

2005

# Full Issue, Number 21, Summer 2005

The Congregational and Synodical Mission Unit, The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/intersections>

---

### Augustana Digital Commons Citation

The Congregational and Synodical Mission Unit, The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (2005) "Full Issue, Number 21, Summer 2005," *Intersections*: Vol. 2005: No. 21, Article 1.

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/intersections/vol2005/iss21/1>

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by Augustana Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Intersections by an authorized administrator of Augustana Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@augustana.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@augustana.edu).

# INTERSECTIONS

faith + life + learning

NUMBER TWENTY-ONE

SUMMER 2005



# INTERSECTIONS

faith + life + learning

NUMBER 21

SUMMER 2005

**Endings and Beginnings:**

**Some Reflections on the ELCA and Higher Education in the Last Decade**

*Changes* ..... 4

W. Robert Sorensen

*The Church in Education? Education in the Church? Ten Theses on Why These Questions Matter* ..... 7

Leonard G. Schulze

**Lutheran Higher Education—A Public Presence:**

**Presentations at the Vocation of a Lutheran College Conference, Carthage 2004**

*Private Life, Public Witness: Life in the "None Zone"* ..... 14

Loren J. Anderson

*Finding Words that Matter (Proverbs 1:20-21; 4:10-13)* ..... 20

Harvard Stevens Jr.

*Money, Sex and Power: An Exploration of Some Controversial Issues in the Public Witness of the Church* ..... 21

Pamela K. Brubaker

*Education as a Christian (Lutheran) Calling* ..... 28

Tom Christenson

**Poem**

*Sprigs of Mint* ..... 19

Caitlin McHugh

**INTERSECTIONS**

**Summer 2005**

**Published by:** The Division for Higher Education & Schools

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Published at Capital University, Columbus, Ohio USA 43209-2394

Arne Selbyg, *Publisher*

Tom Christenson, *Editor*

Caitlin McHugh, *Student Editorial Assistant*

Vicki Miller, *Secretary*

**Editorial Board:** Timothy A. Bennett, Wittenberg Univ.; Karla Bohmbach, Susquehanna Univ.; DeAne Lagerquist, St. Olaf College; Victoria Horst, Newberry College.

**Cover:** "Ubuntu ... Do Life." Mural designed by David J. Hetland, painted by participants of the Lutheran Youth Gathering in Atlanta, 2000.

---

## **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 Division for Higher Education and Schools of the ELCA. The publication has its home at Capital University, Columbus, Ohio 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 which 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**

When I meet with my counterparts in other denominations, they are sometimes envious that the colleges and universities that are related to the ELCA have remained very loyal to the church and to Lutheran traditions and principles of higher education, compared to what has happened to many colleges and universities that once were related to Baptist, Congregationalist, Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian, or other church bodies. I know of only one college in the USA that has formally severed its ties to the Lutheran church (Hartwick College in New York in 1968). There are other Lutheran colleges that want to avoid too close an embrace by the church as an institution, but they continue to honor the Lutheran ideals for higher education.

One of the main places where these Lutheran ideals are developed is in this journal, *INTERSECTIONS*. And since its founding in 1996, the journal has been edited by Dr. Tom Christenson, professor of philosophy at Capital University, and has been supported by that institution. This issue marks the ending of that service. Beginning with the next issue, the editor will be Dr. Bob Haak, professor of religion at Augustana College in Rock Island, Illinois; and Augustana will help the church with its publication.

For the ELCA this is quite a change. Tom has been an outstanding editor, and we are very grateful to him. He has done all the practical things, so we have not had to worry at all about getting the journal out; this has been outsourcing at its best. But more importantly, he has set an editorial tone that his faculty colleagues at colleges and universities across the country have responded to with enthusiasm, and he has generated articles and other content for the journal so we have had to increase the frequency of publication. Sometimes he has done cover art; sometimes he has added poetry. But in many ways this has been his journal, and through this journal he has strengthened the Lutheran identity of twenty-eight colleges and universities. Tom, we deeply appreciate all you have done for Lutheran higher education through this journal during these nine years, and we thank you for your service.

Living in God's amazing grace,

## **Arne Selbyg**

Director, ELCA Colleges and Universities

---

### **FROM THE EDITOR**

What adjective should we use to talk about this issue? It's thicker than usual, in case you hadn't noticed, and it has more pieces than usual. But I hesitate to call it "fat" because that suggests that it has unnecessary overages, which it doesn't. Should we choose "weighty"? That suggests verbiage both long and dense as well as important. I doubt that's what we want to say either. Perhaps "muscular"? Someone once referred to my physique as "well-developed." I appreciated their kind efforts at euphemism. People used to use the word "fleshy." Incarnationists, particularly Lutherans, should have little quarrel with that. So here we go once again, fleshing out our thoughts for sharing.

This issue contains both some of the papers shared at last summer's Vocation of a Lutheran College Conference as well as two papers commissioned by *INTERSECTIONS* from persons who have been at the heart of the ELCA's efforts at higher education, the two directors of the Division for Higher Education and Schools, Robert Sorenson and Leonard Schulze. We thought it was appropriate to hear from them at this point in time, when the ELCA is considering restructuring and re-prioritizing the offices that oversee higher education in the church.

Arne Selbyg insisted that I use this letter as a kind of valedictory, since I am stepping down as editor of *INTERSECTIONS*. This is the last issue that I will edit. The editorship will be passed to Bob Haak at Augustana, Rock Island. I wish him well and I'm extremely happy that *INTERSECTIONS* will continue under his leadership and the support of Augustana College. Our thanks are due to Bob and the leadership at Augustana for picking up the ball and moving it on down the field.

When I first took the idea for this publication to Naomi Linnell and then to Jim Unglaube at DHES in 1994, they were both interested in the prospect but somewhat skeptical about its practicality. I think they figured it was a momentary enthusiasm (I've been known to have such) that would soon be replaced by something new. I didn't quit hounding them about it, and they finally agreed to take a proposal to the council of presidents. The presidents showed some enthusiasm for the idea, even if not for paying for it. And so the project was launched on a shoestring, where it's been hanging ever since. DHES agreed to pay for the printing, and Josiah Blackmore, then president at Capital University, agreed to pay for everything else. Subsequent presidents here have continued that commitment.

We sent out a "Birth Announcement" in the spring of 1996. Here's part of what it said:

We are pleased to announce the birth of a new publication. It will be called *Intersections: Faith+Life+Learning*. ... Why do we need such a publication?

At some recent conferences I've had a chance to talk with faculty colleagues from other ELCA colleges. From them I have heard comments such as these: "Many of the faculty at my institution don't even know we're church related, to say nothing of knowing what that means." "Is being church related anything more than a public relations device?" "Most of the faculty at my college are afraid of our church connectedness. They assume it implies another Inquisition and want nothing to do with it." "I didn't realize that we had any 'sister colleges' or that I had colleagues beyond my institution



who were asking some of the same questions that I do.” “The Lutheran connection at our college is very vague, mostly because no one seems to know exactly what it means.” “Somebody ought to do us the big favor of articulating what it means to be a Lutheran college. The question, at our school, is most often met with a kind of bemused silence.” ... It is in response to this lack of awareness, this vagueness, this sense of disconnection, that *Intersections* hopes to speak.

