intersections

Spring 2007

in this issue

Shared Commitment and Diversity

Purpose Statement

This publication is by and largely for the academic communities of the twenty-eight colleges and universities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. It is published by the Vocation and Education unit of the ELCA. The publication has its home at Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois, which has generously offered leadership and physical and financial support as an institutional sponsor for the publication.

The ELCA has frequently sponsored conferences for faculty and administrators that have addressed the church-college/university partnership. The ELCA has sponsored an annual Vocation of the Lutheran College Conference. The primary purpose of *Intersections* is to enhance and continue such dialogue. It will do so by:

- Lifting up the vocation of Lutheran colleges and universities
- Encouraging thoughtful dialogue about the partnership of colleges and universities with the church
- Offering a forum for concerns and interests of faculty at the intersection of faith, learning, and teaching
- Raising for debate issues about institutional missions, goals, objectives, and learning priorities
- Encouraging critical and productive discussion on our campuses of issues focal to the life of the church
- Serving as a bulletin board for communications among institutions and faculties
- Publishing papers presented at conferences sponsored by the ELCA and its institutions
- Raising the level of awareness among faculty about the Lutheran heritage and connectedness of their institutions, realizing a sense of being part of a larger family with common interests and concerns.

From the Publisher

Most issues of *Intersections* include papers delivered at the annual conferences on "The Vocation of a Lutheran College," organized by the Vocation and Education unit of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for the colleges and universities that are related to the ELCA. But most of the papers in this issue grew out of a pan-Lutheran conference organized by the Association of Lutheran College Faculties in the fall of 2006. This is an association of Lutheran faculty from public and private institutions, and from Lutheran colleges affiliated with different church bodies.

The ELCA is an ecumenical church body, committed to friendly and cooperative relations with people and organizations of many faith backgrounds. We have no difficulties working with and discussing issues with Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Jews, Muslims, or with other Lutherans who are not feeling at home in the ELCA. We know we can learn from them, and we hope that they will learn something from us.

It is always challenging to work with people who are not ecumenically oriented, who believe that they or their church body have the whole truth and do not need to learn from anyone else. We who are in the ELCA also know the truth, but we recognize that the truth that we know may be limited. Just like the disciples who were following Christ, we try to figure out what his sayings mean, and some times we discover that we have misunderstood him. We think that this applies to all humans. While God is infallible, we humans are not.

The ELCA view is a good foundation for institutions of higher education. Like the faculty members at the Lutheran colleges, the ELCA professes. Like the faculty members, we recognize that what we profess is subject to change based on new research, new discoveries, and new insights. That is the beauty and the value of the conferences of ALCF. They bring together faculty who know the truth, truth that has set them free. And these faculty members listen to each other, and they may leave the conferences with a different truth than when they arrived. We hope that the articles in this issue will stimulate you to attend future ALCF conferences (and, of course, "Vocation of the Lutheran College" conferences!), and we hope that they will add new insights to your truth, so you will be a professor with a stronger base from which to profess.

Living in God's Amazing Grace,

ARNE SELBYG | Director for ELCA Colleges and Universities

Contents Number 25 | Spring 2007

4

From the Editor | ROBERT D. HAAK

5

Reflections on Our Shared Commitments | MARK S. HANSON

11

Currents | JAIME SCHILLINGER

13

Guest Editor | MADELEINE FORELL MARSHALL

14

Sojourners in a Pluralistic Land: The Promise and Peril of Christian Higher Education | RANDALL BALMER

19

Lutheran Identity, Academic Integrity, and Religious Diversity | STORM BAILEY

25

Why Diversity and Civic Engagement Don't Talk to Each Other on College Campuses: The Need for Public Work | JOSÉ MARICHAL

31

Rich and Poor in an Era of Globalized Religion and Economies: Challenges to Lutheran Colleges | PAMELA K. BRUBAKER

intersections

Arne Selbyg | PUBLISHER
Robert D. Haak | EDITOR
Matthew J. Marohl | EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
Laura O'Melia | SECRETARY

PUBLISHED BY
The Vocation and Education Unit | The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

PUBLISHED AT
Augustana College
639 38th Street
Rock Island, Illinois USA 61201-2296

EDITORIAL BOARD
Timothy A. Bennett | WITTENBERG UNIVERSITY
Karla Bohmbach | SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY
DeAne Lagerquist | ST. OLAF COLLEGE
Victoria Horst | NEWBERRY COLLEGE

ON THE COVER
Nest by Christopher Marshall, oil & canvas, 10" x 13", *Bromme Collection*. On display until Aug 13, 2007 at the Kwan Fong Gallery at California Lutheran University.

From the Editor | ROBERT D. HAAK

SO WHAT IS IT that holds us together? What are our shared commitments? What does "diversity" mean on a Lutheran college campus? While the contributions to this issue themselves come from diverse sources, this question is one they hold in common.

Bishop Mark Hanson addresses this question in a talk to the assembled presidents of the twenty-eight ELCA colleges that met in March 2007. At least from the inside, when one looks at the full gathering of all the ELCA colleges and universities, one may be struck by the wide range of diversity—geographic, economic, theological. The understanding of the relationship between the colleges and "churchwide" is another expression of diversity mentioned by the Bishop. Some embrace the relationship closely; others hold it much more gently. Some parade their "Lutheran-ness" on their website. Others mention it as part of the "historical background."

With all this diversity, what *does* it mean to be a "Lutheran" college or university? I would suggest that this question itself is one that is well worth asking (and attempting to answer) on each of our campuses. I would also suggest that the annual *Vocation of the Lutheran College* conference is a productive place for these conversations to continue. By the time you get this, this year's conference will be upon us—held this year at Augustana College in Rock Island, IL from August 2-4th. You can check with the president's office at your institution to find out more information about how to attend.

While this great diversity is evident to those of us within the group called "Lutheran colleges and universities," Randy Balmer's contribution shows us that we have some commonalities that may be more evident to those looking at us from the outside. It may be like someone telling me that I look just like my brother. (I'm not sure either of us sees this as a compliment!) Sometimes we can see ourselves better through eyes of "the other." We might well be pleased with what Randy Balmer sees when he looks our direction.

José Marichal and Pamela Brubaker talk about other sorts of diversity—those that come from our places in our communities and in the world. Each of them sees opportunities in these diversities. Storm Bailey argues that being Lutheran is precisely that which makes us embrace the diversities we find. We do not embrace diversity in spite of the fact that we are Lutheran but *because* we are Lutheran. This surely is a theme that our administrators and faculty need to say in a variety of ways—to each other and to students and to the communities in which they find themselves. What else can we say about ourselves *because we are Lutheran*?

We are also glad to reprint a talk given in chapel by Jaime Schillinger at St. Olaf. This piece might well remind us of the importance of worship, of liturgy, to our formation as communities. Here we are bound together in the story that we tell and that "tells us" from ancient times into the ever renewing present. This also is a gift of Lutheran theology that calls us to unfold and blossom.

Again, I invite you to consider submission of materials that speak to the concerns of the Purpose Statement at the front of this issue. Please submit your work (preferably in electronic MLA format) to me at BobHaak@augustana.edu.

The vast majority of copies of *Intersections* are distributed through an office on your campus (different on each campus). If you find this forum valuable—and want to ensure that you receive your own copy and not be at the mercy of whomever distributes the newsletter at your institution—please send a note indicating your interest to LauraOMelia@augustana.edu. You will be added to our direct mailing list.

ROBERT D. HAAK | The Augustana Center for Vocational Reflection, Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

MARK S. HANSON

Reflections on Our Shared Commitments

IT IS A PRIVILEGE for Ione and me to be with you and to thank you for your exceptional leadership. Although it has been four years since I was with this group last in Sarasota, I have appreciated the opportunity to be with many of you on your campuses and in other gatherings.

This academic year, I have been on five of your campuses, maintaining my commitment to support the twenty-eight colleges and universities of this church and to be with students. Last week I was on two campuses—Dana and Luther. I was so impressed as I listened to the students share their passions and their faith and reflect their varied experiences in the classroom and in the world.

I often comment that the current generation of students seems increasingly clear that they want to be part of a church that matters: a church in which faith matters, worship matters, commitment matters, Jesus matters, the Bible matters, and the experience of God matters. They also want to be part of a church that makes a difference. They want to be part of a church that makes a difference in their personal lives of faith, in families, and in neighborhoods; a church that makes a difference in confronting the issues of HIV/AIDS, global warming, poverty, war, and peace. They are impatient with a church that seems turned inward and preoccupied with what appears to students to be secondary, even insignificant, issues. I recognize that I am not describing all students, but significant numbers of them. I believe your schools, your faculty, your staff, and your boards are creating the context that nurtures and encourages such commitments.

When I have the opportunity to talk personally with you who are presidents, my appreciation for the complexities of your callings always grows. The incredible expectations that you will have a major role in raising funds; in balancing budgets; in increasing enrollments, but reducing or at least maintaining discount rates; attending to alumni expectations while increasing their participation in the annual fund; recruiting and retaining gifted faculty; maintaining staff morale; building relationships with civic and corporate leaders; tending to relationships with the church. Should I continue or did you come to Florida to distance yourselves from those realities?

You have my deep respect and profound gratitude. I want to say a special word of thanks to the four presidents who will be completing or have completed their calls this year: Jon Moline, Texas Lutheran; Steven Titus, Midland; Paul Formo, Bethany; and Bob Ubbelohde, Finlandia.

I am privileged to address you today, but it is my churchwide staff colleagues who daily tend to our relationships with you with great dedication and imagination—Stan Olson, Mark Wilhelm, Arne Selbyg, Marilyn Olson, and Myrna Sheie. They are advocates for you, interpreters, and accompaniers.

The last time we met it was not yet clear how we would restructure the churchwide organization, including personnel and budgets to undergird our strategic Plan for Mission. You as presidents and board chairs were very helpful and sometimes critical in shaping what is now the Vocation and Education program unit. I believe Vocation and Education reflects this church's commitment to our colleges and universities within the

---

MARK S. HANSON *is the Presiding Bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.* *This address was first presented at the Lutheran Educational Conference of North America (LECNA) on March 1, 2007. This article is reprinted with the permission of the ELCA and the Bishop's office.*

broader context of our Lutheran understanding of vocation and life. Many dimensions of the ELCA Plan for Mission relate to colleges and universities, but one strategic direction in particular does: "Assist this church to bring forth and support faithful, wise, and courageous leaders whose vocations serve God's mission in a pluralistic world."

> "Vocation and Education reflects this church's commitment to our colleges and universities."

In a recent interview, I was asked by a New York Times reporter what I understand to be the role of a national church denomination and its leaders given the changing landscape of American religious life. I said I believe we in churchwide leadership are called to steward the ecology of interdependent ecosystems that make up this church. There was total silence on the other end. "You're not going to use that quote in your story, are you?" I asked. "No," was the one word response. I was not to be deterred, so I continued, "I believe we are to build capacity and encourage imagination for our shared mission." Not only did that statement also fail to capture how we interact, the entire interview did not result in a story.

The image of the ELCA as an ecology of interdependent ecosystems is one I received from Dr. Craig Dykstra, vice president for religion at the Lilly Endowment, when he described how he sees the ELCA. It certainly is reflected in our polity. We say in our governing documents that we are one church in three expressions—congregations, synods, and the churchwide organization. By the way, I am convinced the word "churchwide" to describe the national expression of the ELCA is not accomplishing its intent. So, increasingly the churchwide expression—or more specifically, the churchwide organization—is referred to as "the ELCA" when, in fact, the whole ecology is the ELCA. Three expressions, but also eight seminaries, twenty-eight colleges and universities, outdoor ministries, campus ministries, schools, the varied vocations of the 4.9 million members of this church as they live out their baptismal callings in daily life (note that all of those belong to Vocation and Education program unit), social ministry organizations, ecumenical partners, and global companions. Therefore, when I speak today about our shared commitments, it is within the context of our tending to and stewarding this living, changing ecology of interdependent, deep, and abiding relationships.

That is a significant change from the not-too-distant past, when discussions of this relationship often focused on whether the colleges would remain church-related, whether in fact the relationship was deep and abiding; or whether there was an inevitable trajectory in American life that would lead colleges to abandon their church-relatedness. Was the relationship between culture and the church a reality that most colleges would discover with time? Implicit in these conversations was the sense that the mission of a higher education and the mission of a church body, while not congruent, were not easily compatible. As if God is opposed to free inquiry.

We still debate the nature of the relationship between the church and the colleges, but I sense the question is shifting from whether colleges will and should be church-related (although that question remains with us somewhat) to the question of the content of this deep and abiding relationship or what should it be.

I don't want to minimize these various indicators of our shared relationship that reflect our shared commitments, including:

- The make-up of your boards and how many members are Lutherans
- Whether the president is or must be Lutheran
- The number of Lutheran students
- The level of financial support from the church—be it churchwide grants, synodical grants, congregational gifts, or individual gifts
- Your religion requirements
- Your understanding of your ownership both legally and how you perceive the church as "moral owners"
- Your branding and whether it includes your Lutheran identity
- How the churchwide organization reflects in structure, budget, staffing, and communication this church's commitment to its twenty-eight colleges and universities
- The presence of ELCA clergy in your campus ministries
- How you structure church relations

All of those are important indicators of our shared commitments, yet it is a shared mission in higher education that is truly central—core—to our deep and abiding relationship. I believe shared mission is increasingly and rightfully becoming our focus.

I am sure that each of you can share examples from your own context about how attention is being given to our shared mission, identity, and vocation, and about how these shape the life of the colleges and universities and the life of this church. Let me share just a few recent examples that I have found very helpful as I reflect upon stewarding this relationship.

The report of the Wittenberg Lutheran Identity Study Commission is a rich, thoughtful, historical analysis of Wittenberg's

Lutheran identity with concrete proposals for strengthening that identity because it is core to Wittenberg's mission.

The "Five Faith Commitments" of Augustana College, Rock Island are each made with specific descriptions of how the commitment is carried out in the life of the college. The appendix sets the commitments in historical context and includes President Bahls' insightful reflections about the Lutheran expression of higher education at Augustana. Again, it is clear one is reading commitments core to the identity, microcosm, and vocation of this college and this church.

"I believe shared mission is increasingly and rightfully becoming our focus."

Pamela Jolicoeur's inaugural address as the 10th president of Concordia College was titled, "Re-imagining Concordia's Mission Moment." Building upon Concordia's history and citing Gustavus Adolphus professor Darryl Jodock's interlocking set of five characteristics that define the Lutheran approach to higher education, President Jolicoeur called Concordia into a process of re-imagining liberal arts education that cultivates compassionate education and connects students to the world.

