

TOWARD A PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION
FOR IN NAZARENE COLLEGES

A. Elwood Sanner

Department of Education and The Ministry

- o o 0 o o -

Northwest Nazarene College
Nampa, Idaho

November 11, 1969

Toward a Philosophy of Christian Education ^{For} Nazarene Colleges

My assignment is to review the statements on a philosophy of education, prepared for our Church by the Commissions on Education of 1952 and 1964, and to relate those statements to NNC's published objectives. In addition to these reports I have also consulted a number of corollary and supporting documents which date back some fifty years. Our Church has long been concerned with an attempt to formulate its philosophy or theology of Christian education. The effort may have been rough-hewn and in plain speech, but this is what was being attempted. Presumably the faculty study of the current year proposes to pursue this attempt further, in ~~a~~ search of contemporary relevance.

It should be evident that the task before us in this session is first of all and chiefly one of exposition. I shall try to "level with you" and report the realities as they apparently exist. Some interpretive elements will also appear, however, for my own educational and ecclesiastical experience have served to generate some basic convictions.

The following outline will provide an overview of our discussion:

- A. A definition and plea for a "philosophy of education."
- B. A survey of Nazarene attempts to phrase such a philosophy.
- C. A summary of the salient implications of these statements.
- D. An attempt to relate these implications to our objectives at NNC.

A. A Definition and Plea for a Philosophy of Education

1. A definition of "philosophy of education."

Marian Marsh plans to give us a more academic and definitive delineation of the principal philosophies of education and will doubtless propose a position congenial to us. My purpose here is to set forth simply and briefly a working definition in order to sharpen the point of our review. Technical writers in this field produce heavy and useful tomes on their philosophies of education but seldom define the phrase. It seems

to me that one's philosophy of education is his view of how education should be conducted, and why; namely,

What the purpose of education should be (growing out of one's theory of reality);

What the procedures, methods, and spirit of education should be;

What the specific goals and objectives should be in order to achieve the purpose of the educational process.

Behind these apparently simple matters are many profound concerns, including metaphysics and anthropology. As J. E. Park has said, ". . . The philosophy of education is an attempt to find answers that some would call ultimate" (Westminster Dictionary of Christian Education, p. 500). We shall have to wait on Dr. Marsh's paper, however, for a survey of the leading educational philosophies and the options open to us as Christians.

2. The plea for a philosophy of education.

I have been surprised and challenged to discover the numerous and widespread calls for the formulation of a philosophy of Christian education. In fact, the call for such a statement comes from educators generally:

Writes J. Donald Butler, of Princeton Theological Seminary: "Protestantism has not yet achieved an explicit philosophy of education or philosophy of Christian education . . . Consequently, there has been no achievement of a philosophy of education by a Protestant or by Protestant groups which could be recognized as a Protestant philosophy, not even by a narrow spectrum of Protestantism" (Religious Education, p. 134).

If it be supposed that such an assertion could come only from the more liberal wing of Protestantism, listen to J. Edward Hakes, of Wheaton College, and a spokesman for many evangelicals, who writes that the "development of a comprehensive philosophy" is one of the problems calling for a solution: "Evangelicals have stopped short of spelling out their distinctive educational viewpoint. As a result many who have engaged in the Christian educational program tend to operate according to pragmatic

standards^{...} rather than by other more educationally defensive criteria" (An Introduction to Christian Education, Marvin J. Taylor, Ed., p. 325).

But even closer is the growing persuasion that Nazarene higher education -- indeed, all education undertaken by the Church -- needs the undergirding of a clearer statement of purpose, as Willis E. Snowbarger has written (personal correspondence): "I must confess that . . . I am quite convinced that a philosophy of education around which faculty, administrators and students can rally is one of the pressing needs of the moment."

But this plea for a clarification of what education is all about comes from sources beyond the church as well. It should be of more than passing interest that Mr. Oglesby, superintendent of the Nampa School district, has at the outset of his term proposed a philosophy of education and has submitted it to the school board for study. He evidently wants clear direction and purpose.

One of the most trenchant appeals I have read, however, comes from John Fischer, of Harper's magazine, in his column, "The Easy Chair" (September, 1969, p. 12ff.). The article begins with a quotation from a letter written by a University of California senior: "It gets pretty depressing to watch what is going on in the world and realize that your education is not equipping you to do anything about it." In comment, Mr. Fischer goes on to say:

She is not a radical and has never taken part in any demonstration. She will graduate with honors, and profound disillusionment. From listening to her -- and a good many like-minded students at California and East Coast campuses -- I think I am beginning to understand what they mean when they say that a liberal arts education isn't relevant.