Of course people at our colleges and universities still have questions about Lutheran identity and its implications, but now they are aware that they are not asking these questions all by themselves and they have some resources for addressing them, resources provided in some part by the annual Vocation of a Lutheran College Conference and by *INTERSECTIONS*. Our purpose was to encourage and facilitate such discussion, to create a larger sense of community among the ELCA institutions, and to share the best thinking that we were able to bring to this matter. I think we have succeeded in that enterprise. Just recently I was asked to be of help in completing a bibliography of resources for a university’s Lutheran identity study. It was interesting to see that almost a third of the readings included in the bibliography were pieces that had been published in *INTERSECTIONS*. Not infrequently I get an e-mail from colleges requesting copies of particular back issues to be used to facilitate campus discussions about vocation, tenure, academic freedom, service learning, etc. I am happy when such things occur. It means that somebody is reading and that a discussion somewhere is being informed by this publication.

There are some things I wish we had been able to do better. I guess I pass this list along to Bob Haak in the hope that he may be able to improve the publication in ways I was not able to. 1) I wish I had been better able to use the board of editors. That group had potential but was under-utilized. That was my fault, not theirs. 2) I wish I had been able to get more offerings of poetry and art from people at other institutions. Very often I had to call on the considerable talents of colleagues here at Capital for art or poems to fill out an issue. 3) The same can be said for essays and homilies and reflections from colleagues around the league. The journal survives not only on financial support but on the gift economy of shared ideas. That being said I do need to boast that over the 21 issues we’ve done so far, we’ve published pieces from persons at 20 of the 28 ELCA colleges and universities as well as from 10 institutions outside that group. I think that’s mighty fine, and I hope it continues. Send your ideas and proposals to Bob Haak. Let’s keep him and his editorial assistants busy.

There are three people in particular whom I wish to thank for their work on *INTERSECTIONS*. They are the students who have worked as copy editors with me over these years. They are: Jessica Brown, Marissa Cull, and Caitlin McHugh. *INTERSECTIONS* would have been a mess without their work. Together we learned how to format and edit an issue and get it ready for the printer. My thanks also to the presidents and provosts at Capital University who over the years have supported the publication with money, facilities, and encouragement. And to all others who have been help and support in this process a heartfelt thank you.

**Tom Christenson**

*tchrste@capital.edu*

## CHANGES

W. Robert Sorensen

Structure is important. I realize those words land with a bureaucratic “clank” on many ears, but the obvious fact is no community—including a church or a college—can be without it. It is certainly true that where there is no vision, people perish. It is also equally true that without adequate structure, no community can flourish. How an organization is structured tells us a great deal about what it values and how it functions.

Therefore, when an organization restructures, it is worth our attention. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) is in the midst of such a process and will recommend a new structure for the Division for Higher Education and Schools (DHES). I have been asked to comment about what the Division was like at the beginning and what the recommended change might mean for the church and for the colleges and universities that carry the church's name.

Colleges and universities have always been a vital part of the Lutheran community. From the beginning of Luther's reform, three movements can be identified. The first was a movement of reform in the University itself. Note this is not saying it was a 16th century Reformation that occurred in the new and modest setting of Wittenberg University, but rather a renewal of universities. They gained greater intellectual freedom from Luther's reform, without which, in turn, that reform could not have moved forward. The second movement changed the life and structure of the church, an attempt to renew the church so that it more clearly reflected the centrality of the Gospel which Luther's scholarship had uncovered. What distinguished Luther's Reformation from earlier reforms was that those efforts focused essentially on reforming the life of the church. Luther first centered on the thought and theology of the church, a rediscovery of the radical grace of the Gospel and then, from that understanding, sought to shape in new ways the life and structure of the church. And finally, as time went on, there developed a third movement, Pietism, that wished to deepen the spiritual life of the individual.

To change the imagery a bit and place the Lutheran Reformation upon the stage, we can view it in three interrelated scenes: first the University; then the Church; and finally the individual's spiritual life. When Lutheranism came to this country, the same three emphases came with it. But interestingly, in exactly the opposite order.<sup>1</sup>

This heritage helps us understand why education has played such a significant role in the life of the Lutheran Church. When the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America was formed, it gave expression to this reality in several ways. One of the most important was through its churchwide structure, which has the primary task of helping the church carry out its national and international work. Only six Divisions were used to focus these efforts, and one of the six was the Division for Higher Education and Schools, named originally, more simply but less accurately, the Division for Education. Some readers will know the Division has three departments with directors and small staffs for Colleges and Universities, 28 across the country; Campus Ministry, some 200 ministries primarily at state institutions, but also including such campuses as Harvard, Yale and Stanford; and Schools, over 2000 early childhood centers, elementary and secondary schools.

Thus the world's second largest Lutheran church, as it began, gave high visibility to the place of education in the life of this church. It was structured so that educational issues would always be in the mix of churchwide discussions and planning, and that the church would always have a voice in the many areas of college and university life engaged by the Division. It also meant the ELCA could enter, through the Division, into international areas of educational concerns, about which I will say more later. The Division, therefore, signaled a central place for higher education and schools in the heritage and life of this church and was an important symbol of that reality. This is a fact, I would argue, as important as the Division's work.

But what would hold the work of a Division together that went, as Bishop Steve Bowman once aptly said, from ABC's to PhD's? The cohesiveness began with a definition from the late Joseph Sittler. He spoke of education as movement into a larger world. It was a definition well made for the Division, applicable to an early childhood center or to a college. This is what learning is and does for those fortunate enough to participate in it. And, when done well, it takes place at all ages, within every discipline, and continues for a lifetime.

Within the Division we also understood this larger world to be comprised of two levels of reality, the realm of nature engaged through our senses and the realm of the Spirit, within and around the natural, that can and does

break into our experience. Those familiar with the work of Houston Smith will recognize this view of the world with two dimensions of reality as that which he calls the "primordial tradition," a universal view found within every culture throughout time.<sup>2</sup> In the Christian tradition out of which our colleges have come, it resonates with what Jesus called the Kingdom of God. The vast majority of people, according to Smith, experience reality in this two dimensional way. Readers of this essay will also recognize it as a view essentially rejected by the Enlightenment, which gradually narrowed its understanding and investigation primarily to the natural order. Much of great value has been accomplished because of it. This narrower view of reality is also found in most of higher education today, but its inadequacy is increasingly called into question, especially in theoretical physics, although the critique is by no means confined to that discipline. The Division sided with the critics.

So the Division, with its work in colleges, universities, campus ministries, elementary and secondary schools and early childhood centers cohered around an understanding of education as movement into a larger world. From this center, the Division carried out its work by developing various programs that sought to advance three main goals.

To name one of the goals, we wanted to help strengthen educational excellence in our colleges and universities. We used the academy's definition of excellence in terms of faculty degrees from quality institutions, publications, and especially competence as classroom teachers. A second goal for our programs was to assist the colleges and universities in bringing the Christian theological heritage into academic settings. I sometimes liked to say to the more secular faculty or administrators on our campuses that the colleges of which they were a part would not exist if it were not for the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. Jaws dropped. I meant nothing esoteric by such a statement but simply the fact that without the reality it pointed to, there would be no Christian church, nor that part of it called Lutheran and therefore no people who founded the institutions we now have. But not only heritage gave reason for our colleges and universities to explore theological issues. Such reflection in classrooms and experiences of worship in chapels deepen the learning life of the campus. And thirdly, we wanted the work we did to enhance community on our campuses, glaringly lacking in far too much of higher education today.