A favorite example is the collected papers and presentations of Bill Frame under the title "Faith and Reason." The papers reflect Dr. Frame's immense contributions to our rethinking, reclaiming, and re-imagining the mission of Lutheran higher education as it continues to be informed by Luther and Melancthon, and especially by the Lutheran understanding of vocation and the two kingdoms.

These are just a few examples of the many that indicate our shared commitment in the context of a deep and abiding relationship that belongs to our shared mission, shared identity, and shared vocation as Lutherans.

What does this shared mission look like? I recently had the privilege of giving convocation addresses at Dana and Luther. I titled one of the addresses, "A College of the Church Reaching Out in Mission for the Sake of the World" and the other, "Unquenchable Curiosity and Evangelical Persistence." From these addresses I want to highlight at least four characteristics of our shared mission in higher education to which I hope we are committed.

Our shared mission means the twenty-eight colleges and universities of this church will be communities of free inquiry that nurture unquenchable curiosity in a cultural context that often seems preoccupied with satisfying our insatiable appetites for possessions, power, and consuming.

Recently, a young woman wrote to Dear Abby, "I'm 19 and dropped out of college in December 2005. After years of going through honors classes, I felt like I had nothing left. My brain was on cruise control. I think I want to go back to school in August, but I also feel I'm doing it to please everyone else. Honestly, I no longer know what I want to be in life. I have no idea what I want to major in. I'm just lost. I've never dated, done drugs, drunk, partied or anything else besides go to school. And I was good at it. I have dreams of what I want out of life—a mansion, a nice car, money in the bank, but I don't necessarily have to go to college to achieve that. I know it sounds like a cliché, but I feel like I don't know who I am."

Dear Abby said something like this, "Your first step should be to return to college. The next step should be a visit to the college career counseling department. It is important that you learn what it is you enjoy as well as have an aptitude for."

The vocation of a Lutheran college that is so vital to the mission of this church is to plant deep within students a lifelong unquenchable curiosity about God, about the meaning of life and being human, and the centrality of faith; an unquenchable curiosity about the vastness of the cosmos, the intricacies of DNA, and the beauty of the earth; the complexities of science, math, and economics; the richness of history; an unquenchable curiosity about life's big questions. However, it is also vital that ELCA colleges and universities value and provide for religious study as an important tool for the intellectual exploration of the big questions of life such as: What makes life meaningful? What does it mean to be human? How do we live together on this planet?

I commend to you an article by W. Robert Connor, president of the Teagle Foundation titled, "The Right Time and Place for Big Questions." He asks, "Can students' interest in and engagement with religion and spiritual matters, and the questions associated with them, invigorate their liberal education? Based on my conversations with faculty members in a wide range of fields, meetings with students, and class visits, the answer clearly is 'Yes.' As a result, the Teagle Foundation invited colleges to apply for support for projects that deal with big questions in undergraduate education."

Connor writes, "Despite the number and quality of those applications, however, we can see that there is still reluctance among faculty members to engage with the big questions—many professors clearly feel that they are not adequately trained to deal with them. Faculty members have also expressed concerns that tenure and salary increases will be put in jeopardy if they break out of existing disciplinary paradigms—or that a few students who find that class discussions run counter to their beliefs or preferences could damage professors' careers by filling

out negative course evaluations. Teachers sometimes need to be assured that they do not have to answer the questions for their students; rather, their role is just to help students think about them." Connor continues that a friend recently wrote, "It is less a question of expertise than of feeling comfortable enough to articulate an issue in a way that is cogent and civil, and encourages and doesn't close off discussion."

Isn't he describing Lutheran higher education? We who were formed catechetically by asking the question, "What does this mean?" will be a church drawn to—rather than fearful of—big questions. We are committed to being a church that nurtures unquenchable curiosity. Therefore, as an ELCA church-related college, our schools shall ensure that all students, especially undergraduates, are confronted with the role of religion in civilization and its importance in asking (and for believers, in answering) the critical "big questions" of life. To be educated is to understand this and to grasp its significance. Joseph Sittler wrote, "What I am appealing for is an understanding of grace that has the magnitude of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The grace of God is not simply a holy hypodermic whereby my sins are forgiven. It is the whole giftedness of life, the wonder of life which causes me to ask questions that transcend the moment." (14)

"We are committed to being a church that nurtures unquenchable curiosity."

Two weeks ago my 95-year old aunt and godmother died. Betty Burtness was a vibrant, wise woman of faith who taught English in high school and at Waldorf College. She never lost her Hauge piety or her unquenchable search for wisdom. Betty's passion for sharing the Word led her to call me after she turned age 88 and ask me what I thought of her leading worship at Commonwealth Nursing Home. I said, "That's great," figuring she wasn't really seeking permission anyway. The Saturday before the first Sunday she called and asked, "Are you preaching tomorrow, Mark?" I answered, "Yes," and she replied, "So am I. I'm going to use the lectionary text from Luke 13 where Jesus is being asked if he thinks the eighteen who were killed when the tower of Siloam fell on them were worse offenders than all the others living in Jerusalem."

"What are you going to say?" I asked.

"Well, I've been reading the commentaries," she said, "maybe I'll talk about the difference between moral and natural evil."

I said, "Well, you go, Betty! I think I'm going to stick with talking about the righteousness of God."

She called me back that evening and said, "I gave up on evil. I'm just going to preach grace. It's what the people most need to hear."

Betty increasingly believed that it is the questions with which one lives and not necessarily the answers one gives that give evidence of faith.

In our commitments to our shared mission, I believe it is vital that ELCA colleges and universities value and provide for religious study and reflection as an important tool for the intellectual exploration of the "big questions" of life—in other words, to be communities of free inquiry that nurture unquenchable curiosity. Our shared mission means the twenty-eight colleges and universities of this church will be communities that encourage religious expression, exploration, and conversations in our increasingly diverse society.

I know of none of the twenty-eight ELCA colleges and universities that greet incoming students with a sign that says, "Welcome. Drop your faith at the door and pick it up again in four years in case you still need it." Yet, though not explicitly stated, it could become a not-too-subtle implicit message conveyed. When visiting Bethany College last fall I preached in chapel led by an ELCA campus pastor. The room was full. That evening I was invited to the first fall meeting of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes. Some of your campuses have a strong presence of Campus Crusade for Christ in addition to Lutheran Campus Ministries. I know at least from our youngest daughter in her first year at Augsburg, that it is important for her that there is worship in which her faith is nourished through music, Word and Sacrament, and prayer. It is also important that there are religious classes in which faith is stretched and even challenged and that there are experiences—such as she had in January to travel to El Salvador—to see first-hand the resiliency and challenge people of faith experience in daily life and the church's solidarity with those who live in poverty and struggle for justice.

The article by Connor references research with which I imagine you are all familiar. The UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education Project revealed, according to Helen Astin, "Students become less religious while in college with respect to attending church, but their goal to integrate spirituality into their lives increases in importance." (Connor 4)

A University of Indiana study of 150,000 students at 461 four-year colleges found that what they termed "spiritually enhancing activities" such as worship, meditation, and prayer had no negative affect on "educationally purposeful activities" (i.e. deep learning reflected in the students ability to analyze, integrate, and synthesize information from various sources and apply it to new experiences). The National Longitudinal Survey of 4000 freshmen from 28 highly selective colleges found that students who participated in religious rituals at least once a week

studied longer and reported higher grade point averages and greater institutional satisfaction than their peers. But you don't need convincing—just encouragement—to remain strong in your school's commitments.

9/11 is no doubt a—if not the—formative event in the lives of college students. On that day, we were awakened to the reality of our vulnerability in a world of violence. Since then, it seems we increasingly are living in—dare I say—socialized and politicized into a culture of fear. Yet we know what happens when fear drives our lives. We become preoccupied with fortifying borders, erecting barriers, and defining rigid boundaries. We become distrustful of others, especially those who do not look, act, or speak like us—particularly if they appear Middle Eastern. Fear, says Walter Brueggemann, makes us possessive of what we have and finally downright anti-neighborly. The core of the Gospel is the good news that we have been saved by God's grace in Christ, which frees us to live in faith not fear; faith that frees us to be Christ to the neighbor next door and Christ to the world.

Think of the incredibly important role your college or university plays in providing experiences in which students not only can express and explore their own faith, but also begin to understand and appreciate the religious beliefs and practices of others. The rabbi serving as one of the campus chaplains at Muhlenberg College says that religious Jewish students have found a home at Muhlenberg because it is related to the ELCA, a tradition that values religion in life and affords opportunity for religious practice in an environment of free inquiry.

There are two other characteristics or marks of our shared mission to which I believe we share commitment. Vitally important to our shared mission is our commitment to the education of learners who can contribute to the common good in part because they have learned to address the "big questions" of life. For Christians, exploring meaningful purpose in life is related to God's call that we serve the common good—freedom in Christ to love and serve the neighbor. The genius of the vocations program sponsored by the Lilly Endowment lies in this truth. Students of other religious beliefs and practices and even non-religious students can share in the exploration of "big questions" and how they might serve the common good, even if the motivation is not believed to be a call from God.

The ELCA mission statement is, "Marked with the cross of Christ forever, we are claimed, gathered, and sent for the sake of the world." The college students with whom I meet understand that our baptismal identity and calling leads to our being sent for the sake of the world. Last night our son at St. Olaf called, "Dad, I need two deposit checks, one to go to New Orleans for spring break to work on Katrina cleanup and the other to go to India in the fall to work and study at a biological research center." Your students get it: education is for the neighbor, for the common good.

"For Christians, exploring meaningful purpose in life is related to God's call that we serve the common good."

Our colleague Jonathan Strandjord says wisdom usually comes in one of two flavors: wisdom that seeks to satisfy our desires or wisdom to reduce our cravings. Both are essential to human life. Yet, he cautions, one can lead to a life preoccupied with our own needs and the other to cool detachment, even isolation. He calls us to another form of wisdom: wisdom that makes us "other-wise." Not the mastery of a specialized subject, but a basic posture, an over arching purpose, intellect in search of an extraordinary project. Being other-wise is not driven by the need for power or possessions or by the quest to be above the fray. It is instead, born of wonder or ecstasy, which takes us out of ourselves, but not out of the world; it places us before the neighbor.

A part of the calling to form students who are other-wise, whose gifts and passions serve the common good—the neighbor next door in Namibia—is for the Lutheran college or university to be a community of moral deliberation and discernment.

In our contentious, fractious, and polarized society, your school can help students, help the church, and help communities learn the art of public moral deliberation: respectful, thoughtful, civil engagement, and even disagreement for sake of the common good. Cynthia Moe Lobeda in *Public Church for the Life of the World* writes, "The heart of discernment is to hold 'what is' and 'what could be' in light of the life-giving, life-saving, life-sustaining mystery of God's ongoing work toward the redemption and flourishing of creation. Where vision of life's realities is obscured by illusions, a task of Christian discernment is to see differently, so that we might live differently. Where dominant forces distort historical realities by describing them falsely, Christian discernment must re-see and then 're-describe the world.'" (65-66) Is she not describing the vocation and mission of Lutheran higher education? To such a task we are called in our shared mission—to a shared commitment.

Finally, and briefly—but not at all insignificant—is our shared mission to provide leaders for this church and for religious communities throughout the world. I am not only speaking of future pastors or other church workers—though I

must say how delighted I was to learn Luther College has about seventy students in a group considering church vocations—I am referring also to future leaders of Lutheran educational and social ministry organizations, to Lutheran scientists who will help this church's reflections on the revolution in genetics, science, and religion and its impact on human life and to Lutheran economists who will be part of the growing conversation about the strengths and weaknesses of economic globalization, to Lutherans who are committed participants in the sustaining and the changing of rural and small town communities.

Your faculty members are important contributors to the development of ELCA social statements. It is vital that our twenty-eight colleges and universities continue to develop collaborative programs with the eight ELCA seminaries such as the creative ventures involving Carthage College and Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago; Wagner College and Philadelphia Seminary; Augsburg College and Luther Seminary in the Faith in the City program; and Wartburg College and seminary.

This church remains deeply committed to our shared mission in higher education. It is a shared commitment that calls for constant exploration, imagination, and mutual accountability. It is a shared commitment to which I pledge my leadership and for which your continued leadership is vitally important. As competitive as higher education is today, I am convinced that a commitment to our deep and abiding relationship and our shared mission will strengthen each of the twenty-eight colleges and universities and the contribution we as the ELCA are making to the common good and the life of the world.

Works Cited

Conner, W. Robert. "The Right Time and Place for Big Questions." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 9 June 2006: B8+.

Moe-Lobeda, Cynthia. *Public Church for the Life of the World.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004.

Sittler, Joseph. *Gravity and Grace: Reflections and Provocations*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.

JAIME SCHILLINGER

Currents

HERE WE ARE this beautiful morning in March, at a nexus of three currents of life pulling us into their rhythms. First, it is spring in Minnesota, and we can feel the earth starting to stir, starting to grow and green. Second, as faculty, staff and students we're back from spring break heading into the final seven weeks of school. There is a lot of work to be done, and we may be uncertain about what the future holds, nevertheless, we know that the future will come, the end of the school year will be upon us before we know it, and we'll be on our way even if we don't know where we'll be going. Third, for those of us who find strength and meaning in the church, we're fresh from the joy and the drama of Holy Week and its passion—the crucifixion, the empty grave, and the resurrection. In this third rhythm, as with the rhythms of spring and the school year, we find ourselves asking "What is happening now? Where is this current pulling us?"

In the midst of these three currents, one might be forgiven for feeling somewhat overwhelmed! Spring, at least for me, is quite enough. It is difficult for me to concentrate. My senses are awakening after the longest slumber. I can smell the earth that has been dormant for too long coming back to life and hear the birds that have been absent. The cycle of birth and life is beginning again, and it makes me giddy.