They mean it is incoherent. It doesn't cohere. It consists of bits and pieces which don't stick together, and have no common purpose . . . These fragments are meaningless because they are not organized around a central purpose, or vision of the world. The typical liberal arts college has no clearly defined goals . . . Except for a few surviving church schools, no university even pretends to have a unifying philosophy.

He observes further that "education was not always like that." Early European universities trained an elite for service in the church, and British universities sought to train "administrators to run an empire." So too Harvard and Yale. Their task was

to prepare clergymen and other professional people for service in a new country. He finds this sense of purpose strong even now in the professional schools: "Only in the liberal arts colleges . . . do the youngsters get the feeling that they are drowning in a cloud of feathers."

Mr. Fischer finds the several attempts to restore coherence quite ineffective. He has in mind Robert Hutchins' Great Books concept and Harvard's core curriculum, among other efforts. He notes also that "the Soviet experience is hardly encouraging" either. Marxism-Leninism has not provided the unifying ideology hoped for and needed in Russian education: "Soviet intellectuals apparently are almost as restless and unhappy as our own."

Mr. Fischer believes something more revolutionary should be attempted. At a minimum education should be: "1) Founded on a single guiding concept -- an idea capable of knotting together all strands of study, thus giving . . . coherence and purpose. 2) Capable of equipping young people to do something 'about what is going on in the world.'" He proposes the establishment of "Survival U", dedicated to the purpose of combating the fourfold threat to human existence -- wars, overpopulation, pollution, depletion of natural resources -- in order to make the survival of mankind possible. The motto of the school would be, "What must I do to be saved?" Students interested in trivia ("junk sculpture, the Theater of the Absurd") would not be admitted. No detached, dispassionate scholars would be hired, only the "moralist" and those with "emotional commitment to our cause" could become faculty members. His rationale: "this generation of students, like no other in my lifetime, is hungering and thirsting after righteousness. What it wants is a moral system it can believeⁱⁿ. . ."

This man obviously writes with a bit of tongue in cheek and produces something of a parody of Christian education, but he makes clear that a liberal arts college must have a great consuming moral idealism to give its curriculum coherence and its graduates purpose and meaning in life.

and where it is clearly seen that an intense and enthusiastic devotion is a help instead of a hindrance to intellectual development." This sentiment runs throughout all of the documents to which I have alluded. Quite honestly, however, I do not see quite the same emphasis in the report of 1964, which strikes me as being somewhat more technical, denominational, and rigid. The concern is surely implied, notwithstanding. In any case, it is the clear intent of these statements on our philosophy of education to say that our colleges exist not just to provide an education, but a Christian education.

2. A basic conviction that putting the moral and spiritual life first means something unique in education.

H. Orton Wiley, the first president of NNC, wrote in 1920:

" . . . Christian education is not Greek learning baptized nor worldly education rechristened. Placing the Bible in the schools does not make education Christian, neither does the transplanting of current education to a 'spiritual environment' make it any less 'rudiments of the world.' The fundamental principles are wrong, the motive is wrong . . . Herein lies the essential difference between . . . the education of the world, and true Christian education. The one seeks to find grace at the end of a system of truth; the other seeks first the personal knowledge of Christ through a gracious transformation into the moral image of God by the Spirit, and then plunges deeply into the search after truth as it is in Christ, the eternal Word . . ."

Incidentally, Dr. Wiley developed philosophically the concept of the Logos as the creative link between God as absolute and the world as relative, making the rational structure of the universe the expression of this Word (as Paul said in Colossians 1:17, "by him all things consist" or cohere). Truth is of a piece and cannot be inherently contradictory.

To spell out this implication further, the 1952 statement notes that our philosophy of education is based upon our understanding of the Christian faith, that is to say, upon our theology:

It is based on our understanding of God as absolute, infinite, holy personality; of Jesus Christ as Son of God and Saviour of mankind; of the Holy Spirit as the third person of the Trinity and the executive of the Godhead in the world; of the Bible as God's revealed word for every generation; of man created in God's "own image" but depraved in his faculties as a result of the Fall, and therefore not sinful but savable through divine grace. God's plan of salvation demands that the individual must be born again, sanctified wholly as a second crisis experience, and live a life free from volitional sin while in this present life.