The Division therefore centered its work on tasks that would enhance excellence, deepen theological reflection in academic settings, and enrich our schools as

communities of faith and learning. I am convinced such efforts strengthen our campuses as places able to "probe both the deep places of the human mind and the deep longings of the human spirit," to quote a phrase from a speech the late Ernest Boyer once used to praise the colleges and universities of the ELCA. It is unfortunately clear such places are not easily found in higher education today. We worked to help our colleges and universities provide this rare and rich experience to those who were a part of them. If this were done, then the more traditional task of an educational structure in a churchwide office, to help educate the next generation of leaders for church and society, would be enhanced. And students would be moved into a larger world.

This was the center of the Division's efforts. We wanted it reflected in our work with boards, administrators, faculty, and students. It also stands behind the effort to promote an understanding of vocation in our schools, the faculty conferences on the Vocation of a Lutheran College, the Lutheran Academy of Scholars, the publication of this journal, and the establishment of the Conrad Bergendoff Series of publications on faith and learning in higher education, which to this point includes two books: Ernest L. Simmons, *Lutheran Higher Education: An Introduction for Faculty* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993); and Tom Christenson, *The Gift and Task of Lutheran Higher Education* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004).

As I indicated earlier, there was also a strong international dimension to DHES. A part of it can be seen in the program to educate in our colleges and universities one hundred Namibian students, an effort well-known and respected. It produced a cadre of young leaders to help their nation break free from the shackles of Apartheid. There is ongoing work, centered in New Delhi, with colleges in India and other areas of the Near East. And there is the present effort of the Division's department for schools to strengthen elementary schools in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Palestine. We also helped establish and lead conferences in developing countries, using international settings such as Bethlehem University and Jerusalem, at which educational leaders from developing nations participated with educational leaders from the Vatican and other church bodies. All of this, and much more, was done with competent staff and board members, many of whom I had the pleasure of working with for thirteen years. I think it is a fair evaluation to say the work was done effectively for both the colleges and the church.

And now we are in a process to transition the Division for Higher Education and Schools into the much larger and



more broadly focused Division for Vocation and Education. It will be a Division that merges much of the work of the Division for Ministry with that of DHES. Since I am no longer connected to the Division for Higher Education and Schools and have not been since my retirement in 2000, I am less aware of the significance of this proposal than others. I understand that after some initial mistakes the process has moved forward more effectively and will likely be adopted. The work of the Division with colleges and universities, campus ministries, and schools will be brought together with the ELCA's eight seminaries, various forms of youth ministry, as well as with other areas of ministry. Those who support the transition think it could create a web of connections that might be helpful to the colleges and universities—perhaps, for example, in the area of recruiting.

My concern is twofold: will the new structure signal to both those within and outside the ELCA the core significance of education in the heritage and life of this church; and, secondly, can it carry forward the effectiveness and scope of DHES' work with the colleges

and universities (as well as with campus ministries and schools)? I am more hopeful about the second concern—the ongoing work. I am less certain about the first. In the twentieth century, the relationship between churches and their colleges has frequently collapsed, a story familiar to all of us. The ELCA has been regarded by many in higher education and in other church bodies as a church where the relationship is healthy. This has been the result of a great deal of concern and effort in a network of relationships involving many people, and a very important core of those relationships has been maintained and developed through DHES. Will the new structure be able to give these relationships the same attention, or will they become obscured because of the larger focus of the new Division for Vocation and Education? I know the leadership of the ELCA and the college and university presidents do not wish this into the amazing and changing vitality of the educational environment where exciting and important ideas are flying around. You are a significant sign of this church's heritage and involvement in this creative process. Whoever you may be, God bless you, the Division you will lead, the colleges and universities, and the church from which they came.

---

*Rev. W. Robert Sorensen is former executive director of the Division for Higher Education and Schools.*

#### **Endnotes**

---

<sup>1</sup> The distinguished Yale historian, Professor Emeritus Jaroslav Pelikan, has used similar terminology in speaking of the Reformation, citing first a university phase, then a period of orthodoxy, and finally Pietism. Pelikan's views are noted in a speech by Donald Hertzler delivered to a Campus Ministry gathering in May of 2003.

<sup>2</sup> Huston Smith, *Forgotten Truth: The Primordial Tradition*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

## THE CHURCH IN EDUCATION? EDUCATION IN THE CHURCH? TEN THESES ON WHY THESE QUESTIONS MATTER

Leonard G. Schulze

You should also take pains to urge governing authorities and parents to rule wisely and educate their children. They must be shown that they are obliged to do so, and that they are guilty of damnable sin if they do not do so, for by such neglect they undermine and lay waste both to the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world and are the worst enemies of God and humanity.

--Martin Luther, Preface to *The Small Catechism*

...assist this church to bring forth and support faithful, wise, and courageous leaders whose vocations serve God's mission in a pluralistic world.

--Churchwide Organization Strategic Direction

I skate to where the puck is going to be.

--Wayne Gretzky

*Intersections* editor Tom Christenson has asked me to describe my vision for the Division for Higher Education and Schools (DHES). Within a few weeks, at its August 2005 Churchwide Assembly in Orlando, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America will almost certainly vote to put DHES out of existence. The decommissioning of DHES is the result of an ongoing initiative by Presiding Bishop Mark S. Hanson to restructure the work of the churchwide organization of the ELCA.

Almost two years ago, Bishop Hanson issued a restructuring plan that would have terminated not only DHES, but the entire churchwide program for schools and early childhood education. That plan was withdrawn a few months later, in the midst of significant controversy about both its process and its content. Under the revised restructuring plan to be voted on this summer, all of the ministry areas heretofore served through DHES—including schools and early childhood education—are scheduled to be integrated into a newly created larger program unit responsible for “Vocation and Education.”

Pondering the significance of these developments for the life of the church, and for education in North America, is a bittersweet experience. On a rational level, I am not fully persuaded that the loss of DHES will be good either for the church or for education. And on an emotional level, I mourn the loss of something that has been precious to me and to many others, both in the church and in education.

Therefore I humbly confess at the outset: these reflections are not dispassionate. I pray fervently that the new structure of the churchwide offices does in fact make possible synergies and energies that renew the church and its understanding of its mission in education. There is

much good language in place describing the proposed new unit for “Vocation and Education” (see Thesis #9, below). Realizing the full potential of the new unit will require the vision and labor of many people. May God’s blessings shower upon it and upon them.

So, what *was* my vision, and how did it shape my leadership of the division? Actually, much of it can be found on the current Web site of DHES: [www.elca.org/education](http://www.elca.org/education). There you will find succinct statements of mission, vision, core values, contexts and commitments, and strategic directions for the division. These statements are appended to this essay for convenience of reference.

All of these statements emerged through much intensive work over a period of three years with the DHES staff and over five meetings with the board. I am deeply grateful to all these colleagues, especially to Board Chairs John Andreasen and Rod Schofield. Without their leadership, collegiality, and support, these important formulations would have remained at best institutionally inchoate.