Perhaps we might content ourselves with celebrating this rebirth of spring. Perhaps we ought to refuse attempts to synthesize its meaning with our own personal journeys, or the mythos of a religious narrative. Maybe spring should be protected against a religious desire to baptize and control it's unruly energy. ee cummings, for example, seems to urge this resistance when he writes to the earth:

> *"how often have religions taken thee upon their scraggy knees*
> *squeezing and buffeting thee that thou mightest conceive gods*
> *(but true to the incomparable couch of death thy rhythmic lover*
> *thou answerest them only with spring)"* (O sweet spontaneous)

Alternatively, if the brute naturalism of cummings is unpersuasive, we might try to connect spring with the rhythms of the Christian life, reading into its significance the innocence of the garden, as does Gerald Manley Hopkins when he wonders,

> *what is all this juice and all this joy?*
> *A strain of the earth's sweet beginning*
> *In Eden garden –*
> *Have, get, before it cloy*
> *Before it cloud, Christ, land, and sour with sinning*
> *Innocent mind and Mayday in girl and boy. (Spring)*

But suppose you hesitate at this tug of spring; you might not find it so innocent. With Edna St. Vincent Millay, you might acknowledge that

> *The smell of the earth is good*
> *It is apparent that there is no death*

And yet, as she does, you might require better answers, noting

> *But what does that signify?*
> *Not only underground are the brains of men*
> *Eaten by maggots...*
> *It is not enough that yearly, down this hill,*
> *April comes like an idiot,*
> *babbling and strewing flowers.*

JAIME SCHILLINGER *is Assistant Professor of Religion at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota. This talk was presented on March 29, 2005.*

I leave it to you to decide which current you feel most strongly today, whether you feel swept up by the pulse and eternal rhythm of nature, or can also feel the pull of career, academy, and religious narrative. Regardless, we find ourselves here together this morning in the midst of spring and the Easter season, being called into a future that is redolent with promises of unruly growth, graduation and vocation, a future that is coming but a future that we cannot predict or control.

And the passage from Scripture read this morning, I'd like to suggest, speaks beautifully to our situation. A fragment of a poem taken from the Song of Songs, it offers another poetic voice to add to those I've mentioned. (Actually it offers two voices, two rather bold young lovers, a bride and a bridegroom in the P.C. version.

The young woman imagines her beloved, and in her anticipation compares him to spring itself bursting forth in the land, a gazelle bounding over the hills, the very picture of exquisite desire.

And in that bucolic setting, she tells us, she hears her beloved calling to her. He uses the occasion of the tempestuous promise of spring, to call:

Rise up, my darling; my fair one, come away.
For see, the winter is past! ....
Rise up, my darling; my fair one, come away.

To where is she being called? Why can't he come to her where she is? And, if, following our Jewish and Christian forbearers, we read ourselves into this fragment somehow, we must also ask: To where are we being called in the spring? And who is calling us? And if we respond, will we be found?

With the right kind of imagination, I think, we *ought* to read ourselves and this spring morning into this biblical passage. Whether you manage to feel all three of the currents carrying us forward this morning or only one or two, I would like to suggest that at this very moment you are being stirred up to the rush and rhythm of something like love, provoked by a promise, called out of yourself by someone else.

Even if we were to focus only on the academic current, the language of love should hardly seem strange. The erotic attraction of truth and beauty and goodness has been an essential element of true liberal-arts learning since Plato penned dialogues like the Symposium and the Phaedrus. You may not realize it, but when you sit down to contemplate that end of the semester seminar paper, I'm suggesting, you're being called by a kind of love. And how implausible is it really, to extend this excitement to the sense of spiritual journey that your life ought to have—how surprised should you be to discover that your late night jaunt to the L & M, or your chance encounter with a homeless woman on a street corner in the city was a moment for you to experience the agitation of new life presenting itself to you as awakening desire. Why can't this call be understood in terms of the promise and frustrations of love?

Finally, suppose that you understand your spring, your academic search for knowledge, and your spiritual search for vocation in the context of Easter, suppose that you are flush with the surprise and joy of an empty grave. Consider the astonishing mix of terror and joy the two disciples felt as a result of their encounter on the road to Emmaus. Is it really so implausible to understand the provocations lying in wait for you this season in the same way? As hoped for but unpredictable meetings with the new surprising life to be found in your risen Lord?

In conclusion, let me return to the Song of Songs and observe an important point essential to understanding the kind of love that the text urges. While I've invited us all to read the text with imagination, we cheat ourselves if we spiritualize and allegorize too much or too quickly. Particularly as Christians, we may read the Songs as an allegory of Christ and the church; even so, I don't think we should ignore the fact that the language of love here is the language of love in the spring, it is the language of flirtation, it depends on felt desire in its raw form—insistent, straining, delighting in and surrendering to and searching out the concrete details. She has more hope than cummings will allow. While the lover who calls the woman may be a symbol of Christ to Christians or God to Jews, the main character of the Songs is not the woman's lover. It is undoubtedly the woman herself, and while she is young, she is not an innocent child to be comforted by a father figure who will keep her safe and secure. So the poet of the Songs offers a counter to Hopkins as well as cummings. It is this bold woman's desire and her trust in this desire that is felt most vividly in the Songs. And if you read the rest of the Songs, you discover that her felt desire is not easily resolved. Hers is not a love of blessed assurance. Thus, while she is more hopeful than St. Vincent Millay, she does not respond to her request for better answers with pat guarantees. The woman searches for her lover, she tries to answer his call, but she does not seem to find him nor is it clear that she is finally found. This is not to say that she is not truly both lover and beloved; it is only to avoid simplifying or sentimentalizing the desire and love that animates her.

What does it mean then to read the Songs in the spring at St. Olaf? Like the woman in the Songs, you are being caught up in something and called by an elusive promise. "It is spring," the voice says, "rise up and come away." This love that can animate us may not be easy or smooth, but it is there if we pay attention and respond, it is coursing through our lives, pulling us into its current, as sure as spring is coming and as sure as our lives will continue to unfold and, we hope and pray, blossom.

Guest Editor | MADELEINE FORELL MARSHALL

FOUR PAPERS COLLECTED in this issue of *Intersections* represent the 70th annual meeting of the venerable Association of Lutheran College Faculties (ALCF) held at California Lutheran University in October 2006.

The topic of the meeting at CLU was intentionally and provocatively vague: *Identity and Diversity in the Lutheran College*. What identity? What diversity? What college? In fact, as the papers came in, Lutheran identity tended to be as much conceptual and pedagogical as historical. Differences among the colleges emerged in both the presentations and in the accompanying discussions.

These essays are observed from markedly distinct disciplinary and personal vantage points as well. Randall Balmer, the distinguished scholar of American evangelicalism and our keynote speaker, recalls his own experience as an undergraduate at a conservative evangelical college and considers that formation in light of his subsequent achievements and study of evangelical culture. His perspective from outside Lutheran higher education balances the insiders' perspectives and may remind the reader that Lutherans are not the only purveyors of Christian liberal arts, and also that the wide world of evangelical religion is not quite as hostile as we might suppose.

Storm Bailey, our representative philosopher and a professor at Luther College, reflects on specifically Lutheran identity as contributing to notions of academic integrity, with particular attention to our understanding of academic freedom. Reporting on fruitful "Faith and Learning" discussions at Luther, he writes of the usefulness of faculty from different disciplines and diverse religious backgrounds addressing "Lutheran questions."

In his essay, José Marichal, a CLU political scientist, observes the odd mutual failure of campus diversity initiatives to collaborate or even meaningfully to connect with those promoting service learning or other sorts of educational civic engagement. He maintains that a better understanding of both democracy and the Lutheran call into the world can and should draw these initiatives together, enhancing the education we offer our students.

Pamela Brubaker, who teaches ethics at CLU, projects our understanding of diversity onto a global screen, where the economics of globalization challenge and compromise universal human rights. As we seek to educate students for critical citizenship—a particularly Lutheran project—she maintains we can and must help them to understand and value the social, economic, cultural, civil and political rights of people.

From a California perspective (which the venue encouraged), I find it very interesting that, of the four talks collected here, the two delivered by scholar-teachers living and working "back East" seem most anxious about the academic standing of Christian liberal arts education. Professors Balmer and Bailey, while valiantly and persuasively championing the cause, assume a measure of suspicion and even antagonism toward Lutheran higher education. In contrast, Professors Marichal and Brubaker, our representative Westerners, assume Lutheran identity as a critical advantage, take diversity as a Lutheran given and proceed to define and elaborate some of the challenges. Perhaps the fact that we inhabit a region where white is a minority and monolithic Lutheran identity only a memory explains the difference. Certainly such geographical difference, if it is significant, supports the usefulness of ongoing national conversations made possible by the ALCF and by this journal. Indeed, the long series of conference topics and venues, available on the ALCF website reads like something of a cultural history of Lutheran higher education: http://www.lutherancolleges.org/alcf/history/about.htm.

A number of items that played an important part in this conference are lamentably missing from this collection, a reminder how ephemeral some of our most interesting projects and discussions often are. Four professors from Wartburg College [Cynthia Bane (Psychology), Kit Kleinhans (Religion), Penni Pier (Communication Arts) and Fred Waldstein (Political Science)] reported on a cross-curricular faculty and staff development seminar on the "Lutheran Heritage." Then there was a dramatic dialogue written, performed and directed by their colleague Kathleen Book. Guy Erwin performed the role of Philip Melanchthon in "'No Child Left Behind' Meets Philip Melanchthon." A concluding discussion encouraged classroom applications of the many ideas that we had entertained.

The 2007 annual meeting of the Association of Lutheran College Faculties will be held October 5-7, 2007 at Newberry College. This year's theme is "Beyond 'Whatever': Values Based Learning in Lutheran Higher Education." For further information about the conference, please contact Professor Wayne Kannaday (Wayne.Kannaday@newberry.edu).

MADELEINE FORELL MARSHALL, *Senior Fellow, Segerhammar Center for Faith and Culture Lecturer in Religion and English at California Lutheran University.*

RANDALL BALMER

Sojourners in a Pluralistic Land: The Promise and Peril of Christian Higher Education

I AM CERTAIN to make some enemies here before the evening is over, so I might as well get started. Despite my respect for church-related schools, including Lutheran schools, the schools of the Christian Reformed Church, and even the parochial school system mandated by the Third Plenary Council of 1884, and despite my strong conviction that parents have every right to educate their children anywhere they please (including at home), I am—and I have been for nearly half a century—a passionate advocate for public education at the elementary, junior high, and high school level. Public schools, originally known as "common schools" in the nineteenth century, may be the only place in our society where children from various racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds can come together and, in the context of both the classroom and the playground, learn to get along with one another in at least a measure of comity. That sounds to me like a recipe for democracy, and it is one that has served us well for most of American history.

Although I acknowledge that what I have just described is an ideal view, and that public education is in real trouble today, I prefer to view the glass as half full rather than half empty. We need a place in America where children drawn from different backgrounds can meet on a more-or-less equal footing and learn the rudiments of democracy. Public schools, for all their faults, provide that space. I worry very much that sending Jewish children to Jewish schools, Catholic kids to parochial schools, evangelical kids to Christian schools (or home schooling), and the children of affluent parents to elite private schools leads inevitably to a further Balkanization of American society, which cannot help but have deleterious effects. I believe that if we, as a society, care anything about the future of democracy, especially in a pluralistic context, we cannot afford to give up on public education.

I realize full well the implications of what I am saying for people of faith. It means, at the very least, that parents and churches have to bear more of the responsibility for the religious formation of their children. That's not a simple task, especially in the context of a media-saturated, peer-driven society. And I also recognize the ways in which religious schools—whether they be Jewish, Lutheran, Catholic, or Christian Reformed—have safeguarded the ethnic identity and particularity of specific populations. That is not a negligible consideration, and I acknowledge its importance. I first became aware of this when I studied the religious dynamics in colonial New York City. The Collegiate School, which is still in operation on the upper west side of Manhattan, was founded by the Dutch Reformed Church in 1628. Shortly after the English Conquest of 1664, Trinity Church, a congregation of the Church of England, established

> "Parents and churches have to bear more of the responsibility for the religious formation of their children."

RANDALL BALMER, *a widely-published scholar of American evangelical religion, is the Ann Whitney Olin Professor of American Religion at Barnard College, Columbia University.*

Trinity School. The fortunes of the Collegiate School suffered thereafter so that by the middle of the eighteenth century, the Dutch congregation appealed to the ecclesiastical authorities in the Netherlands for an English-speaking minister; the younger generation, educated at Trinity School, could no longer understand the Dutch language.

Such is the power of education in transmitting both faith and culture. I acknowledge that, and I honor its importance. Still, despite these considerations, I stand by my defense of public education, while, at the same time, I support the prerogative of parents to educate their children in any venue they see fit.

Having said that, and although it may sound counterintuitive, I am equally committed to the importance of Christian higher education. Some of this, I realize, is autobiographical. I grew up in parsonages in rural Minnesota, Michigan, and Iowa, where I attended public schools—and I happen to think that I am none the worse for wear. For college, however, I went to a Christian liberal arts college and had there (on balance) a wonderful experience, and it is on that experience that I should like to focus the balance of my remarks this evening.

A few more autobiographical details—of necessity, I'm afraid. I very nearly didn't attend college at all; I had started a small business as a teenager, and I was convinced at the time that this was what I wanted to pursue as a career. My father, however, urged me to think about higher education. Finally I agreed, first, to attend a state university within commuting distance so that I could continue operating my business. Then, succumbing to a bit more pressure, I relented and submitted a last-minute application to Trinity College in the North Shore suburbs of Chicago.

The decision to attend college was, I see now, the first of many Robert Frost moments in my life, where I stood at the fork in the yellow woods and contemplated two pathways, both of which seemed agreeable at the time. I have occasionally reflected on "The Road Not Taken," and I imagine that, all things considered, I probably chose the better route. And what if I had chosen the state university? All of this is speculation, of course, but I suspect that, given my rootedness in evangelicalism, I would have burrowed deeper into the subculture, this vast and interlocking network of congregations, denominations, Bible camps, Bible institutes, mission societies, and publishing houses that was constructed in earnest during the middle decades of the twentieth century to protect innocents like me from the depredations of the larger world, a world that my parents believed was both corrupt and corrupting.

There is safety within the evangelical subculture, I'll not deny it—or any religious subculture, for that matter. My religious upbringing—in the home, at church and youth group and Sunday school, at vacation Bible school, and Bible camp—had provided me with a firm grounding in the faith, and I might very comfortably have remained safely within the bosom of the subculture.

Instead, I attended a Christian liberal arts college, one supported by my own denomination. Like many such institutions, it began as a Bible institute, but it evolved, as these schools often do, into an accredited four-year college. (It now bears the rather grand moniker of Trinity International University—having passed, apparently, on Trinity Intergalactic University!)

Soon after I shambled onto campus in early September 1972, I recognized that Trinity was an unusual place, at least by the standards of Christian higher education. A wise and forward-looking dean had hired a cohort of young, energetic, newly-minted PhDs who challenged the presuppositions of their students, most of whom hailed from politically and theologically conservative households. But they did so not as provocateurs but as fellow-travelers, and they did so not with the intention of robbing us of our faith altogether. As a student, as someone whose notion of rebellion was to wear blue jeans to the Sunday-evening service, the experience of probing the parameters of the faith and questioning the shibboleths of the subculture was unsettling. But it was also bracing, and it changed me in ways that even now, in late middle age, I appreciate only in part.