Also, in obedience to God, man is called to a life of Christian service to all mankind irrespective of color, race, or social position.

This précis of our doctrinal position is not essentially different from the compendium in the Manual of our Church and which also appears in our catalog and on the contracts we all sign. Evangelicals generally would support all but the unique Wesleyan emphases.

It is fascinating to discover how this second implication has been at work in the Christian church at large. In the first two or three decades of this century, there was a strong link-up between the progressivism of John Dewey and the liberal theology of that period. Religious education in the Christian church had fallen in with the naturalistic humanism of John Dewey and his school of thought. The Hebrew-Christian tradition and the historic Christian faith counted for little. However, the powerful movement associated with the Biblical theology of this century blasted the John Dewey-liberal theology combination and showed that education will have to be Biblical and Christian if it is to exist at all in the church, hence the increasing use of the phrase Christian education rather than religious education. This theological force has resulted in radical curriculum changes in the great denominations. Indeed, this force is not spent even yet and finds significant expression in the immense and influential Cooperative Curriculum Project, involving fourteen major denominations, our own included.

Incidentally, the publications of the CCP make it clear that the churches must think of higher education and seminary study, as well as the local church school, as all a part of the educational task and ministry of the church. This is the position we are taking in the development of the new text, Exploring Christian Education. If these institutions are not all on the same continuum, however their curricula may differ, we shall stumble on with the divided mind we have too long possessed.

An example of what is implied here is found in the 1952 statement (p. 3, "Short Statement") -- "It is not only desirable that the departments of theology, Biblical literature, and philosophy be in harmony with the doctrine of our church but also

that such be the case with the fields of psychology, sociology, education, history, as well as the sciences both social and physical." It would appear that the working out of all these implications on the liberal arts level remains to be done, but it is evident that H. Orton Wiley sounded a true note: Christian education is something unique.

3. A firm persuasion that such purposes are fully consonent^a with a standard liberal arts education.

It is often charged that a liberal arts education in a church college is a logical impossibility: "the function of a parochial school is to produce a parochial mind", is the way one cynic put it. I believe this charge can be confuted, but I also think that much more serious thought needs to be given to the issue. In any case, quite the opposite of this charge is presumed in the statements of the church.

For example, Bertha Munro, who was a member of the 1948-52 commission, prepared a resource paper for the commission. I have read it with great care and profit. She says, in part: "The core of our educational system, then, should remain the traditional liberal arts curriculum, so directed and channeled and expanded as to meet individual needs and fulfill social responsibility. It is peculiarly adapted to the use of the Christian faith and the achievement of our specific goals." I wish she had supported this thesis in greater detail, for that assertion is a moot question in the minds of many. At the moment, however, the point is that she and the other members of the commission were persuaded of its truth.

Miss Munro's position was taken up into the substance of the 1952 report: "They (the schools) are to consider their educational task as an academic program of standard quality, interpenetrated with Bible holiness, and their educational objectives as assisting young people to achieve a fusion of holy character and sound education."

As a matter of fact, I will confess to some surprise when I read in the 1964 report the recommendation that only those students be admitted who "give reasonable assurance" of being able to do "college-level work satisfactorily" (p. 28, The Summary Report).

4. A burgeoning insistence that our colleges be uniquely Nazarene as well as earnestly Christian.

P. F. Bresee spoke of the "twaddle" that would mute denominational loyalties. While eschewing bigotry and sectarianism, he called for a loving, firm commitment to the Church of the Nazarene. This feeling is clearly present in the report of 1952 but not especially predominant. I refer to objectives 1 and 4 (p. 4, "Short Statement").

1. The schools are committed to the propagation of holiness, with particular emphasis on the necessity of a second crisis experience known as entire sanctification, and that this message can best be maintained through the work of an organized holiness church.
4. The educational institutions must help young people to become conscious of the possibilities of Christian service in each generation and encourage them to accept their individual responsibility to serve God and the church through their respective vocations and as citizens of the country to which they give loyalty and allegiance.

Hugh C. Benner, however, in his address to the Seventh Educational Conference (1959), "laid it on the line" -- "Nazarene colleges are maintained and supported by the Church of the Nazarene. Their only basis for existence is the Church of the Nazarene. In a certain sense, they are to be judged on the basis of their direct and measurable contribution to the church which supports them."