On one level, these reformulated statements of mission, vision, core values, and strategic directions speak for themselves. They do not represent a major departure from the work of DHES under the leadership of my predecessor Bob Sorensen. But they do represent some new vocabulary, new emphases, and new specificity about the role and work of the division itself, as opposed to other expressions of the church or the educational institutions connected with our work. It is, perhaps, useful to know that these new emphases and foci were designed as explicit responses to *urgent strategic exigencies*.

I had—and continue to have—a sense of urgency about responding constructively to those exigencies. Visions of executive directors and strategic plans of boards are irrelevant unless they connect us vibrantly to our identity, on the one hand, and to our changing expression of our mission in a changing world, on the other hand. As I saw them, these exigencies all related to *the church, to education, and to the relationship between the church and education*. Invoking Martin Luther's own intellectual style, scholarly rigor, and pedagogical heart, I shall present them as *theses* that shaped my leadership of the division.

The claims presented in these theses represent touchstones of my public communications during my tenure as executive director of DHES. And my use of the discourse of “theses”—along with Luther's persistent catechetical question, “What does this mean?”—is intended to invoke the discourse of the *academy*, as distinguished from the dominant contemporary discourses of the church or of modern management.

Asking you to receive these statements as *theses*, rather than, say, as pronouncements, or policy edicts, or for that matter merely the personal preferences of someone who happens to find himself in a position of leadership, is itself a meta-thesis about discourse and communication styles. It is a meta-thesis, I propose, that both the church and our increasingly “managed” public sphere might do well to ponder. Whatever else they are, theses are invitations to join in a *reflective community of discourse*.

**Thesis #1: Critical thinking and reading, deep learning, rational public discussion, and moral deliberation are dominant traits in the gene pool of the Lutheran Church.**

#### **What does this mean?**

Martin Luther was both an Augustinian monk and a university professor. His persistence in remaining true to both these expressions of his Christian vocation fueled both the Protestant Reformation and the establishment of the church body that now bears the name “Lutheran.”

The use of “theses” as modes of discussion and debate (“disputatio,” in Luther's day) came naturally to Luther as a university professor. Without his commitment to rigorous public discussion of important issues, there would have been no Lutheran church. But, more significantly, critical thinking and passion for the truth came naturally to Luther not only as a university professor, but also as a faithful Christian. The integrity and courage with which Luther entered into honest

debate with the leading theologians of his age was grounded in his profound respect for the unity of God's truth.

**Thesis #2: Luther's personal and public devotion to learning as an expression of his Christian vocation was not a mere personality quirk or the unreflective habit of a university professor. It was a direct and faithful expression of his understanding of Scripture, of the teachings of Christ, and of the writings of profound theological thinkers, notably St. Augustine. These sources all tell us that as Christians we are called to be disciples and to make disciples of all nations. Luther radically renewed the church's understanding of that Christian vocation.**

#### **What does this mean?**

Through centuries of ownership by the priestly class, the original liberating power of the call to be disciples—to be *learners*—had by the time of Luther become obscured, and it seems to have become obscured again today among many Christians. It is by *coming to know the Truth* that we become free.

And the truth we are called to know and share is the Truth conveyed to us by *all* persons of the Trinitarian God: Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. Our call to discipleship—to learning—is a radical summons to open ourselves to the wonder of the whole world in its full reality. Faith is called to seek understanding—of the created order and of our place in it, of our sinful-yet-redeemed status as followers of Christ, of our intimate kinship and spiritual fellowship with all people in the world.

Too many people who claim to be Christians behave as though they have completed their apprenticeship as disciples and rush to claim their authority as apostles representing the Truth as something we have already gotten under our complete control. The church does not own the Gospel, but is called to proclaim it. And proclaiming it effectively can only be done if we ourselves remain forever open to being transformed anew by it—that is, if we ourselves remain disciples. The church needs lifelong learning as much as any individual does. The church needs education at least as much as education needs the church.

**Thesis #3: The continuing vitality of the Lutheran church as a reforming movement in the church catholic is intimately bound up with these features of its genesis and its gene pool.**

### What does this mean?

Dogma and doctrine remain important to any faith community, especially, perhaps, to the confessing church. But the merely dogmatic and doctrinaire are alien to the spirit of Lutheran Christianity. The energy of the Lutheran church itself as a distinctive voice in the Christian community derives from its capacity to *renew* its understanding of foundational principles. That is, the very identity of the Lutheran church is constitutively bound up with its capacity for learning and teaching.

**Thesis #4: Many different cultural and national strands of Lutheranism are represented in the ELCA as it exists today. Unexamined assumptions underlying disparate conceptions of the appropriate relationship between church and education, faith and learning, have produced misperceptions, caricatures, and mistrust that undermine the relationships between education and the church.**

### What does this mean?

The history of Lutheranism in North America is a history of mergers. Dozens of smaller churches grounded in disparate polities, ecclesiologies, and even theologies finally landed in the ELCA with the 1988 merger. Many of these churches originally had their own organic relationship with their specific educational institutions, including seminaries and colleges.

Some traditions are assertively grounded in social service as the motive for education, others in a more classical understanding of the liberal arts as learning for learning's sake, still others in pietism. Some had a deep commitment to a Trinitarian view of education, others a more Christological view. Some saw higher education as diaconal service that the church should provide to the broader world, others as the in-house guarantor of faithful church workers. In each case, the (often implicitly) shared understanding between a given church's congregations and its related colleges and seminaries ensured mutual loyalty and support.

But as successive mergers threw both congregations and institutions into close corporate relationships with other strands of Lutheranism, the grounds of the relationship between "church" and "education" often became blurred. Articulating a consensus regarding these grounds required energy and commitment at all levels of the church, but especially at the national level. Individual congregations and synods cannot be expected to provide such conceptual and theological leadership.

To the degree that energy and commitment of both educational institutions and the church have been preempted or diverted by other more "immediate" concerns of their respective cultures, tending to the vitality and integrity of their relationship has been accorded relatively low priority, especially among individual congregations. If a sense of shared purpose among the educational institutions of the ELCA is to be fed and nurtured, if campus ministry is to remain a significant ministry of the whole church, then some significant centripetal activity at the churchwide level will be necessary to counteract the centrifugal effect of congregational and synodical preoccupations.

**Thesis #5: The single most significant development in American higher education during the twentieth century was the steep decline in the significance of the residential church-related liberal arts college, concomitant with the steep increase in the significance of the research university. As a result, the landscape of American higher education in 2005 is strewn with "formerly" church-related colleges.**

### What does this mean?

This story can be told with varied protagonists, and it would be shortsighted to dismiss them. There is much to celebrate in the diversification of institutional settings, the democratizing of access, the increased social mobility, and the growth of knowledge associated with these changes. But several concomitant developments profoundly impacted the questions we are examining here: the role of the church in education, and the role of education in the church.

The research university displaced the liberal arts college not only demographically, but also professionally, as the certifier of disciplinary rigor in the academy. Increasingly, college faculty were socialized during their graduate training to aspire to research, rather than teaching, careers. Those who wind up at church-related liberal arts colleges anyway—whether by choice or by default—are often systematically devalued by their colleagues at research universities. Not only is pedagogy devalued, but the very structure of the academic disciplines is often shaped by the hyperspecialization prevalent in the profession.