Beginning with the publication of the first edition of *Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory: A Journey into the Evangelical Subculture in America* (1989), I've heard from dozens of people over the years who were reared evangelical but who left the faith, many of them in late adolescence. Their letters are poignant, even plaintive. They reminisce, page after single-spaced page, about their religious background—Sunday school and singing songs around the campfire. They express appreciation for their upbringing and sadness for having left the faith. Some left because of intellectual doubts or because of sexual orientation or because of what they perceived as hypocrisy in the ranks of the religious leadership. More recently, I hear utter disgust at the ways in which the leaders of the Religious Right have delivered the faith captive to right-wing politics.

Finally, these correspondents express a kind of envy of someone who has been able to retain his faith. For some, those who perceive me as an intellectual, the fact that I teach at a prestigious university deepens the conundrum because they assume, I guess, that no one with academic credentials can simultaneously be an advocate for the faith.

I respond carefully to these letters, and I acknowledge that even a college sophomore can explain faith away as hysteria or delusion or the search for a father figure. Then I generally explain my decision years ago that I would not allow the canons of Enlightenment rationalism be the final arbiter of

truth. I elect to inhabit an enchanted universe where there are forces at work beyond my understanding or control. I wouldn't live anywhere else.

I don't know whether or not my testimony is compelling, but I've come to reflect on why it is that I've been able to retain the faith when so many of my contemporaries have lost or discarded theirs. I suspect that, as with all such matters, a variety of factors come into play, but I have to believe that my formation at a Christian liberal arts college was crucial. Trinity College was far from perfect, but I think the place struck the right balance in a number of ways.

First, I think that any such institution faces the challenge of navigating between the Scylla of secularism and the Charybdis of sectarianism—although I think that channel is wider than is commonly believed. I heard a lot of rhetoric about "the integration of faith and learning" when I was an undergraduate—a lot of rhetoric. It was an effective mantra, a comforting piety, but I was never exactly sure what it meant, nor do I know today.

The dangers inherent in such pieties are obvious, and they have been amply illustrated in recent years in the calls for a kind of repristinization of America's educational institutions. Yale is no longer a safe haven for Congregationalists, the lament goes, or Princeton for Presbyterians. No one will argue that many of the nation's élite institutions of higher education are still the "nurseries of piety" that their founders intended. But the accompanying argument that people of faith should be granted special pleading in the academy is, to say the least, suspect. I will never contend that the academy is a perfect meritocrary—I have my own quiver of anecdotes and more than a few bruises to refute that—but people of faith need to play by the same rules and abide by the same standards of academic scholarship as everyone else.

For example, as a person of faith and as a historian of religion in America, I believe that the hand of God was present in the event historians call the Great Awakening, a revival of piety that swept along the Atlantic seaboard in the 1730s and 1740s. When I teach the Great Awakening, however, or when I write about the topic, I describe the historical, social, and cultural circumstances that gave rise to the Great Awakening, and I quote the perceptions of contemporaries that it was an event of supernatural inspiration. But for me to attribute the revival solely to divine providence would be to default on my responsibilities as a historian.

Or, to take another recent example, consider the case for intelligent design, a topic I cover extensively in *Thy Kingdom Come*. For that chapter, I framed the issue by describing a debate at Princeton University between Lee Silver, a molecular biologist at Princeton, and William Dembski, a kind of high priest of intelligent design and the chief evangelist for the intelligent design movement. I made it clear in my narrative that, as a person of faith, I happen to believe in intelligent design (or something very close to it), although I confess that I've grown accustomed over the years to referring to the "intelligent designer" simply as "God." I rehearsed Dembski's very impressive academic credentials and suggested that, although I laid no claims to being a theologian or a philosopher, he struck me as a very competent theologian and philosopher. But the issue is the validity of Dembski's assertion that intelligent design is science and therefore should be taught in the science classroom.

If he means to be a scientist, Dembski should be prepared to make his case as a scientist and not angle for special pleading, as he did in the debate at Princeton. He argued, in effect, that because he is a person of faith he should therefore be exempted from the mores of inquiry peculiar to the discipline he claims as his own. As I emphasized in the chapter, I have no objections whatsoever to the teaching of intelligent design in colleges or universities; in fact, one of my PhD students, with my blessing, taught a course in intelligent design at Columbia this past summer. But the appropriate venue for such inquiry is the religion classroom or the philosophy seminar—at least until Dembski or someone can make a case that intelligent design is science. (Even the judge in the Dover, Pennsylvania, intelligent design case, a George W. Bush appointee, found this claim ludicrous. By peddling their theological claims as science, Dembski and the intelligent design advocates seek a double standard: "Hey look, I'm a scientist! I don't do any of the things that other scientists do, I refuse to submit my work for peer review, I don't ask the same questions that other scientists ask, and I don't want to play by the rules of scientific inquiry, but, trust me, I'm a scientist!"

That, I submit, is no way to integrate faith and learning. It fails to abide by the professional standards of the academy, and, more important, it demeans the faith because it suggests that faith needs the imprimatur of science in order to be valid. I emphatically reject that notion.

If that sort of intellectual dishonesty represents the Charybdis of sectarianism, the Scylla of secularism at institutions of Christian higher education is a kind of intellectual arrogance that is allergic to expressions of piety. I understand this aversion, especially because I grew up within evangelicalism, where piety tends too often toward the rote and formulaic. I too participated in this cult of intellectualism, especially in graduate school—a reaction, no doubt, to my upbringing.

Engendering spirituality and encouraging piety is a tricky business, and I've never trusted institutions with this task. Institutions, in fact, are remarkably poor vessels of piety, in my experience; they tend to quash it more often than abet it, so

the programmatic approach of chapels, chaplains, and spiritual emphasis weeks—commendable and important though they may be—falls short, in my judgment.

I turn instead to the incarnational expressions of faith and piety. What I found most effective during my intellectual and spiritual development in college was the example of my mentors. These were women and men of deep and abiding faith who were also manifestly human. They were unafraid to question their faith or to express their doubts, but the best of them also modeled for me a piety that found expression not only in declarations of belief but in sincere intellectual engagement and lives of integrity. They were my teachers in the fullest sense of the word. Their example impressed me deeply and affected me profoundly, and I maintain my friendships with many of these mentors to this day, thirty years after graduation.

Aside from the twin perils of secularity, which manifests itself in intellectualism, and sectarianism, which posits a kind of alternate academic universe, the final peril of Christian higher education is insularity. Shirley Nelson's troubling novel, *The Last Year of the War*, a thinly fictionalized account of student life at Moody Bible Institute, illustrates this copiously, and although I'm certainly aware of the differences between Bible schools and Christian liberal arts colleges, I think Nelson's novel is certainly worth reading. I recall that I seldom read a newspaper while I was in college, and I had little interaction with the larger world during the academic year, aside from my jobs in the community. Add to that the homogeneity that tends very often to afflict these schools, and the problem of insularity becomes acute.

"The final peril of Christian higher education is insularity."

I ran across an extreme example of this during my visit to Patrick Henry College last December. Patrick Henry was founded in 2000 by Michael Farris to provide a place where parents who home-schooled their children could secure a college education free from such alien influences as feminism or Darwinism, a place where, in effect, parents could rest assured that their children would never encounter an idea that the parents would find objectionable or even questionable. The school's website (www.phc.edu), for example, informs parents that all "biology, Bible or other courses at PHC dealing with creation will teach creation from the understanding of Scripture that God's creative work, as described in Genesis 1:1-31, was completed in six twenty-four hour days." Students who attend Patrick Henry College, moreover, pledge to "reserve sexual activity for the sanctity of marriage" and promise to "seek and obtain parental permission when pursuing a romantic relationship."

Patrick Henry, as I said, is an extreme example of insularity, but the unfortunate corollary is that Patrick Henry College also aspires to train America's leaders for the twenty-first century. Michael Farris, the founder and now the chancellor of the school, told the *New York Times* that the sentiment he hears most often from parents is that I want my kid to be on the Supreme Court someday. Farris added that, if we get enough kids into the "farm system," that will happen. Since 2002, Patrick Henry College, a school with an enrollment of only two hundred, has placed twenty-four of its students as White House interns; a larger number have served internships in other governmental agencies and on the Congressional staffs of elected officials sympathetic to the Religious Right.

These are the people who aspire to lead the United States, this gorgeously pluralistic nation, in the twenty-first century. Because of their home-schooling and their experience at Patrick Henry College, these students most likely have never had any sustained or significant interaction with anyone outside of their own cohort of white, middle-class evangelicals. Because of the insular nature of their upbringing and their undergraduate education, they have never encountered an idea or an argument—feminism, for instance, or civil rights for lesbians and gays or Darwinism or environmentalism—except in caricature. As I ask in *Thy Kingdom Come*, I wonder how many graduates of Patrick Henry College have ever read *Das Kapital* or *The Feminine Mystique* or *Fast Food Nation* or *Catcher in the Rye* or *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*. How many of them have watched the "Eyes on the Prize" documentary or "The Future of Food" or "What Happened to the Electric Car?" What goes on at Patrick Henry is not so much education as indoctrination.

I emphasize (a second time) that Patrick Henry College is an extreme example of insularity, but it points to a real danger faced by institutions of Christian higher education. Instead of a hot house, I prefer to think of Christian liberal arts colleges as halfway houses, a place where students reared in a religious subculture can begin to interact with the wider world. They experiment with new ideas and try on new personas (which, of course, is the task of every adolescent). They interact with the larger culture not by plunging directly into the sea of pluralism and secularity, but by means of tentative forays—dipping a toe in the water, teasing the waves, and then maybe a few dog paddles into the current, but never far from a mentor navigating the same waters.

This is my vision for Christian higher education, a venue where students thoroughly grounded in the religion of their parents can begin to interact with the world outside of their own

subculture—not from a posture of fear or defensiveness, though some of that is inevitable, but from a position of strength and curiosity and engagement. Are there risks inherent in such a strategy? Of course there are, and we all have stories of those who have lost their faith in the process. But my experience, not to mention my theology, tells me that we have to trust the process and, more important, trust that Jesus will ultimately gather his children unto himself.

> "This is my vision for Christian higher education ..."

If I am right that Christian liberal arts colleges represent a good place to make an effective transition from the subculture to the larger world, one key component for that transition is exposure to pluralism and the avoidance of insularity. How to do that? Admissions officers, in my experience, make a good-faith effort to recruit students beyond the usual cohort, but the competition for qualified students of color is often fierce. But there are other ways to combat insularity and to expose students to the universe beyond their subculture.

In a perfect world, one with unlimited resources, I'd start by providing every student with a daily subscription to the *New York Times*—not because the *New York Times* is perfect or inerrant, but because it opens a window to the larger world and it instills the importance of becoming conversant with developments beyond the campus. I'd encourage faculty to expose students to ideas other than those sanctioned by the religious subculture—and to do so with primary sources rather than through the lens of secondary treatments. Internships are also effective (Patrick Henry College is right about that), but let's encourage students to think creatively about their activities outside of campus. Non-profit (and non-religious) agencies, environmental networks, political campaigns, local government, hospice, councils of churches, interfaith agencies—all of these expose students to people and ideas beyond their own subculture.

And it's time also to think more creatively about the meaning of pluralism. Not only African Americans, for example, but Hispanic Americans and Native Americans and South Asians and people of different ethnic backgrounds. Diversity comes in many colors, creeds, and ages. I would love to see Christian liberal arts colleges construct condominiums and townhouses for retirees on or adjacent to their campuses. Invite seniors to participate fully in campus life, to attend classes and athletic and cultural events, and interact with students in the dining halls. And can you imagine the volunteer work force they would contribute to the campus? One of the real scandals of American society is the way we warehouse the elderly in nursing homes and neglect them, rather than draw on their experience and wisdom. And, who knows, maybe one of the students will one day point us to a better way of treating our elders.

I have no regrets whatsoever for choosing the path that led me to a Christian liberal arts college all those years ago. My undergraduate education shaped me in important ways by exposing me gradually to a larger world that I never would have encountered had I remained sequestered in my religious subculture—or certainly would have encountered on very different terms. I'm grateful for that. I'm grateful for the example of my mentors, fellow-travelers in the enterprise of sustaining the faith in an environment that all too frequently is hostile to faith. The whole experience of baccalaureate studies made my faith stronger and more resilient, but it also ensured that I could never again hide my light under a bushel or burrow back into the insularity of the subculture.

I function today as a person of faith in a pluralistic context. As such, I simultaneously inhabit two worlds, and I embrace them both—sometimes with fear and trembling, but more often with gusto and enthusiasm. I wouldn't have it any other way.

Works Cited

Balmer, Randall H. *Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory: A Journey into the Evangelical Subculture in America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1989.

Balmer, Randall H. *Thy Kingdom Come: How the Religious Right Distorts the Faith and Threatens America, An Evangelical's Lament*. New York: Basic Books, 2006.

Nelson, Shirley. *The Last Year of the War*. New York: Harper, 1978.

STORM BAILEY

Lutheran Identity, Academic Integrity, and Religious Diversity

I WOULD BE PLEASED to discover that my approach to the question of "Lutheran Identity and Academic Integrity" is shaped by an outdated concern. I am concerned about the assumption that religious commitment in general—and Christian commitment in particular—threatens purely academic aspirations. If this is no longer the dominant view in American higher education, that fact is very good news. Even so, some—perhaps some few—continue to suppose that, when it comes to religious identity and academic integrity, the only real question is which one will give way to the other. I want to say that neither *has* to give way to the other. In fact, I want to say more than that. If we are past the point where people say "that can't be a good school because it's religious," another sentiment may still be common: "that's a pretty good school in spite of being religious." I propose to emphasize ways in which Lutheran identity might *promote* our academic aspirations; that is to say, I want to suggest the possibility that someone might say "that's a pretty good school *because* it's religious."

In suggesting this possibility, I'll mention three kinds of considerations: academic virtues, institutional or curricular virtues, and the matter of academic freedom. In spite of the fact that religious (or Christian, or Lutheran) colleges and universities have not always exhibited excellence in these areas, not only can they do so, but they can do so for emphatically religious (or Christian, or Lutheran) reasons. I will try to make this case fairly quickly, because even if it is persuasive, questions should remain about the third aspect of my professed topic (and the emphasis of this conference): diversity. I will focus on religious diversity because it may seem most out of line with the argument so far proposed. After all, if whatever we are up to is a substantively Lutheran mission, doesn't it stand to reason that we need Lutherans to pull it off, and that Lutherans are the ones who will enjoy the fruits of it? I don't think so. Actually, what I think is that we don't need *only* Lutherans. I will argue in the concluding discussion of religious diversity that the people who can say "that's a pretty good school because it's Lutheran or Christian" don't have to be Lutheran or Christian to say it—if it's true.