More recently and of course more officially, the Education Commission Report of 1964, adopted with revisions by the Sixteenth General Assembly, included among its recommendations one entitled "Distinctive Features" (see p. 29 of The Summary Report). Everyone associated with the educational institutions of the church was reminded of the following "distinctive features" of our schools:

- 1) Nazarene colleges are church colleges and not merely church-related colleges.
- 2) Nazarene colleges are to preach and teach the two crises experiences of regeneration and entire sanctification in a manner which leads students into these experiences, and into a developing life of holiness and Christian service.
- 3) All fields of study in Nazarene colleges must be viewed through the eyes of faith grounded in Scripture; all theories of life and its meaning, must be subjected to the test of Biblical truth.
- 4) The Church of the Nazarene through its colleges must communicate its heritage effectively to both present and future generations.
- 5) Nazarene colleges, to deserve their existence, must be uniquely Nazarene.

D. An Attempt to Relate These Implications to Our Objectives at NNC

1. The over-riding concern that the cultivation of the moral and spiritual life is to be the chief end in view in our educational task.

It would be fair and accurate to say that this concern is indeed the chief end in view at NNC. The motto of the college is still Matthew 6:33 -- in fact as well as in word. (We are, however, losing something in not keeping the words vividly before us as we did in the old chapel.)

This conclusion is perfectly clear from key catalog statements, including the following: "The college has a specific mission to fulfill. While it affords opportunities for true scholarship, in harmony with the purpose of its founders it seeks as well to create a spiritual environment and to train young people for Christian service" (Catalog, 1968-70, p. 25).

This conclusion is also perfectly clear from the precept and example of the administration of the college and, in the main, from the faculty as well. I shall not soon forget Dr. Riley's chapel address of May 23, 1969, on the Holy Spirit. He made it unmistakably clear that the cultivation of the moral and spiritual life is NNC's unique reason for being. We were surely also gripped, at this year's faculty retreat, by his appeal for each one of us to be an evangelist. The same can be said of all the other administrative officers of the college. I could face any group of Nazarene people and make this affirmation without the slightest reservation.

The same must also be true of every faculty member. As a matter of fact, few if any are here without a sense of divine call. Continuity of service in Nazarene colleges seems to require a genuine commitment to the ideals of Matthew 6:33. The loyalty of NNC faculty members is a source of amazement to members of the evaluation teams from the accrediting agencies.

Notwithstanding, this over-riding concern needs to be kept ever before all of us, perhaps especially younger faculty members and students. During our golden anniversary year, Kenneth Scott Latourette, the great church historian of Yale, recounted for us the

stages by which the big-name universities of the East ceased to be Christian schools and, instead, became schools with Christians in them. He cautioned that to remain Christian, a college must have Christian trustees, Christian administrators and faculty members, and Christian students. If I demurred at that time, I concur now.

The great joy and relief with which most of our campus family witnessed the recent spiritual awakening is prima facie evidence that as an institution we are steadfast in the ideal of putting spiritual concerns first. If there is one among us for whom this is not a summum bonum, even or especially on a college campus, we should all be deeply disturbed.

2. A basic conviction that putting the moral and spiritual life first means something unique in education.

It would seem that NNC's stated objectives support this conviction as well. We read the following from the current catalog: "Northwest Nazarene College is distinctly a Christian institution whose purpose is the development of Christian character. Its entire program is based upon the doctrines as set forth in the Manual of the Church of the Nazarene" A compendium of doctrine follows in eight rather brief sentences. The catalog statement is in essence identical with the position of the 1952 report. I suspect, however, that there yet remains the task of clarifying such a statement and of drawing out its implications. To this I would like to turn.

It is important to see that Christian education is sui generis and not simply a typical liberal arts education with the Christian faith as an adjunct. A fuller development of this idea will be offered under the next division, but the point should be established here.

I wish to propose a thesis for discussion and debate:

In the main, Nazarene education has failed to grasp Dr. Wiley's position that "Christian education is not Greek learning baptized nor worldly education rechristened," that Christian education proceeds from fundamental principles and motives quite different from the education of the world. As a consequence we have unwittingly encouraged bifurcation of learning and piety, of scholarship and faith.

In what way have we failed to grasp this philosophy of Christian education?