As a result, there is enormous pressure on colleges and their faculties to "grow in excellence" by emulating the dominant research-university model. Under this model, the locus of excellence is the discipline, not the institution and its character. Indeed, the "church-relatedness" of a college is viewed by many academics as

suspect—as a danger to academic freedom, or as a dilution of intellectual rigor.

These developments represent not merely a failure of nerve on the part of faculty at church-related colleges, but a massive shift in the broader public consumption of higher education. The people in the pews of ELCA congregations have been conditioned by this paradigm shift along with the rest of America. Nowadays, more than 90% of Lutheran 18-year-olds attend public universities. Thankfully, Lutherans foresaw these developments and took steps to ensure that both “our” colleges and public institutions would be places of Lutheran witness. With the establishment of a campus ministry in 1907 at the University of Wisconsin (now UW-Madison), Lutheran Campus Ministry was launched as a ministry of the whole church.

**Thesis #6: In connection with the paradigm shift described above, the default public understanding of “religious” education (including schools and colleges) has shifted. Current public opinion regarding the very word “evangelical” is that it must entail something essentially irrational, sectarian, and stubbornly fundamentalist—and that it is inherently bound up with certain political views. Those who want their children “trained” in sectarian fashion will seek out precisely schools and denominations that have narrow definitions of both faith and learning, and rigid understandings of the connection between them. Those whose vision of education is more liberating will avoid such institutions like the plague.**

#### **What does this mean?**

The dialogical relationship between faith and learning that has been central to Lutheran theology and Lutheran education since the Reformation is virtually defined out of existence by this binary mode of thinking. To the degree that the leadership of the ELCA does not boldly hold up the distinctiveness of this Lutheran understanding, the categories of the culture will sweep over church and education alike. To the degree that most of the membership of the ELCA has already been deeply influenced by these categories, the church itself loses the ability to speak to the culture with a distinctive voice.

**Thesis #7: There is much to celebrate. The ELCA has inherited an enviable presence in this changing landscape of American higher education, and congregational investment in early childhood education is growing faster than any other part of the church. At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the 28 colleges and universities of the ELCA have a closer**

**relationship with one another, and with the various expressions and agencies of the church, than the colleges of any other Protestant denomination. (Colleges sponsored by Roman Catholic orders offer fascinating comparisons, especially the Jesuit Order, which also has 28 colleges and universities in the United States). Almost one-fifth of ELCA congregations are engaged in early childhood, primary, or secondary-school ministries. And the 200 campus ministry sites of the ELCA have been the envy of other denominations for decades.**

#### **What does this mean?**

The vitality of these educational ministries, often in the face of overwhelming financial and organizational challenges, is reassuring evidence that the gene pool of Lutheranism continues to generate lively educational ministries. Often this vitality persists despite meaningful recognition of this work *as* a ministry of the church, and with minimal and dwindling infrastructure and support for it from one or more of the three “expressions” of the church. Reports persist that some congregations continue to view schools as sources of supplemental income, rather than as congregational ministries. Campus ministries must cobble together resources from local individuals and congregations, in the light of dwindling financial support from synods and the churchwide organization. And operating grants to colleges and universities have plummeted since the 1988 merger.

Comparisons with the devolution of educational ministries in other denominations clearly show the wisdom of clear and visible leadership for education at the churchwide organization. Given the centrality of learning to our theology, loss of such focus would be unconscionable. The ELCA would experience what has happened to other denominations: campus ministries would be further curtailed; colleges would see diminishing rationale for remaining distinctively Lutheran; and early childhood centers would not receive the managerial, organizational, and theological counsel they need. Congregations and synods, while they do many things well, are simply not constituted to provide leadership in these areas.

**Thesis #8: DHES and the agencies and institutions it supports have been traditionally perceived by the whole church as working at the *margin* of the church. This perception is shared by many who work in the church itself, and by many who work in those institutions and agencies. While such “rim-walking” can be understood as a form of healthy outreach, it can also—especially in a time of dwindling resources**

**and organizational restructuring—easily be characterized as a “lack of congruence with central institutional agendas.”**

### **What does this mean?**

The three ministry areas assigned to DHES at the founding of the ELCA were more heterogeneous than the ministries of any of the other five program divisions. Initially called the “Division for Education,” the name was quickly changed to “Division for Higher Education and Schools,” with the plausible rationale that “education” was also within the purview of several other units. What the name change certified, however, was a perception that DHES did not have a mission of its *own* for the sake of the church, but merely existed for and on behalf of higher education and schools. Contrast the names of the other five divisions: Congregational Ministry, Outreach, Global Mission, Church in Society, Ministry. Their very names carry clearer legitimization of ecclesial functions.

Changing the name of the division signaled its secondary status. The name invited perception of DHES as an institutional support service, rather than as a home for a major, identifiable ministry of the church. It seemed important to me to redress this marginalization. We tried to do this by continuing to serve the institutions and agencies with whom we were partnered, but in such a way that the foundational theological rationale for the work of the division in the *Lutheran* church was foregrounded. The proposed name of the new unit that will absorb DHES is in this sense a heartening development: Vocation and *Education*.

**Thesis #9: The reformed concept of vocation is one of Martin Luther’s most significant contributions to theology, the church, and the world. There is no single concept that is more important to our understanding of why the church must be involved in education and why education is crucial for the continuing vitality of the church.**

### **What does this mean?**

Luther’s bold, incarnational redefinition of the concept of vocation involves the central insight that we are called to excellent work in the world and in service to our neighbor. Being “called out” (*ek-klesia*), being the church (*ecclesia*) is not an end in itself. The church, if it is to be faithful to the God it worships, must return to the world “that He so loved.”

And in order to serve with the genuine excellence which our love of God and our neighbor compels us to, we need to do at least two things: we need to do everything we can to sharpen our ability to hear with full volume and clarity the call that is ours, and we need to develop the full range of capacities and skills—intellectual, manual, emotional, professional, interpersonal, technical—that will allow us to respond to that call fully. That is, we need *discernment* and *equipping*.

Discernment and equipping are the goals of the sort of “practical liberal arts” education that Lutherans of many varieties have cherished through the centuries. If Lutherans are to be credible witnesses to the incarnational God in the twenty-first century, now is not the time to abandon that precious heritage. In this context, the rationale for the soon-to-be-created program unit for “Vocation and Education” should stir our souls.

This unit brings together ELCA churchwide ministries involved in the development and support of faithful, wise, and courageous leaders whose vocations serve God’s mission in a pluralistic world. This unit assists this church and its institutions in equipping all people to live out their callings for the sake of the world. This unit seeks mutual accountability among congregations, synods, institutions, and churchwide units for engaging all arenas of knowledge in the context of faith and fostering a culture of theological wisdom.

Responsibilities include: encouraging a sense of vocation in children, youth, and adults; lifting up the centrality of the church in education and education in the church; sustaining the foundational place of seminaries and theological education; overseeing the preparation of people for ordained and lay rostered ministry; and serving as a steward of the ELCA’s networks and systems for leadership development and support for leaders in church and world.