Academic Integrity: Academic and Curricular Virtues

Recent critiques of Enlightenment ideals such as individualism, objectivity and certainty have carried over to academic practices and institutions which bear the stamp of those ideals, and I should confess at the outset that I do not side wholeheartedly with critics of the Enlightenment academy. Nevertheless, even if one is enamored of individualism, the communal nature of learning and the pursuit of knowledge is undeniable. Further, no matter how significant the ideals of objectivity and certainty may be, it must be regarded as folly to ignore the limits of finite (and interested) reason—bound by perspective even if reality is not. Since this is the case, the academic enterprise—learning, research, teaching—requires communities in which the virtues of humility, hospitality and charity (to name but a few) are deeply ingrained. Christian communities are not the only ones in which these virtues ought to flourish, but they should be exemplary ones.

STORM BAILEY, *Associate Professor of Philosophy at Luther College, recently published a related essay, "Uneasy Partners? Religion and Academics" in* Academe *(92:4).*

Others have articulated this more elegantly and in more detail than I can pretend here, and I'll refer to just a couple of familiar examples. Almost fifteen years ago, Mark Schwehn described how spiritual virtues are indispensable to academic inquiry and emphasized the role of Christian communities of learning in *Exiles from Eden: Religion and the Academic Vocation in America*. More recently, Richard Hughes has elaborated how Christian faith can sustain the life of the mind in his book of that title. Hughes claims that "a scholar's Christian faith can express itself in the highest and finest kind of scholarship—a scholarship committed to search for truth, to engage a variety of conversation partners, to critique all perspectives, even one's own, and to nurture creative imagination" (11). When (appropriately for our present discussion) he focuses on the Lutheran tradition as a whole, Hughes has this to say:

> The truth is, the Lutheran tradition possesses some of the most potent theological resources for sustaining the life of the mind that one can imagine. It encourages dialogue between the Christian faith and the world of ideas, fosters intellectual humility, engenders a healthy suspicion of absolutes, and helps create a conversation in which all partners are taken seriously (93).

On the subject of teaching and pedagogy, I need only mention the familiar work of Parker Palmer. Though much of this work is not explicitly Christian or religious, I agree with both Schwehn and Hughes that all of it is deeply and substantively rooted in Palmer's Quaker heritage. A more explicit illustration from a colleague at a Lutheran college is Lendol Calder's "For Teachers to Live, Professors Must Die" presented at Baylor University's *Christianity and the Soul of the University* conference in 2004. Calder powerfully applies to classrooms the claim from the Gospel of John that "unless a grain of wheat falls into the ground and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies it bears much fruit."

But it isn't the case that just telling people how to live Christianity (or religion) tells people how to teach. The very act of asking what religion has to do with what goes on in our schools can move us to analysis of our pedagogical aspirations and methods. The most substantive and illuminating public discussion of teaching I have ever been in at Luther College was just a month or so ago, and it wasn't in a workshop on pedagogy. It occurred among a group of second-year faculty from a wide range of disciplines and religious perspectives, convened for a workshop on the mission of the college and on what we tend to call "the dialogue between faith and learning." Talking about the interactions of persons with widely varying fundamental commitments in our institution led us directly—and repeatedly—to the central questions of what we seek to accomplish in our classrooms, and what means and methods will make it happen. This is a specific way in which our institutional commitment to questions of religious identity invigorates and enhances our academic work and aspirations.

"Institutional commitment to questions of religious identity invigorates and enhances our academic work and aspirations."

The example of Luther College's faith and learning discussions (with the reader's indulgence) will also serve to introduce one way in which religious identity can enhance what I've labeled institutional or curricular virtues. In the course of our wide-ranging discussion about the meaning and implications of the Lutheran academic tradition, contributions by workshop members were often prefaced by phrases like "As a biologist I..." or "In Social Work we..." or "historians sometimes..." The idea here is that the nature of the conversation not only elicited varying disciplinary perspectives on a common idea, but also required the articulation of what that disciplinary perspective consists of and how, to some extent, it works internally. The fact that such articulation is necessary even among faculty and that opportunity for conversation that requires it is increasingly rare reflects increasing fragmentation along disciplinary lines in higher education. In their *Devil's Dictionary for Higher Education*, Cary Nelson and Stephen Watt have labeled the extremes of this trend as "entrepreneurial disciplinarity," a circumstance which despairs of identifying any common mission even within disciplines. Of the many ways in which liberal arts colleges might emulate the habits of faculty-producing research universities, surely this is one of the more pernicious.

The discussion in our faculty workshop on faith and learning illustrates a more general principle. Institutional religious commitment or identity serves the academic goals of learning communities by inviting—or provoking—conversation across disciplines, and providing a framework for integrating disciplinary pursuits and perspectives. Insofar as the core claims of the institution's religious tradition cut across disciplinary lines, and insofar as those claims are taken seriously, they provide a set of questions serving as integration or contact points for the various elements of an academic course of study. (These core claims or questions serve this academic function for *all* members of the academic community—whether individually within the affiliated religious tradition or not.)

Note that, if the religious commitment of the institution is just lip-service, if the core questions are seen as imposed on some by others, or if those questions are widely considered irrelevant to subjects of substantive academic inquiry, then this particular academic benefit is very unlikely to result. It seems in this case, then, that the *more substantive* the religious commitment, the greater the academic benefit. Substantive religious commitment in an institution means, in part, a faculty and administration which take the core questions of the tradition seriously. Note also that respect for these questions and attention to them do not imply an imposed consensus about their answers. In fact, the goal of integrating a course of academic study around key common questions would seem to be served by the broadest possible range of perspectives on the questions. This is a key consideration in the matter of religious diversity, to which I will return below. Before ending the discussion of religious identity and academic integrity, however, the crucial issue of academic freedom must be addressed.

Academic Integrity: Free Inquiry

I won't beat around the bush about this. One of the reasons why we have to talk about academic freedom in this context (and one of the reasons why apprehension about religion and the academy may be well-founded) is a very real history of abuse of this principle by religiously-affiliated colleges and universities—in the name of their religious identity. It is by no means the case that only religious institutions, or that all religious institutions, have violated this principle. Nor is it true, in my view, that every religious restriction is an unjustified or abusive violation of academic freedom. It is nevertheless the case that religiously-based violations of academic freedom too often occur. Some think that, for this reason alone, religious commitment must be considered a threat to the academic integrity of educational institutions. I don't think that's true, and I'll say why in terms of (at least one version of) Christian commitment.

The preeminent banner under which academic freedom is promoted in the United States is the American Association of University Professors' *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*. Justification for policies urged in the document is offered, in part, as follows:

> Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.
>
> Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning.

The *1940 Statement* advocates academic freedom on grounds that the principle is crucial to the search for truth. I want to make it clear that this line of justification for free inquiry does not put it at odds with Christian commitment. Insofar as principles of free inquiry aid the pursuit of truth, scholars and institutions committed to the Christian tradition should be vigorous advocates for academic freedom—given the importance of truth-seeking to that tradition.

For the sake of brevity, I will not make even a cursory attempt to survey or explain the role of truth-seeking in the Christian tradition. Allow me simply to represent this long-standing (even if recently underemphasized) aspect of the tradition with Cardinal Newman's claim from *The Idea of A University* that "Truth...is the main object of Religion." (Discourse II.5) This will suffice because the phrase not only represents Christian truth-seeking but is also likely to incite just the sort of suspicion that we are undertaking to address. Why is it that academically-inclined people get nervous when Christians start talking about *truth*?

One reason (and here we might go all the way back to the notorious—even if abused—example of Galileo) is that authoritative professions to *have* the truth can be taken as grounds to stop looking for it, or asking questions, or listening to others. Since this attitude has too commonly accompanied strong religious commitment (both in- and outside the academy) it has undoubtedly encouraged widespread resistance to the notion of truth being "the main object of religion," and a corresponding lack of appreciation for Christianity's conceptual capacity to undergird principles and policies of academic freedom.

Nevertheless, an attitude which impedes the search for truth because truth has already been found fails to take sufficient account of uncertainty. Mill makes this point in his classic argument for free expression: "All silencing of discussion," he writes in *On Liberty*, "is an assumption of infallibility" (17). To shut off questioning or the airing of alternative views on grounds that the truth is known is—given the assumption that the truth is important—implicitly to claim certainty. (Mill points out that even the practical considerations which may require an end of discussion are served by prior open inquiry.) Certainty is, of course, a vanishingly rare commodity if taken to refer to the impossibility of being mistaken rather than to mere strength of conviction, and thus the consideration is a compelling one.

The necessity to acknowledge uncertainty, however, should not be considered an *external* restraint on the Christian religious tradition as personally or institutionally expressed. The notion of human weakness—including epistemic weakness—is as central to Christianity as any idea. Allow me to return to Richard Hughes for an eloquent expression of this academic implication of the doctrine of human finitude:

> This position means that every scholar must always confess that he or she could be wrong. Apart from this confession, there can be no serious life of the mind, for only when we confess that we might be wrong can we engage in the kind of conversation that takes seriously other voices. And only when we confess that we might be wrong are we empowered to assess in critical ways our own theories, our own judgments, and our own understandings (86-7).

It is especially pertinent for the present discussion that Hughes cites this doctrine and its implications as a particular contribution of the *Lutheran* tradition to the life of the mind. Since the possibility of being mistaken is an important motive to free inquiry in the pursuit of truth, such inquiry ought to be a hallmark of the Lutheran tradition, and to its institutions of learning.

Thus the Christian tradition, and by extension associated learning institutions, have internal reasons for allowing free discussion and questioning—even of their own basic truth-claims. But this is not the only motive for actively encouraging open inquiry. It is not merely to the extent that one might be mistaken that one ought to welcome questioning, but also to the extent that one is *confident* of the truth of one's commitments. This point also reiterates Mill, who held that the highest intellectual ideal is not just to hold true beliefs, but to hold them in a certain way. His summary of the argument in *On Liberty* is this:

> Even if the received opinion be...the whole truth; unless it be suffered to be, and actually is, vigorously and earnestly contested, it will...be held in the manner of a prejudice, with little comprehension or feeling of its rational grounds. And not only this, but...the meaning of the doctrine itself will be lost or enfeebled, and deprived of its vital effect on the character and conduct (50).

Free inquiry serves the truth, then, regardless of the status of the received opinion or tradition. Truth is served by the questioning of false received opinion for obvious reasons. Truth is served by free questioning of partially correct received opinion because the true is thereby winnowed from the false. And, finally, even wholly true opinions benefit from rigorous questioning since the vitality of our understanding and use of the truth is enhanced.

The familiar argument for absolute freedom of inquiry and expression in the second chapter of *On Liberty* seems to be an elaboration of the claims implicit in the AAUP's *Statement* on academic freedom, since Mill's argument depends crucially upon truth-seeking. To the extent, therefore, that Christian religious commitment is genuinely characterized by truth-seeking, it is wholly congenial to promoting rigorous free discussion and inquiry, both as advocated by a key founder of the modern liberal tradition, and as defended by the primary American academic organization for promoting and protecting free inquiry. If Christian scholars or Christian institutions are perceived as being at odds with that tradition or the goals of that organization, they should respond by vigorously emphasizing—in profession and in practice—the common commitment to truth.

> "The possibility of being mistaken is an important motive to free inquiry."

Here I would like to acknowledge again that not all institutions with strong Christian commitment put this theory into practice (hence the preceding exhortation). But I would also like to say that this theoretical account is more than an apologetic exercise—a way of reconciling Christian commitment and academic freedom. To a greater degree than some may realize, the philosophical foundations for the AAUP's paradigmatic defense of academic freedom have been challenged, and in some circles abandoned. Commitment to those academic standards may depend far more upon social convention in the academy than upon theoretical foundations. People defend academic freedom because that's just the way we do things. Philosopher Richard Rorty has argued that this reliance upon convention is sufficient support for academic freedom. I disagree. I'm not sure that convention and tradition is a strong enough foundation, and unlike Rorty I think that theoretical justification is possible. This is part—an instance really—of a larger debate in contemporary political theory about the viability of classical liberalism (Mill being a key figure in this tradition). The details of that argument are better left for another occasion. I will observe, however, that if Christian commitment *can* be a theoretical foundation for principles of academic freedom, and if those principles *do* turn out to be in need of theoretical support, then the considerations above may show again that our institutions can exhibit their academic integrity *because of*—not merely *in spite of*—religious identity.

Religious Diversity

I conclude as promised, by turning to the question of religious diversity in colleges and universities. To focus the present discussion, I will set aside several very important questions and issues. First, I focus here on religious diversity rather than on other issues of diversity. At my college, for example, the question of racial diversity is a pressing matter of ongoing concern and attention. From the point of view of Lutheran (or Christian) identity, it seems to me that the theoretical reasons for valuing and pursuing such diversity are evident; the hard part (for isolated colleges in the land of Norwegians) is strategy for achieving and preserving it. Religious diversity, on the other hand, is easy to achieve (maybe too easy), but its theoretical support, or its compatibility with robust and particular religious identity may be less clear.

Next, in focusing on a religiously diverse faculty, I set aside for now the religious composition of the student body and of administrative boards, etc. I hope that the applicability of ideas expressed so far to wider constituencies will be plain, but to the extent that it is not—or that different considerations are relevant—I leave that work for another occasion.

Finally, I want to acknowledge that some schools very clearly and narrowly define the range of faculty religious diversity which is compatible with their religious identity and academic mission. Here I have in mind those schools whose faculty positions are open only to members of the founding denomination, or to scholars who hold a specified range of theological views. In articulating a model for a wider range of faculty diversity, I want to be clear in saying that I don't intend to imply that more restrictive models are less consistent or desirable. I myself am a graduate of Wheaton College, and I consider Wheaton (and Calvin, so as not to appear entirely self-serving) to be an example of religious and academic integrity, and of exemplary academic excellence. Others disagree, of course, (see Kenneth Wagner's "Faith Statements Do Restrict Academic Freedom" in *Academe*, January-February 2006, and responses in that themed issue) but that too is an argument for another day. For now, I only want to resist that notion that colleges and universities must choose between adopting the Wheaton/Calvin model or abandoning substantive Christian identity. There are strands of that way of thinking on my own campus—proponents of the opposing choices all being dubious (at best) that we can long maintain a strong Lutheran identity and a religiously diverse faculty. I am arguing that there is more than one model for a strong and thoroughgoing Lutheran or Christian institutional identity in church-related colleges and universities, including models with religiously diverse faculties.

