. It is a Christian value of the truest order. But it must be recognized that along with intellectual integrity must go moral integrity. I think I understand the workings of the human mind to the extent that I can see why some may come to the place where they no longer hold in religious faith what they once believed. However, it is impossible on any principles to justify subversion, conscious disloyalty to the essential doctrines upon which the church stands committed.

VIII

Within this framework of free association and agreement in basic commitments we must view the ofttimes perplexing problem of academic freedom. A few years back, I expressed to a college faculty my conception of "The Other Side of Freedom." It was based on the notable argument for moral freedom developed by Immanuel Kant. This great German thinker lived in an age when the problem of human freedom was uppermost in human thought, because belief in freedom was at that time imperilled by the rising conception of natural law in the physical sciences. Typical of the so-called Enlightenment period was the conclusion that because the physical order appears to be under the reign of absolute law, therefore all human action is determined. Each assertedly free choice was thought to be the effect of causes outside the volition of the individual, or the choice itself was determined by antecedents over which the individual had no control.

Kant wrestled long with this problem. How can one assert freedom in a world of law? How can the individual escape being merely a cog in the cosmic machine? He found the answer in a surprising place, yet Kant's argumenthas proved eminently satisfying across the years. The clue is in the moral nature of man, in conscience, the inescapable sense of "ought" we all recognize. Here, then, is evidence of freedom: "Thou

oughtest, therefore thou canst." The moral ought makes no sense unless accompanied by moral freedom. No rational mind can affirm an "ought" unless corresponding with that "ought" is freedom, ability, or what William James called "a live option."

What we need to see today is that Kant's argument works both ways. We live in an age supremely, almost painfully, couscious of freedom. We prize highly political freedom, economic freedom, religious freedom, academic freedom, and our famed and often-threatened "Four Freedoms," from want, from fear, freedom of the press, and freedom to worship. Kant was sure of the "ought," and proceeded from there to freedom. We are conscious of freedom and need to travel in the other direction, to the "ought" which is its other side.

For the other side of freedom is not bondage or determinism. It is responsibility, all that is implied in "ought." With ability always goes responsibility. This is true in every area of life. We cannot turn over responsibility to another without losing freedom to that extent. If we in America turn over to government the responsibility for our economic well-being, we shall lose the freedom and ability to provide our own. The only way we can avoid responsibility is to surrender freedom.

With all my heart, I believe that this principle is true with regard to academic freedom. There is no academic freedom without academic responsibility. And responsibility does not limit freedom, it expresses it. For freedom is never license, however much it may have been confused therewith. Irresponsibility is not characteristic either of maturuty or of real freedom. And it strikes me as a singularly immature notion that the responsibilities of church membership and participation in the work of a holiness college should ever be construed as a limitation on academic freedom.

IX

Let me say a word, too, in behalf of the beleaguered breed of school people known as administrators, presidents, deans, and business managers. Since my own adminstrative titles happily now carry the prefix "ex-", I think I can speak without present self-interest. I know not what it may be, but there is certainly some sort of special crown for those who carry the burdens of administration in the seminary and colleges of the Church of the Nazarene. While the rest of us sleep the blissful sleep of the hardworking innocent, these men wrestle through the wee small hours with problems of budget, of discipline, of public relations, of educational planning. Of these problems most of us know little or nothing. This is why their eyes sometimes get glassy when we drop around to talk about the needed improvements which cost money--and what needed improvements are there which do not cost money? This is why department heads find the idea of additional assistants too hard to sell.

In this area a chief duty becomes the cultivation of the virtue of loyalty. Perhaps Josiah Royce had something when he found in loyalty the essence of good, and in disloyalty the poison fang of evil. Certainly nothing makes small men big quicker than a great loyalty; and nothing makes big men little faster than disloyalty. After all, no team can win with more than one quarterback. He may not always call the right plays, but the score will be far higher than it will with a half dozen arm-chair quarterbacks calling the signals.

X

For the long road ahead, should Jesus tarry, we may have the greatest confidence. Those who have preceded us have built well. They have laid a solid foundation. They have given us the heritage of a great traiditon. They have provided for us the basic tools we need by way of buildings and equipment. We should reach higher because we stand on tall shoulders. If we fail, we fail both past and future. But we

shall not fail.

This means that we must keep our perspectives undistorted. We must see our task for what it really is. We must be good teachers, good leaders in social activities. But we must be more. We must be men and women consecrated to a single goal, to keep Christ the Center of all we do..

I got to toying with the idea once of the way in which the Biblical presentation of Christ may pervade all the varied areas of our curricula.

In art, He is the fairest of ten thousand, the One altogether lovely.

In astronomy, He is the Bright and Morning Star, the Sun of righteousness.

In botany, He is the Rose of Sharon, the Lily of the Valley.

In chemistry, He is the Universal Solvent for every human woe.

In economics, He offers wine and milk without money and without price; He redeems, but not with silver or gold.

In education, He is the Master Teacher.

In geology, He is the Rock of Ages.

In history, He is the beginning and the ending, Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever.

In home economics, He is the Bread of Life, who satisfieth thy mouth with good things.

In journalism, He is the good news.

In the languages, there is no speech nor language where the voice of His creation is not heard.

In mathematics, He is the sum of the gospel; His blessing maketh rich and he addeth no sorrow with it; in Him grace and peace are multiplied.

In music, He is the theme of the song of Moses and the Lamb.

In philosophy, He is the Way (ethics), the Truth (logic), and the life (metaphysics).

In physical education, He is the Lord our strength.

In physics, by Him all things cohere.

In political science, it is He who shall rule the nations with a rod of iron; of the increase of His government and of His peace there shall be no end.

In psychology, the Mind that was in Christ Jesus should also be in us.

In sociology, He is the Friend that sticketh closer than a brother.

In speech, He it is through Whom God in these last days hath spoken.

In theology, He is the One in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

He it was who brought the highest in religion and education together when He spoke of the Comforter to whose sanctifying grace we humbly witness, as "The Spirit of truth." May His guidance and blessing always be ours as we hold in focus our vocation as scholars and our commitment as Christians.