If this unit lives up to its charge, the place of education in the church will once again be central, not marginal. The rationale for the church’s involvement in education will be clearer for both committed Lutherans and for those “outside” the church who may be prone to dismiss or caricature its motives for such involvement. Many active Lutherans are completely unaware of the emphasis Luther placed on deep and broad education, and on the significance of education for Christians, indeed, for all people. Moreover, 75% of the students at ELCA colleges and universities, an even higher percentage of the faculty



at those institutions, and many teachers in ELCA elementary schools and early childhood education centers are not members of any Lutheran church. How will these partners in, and beneficiaries of, “Lutheran” education appreciate what a precious gift and task it is—unless that preciousness is lifted up boldly and clearly?

**Thesis #10: The emergence of an ELCA Social Statement on Education is an important step in raising the consciousness of current ELCA members about the centrality of learning and teaching in our heritage and about the crucial role they will play in the ability of the church to speak its Word meaningfully in the diverse world of this century.**

#### **What does this mean?**

The study documents relating to the social statement are available on the Web site of the Division for Church in Society, [www.elca.org/socialstatements/education](http://www.elca.org/socialstatements/education). I urge you to engage them and the task force as it continues its work. It is essential that our deeply theological understanding of incarnational vocation be reflected in this document, for that will enable generations of Lutherans to grow in their appreciation of the perfect freedom and the perfect servanthood to which Christians are called, here, now, and in the world, as well as in the church.

The relationship between the church and education that is articulated in this document must lift up Luther’s celebration of education—lest we “by such neglect...undermine and lay waste both to the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world.”

#### **A Gift to the Oikumene**

Shortly after I accepted my election to the position of Executive Director of the churchwide program unit Division for Higher Education and Schools in March of

2000, I received a letter from then-Presiding Bishop H. George Anderson. He wrote:

It is rare among other denominations to have a division that is directed to the educational ministry of the church at all levels. In the case of the ELCA, I believe it demonstrates one of our distinctively Lutheran traits: in a sense it is a gift that we bring to the *oikumene*.

Bishop Anderson’s endorsement of the distinctiveness and significance of DHES gave me courage and hope, for it echoed my own conviction that the ELCA is the steward of a remarkable and precious understanding of the relationship between learning and faith. Now, as DHES is decommissioned, I pray fervently that the program unit for Vocation and Education will nurture in highly visible and publicly celebrated ways this church’s glorious heritage in education.

“Lifting up the centrality of the church in education and education in the church” will require renewed “interdisciplinary” understanding of evangelism, outreach, global mission, and much other work undertaken by the church. All of this work is grounded in discipleship, that is, in learning. The prospect of “mutual accountability...for engaging all arenas of knowledge in the context of faith,”—accountability that explicitly involves synods and congregations as well as institutions and churchwide units—is inspiring.

The church and the world cry out for “faithful, wise, and courageous leaders whose vocations serve God’s mission in a pluralistic world.” The next chapter in the story of Lutheran boldness in education is about to unfold. Let us confidently claim our discipleship and humbly commit ourselves to excellence and mutual encouragement as we respond joyfully to our vocation.

Now, where’s that puck headed?

---

*Leonard G. Schulze serves as Professor of English and Communication, and Chair of the Department of Communication and Digital Media, at Carthage College. He is founding co-director of the Augustine Institute, an online journal designed to nurture thoughtful and respectful dialogue about concepts, themes, and ideas that have been and continue to be important to the Augustinian/Lutheran tradition and those who care about it ([www.carthage.edu/ai](http://www.carthage.edu/ai)).*

#### **Appendix: Strategic Planning Overview, 2005 Division for Higher Education and Schools**

##### **Mission Statement**

The mission of the Division for Higher Education and Schools is to provide leadership in defining, supporting, and advocating for the interactive ministry of the church in education and education in the church.

## **Vision Statement**

The Division for Higher Education and Schools nurtures grace-filled communities of faith and learning that inspire service to God, church, and the world.

---

## **Core Values**

---

<i>Truth</i>	We strive to know the truth of Christ and to understand the truths about God's creation.
<i>Intellect</i>	We affirm intellectual curiosity and wonder, while striving for faith-informed understanding.
<i>Individuality</i>	We acknowledge each human being as uniquely created in the image of God and possessing intrinsic worth.
<i>Vocation</i>	We believe that we are called by God to be people of God, empowered for service in the Church and the world.
<i>Community</i>	We profess that we are created by God to be in relationship with each other and that liberal arts learning helps build relationship in community.
<i>Inclusivity</i>	We affirm that the educational mission of the Church is to serve all the people of God.
<i>Freedom</i>	We simultaneously affirm the expression of academic freedom and Christian freedom in the pursuit of education.

## **Contexts and Commitments**

The Mission, Vision, Strategic Directions, and Commitments of the ELCA Churchwide Organization inform and guide the work of this unit. Specifically, the Division for Higher Education and Schools affirms and commits itself to the following:

- Lively and creative exchange of resources and ideas;
- Recognizing and encouraging the vital contributions and deepening relationships with institutions and agencies of this church, especially its colleges, universities, campus ministries, schools, and early childhood education centers;
- Confronting the scandalous realities of the multitude of barriers that manifest themselves in exclusion, poverty, hunger and violence;
- Engaging ardently our diverse, multi-cultural, multi-generational and global context.

## **Strategic Directions**

Shaped by these Contexts and Commitments, and by our own Mission, Vision, and Core Values, the Division for Higher Education and Schools will:

- Articulate and advocate for a Lutheran understanding of the relationship between faith and learning, the role of this understanding in evangelical outreach, and the significance of this understanding in response to the rise of fundamentalism and civil religion in the culture of North America.
- Contribute to the ELCA's call for a social statement on education.
- Provide resources in faith formation and leadership development to assist and affirm our schools, early childhood education centers, colleges, universities, and campus ministries to achieve excellence as they discover and fulfill their vocations in Jesus Christ.
- Provide staff support and create other resources of high quality that are easily accessible and responsive to the needs of our constituencies and partners in ministry.
- Build strategic relationships with
  - Other units of the churchwide organization;
  - Synods;
  - Congregations;
  - ELCA and related agencies, institutions and entities;
  - Ecumenical partners;
  - International companion churches;

that strengthen and expand ministries to and with children and their families, youth, and young adults.

# PRIVATE UNIVERSITY, PUBLIC WITNESS: LIFE IN THE "NONE ZONE"

Loren J. Anderson

## Background

As I set out to prepare these comments, I was struck (and a bit mortified) by the realization that 28 summers have passed since I attended my first conference that focused on the mission and identity of Lutheran colleges. The year was 1975, the location was Concordia College in Moorhead, and the participants included two faculty members from each of the eleven American Lutheran Church colleges. An additional group of us from Concordia attended as listeners and observers.

At the time of that conference I was a third-year faculty member and novice administrator, and the experience made a lasting impression. That impression began with the participants, for this 1975 gathering was one of the early conferences on Lutheran identity, and it drew together legendary faculty leaders such as Dittmanson from St. Olaf, Diers from Wartburg, Storvick from Concordia, Hull-Mohr from Luther, and Nordquist from Pacific Lutheran. In the years that followed, these faculty members would serve as leaders of the "Lutheran" conversation both on their respective campuses and across the broader Lutheran community. This current series of "vocation" conferences may be understood, at least in part, as a natural heir of their legacy and their impact and as a continuing conversation on mission and identity that now dates to three decades and more.