I hope that at least some elements of the model I propose will be evident already. Lutherans and many other brands of Christians may—because of their religious commitments—be inclined to academic virtues, and if those commitments inform the ethos of the school, the institution will encourage good pedagogy, interdisciplinary engagement, and academic freedom. So it's great to have plenty of Lutherans (or relevant other brands) around. But the question of religious diversity is, what about having others around?

One sort of response to the question goes by the name of "critical mass" theory. The idea is that if you have enough Lutherans (etc.) around to keep the ethos and identity strong, you can have some others and the benefits they bring without bringing the house down. I guess it is obvious that Lutheran identity is going to require having Lutherans (or suitable substitutes) around, but I'm a little uneasy about tendencies of some versions of critical mass theories. To be specific, I'm uneasy because they focus more on the mass than on the rest of the faculty. The problem is that faculty with other religious commitments, in some sort of free-rider status, may be at best indifferent and at worst threatened by the mission and identity of the school. In practice, younger colleagues in this situation duck and run when talk about mission and identity comes up, and others may gather resources and allies to resist or subvert such talk and its object. I don't know if that's the kind of fun you want to have in promoting or preserving institutional identity, but it's not the only option.

"Lutherans' commitment to search for truth, to critique all perspectives (even their own), and to nurture creative imagination is served by the presence and active engagement of opposing ideas."

Here I'll suggest that the resources of the Lutheran tradition for promoting our highest academic aspirations are of central importance in conceiving of a vibrant, mission-oriented, and religiously diverse faculty. First of all, why might those principles promote a diverse faculty? Because Lutherans' commitment to search for truth, to critique all perspectives (even their own), and to nurture creative imagination is served by the presence and active engagement of opposing ideas, presented by smart and articulate people who themselves are committed to the mission. Fine, but how can others be committed to the mission if, for example, they are not Lutheran or Christian? Well, they have their own reasons for being committed to the academic and pedagogical virtues (if they don't have reasons or don't have those commitments would you hire them even if you didn't care about religious identity?). Chances are, nobody told them in grad

school that those academic virtues might be robustly supported by Lutherans—for Lutheran reasons. So tell them. Now, instead of seeing that, well, Lutheran identity won't bother them much if they stay out of sight until tenure, they might see that Lutheran commitments promote *their* academic aspirations, maintain circumstances that allow those aspirations to flourish, and require their own authentic voice in order to keep doing this job in a vital way.

It is true that this requirement entails that all faculty engage—in our example—Lutheran questions. I don't want to slide over the fact that my approach privileges the religious tradition of the college. But since the very idea of having an identity seems to involve privileging the identifying elements, I'm not inclined to apologize for that—not as long as those essential elements create the conditions for communities where our highest academic aspirations can flourish. Substantive Lutheran, or Christian, identity can and should do this in our colleges. This will make them academically better institutions for *everyone* involved.

Works Cited

American Association of University Professors. *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.* <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/1940statement.html>.

Calder, Lendol. "For Teachers to Live, Professors Must Die." *Christianity and the Soul of the University* Conf. Baylor University, 25 Mar. 2004.

Hughes, Richard T. *How Christian Faith Can Sustain the Life of the Mind*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 1978.

Nelson, Cary and Stephen Watt. *Academic Keywords: A Devil's Dictionary for Higher Education*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Newman, John Henry Cardinal. *The Idea of A University.* New York: Longmans Green, 1921.

Rorty, Richard. "Does Academic Freedom Have Philosophical Presuppositions?" *Academe* (Nov-Dec 1994): 52-63.

Schwehn, Mark R. *Exiles from Eden: Religion and the Academic Vocation in America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1993.

Wagner, Kenneth. "Faith Statements Do Restrict Academic Freedom." *Academe* (Jan-Feb 2006) <http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/2006/06jf/06jfwagn.htm>.

JOSÉ MARICHAL

Why Diversity and Civic Engagement Don't Talk to Each Other on College Campuses: The Need for Public Work

Unless our children begin to learn together, there is little hope that our people will ever learn to live together. MILLIKEN v. BRADLEY 1974.

THURGOOD MARSHALL'S ONE SIMPLE SENTENCE captures a vexing problem for American higher education: how do we educate for a multicultural society in a way that recognizes our need to address common problems? This task requires striking a balance between recognizing and affirming difference (learning together as learning from each other) and encouraging commonality and collaboration (living together).

These two tasks are presumably carried out through university *diversity* and university *civic engagement* initiatives. Both of these efforts are socially and politically fashionable on college campuses. On the one hand, universities (and other social institutions) purport to be engaged in creating "diverse learning environments" that reflect the complexity and pluralism of the society in which we live. On the other, public universities are increasingly justifying public funding by emphasizing their civic missions. Many campus efforts are designed to foster a culture of "civic engagement" where young people come to recognize their *linked fate* (Dawson) and get involved in their communities to solve common problems.

Despite the obvious interdependencies between these two efforts, they are often conceptually detached from one another in practice on college campuses. Civic engagement and its progeny—service learning, community service, and university-community partnerships—often proceed on different tracks than campus diversity initiatives, including multicultural clubs and events, and co-curricular programming.

As McTighe-Musil observes, the explosion of civic engagement initiatives on college campuses has occurred without a serious discussion of how diversity and otherness related to addressing social issues. In her view, "the language of diversity has been decoupled from the language of civic engagement" at colleges and universities (18). This decoupling of diversity and civic engagement as concepts means both efforts proceed without serious reflection on how they work together to promote common ends. *Diversity work* without a solid foundation in a civic purpose becomes little more than, what I call, *menagerie diversity*, or an examination of difference that ends at the classroom bell or when the mandatory campus event ends. Conversely, civic engagement efforts that do

JOSÉ MARICHAL *is assistant professor of political science at California Lutheran University.*

not seriously consider diversity run the risk of merely reaffirming pre-existing structures of injustice and exclusion (Stephan; Eby; Hepburn, Niemi and Chapman).

This essay thus engages the question of why diversity and civic engagement initiatives on college campuses often proceed on parallel tracks. I argue that this disconnect exists primarily because both diversity and civic engagement efforts are undergirded by *thin* or pluralist notions of democracy that emphasize adversarialism and rights-claims rather than a *strong* notion of democracy that encourages deliberation, collaboration and civic obligation (Barber). To the extent that civic engagement encourages students to work collaboratively, it is largely in voluntaristic ways that do not challenge underlying pluralist assumptions about what it means to be a citizen of the United States and the world.

In this article, I illustrate how both diversity and civic engagement efforts reinforce a *thin* view of democracy. I then review the empirical research to highlight the shortcomings of a thin approach to civic engagement and diversity practices. I conclude by advocating for a *public work* (Boyte *Everyday Politics*) perspective as a means to linking diversity and civic engagement and discuss the implications for Lutheran higher education.

Thin vs. Strong Democracy

Both civic engagement and diversity have underlying socio-political assumptions that motivate their work. Guinier calls the process of constructing a freshman class at colleges and universities a public act that either challenges or reinforces current structures of power and oppression. Those engaged in diversity and civic engagement efforts are similarly engaging in political actions. While institutions differ in the actual practice of diversity and civic engagement, there are overarching trends that inform institutional efforts. I argue that, in general, both efforts are tied to a thin version of democracy.

Thin democracy is a term coined by Benjamin Barber to describe what he viewed as an individualistic and interest-based notion of citizenship and social relations. Barber argues that the Lockean tradition of the state as a guarantor of fundamental liberties through a contractual relationship with the citizen encourages a "thin" perspective on the individual's role vis-à-vis government. Government in this instance is presumed to be in need of "watching" from an adversarial public. The extent of civic responsibility in a *thin democracy* is to keep government from infringing upon the individual's fundamental liberties.

A thin democracy also reinforces *pluralist* notions of democracy. A pluralist perspective presumes individuals and groups in the political sphere present a neutral government with competing claims and allow government to arbitrate among them (Truman). Glendon refers to this tendency in American politics as a *rights talk* culture that emphasizes "rights assertion over reason giving," "individual demand vs. collective responsibility," and "debate over dialogue." A protective and pluralist view of democracy reinforces a "thin" (i.e. instrumental) notion of the individual's obligation to his or her fellow citizens.

Barber argues that democratic states need vibrant civil societies that encourage a "strong citizenship" based on identifying shared problems, seeking common ground and working towards the common good. He emphasizes moving from a moribund civic sphere where state and market make the majority of decisions, what he calls a "politics of zoo-keeping," towards a *politics of amateurs* "where every man is compelled to encounter every other man without the intermediary of expertise" (152). The emphasis in strong democracy is developing participatory habits by creating structures for citizen deliberation and decision-making.

The Decline in Political (not Civic) Engagement

The decline in democratic participation (thin or strong) is particularly acute among college-age youth. To the consternation of democratic theorists, there has been a steady decline in youth political engagement in the last three decades (Zukin). Despite the upsurge in voting during the 2004 and 2006 election cycles, young people report significantly less interest in politics than either previous generations or their peers (Zukin). A 2002, study found that only 24% of 18-24 year olds reported "following government and public affairs most of the time" (Keeter et al.). Perhaps more alarming are the decreased levels of social trust among young people. The study found that 70% of 18-25 year olds agreed with the statement "most people look out for themselves," compared to 40% of persons 65 and over (Keeter et al.). A majority (56%) agreed that "most people would take advantage of you" compared to 29% of persons over 65.

What is curious is that this decline in civic-mindedness is happening at the same time a "civic engagement" revolution is happening in U.S. high schools and colleges. In 2002, three out of four high school students and about two out of three (65%) of college students say that their school arranges or offers volunteering opportunities (Keeter et al.). Similarly, one out of five (19%) college seniors participated in service learning in 2004. This was up from one out of eight (12%) in 1999 (Kuh). This increase in civic engagement opportunities is driven by the documented effectiveness of service and experiential learning programs in enhancing student learning (Battistoni).

Not surprisingly, given the effort put forth by secondary and post-secondary institutions, young people report levels of volunteerism comparable to older cohorts. In 2006, 15-25 year

olds were more likely than older cohorts to have volunteered in the last twelve months (Keeter et al.). Over one-third (36%) of 15-25 year olds had volunteered in the last twelve months compared to 32% for persons over twenty-five. Evidence suggests that people who engage in mandatory service learning projects go on to volunteer at greater levels than those who do not (Lopez et al.). Thus at first glance, it would seem that students involved in service learning are developing habits that lead to more political engagement in a strong democracy.

However, the upsurge in volunteerism has not brought with it an increase in political engagement. Why is this? In the same 2006 survey, only 13% of young people ages 15-25 who had volunteered in the last twelve months reported volunteering for a "political group" (Lopez et al.). This is because community service might connect young people to others in their community, but is does nothing to alter their fundamental understanding of the political system and their role therein.

Levels of political engagement among young people could be low because there is a time lag between doing service learning and civic engagement projects and translating those civic skills into the political sphere. Perhaps if we check back in ten years, this generation will be as politically active as their grandparents' generation. This may turn out to be the case. Young people's levels of social trust and their attitudes towards citizenship suggest, however, that the larger culture is reinforcing a sense of atomism that is difficult for campus service projects to combat. Lopez et al. found that only 38% of young people thought that being a citizen entailed a sense of responsibility (as compared to 60% of people over forty years of age). The typical view of young people was that being a citizen meant being a good person and following the law (Lopez et al.).

> "The larger culture is reinforcing a sense of atomism that is difficult for campus service projects to combat."

Given the data, it would appear that civic engagement efforts on college campuses do not appear to be altering a thin view of citizenship. I argue that if civic engagement efforts hope to produce democratic citizens, they must explicitly challenge thin notions of democracy. As Theiss-Morse and Hibbing recently suggested, it may be challenging, if not impossible, to develop democratic habits through volunteerism, largely because volunteerism does not necessarily promote or teach democratic values of deliberation, compromise and conflict-resolution. One way that campus civic engagement efforts can provide citizens with these vital democratic skills is by being deliberate about combining civic engagement with diversity.

Diversity Work and Thin Democracy

The American Association of Colleges and Universities statement on diversity suggests that diversity is to be centrally linked to civic engagement. Its statement calls on universities to deploy "diversity as an educational asset for all students, and prepare future graduates for socially responsible engagement in a diverse democracy and interdependent world" (AACU "Statement on Diversity"). Inherent in the term "diverse democracy" is recognition that engagement with otherness is important for democratic practice. These efforts seem to be complementary. Just so, a number of amicus briefs in the *Grutter v. Bollinger* Supreme Court decision on affirmative action at the University Michigan Law School argued that educating citizens for a diverse society served as a "compelling governmental interest" needed to support affirmative-action programs.

Indeed, diversity serves a great many pedagogical purposes. It serves to enhance cognitive complexity among those exposed to "diverse courses" (Antonio et al.), it leads to greater empathy and openness to other views (Astin), and it provides students with the *cultural competency* needed to function in a diverse workforce (Carnevale).

The academy, however, is unsure how to "deploy diversity" toward the end of training democratic citizens. A recent call for papers to an American Association of Colleges and Universities conference on the intersections of diversity and civic engagement suggests as much:

> The Academy has witnessed a significant expansion of innovative civic engagement programs in recent years, driven by student interest, community needs, social inequities, new understandings about teaching and learning, a growing commitment to social responsibility. At the same time, decades of work in diversity and global education driven by similar forces and committed to similar goals have often developed on separate tracks (AACU "Call for Papers").

The presumption is that increased exposure to otherness translates into increased tolerance towards out-groups which will lead to more acceptance of pluralism and difference in a democracy. Indeed, as diversity initiatives have increased on college campuses, so too have tolerant attitudes. Keeter et al. found greater acceptance of gay marriage and immigrants among people aged 15-25 than older cohorts. This tolerance is reflected in a number of

attitude surveys that show greater affinity for once taboo subjects like inter-racial dating, gay marriage and immigrants.

However as important as tolerant attitudes are, it is not altogether clear that they translate into cross cultural engagement. Residential segregation patterns across the United States have changed only incrementally since the 1960s (Adelman). Driven by persistent residential segregation, public school systems in the United States are in the process of re-segregation (Orfield and Yun). Two current cases before the U.S. Supreme Court, *Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1* and *Meredith v. Jefferson County Board of Education*, designed to provide remedies for de-facto segregation, are likely to deem voluntary desegregation programs unconstitutional.

> "This evidence presents a challenge to linking diversity to civic engagement."