Chiefly, I believe, in not showing our students how our "entire program is based upon the doctrines as set forth in the Manual of the Church of the Nazarene." We have made this adjustment religiously and morally in our hearts and lives, but we have not made the adjustment intellectually. We have not related our fields--from A to Z--to our theological position. This is an enormous and difficult task, but we shall not succeed unless we do just that. The bright, tough-minded youth senses and is captivated by the sophistication of Renaissance and Enlightenment learning and sees the Christian faith as something dull, reactionary, irrelevant. Ignoring the religious position of his professor, he distills the brilliant ideas of the masters, ideas often at variance with the historic Christian faith, and in the end turns to curse the college, even though it has enabled him to make a high score on his GRE. He has no understanding of the fact that the universities sprang from the church (not the other way around), nor that the great pervading ideas of the Christian faith are creative and dynamic and have produced the soil in which our educational ideals have grown and flourished.

A case in point is the doctrine of original sin. Along with Christendom at large, we hold to the doctrines of original sin and inherited depravity. From the days of the conflict between Augustine and Pelagius to the debate between Reinhold Niebuhr and modernism, the rejection of original sin has been pegged by Christians as heresy. And yet, there are vigorous minds in psychology and literature, not to mention theology and other fields, who scorn the concept of original sin as a debasement of humanity. When one of our students receives and accepts such an idea as valid, he has already taken a long step toward a break with the Christian faith. And what a strange step to take, when the latest best-seller depicts in luminous detail the depravity, bestiality, savagery, and corruption of unregenerate man!

Every year Nazarene schools are graduating too many young people for whom the Christian faith is no longer intellectually respectable. It should surprise no one that these youth have no heart to join a local church and support the work of the king-

dom through its channels. Evangelism is exceedingly important, because it sets the direction of one's life: "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." But such a commitment must be supported by an intelligent faith. If the Christian faith endures, it will not be because it is comfortable, but because it is true.

3. A firm persuasion that such purposes are fully consonant with a standard liberal arts education.

It should be obvious, from the catalog quotations already presented, that we are in full accord with this persuasion. NNC does in fact seek to provide its students with a first-rate liberal arts education, while at the same time encouraging them to a Christian commitment. We see no conflict between the two. However, it is my own belief that a fuller, abler defense and explanation of such a position awaits a more definitive statement of our philosophy of education. We must see and help our students to see why it is that the soul of the Christian faith and the true purposes of a liberal arts education are not only consonant and compatible but congenial, possibly interdependent. Dr. J. William Jones has given us substantial assistance at this point. It should be the responsibility of each presentation in this series to relate one area of study to our Christian stance in education.

Dr. Bernard Ramm, in his work entitled, The Christian College in the Twentieth Century, has wrestled with the issue before us and proffers many helpful insights. He has made a study of five great Christian scholars who were also educators: Aurelius Augustine, Phillip Melancthon, John Henry Newman, Abraham Kuyper, and Walter Moberly. He draws from the thought of each man significant and constructive principles for our task as Christian educators. I shall try to isolate a few of these principles, somewhat at random:

a. Each of these men was first a Christian and then a scholar. They were concerned to ground learning in the Christian faith, "by bringing all cultural activity under the truth of the one true God and putting all knowledge in the service of faith" (p. 21). It was this, Ramm feels, which led Melancthon to break with Erasmus and Reuchlin.

b. They were concerned to magnify the greatness of the Christian revelation. As

Ramm puts it:

It is difficult to keep great minds interested in small problems. If small men interpret the Christian faith in a small way, then great men will lose interest in it. In no place is it more important to maintain a great interpretation of the Christian faith than in a Christian college. If a faculty member thinks that the Christian revelation is not really commensurate with the greatness of God, then he will lose interest in Christianity and give only nominal assent to keep academic peace. And if the student is given a small interpretation of the Christian faith, he will lose interest in Christianity and consider it irrelevant to much of life. (p. 25)

c. They contended, for a variety of reasons, that the church has a responsibility for the transmission of culture. Because God is Creator as well as Redeemer, the church has a responsibility for humanity, and humanity means a civilization under God. The ongoing of civilization is possible, of course, only by means of the transmission of culture. In other words, their aim was not exclusively soteriological.

d. They believed that the individual faculty member has a twofold responsibility:

1) to be a Christian throughout his daily life, including the classroom; 2) to correlate his field with the Christian faith. He needs to be a lay theologian as well as a specialist in his profession.

e. They gave their lives to incarnate the concept of "learned piety." Their own scholarship is almost beyond belief. Phillip Melancthon, for example, was actually the "Teacher of Germany" (p. 31), and laid the foundations of the Germany university system. But like John Wesley, two centuries later, he toiled to unite learning and vital piety.

In my judgment, a great deal of work needs yet to be done in order to sell this persuasion to our students. But this is our calling -- "learned piety." In no other way, under God, shall we capture for Christ the minds of our most talented students.