My second lasting memory of that 1975 conference is the keynote lectures that were delivered by Professor Robert Bertram, then a member of the Seminex faculty. His lectures focused on the question "What does it mean to be a Lutheran college?" I remember clearly how, after three excellent presentations that built the context and background, I arrived for his final lecture awaiting a clear and definitive answer to this "Lutheran" issue. So I was both surprised, and initially disappointed, when Bertram concluded that "What it means to be a Lutheran college is that we are free to ask the question, 'What does it mean to be a Lutheran college?'"

Four lectures later, and that was it! And "it" didn't seem like much at the time. But as the years have rolled past, Bertram's conclusion has stuck with me for it captures so very well our Lutheran understanding of and appreciation for the dialectic, complexity and uncertainty, and for the life of faith as purposeful journey and unfolding mystery. It has also stuck with me because I believe it is absolutely and profoundly true. We must keep searching and

probing and asking. So in that spirit the discussion and conversation continues; it is indeed important work, and it is the latest version of this important and essential conversation that brings us together today at Carthage College, 28 years later.

## Perspective

Cynthia Moe-Lobeda of Seattle University, in her recent book entitled *Public Church: For the Life of the World*, eloquently describes the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America's "public" commitment. She writes: "In baptismal vows and prayers, teachings, constitution, liturgy, order of ordination, and confessional documents, the...ELCA professes to be a public church and a church constituted by God for a public vocation" (pg. xii).

In his recent pastoral letter on the public church, Presiding Bishop Mark Hansen quotes the 1991 ELCA Social Statement entitled "The Church in Society: A Lutheran Perspective." That statement reads:

The ELCA is called to be a part of the Ecumenical Church of Jesus Christ in the context in which God has placed it—a diverse, divided, and threatened global society on a beautiful, fragile planet...this church is committed to defend human dignity, to stand with poor and powerless people, to advocate justice, to work for peace, and to care for the earth...." (p. 2)

Moe-Lobeda asks the great Lutheran question, "What then, does this mean for us—the ELCA—and our role in public life today?" The answer, she observes, "is both breathtakingly simple and confoundingly complex, as is the life of faith itself" (pgs. xii, xiii).

So your conference topic this year that addresses the vocation of a Lutheran college in terms of "the colleges and the public witness of the church" is certainly a natural. What does this mean? The answer is both simple and complex.

In these comments, I will contend that we can best serve the public witness for the church by mining fully our Lutheran tradition and heritage in search of educational excellence, mission fulfillment, and program distinction. Implicit in this argument, of course, is that our ultimate public witness for and with the church is carried out

through the lives of our graduates, individuals who are well prepared to lead and called vocationally to serve the world on God's behalf.

I offer these comments from the perspective of a Lutheran layperson and college leader, a practitioner, if you will. I am not a theologian, and, on the subject of the church and its public witness, I am certainly not a scholar. So the foundation for the ideas and reflections that follow is my experience, sixteen years at Concordia College in Moorhead and twelve at Pacific Lutheran University (PLU). These two venues are at once remarkably similar and dramatically different and, thus, I believe, useful in unwrapping and reflecting upon the vocation and witness of our colleges and universities.

### **Prairie and Pacific: A Comparison**

Concordia-Moorhead and PLU share a common Norwegian Lutheran heritage. They were incorporated as high school level academies just one year apart (1891/1890), and, at least initially, both expressed their vocational calling in a frontier society in nearly identical terms. But the developmental path of these two schools would differ from the beginning, due in significant measure to location and constituency.

Historically, Concordia, as is the case for most of our Midwestern schools (and several further east as well), enjoyed the support of a significant Lutheran constituency and, while experiencing its own share of crisis moments, moved from academy in 1891 to an accredited four-year college by the mid-20s. Overall, the growth and development of the college over 113 years has been continuous and incremental, characterized by stability and steady progress, constantly in missional expression and with a very close church relationship.

PLU, by contrast, was one of six Lutheran schools, each founded by a small group of Lutherans in the Northwest in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The incorporating constituency of PLU included only five congregations and 250 members. Financial crises dominated PLU's early history and delayed development, four-year college degrees were not awarded until 1940 (fifty years later), and survival was an issue until the end of World War II. It was finally the G.I. Bill that launched PLU as a post-war college and, by 1960, as a comprehensive university.

Today, Concordia College has matured in remarkable ways and continues to serve the Lutheran heartland. It is a region where, relatively, the church is still a prominent community center, socialization still drives membership, religious education is common, denominational loyalties

are strong, cultural values are widely held, and diversity is limited. At one point, by my informal count, Fargo-Moorhead, a community of 150,000, included 12 ELCA congregations, several with a membership of 2000 or more. Given Concordia's primary service region, it is not surprising that it is by nearly all traditional measures arguably the most Lutheran of our 28 schools.

Pacific Lutheran University lives and serves in the Northwest, a region of our country that Patricia Killen of our religion faculty and Mark Silk, her co-editor, in their recent Lilly Foundation funded volume, *Religion and Public Life in the Pacific Northwest*, has labeled the 'none' zone, so named because when asked about their religious identification, more people answer 'none' in the Pacific Northwest than in any other region. There is no dominant denomination, and only 2% of the population is Lutheran. Each year, in the Gallup Poll, Washington and Oregon, PLU's two primary constituent states, vie for first and second place as the "least churched" states of our country. By way of contrast with the plains, it may be said that, in the Pacific Northwest, the church is rarely the community center, membership is elective, religious education limited, denominational loyalty is low, and diversity in values and background is significant and increasing.

And this is not a new or recent circumstance. In this book Killen and Silk describe a 1914 symposium on regional issues at which Professor E. J. Klemme of the Washington State Normal School in Ellensburg lamented, "In the east they were faithful church members; now they are not even church [at]tenders." "The ascent of the great divide seemed too steep for church letters. The air of the Northwest seemed too rare for prayer. We have hurried forth to conquer the wilderness, but we have been conquered by it" (Killen, p. 9). Thus, Killen and Silk note, successful religious efforts in the Pacific Northwest "must be ecumenical, inter-faith, and coached in language that resonates with those beyond church, synagogue, temple, or mosque. Demographics do not allow any other option."

Yet, PLU always has been and is today deadly serious about living out our Lutheran heritage, or, as we often say, taking our middle name seriously. Our long-range plan, *PLU 2010*, describes our core identity and self-understanding as "a Lutheran university in the Pacific Northwest."

As noted above, I offer these sketches of Concordia College in the upper plains and Pacific Lutheran University in the Pacific Northwest because I have been privileged to experience both. And, after spending the

first 47 years of my life and my early career years in the Lutheran heartland, my PLU years have been a time of great personal growth and challenge. I have struggled with this question, "Can one be a faithfully Lutheran University (or, a faithful Lutheran "witness") in a world that is largely non-Lutheran, non-denominational, and overwhelmingly unchurched?"

Twelve years later, I am convinced that the answer is "yes." And that is very good news. But the content of the answer is different in the Pacific Northwest, and that is why I believe the comparison with the heartland helps one to think about the evolving nature of the vocation to which we are being called as Lutheran colleges and universities. Colleges and universities seeking to be public witness for the church in a rapidly changing world and in a new time, a time when the religious character of the Northwest is less and less unique and more and more the norm and the context for all of us.