Recent work suggests that an "add diversity and stir" notion leads to negative effects on civic engagement. Research from the civic engagement benchmark survey reveals that people in diverse communities are less trusting of others, more personally isolated, had lower levels of political efficacy, and had fewer acquaintances across class lines (Saguaro). On college campuses, as every diversity officer knows, there is an inherent tendency to form friendship bonds based on *propinquity*, or shared likeness. Maramos and Sacerdote found in their study of social networks at a small liberal arts college in the Northeast that race was a greater determinant of social interaction than common interests, majors, or family background.

This evidence presents a challenge to linking diversity to civic engagement. Why do people report increased levels of tolerance for other groups but are not any more disposed to want to interact with them? Again, we must return to the thin notion of democracy. A view of democracy that treats diversity as a set of competing rights claims that should be respected rather than an obligation to engage each other to explore areas of commonality and pursue the common good does not change the underlying structure of society.

Undoubtedly, making people aware, particularly white males, that "race" and "gender" are phenomena that structure the social world is important work. But is it insufficient to prepare young people to address looming social problems. Making students aware of "isms" and hoping that by some alchemy, students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds have the tools to, as Richard Rorty puts it, "achieve our country," is misguided.

While students are learning all these "isms" in diversity courses (hopefully), they are also being asked to engage with a political system that emphasizes conflict over consensus and claims-making over collaboration. Failing to engage the underlying political factors upon which issues of race, gender, class, etc. are played, means leaving students to ponder the tip of the iceberg they can see above water.

Merging the Civic and the Multicultural Through Public Work

How do we make civic engagement and diversity conform to notions of strong democracy? I argue that both initiatives must be tied together through the notion of *public work*. Boyte defines public work as

> sustained effort by a (diverse) mix of citizens whose collective labors produce things of common and lasting civic value. Public work solves common problems and creates common things. It is also cooperative work by "a public," a mix of people whose interests, backgrounds and resources may be quite different. And it is work that creates "public goods," things of general benefit and use ("Civic Populism" 7).

This emphasis on diversity as *public work* links it to civic engagement by emphasizing diversity as *practice* rather than as an intellectual exercise. This perspective does not replace diversity initiatives on college campuses, but rather integrates them intentionally by creating contexts on campuses and in communities where diverse students work to address common problems (providing day care services, building a well, putting on a play, teaching Shakespeare to high school students).

Far from being a "whitewashing" of differences, a public work perspective that takes diversity seriously engages students and communities without ignoring the group identities that give meaning to them. Diversity brings to collective activity the innovative capacities of "weak ties" necessary for groups to address complex, evolving problems (Granovetter). A *public work* approach focuses on a definition of the political based on "negotiating plurality" and finding common solutions rather than fostering adversarialism or paternalism (Boyte *Everyday Politics*).

Constructing *public work* oriented assignments emphasizing deliberation and collaborative work is made significantly easier by the advent of social networking websites like Wikipedia or De.licio.us that allow users to create on-line group products. The Web can be an effective tool for facilitating

community-based action research, engaging students in organizing campus or community-wide town halls, or study circles.

The Role for Lutheran Colleges and Universities

Lutheran colleges and universities, with their emphasis on vocation as a *call to the world* rather than away from it, are better positioned to bridge the divide between diversity and civic engagement than both public institutions with their wariness of values-based education and more fundamentalist-oriented, religiously-affiliated institutions that emphasize a retreat from the secular rather than a dialogue with the secular (Christenson).

The challenge of getting our students to both "learn together" and "live together" can be both frustrating and invigorating. If we hope to move our students beyond recognizing injustice and intolerance towards acting on that knowledge through the political process, we must challenge our own assumptions of what it means to be a citizen in the United States. Moreover, it requires us to reflect on how that notion of citizenship affects those outside of the United States.

It also means we move ourselves beyond a "thin" view of both diversity and civic engagement. Too often we repeat mantras of "engaging with otherness" that we in the academy do not heed. If we do "engage with otherness" it is an otherness with which we are comfortable. We should not be immune from engaging in *public work* with those whom we might disagree or feel threatened.

This is easier to say than to realize. Private institutions, particularly smaller liberal arts institutions, are heavily dependent upon private benefactors for their survival. As a result, emphasizing a strong democracy that might motivate citizens to participate in ways contrary to those favored by sought after benefactors is a source of tension for institutions. A participatory culture that engages students in collaborative decision-making might produce outcomes that abut the interests of corporate capital. All institutions, including ELCA affiliated ones, must ask themselves how they will address potential conflicts between donor interests and pedagogical practice.

Furthermore, public work is hard work. As faculty at some teaching-oriented colleges are aware, innovation is not always rewarded if it results in poor student evaluations. Those who have entered the exciting yet challenging world of service learning pedagogy will tell you that it takes a great commitment of time on the part of faculty to make it work. At some places, it may not be worth the time and effort. Certainly at Research-1 universities where teaching is not a priority, there is little incentive to bring public work into the curriculum. Institutions like ours can serve a vital niche by creating the institutional infrastructure to support faculty in their efforts to link diversity and civic engagement through public work.

Works Cited

Adelman, R. "The Roles of Race, Class, and Residential Preferences in the Neighborhood Racial Composition of Middle-Class Blacks and Whites." *Social Science Quarterly* 86.1 (2005): 209-28.

American Association of College and Universities. "Statement on Diversity." Retrieved March 2006. <http://www.aacu.org/issues/diversity/>.

_____ . "Call for Papers: Civic Learning at the Intersections: U.S. Diversity, Global Education, and Democracy's Unfinished Work." Retrieved March 2007. <http://www.aacu.org/meetings/civic/index.cfm>.

Antonio, A., et al. "Research Report Effects of Racial Diversity on Complex Thinking in College Students." *Psychological Science* 15.8 (2004): 507—10.

Astin, A. "Diversity and Multiculturalism on Campus: How Are Students Affected?" *Change* 25.2 (1993): 44-49.

Barber, B. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984.

Battistoni, R. *Civic Engagement Across the Curriculum: A Resource Book for Service-learning Faculty in All Disciplines*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact, 2002.

Boyte, H. *Everyday Politics: Reconnecting Citizens and Public Life*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2004.

_____ . "Civic Populism." *Perspectives on Politics* 1 (2004): 737-42.

Carnevale, A. "Diversity in Higher Education: Why Corporate America Cares." *Diversity Digest* 3.3 (Spring 1999) <www.diversity-web.org/Digest/Sp99/corporate.html>.

Christenson, Thomas. "Brief Comments on 'Our Calling in Education: A First Draft of a Social Statement.'" *Journal of Lutheran Ethics* 6.6 (2006) <http://www.elca.org/jle/article.asp?k=618>.

Dawson, M.C. *Behind the Mule*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1994.

Eby, J. "Why Service-Learning Is Bad." March 1998. <http://www.messiah.edu/external_programs/agape/service_learning/articles/wrongsvc.pdf>.

Glendon, M. *Rights Talk: The Impoverishment of Political Discourse*. New York: Free Press, 1991.

Granovetter, M. "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited." *Sociological Theory* 1:1 (1983): 201-33.

Grutter v. Bollinger (02-241) 539 U.S. 306 (2003).

Guinier, L. "Admissions Rituals as Political Acts: Guardians at the Gates of Our Democratic Ideals." *Harvard Law Review* 117.1 (2003): 113-224.

Hepburn, M., R. Niemi, and C. Chapman. "Service Learning in College Political Science: Queries and Commentary." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 33.3 (2000): 617-22.

Keeter, S., et al. *The Civic and Political Health of the Nation: A Generational Portrait.* College Park, MD: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), 2002.

Kuh, G. *The National Survey of Student Engagement: The College Student Report.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning, 2000.

Lopez, M., et al. *The 2006 Civic and Political Health of the Nation*. College Park, MD: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), 2006. <http://www.civicyouth.org/research/products/youth_index_2006.htm>.

Marmaros, D., and B. Sacerdote. "How Friendships Form." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121.1(2006): 79-112.

Milliken v. Bradley. (1974) 418 U.S. 717, 783.

McTighe-Musil, C. T. "The Civic Work of Diversity." *Diversity Digest* 9.1 (2005), 1-11.

Orfield, G., and J. Yun. *Resegregation in American Schools.* The Civil Rights Project. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U, 1999.

Rorty, R. A*chieving Our Country: Leftist Thought in Twentieth-century America.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1998.

Saguaro Seminar. "Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey: Executive Summary." Cambridge, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard U, 2000. <http://www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey/results.html>.

Stephan, W. "The Contact Hypothesis in Intergroup Relations." *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 9 (1987): 13-40.

Theiss-Morse, E., and J. R. Hibbing. "Citizenship and Civic Engagement." *Annual Review of Political Science* 8 (2004): 227-49.

Truman, D. *The Government Process*. New York: Knopf, 1951.

Zukin, C. *A New Engagement? Political Participation, Civic Life, and the Changing American Citizen*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006.

PAMELA K. BRUBAKER

Rich and Poor in an Era of Globalized Religion and Economies: Challenges to Lutheran Colleges

Aruna, a World Council of Churches staff member, tells of worshipping with a poor Aymara (Indian) Lutheran community high in the Andes Mountains in Bolivia. After worship she and those with her were invited to participate in a community lunch with the congregation, but she saw no signs of cooking or food. Then a long piece of cloth was placed on the ground in front of the church and the community sat down on either side of the cloth. "The women unloosened the shawls wrapped around their waists and poured onto the cloth, many kinds of potatoes. ... We ate our fill and I wondered what would happen to the remaining potatoes—the surplus of which there was plenty. On a quiet signal from the elder, everyone took a share of the potatoes ... Everyone, even those who had brought no food with them, took a share of the potatoes. ... We were told that all congregations do the same thing every Sunday!" (Gnanadason "All are invited")

Christine, a German Lutheran delegate to the recent Assembly of the World Council in Brazil, tells about attending worship at a prosperous immigrant (German) Lutheran church along with several other delegates. During the service the pastor announced that those who had received invitations ahead of time would join the congregation for lunch afterwards, others would need to have lunch elsewhere. Christine was rather surprised about this and wondered if the pastor feared there would not be enough food for everyone who had come. Still, it seemed a breach of hospitality, especially since one of the delegates who had not received an invitation ahead of time was a Lutheran bishop from Asia. (Personal communication February 2006)

I retell these two stories of rich and poor not to make a point about "spiritual" poverty and wealth, although one might do so. Rather I tell them to illustrate two seemingly different attitudes—one open, generous and sharing, the other controlling and protective. When we think about identity and diversity in Lutheran colleges, which will be our stance?

Identity and Diversity in the Lutheran College

In his study of models of church-related colleges, Richard Hughes states that in the Lutheran approach, "the task of the Christian scholar ... is not to impose on the world—or on the material that he or she studies—a distinctly 'Christian worldview,'" as in the Reformed model. "Rather, the Christian scholar's task is to study the world as it is and then to bring that world into dialogue with the Christian vision of redemption and grace." Hughes believes that "this theological vision is the great strength of Lutheran higher education for it enables Lutherans to take religious and cultural pluralism with a seriousness that often escapes other Christian traditions" (6-7).

In his introduction to Lutheran higher education, Ernest Simmons claims that "Lutheran identity is forged ... in the dialectical tension" of what he calls "ecumenical confessionalism." The ecumenical side can discourage "denominational ideology" by keeping the community mindful of the presence and value of other theological and denominational perspectives, "affirming diversity on our campuses." The confessionalism side maintains the value of affiliation "by affirming that in the intellectual arena

PAMELA K. BRUBAKER *is an ethicist and Professor of Religion at California Lutheran University*

it is preferable to be self-conscious about one's commitments, not assume such discussion is value-free." He insists that "confessionalism as a dynamic theological expression does not seek imposed doctrinal uniformity but rather a lively and healthy confessional dialogue between traditions" (23).

This understanding of identity and diversity resonates with that of Linell Cady. In her discussion of *Religion, Theology, and American Public Life,* she suggests that "commitment to a global community" requires an identity for both individuals and societies that reflects "a dual allegiance to both a particular history within which identity and meaning have been rooted and the global order which remains to be fully actualized" (160). Cady insists that "the impossible pretensions to neutrality and universality that underlie the Enlightenment understanding of public, and the public exercise of reason" must be unmasked (64). This caution is particularly relevant when we think about rich and poor—social class—in an era of globalized economies and religion.

PART ONE: GLOBALIZED ECONOMIES

We—and most all of the world's peoples—are aware of living in an age of globalization. In some ways, this is not a new phenomenon. Martin Luther King wrote in 1967 that "We are everlasting debtors to known and unknown men and women ... At the table we drink coffee which is provided for us by a South American, or tea by a Chinese or cocoa by a west African." Today we could add to King's list the clothes we wear—underwear and shoes from China, outerwear from Guatemala, Mexico, and India. King concluded that "Before we leave for our jobs we are already beholden to more than half the world." Ulrich Beck calls this "globality"—this sense of living in a world society, without closed spaces. He distinguishes this from "globalism"—the ideology of neoliberalism—or rule by the world market (Held and McGrew 100-102).

The term "globalization" was first used in the late 1960s or early 1970s to refer to "rapidly expanding political and economic interdependence." In their introduction to the globalization debate, David Held and Anthony McGrew define globalization as "the expanding scale, growing magnitude, speeding up and deepening impact of interregional flows and patterns of social interaction." They note that the process of globalization is "deeply divisive" and "vigorously contested" because a significant portion of the world's population is largely excluded from its benefits (3-4). This continues to be the case, in spite of Thomas Friedman's assertions to the contrary in *The World is Flat.*

The World Development Report 2006: Equity and Development from the World Bank admits as much. This report first notes that inequality between countries was relatively small in the early nineteenth century, but had come to account for a larger part of inequality (as contrasted to inequality within countries) toward the end of the twentieth century. It then states, "If China and India are excluded, global inequalities continue to rise, owing to the continuing divergence between most other low-income countries and rich countries" (7). Indeed, China and India have benefited from integration into the global economy. Two qualifications are necessary. First, India and China did not follow all the policy prescriptions of the dominant neo-liberal model; second, inequality has increased rather dramatically within these two countries. The Lutheran World Federation sums this up succinctly, in its "Call to Participate in Transforming Economic Globalization"—"globalization is *not* global in its benefits" (LWF 115).

The Dominant Paradigm

Globalization, for some, is another name for transnational capitalism. That certainly is the dominant form of economic globalization. It is also called neo-liberalism, because it advocates opening markets (liberalization), promoting exports and foreign trade, deregulation including labor and environmental standards, and privatization of public owned enterprises. This is what Ulrich Beck referred to as "globalism" or the rule of the world market. These policies have been imposed by the International Monetary Fund and World Bank as part of structural adjustment programs in one hundred or so countries as conditions for restructuring loans. Neo-liberalism has also been called the Washington consensus, since the policies are advocated by the US Treasury, which plays a leading role in these international financial institutions. The World Trade Organization and transnational corporations are also key actors in the development of neo-liberal globalization. Two-thirds of world trade is accounted for by transnational corporations, who also control about one-third of the world's productive assets. Of the top one-hundred economies in the world, only forty-nine are countries; fifty-one are corporations.