4. A burgeoning insistence that our colleges be uniquely Nazarene as well as earnestly Christian.

There is no attempt whatever to hide our Nazarene affiliation and commitment. The catalog (p. 2) identifies NNC first of all as an "approved institution of the Church

of the Nazarene." At several points in "Part I, General Information" of the catalog (pp. 10-16), our denominational affiliation is plainly stated (see "Statement of Belief", "History", "Government and Administration"). The colleges are children of the church. We rise and fall together.

In all of this, however, we seek to be as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves. Both in theory and practice we try to balance commitment and charity. For example, the catalog notes that "while NNC is a denominational college . . . , it is not narrowly sectarian" and welcomes students from all churches. This is doubtless the principle back of the relaxation of the chapel requirement, during revival campaigns, for non-Nazarenes who request it.

The virtues of such wisdom I have discovered somewhat painfully in the teaching of theology. It is possible to drive Arminians into the arms of John Calvin through a harsh and sarcastic discussion of unconditional predestination! It is better to make friends out of those from other denominations than to unchristianize them. A more charitable attitude often has a missionary effect. We shall win the denominational loyalty of our youth by the truth, not by pressure and propaganda.

It would possibly come as a surprise to some -- both friend and foe -- to discover that our Church at heart is neither sectarian nor bigoted, as a perusal of the Manual will show (see especially the Preamble to the Constitution and our position on The Church, 1968 Manual, pp. 27, 34-35, resp.). If there are sectarians and bigots in the Church, they misrepresent our history and spirit.

My own burden is that we shall see what it truly means to be a Nazarene. It takes courage to be what we are. We are Christian and so share the historic faith (e.g., the Nicene and the Apostles' creeds) with all segments of the Christian church. We are Protestant and should hold firmly to our Reformation heritage. We are Wesleyan and consequently should not only proclaim the doctrines of free grace, assurance, and Christian perfection, but also practice the Wesleyan attitude of charity and tolerance. One of John Wesley's favorite texts was II Kings 10:15 -- "Is thine heart right,

as my heart is with your heart? . . . If it be, give me thy hand." The genius of our Church has been a spirit of resilience and flexibility which has brought and held together divergent groups with one common cause -- holiness evangelism.

Our church has a right to expect that we shall be good churchmen and that we shall try gracefully and judiciously to help our students to become good churchmen. It has become a personal conviction with me that no one should continue as a faculty member in a church college who is basically out of joint with the sponsoring denomination. It is clear enough to our students where our loyalties lie.

It is our responsibility to marry the church and to cherish and nourish it. Is the servant above his master? Our Lord loved the church enough to give Himself for it (Eph. 5:25). I have often wondered what pain Jesus suffered as over the years He attended the services in the synagogue at Nazareth. If our people are convinced of our basic loyalties, they will call upon us to lead them. Even now, Dr. Gilbert Ford and Dr. Double E Hill are members of significant national committees and are in a position to influence the Church. If we desire to see the Church grow and improve, we should "infiltrate" the Church and exert our influence where it counts. Critical fringe groups are futile.

In presenting the first edition of this paper to the Faculty and Curriculum Committee of the Board of Regents, I told them that in my judgment the Church need have no fear about NNC on this last salient implication of the official statements on our philosophy of education.

Conclusion

In the course of this study two persons -- one ancient, the other contemporary -- have helped me to resolve a long-standing conflict concerning the liberal arts and our Christian commitment. To take these in reverse order, Bertha Munro (whose influence in our fellowship is incalculable) offered the following proposition in her position paper prepared for the education commission of 1948-52: "The responsibility, then, of the colleges to the ideals of the church is to supply a fusion of Bible holiness with a

standard academic program." A good summary and worthy goal. I could live with that.

The other person is St. Augustine, who, as Dr. Bernard Ramm has already helped us to see, "grounded a liberal arts education in the Christian faith" (CCTC, p. 20). As Christians, we believe in both the general and special revelation of God. The former is God's self-disclosure to all men in the very constitution of the universe. The Logos is the principle of rationality and morality by means of which all things cohere. The latter revelation is God's self-disclosure to ancient Israel by the prophets and in Jesus Christ to the apostles. This special revelation is available to us in the Bible. In all our learning, then, whether in astronomy, history, literature, political science, theology, or zoology, we are thinking God's thoughts after Him. What education could be more comprehensive than a Christian education?

-- A. Elwood Sanner

November 11, 1969