Held and McGrew conclude that neoliberal economic globalization has not transcended the old North-South division of the world but superimposed on it new kinds of divisions along gender, ethnic, and ecological lines. Those who have studied its impact on women claim that it is "both liberating and exploitative." For instance, Altha Cravey and Patricia Fernandez-Kelly concluded in their separate studies of women who do factory work in Mexico and Central America that even low paid jobs give women "a modicum of independence." But at the same time there have been "devastating assaults on workers of both sexes" (Brubaker 60-61).

In a special issue of the journal *Feminist Economics* focused on gender and globalization, the editors point to the negative impact of globalization on non-market goods and services, including reproductive work. Values and social relationships that do not adhere to market norms of self-interest and profit maximization are demeaned. "Thus, a significant proportion of women's contribution to the economy is relegated little or no importance, as symbolized by the underestimation of unpaid work in national and international statistics" (Beneria, et al. xiii).

Economist Dianne Elson notes that economic globalization impacts processes of both production *and* social reproduction, although little attention is given to the latter in the globalization literature. "What is left out of account is the process of social reproduction in which women invest time and money in the education and socialization of children; and in nutrition and healthcare for children and adults." There is an assumption that "social reproduction will always accommodate itself to savings and investment decisions made in the public sphere." But Elson notes that this can only be taken for granted "if people can live on fresh air or women's unpaid work is available in unlimited supplies" (164). Serious crises in social reproduction continue in many parts of the world. The impact of these crises differ by class, race/ethnicity, and region—but women bear the brunt. Sociologist Saskia Sassen calls this "the feminization of survival."

PART TWO: GLOBALIZED RELIGION

In his book *Global Religions*, sociologist Mark Juergensmeyer points out that "Although there are regions of the world that serve as dense centers of gravity for certain religious traditions, much of the world is less certain as to its religious identity, and always has been" (3). He thinks about religion in terms of culture, which I have long found to be a fruitful approach. "It is understandable that these cultural elements would move as people have moved," Juergensmeyer suggests, "if one thinks of religion as the cultural expression of people's sense of ultimate significance." It also is understandable, then, "that they would interact and change over time just as people have." He asserts that although most all religious traditions claim some unchangeable "ultimate anchors of truth," it is irrefutable that every tradition also contains within it "an enormous diversity of characteristics and myriad cultural elements gleaned from its neighbors." All of this is part of the "globalization of religion" (5).

Juergensmeyer identifies three types of global religions. The first is global diasporas—religion is global in that it is related to the global transportation of peoples. Judaism and Hinduism are his examples. These are not generally universal religions, open to converts, but the religious expression of particular peoples. The second type is transnational religions such as Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam. These religions are open to converts and spread with the transnational acceptance of their religious ideas. The third type is the religion of globalization—new religions that emerge as expressions of new interactive societies. This type is also the religion of plural societies. Interestingly, he gives Christianity during its origins in the Roman Empire as an example of the religion of plural societies. Finally, Juergensmeyer suggests, it is possible that a global civilization with its own global religion is evolving (5).

Juergensmeyer examines the relationship of religion and the state. He suggests that "The same Christianity, Buddhism, and Islam that provide for some rulers a supportive ideology have been for others a basis for rebellion" (8). A rather crude religious legitimation of transnational capitalism links the market to God. Before his downfall, Enron CEO Ken Lay told a reporter that he believed in God and he believed in the market. Theologian Harvey Cox has written that the Market now is God—it is seen as omniscient, omnipresent, and all powerful—what some call "market fundamentalism." Buddhist author David Loy thinks that the religion of the market is the primary competitor to more traditional religions.

Some adherents of these "traditional" religions are searching for and finding common ground to resist neo-liberal economic globalization. For instance, all the world's religions share the belief that one is responsible for meeting another's needs. Religious and secular groups are forming coalitions to advocate for alternative forms of economic globalization. The World Council of Churches, a fellowship of over three-hundred Christian Protestant and Orthodox denominations from over one-hundred countries, is an example of a "transnational religion" engaged in resistance to neo-liberal economic globalization. The WCC is an official observer at and participant in the work of the United Nations and its various agencies (as is the Lutheran World Federation). It has participated in the meetings of the World Social Forum, which brings together thousands of people and groups committed to social and economic justice. The WCC engaged in encounters with the World Bank and IMF at their invitation. It understands its role to be "bringing the cries of the people."

The WCC was urged by delegates to its 1998 Assembly to challenge economic dynamics which were causing so much suffering to peoples in the South. Since then the WCC has held several regional consultations on economic globalization, in conjunction with the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and Lutheran World Federation. This work resulted in a common critique of neo-liberal globalization and development of an alternative paradigm, "economy of life." An economy of life calls for a world

of just, participatory, and sustainable communities. A full description of the vision can be found in "Alternative Globalization Addressing Peoples and Earth (AGAPE)," a background document for the Ninth Assembly of the WCC in February, 2006. A crucial element of this alternative paradigm is to make "people's work, knowledge and creativity" the driving forces of economic activity, rather than capital owned and controlled by a small, extremely wealthy elite. There is a place for markets in this alternative, but they are not the final arbiter of value. Water, for example, is a basic need and public good which should not be reduced to a commodity to be bought and sold for profit. An economy of life seeks to promote cooperation between individuals, communities, and nations, rather than competition. This paradigm gives greater material and moral value to care work, and addresses the gender imbalances associated with care work.

It is important to know that there are already many alternatives in place in different parts of the world. The work of the indigenous community in Orissa, India, is one inspiring example. Under the leadership of William Stanley (an Indian Lutheran) and Sasi Prabha, the village of Putsil converted an existing small dam into a small scale hydro-electric project. It produces just enough electricity for the needs of the village, and a battery charging facility for a neighboring village. The villagers contributed their labor. Two young people have been trained to run the power plant, completely managed and supported by the people. Besides providing electricity for home use, it also runs a grinding and milling machine. This saves the village women, who were leaders in the movement, many hours of grinding grain by hand (Gnanadason *Listen to the Women* 18-19).

Finance and trade are also addressed in an economy of life. The purpose of an international financial system should be to enhance justice, poverty eradication and environmental sustainability. Trade should aim to serve just ends—"ethical, sustainable and equitable production, exchange and consumption of goods and services to meet the needs of all humankind and the earth." It argues for trade that protects human rights and the earth through effective labor and environmental regulations (WCC 14-22). The WCC, LWF and other ecumenical bodies have sent petitions to the World Trade Organization asserting the importance of recognition of human rights in trade negotiations. After the failure of the most recent round of trade negotiations (summer of 2006), the director of the WTO asked to meet with the WCC and other bodies to discuss their concerns.

Conclusion

How is all this a challenge to the colleges? Part of our task as college and university professors, I have claimed elsewhere, is to educate for critical citizenship, or, to use the words of Darrell Jodock, "to enable young men and women to discern what makes for justice and what preserves and enhances human dignity" (18). Given the hegemony of the neo-liberal model, it is crucial that students are encouraged to question its underlying assumptions, for instance, that growth and profit are the primary ends of economic activity or that the market should be the primary arbiter of value. The Lutheran World Federation and the WCC offer useful resources for this task.

Raising awareness of global issues, including wealth and poverty, is an appropriate task for liberal arts colleges. Exposure trips, study abroad, speakers—all are useful approaches. Adding a unit on an aspect of globalization—one or two weeks long—can be a good way to incorporate such concerns in humanities and social science classes. Films and/or case studies are helpful in making the topic and issues come alive for students. I supplement these with background material on key actors, their values and assumptions, and relevant policies and dynamics.

Since students can feel overwhelmed with the suffering and injustices they are exposed to in films, I include a few specific policies and proposals that address these problems. For instance, I introduce students to the Millenium Development Goals, which aim to reduce poverty and improve education and health. Target rates and deadlines are an important part of the plan. We read a brief article by a staff person at the IMF discussing actions, such as increasing trade and aid, necessary to meet these goals, and an article from Jubilee USA claiming that these are not adequate without cancellation of the external debt of low-income countries. (Most of these materials are available on websites.) Students write a short essay discussing the importance of a few of the goals and comparing the approaches to meeting the goals. I have also focused on global issues that are closer at hand—migrant workers in the garment industry in the Los Angeles area and/or migrant farm workers in the fields of our county. Sometimes we have formal debates on topics such as debt cancellation, with teams of students representing different positions.

Teaching students about universal human rights—social, economic and cultural as well as civil and political—is also a useful strategy for addressing issues of religion, globalization and economic change. Theologian and ethicist Larry Rasmussen contends that the church's universal vision and conviction is of "the necessary, full inclusion of the excluded, on egalitarian terms." Universalism and egalitarianism are both "assertions of faith itself, whether or not they also have secular grounds." These assertions are "the converging Christian ground for one of the lasting moral achievements of modernity itself—universal human rights" (148-9). Rasmussen's stance is not an endorsement of unreconstructed liberalism, with its pretensions to neutrality and universality.

Rather, it is a reaffirmation "of the valuable parts of the liberal Protestant heritage" too often rejected by postmoderns and communitarians: "commitments to public participation, justice, and critical reflection on inherited traditions" (Bounds 118).

At its best, this open, generous stance comes out of the shared life and struggle of peoples struggling against "the all-pervasive neo-liberal logic that undergirds and directs economic globalization as a totalizing system" (Bloomquist 494). It is an affirmation of justice and human dignity. Part of our academic work, I contend, is to develop a richer understanding of rights, particularly universal human rights. Our aim is, as Peter Prove (LWF staff for international affairs and human rights) eloquently charges, for "all people of faith and goodwill ... to claim and use them on behalf of our communities and on behalf of the whole human family, in order to restore right purposes to the process of globalization" (258).

Works Cited

Beck, Ulrich. "What is Globalization?" *Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Ed. David Held and Anthony McGrew, eds. Cambridge: Polity, 2000.

Beneria, Lourdes, et al. "Introduction: Globalization and Gender." *Feminist Economics* 6.3 (November 2000): vii-xvii.

Bloomquist, Karen. "Engaging Economic Globalization as Churches." *The Ecumenical Review* 53.4 (October 2001): 493-500.

Bounds, Elizabeth M. *Coming Together/Coming Apart: Religion, Community and Modernity.* New York: Routledge, 1997.

Brubaker, Pamela K. *Globalization at What Price? Economic Change and Daily Life*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim, 2001.

Cady, Linell Elizabeth. *Religion, Theology, and American Public Life*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1993.

Cox, Harvey. "The Market as God." *The Atlantic Monthly* 283.3 (March 1999): 18-23.

Elson, Diane. "Talking to the Boys: Gender and Economic Growth Models." *Feminist Visions of Development*. London: Routledge, 1998. 155-70.

Friedman, Thomas. *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

Gnanadason, Aruna. "All Are Invited to the Fiesta of God." Unpublished sermon. World Council of Churches, 12 September, 2003.

———. *Listen to the Women! Listen to the Earth!* Geneva: WCC Publications, 2005.

Held, David and Anthony McGrew, eds. *Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate.* Cambridge: Polity, 2000.

Hughes, Richard T. and William B. Adrian, eds. *Models for Christian Higher Education: Strategies for Success in the Twenty-first Century*. Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 1997.

Jodock, Darrell. "The Lutheran Tradition and the Liberal Arts College." *Called to Serve: St. Olaf and the Vocation of a Church College*. Ed. Pamela Schwandt. Northfield, MN: St. Olaf College, 1999. 13-36.

Juergensmeyer, Mark. *Global Religions: An Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.

King, Martin Luther. *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community*. New York: Harper, 1967.

Loy, David. "The Religion of the Market." *Visions of a New Earth: Religious Perspectives on Population, Consumption, and Ecology*. Ed. Howard Coward and Daniel Maguire. Albany: State U of New York, 2000. 15-28.

Lutheran World Federation. *Communion, Responsibility, Accountability: Responding as a Lutheran Communion to Neoliberal Globalization*. Documentation No. 50, Dec 2004.

Prove, Peter, N. "Economic Globalization and Human Rights." *Communion, Responsibility, Accountability: Responding as a Lutheran Communion to Neoliberal Globalization*. Documentation No. 50, Dec 2004. 251-59.

Rasmussen, Larry L. *Moral Fragments & Moral Community: A Proposal for Church in Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Sassen, Saskia. "Women's Burdens: Counter Geographies of Globalization and the Feminization of Survival." *Journal of International Affairs* 53.2 (Spring 2000): 503-24.

Simmons, Ernest. *Lutheran Higher Education: An Introduction for Faculty.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1998.

World Bank. *The World Development Report 2006: Equity and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group, 2005.

World Council of Churches. *Alternative Globalization Addressing Peoples and Earth (AGAPE): A Background Document*, 2005.

ELCA Colleges & Universities

Augsburg College | MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA
Augustana College | ROCK ISLAND, ILLINOIS
Augustana College | SIOUX FALLS, SOUTH DAKOTA
Bethany College | LINDSBORG, KANSAS
California Lutheran University | THOUSAND OAKS, CALIFORNIA
Capital University | COLUMBUS, OHIO
Carthage College | KENOSHA, WISCONSIN
Concordia College | MOORHEAD, MINNESOTA
Dana College | BLAIR, NEBRASKA
Finlandia University | HANCOCK, MICHIGAN
Gettysburg College | GETTYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
Grand View College | DES MOINES, IOWA
Gustavus Adolphus College | ST. PETER, MINNESOTA
Lenoir-Rhyne College | HICKORY, NORTH CAROLINA
Luther College | DECORAH, IOWA
Midland Lutheran College | FREMONT, NEBRASKA
Muhlenberg College | ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA
Newberry College | NEWBERRY, SOUTH CAROLINA
Pacific Lutheran University | TACOMA, WASHINGTON
Roanoke College | SALEM, VIRGINIA
St. Olaf College | NORTHFIELD, MINNESOTA
Susquehanna University | SELINSGROVE, PENNSYLVANIA
Texas Lutheran University | SEGUIN, TEXAS
Thiel College | GREENVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA
Wagner College | STATEN ISLAND, NEW YORK
Waldorf College | FOREST CITY, IOWA
Wartburg College | WAVERLY, IOWA
Wittenberg University | SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

intersections

Augustana College
639 38th Street
Rock Island, IL 61201-2296

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Rock Island, IL
Permit No. 23