What then, given our changing vineyard of service are the callings that define our vocation and shape our public witness? I offer a list of five, I'm sure that you might think of others.

### Callings

#### **1. We are called to build an academic program that reflects both our best educational philosophy AND our Lutheran theological tradition.**

Historically, our colleges and universities have hinged "Lutheraness" on church ownership and/or participation in governance, the number and proportion of Lutherans on our campus, community or lifestyle expectations (no dancing), commitment to faith development for our students, as well as matters of spiritual, marketing, and financial support from the church. Each of these "Lutheran" identifiers, whether treated simply or in combination, is appropriate and helpful in describing our uniqueness over the years. In different ways, these markers still characterize many of our schools, perhaps, to some degree, all of us.

The changing times in which we live and the changing world we serve is rendering these traditional markers obsolete so we must go further. For me, our future focus must begin with the educational program, for that is the very core of our vocation, the ministry of teaching and learning. So, every time I interview faculty or staff candidates, I include the following explanation:

If you come to PLU, I believe you will find that to be an educator in a Lutheran University is a very consonant and happy way of life. This is

true because PLU is an excellent university with a superb faculty and wonderful students. In addition, we are also a Lutheran place and Martin Luther, the founder of our faith was a Lutheran. So it is that our Lutheran theological heritage compliments, reinforces and enriches the best educational instincts of the academy.

For example, Martin Luther laid the foundation for academic excellence and academic freedom. Indeed, you will find here an academic community that understands excellence and intellectual freedom not just as rights and opportunities, but also as mandates and possibilities. And with these mandates we are in effect called to explore the most difficult, vexing and controversial questions. As my predecessor, Robert Mortvedt, president of PLU in the 1960's was fond of saying, "We do not fear the truth because we believe that all truth is God's truth."

But beyond that—our Lutheraness calls us to explore deeply. To get way beyond questions of fact, to explore fundamental principles and values, to seek out the difficult ethical challenges and to explore the great moral dilemmas. In this way, our Lutheran heritage contributes an energy and richness to one's intellectual journey.

And, one last point, Luther's two kingdom theology and his emphasis on the faith/reason dialogue, underscores, I believe, our calling to honor and explore alternative ways of encountering reality. This is important because in nearly every academic area our inquiry has carried us beyond the limits of the scientific method and our inclination to understand too simply and with too much certainty.

Well, much more could be said, and I fear in many of my interviews it is, but the point, I hope, is clear: truth seeking, the basic process of intellectual inquiry in pursuit of understanding and insight, is, for a Lutheran University, driven by both our commitment to good education and our rich theological foundation. It is a great gift that has the capacity to mark and distinguish a "Lutheran" education in any age or any locale.

#### **2. We are called to the task of building vibrant campus communities of faith and learning.**

One of the primary and historic markers of Lutheran higher education has been the claim to educate the whole

person, “mind, body and spirit.” Taken seriously, it is a seminal and powerful notion that sets us apart even as it speaks to the world’s greatest need. It is a vision that we continue to take seriously, and so we build elaborate fitness centers (for the body), and we work to build and maintain strong communities of faith and learning. I believe we are doing very well with the “learning” dimension. But our success in creating vibrant, active and necessarily ecumenical practicing faith communities on our campus is very limited.

It is not an easy matter, for when it comes to campus ministry, worship life, and religious programming, the struggle to balance denominational heritage practice, and calling with ecumenical need and opportunity is difficult. The result in many cases is a program that appeals primarily to Lutheran students and/or those from related mainline protestant denominations. The ultimate results are lonely and frustrated campus pastors, chapels that are mostly empty, and, for most of our students, a disconnect from many of our efforts to foster a major educational outcome as Lutheran schools—spiritual encounter, reflection, growth, and development.

I do not claim to have an answer to this challenge (for there is no simple answer), but here is one idea: At PLU, we have been sponsoring a series of programs called “faith and reason” dialogues. These public conversations focus on high interest, current issues (such as “patriotism in an age of terrorism” or “gay marriage”) and bring together a small group of diverse faculty for public roundtable conversations. Students listen, and then join the dialogue as the program moves along. While it is only one step, these programs have been a huge success in drawing diverse students into an animated conversation that seeks to illustrate by practice the dialogue of reason and faith, the role of both mind and spirit, learning and faith, in encountering reality, and addressing some of the most challenging issues of our day. But if your campus is similar to PLU, there is much more that needs to be done.

### **3. We are called to embrace inclusiveness and ecumenical outreach.**

The world that all of us are called to serve is increasingly diverse in nearly every way; denominations are less important, and religious identification and practice less common. Lutherans continue to decline in total and proportion of the U.S. population. Not surprisingly, the number and percentage of Lutheran students on our campus continues to decline; our faculty and staff are increasingly diverse.

Despite these realities, critical mass theory is alive and well, among both Lutheran leaders and the broader public. Indeed, one prominent sponsor of Lutheran Higher Education within the last decade set out to allocate financial support based on the percentage of Lutherans on our various campuses. And, please do not misunderstand, serving Lutherans is a good thing, and all of us will continue to seek and embrace Lutheran faculty, staff, and students; our vocational calling, our public witness if you will, should, is, and will be—and must be—much more expansive in its vision and reach. The fact that some 70% of our students today are non-Lutheran is one of the strongest expressions of our public witness as colleges and universities and the most powerful outreach efforts of our church. Our capacity as Lutheran colleges and universities to a reach non-Lutheran world is a gift. Let us claim it and move forward!

### **4. We are called to develop a global vision and commitment.**

Lutherans have traditionally thought and acted globally. For better or worse, missionary slide shows have been a staple part of many a Lutheran child’s first exposure to global education! Acts 1:8 describes our calling to be God’s witnesses both at home and “...to the ends of the earth...”

Reflecting this traditional calling and urging, many of our Lutheran colleges and universities have already developed distinguished global educational programs. I believe we are called to continue and expand these efforts, to make global education a distinctive hallmark of Lutheran higher education. Three percent of American undergraduates currently study abroad; we simply must do better if we are to avoid the incredible insensitivity and abysmal ignorance that today jeopardizes the legitimacy of our own world citizenship and the well-being of the global community.

### **5. We are called to develop our campuses as centers for vocational exploration and discovery.**

Martin Luther’s concept of the priesthood of all believers was central to the reformation. What an idea—all work, every profession, not just church leadership, is honorable and God-pleasing when done in His name and on behalf of others. I am not sure one can imagine a simpler, more powerful, or more compelling justification for the Lutheran Church’s involvement and investment in higher education.



The vocation of a Lutheran College is the theme for this conference. The vocation or sense of purpose and calling, of every student and every graduate at our respective schools, is our responsibility. Yet, we have been, and continue to be, remarkably casual and unintentional with the issue. We do not have a clear plan for confronting students with "vocational" questions or supporting their search for insights and answers. The current round of Lilly Foundation grants are a huge step in addressing this issue. At PLU, for example, the grant has already led to a major reorganization of student development services, a first-year student retreat focused on vocational discernment, and a continuing program of faculty and staff seminars, so that we are better equipped to support our students in their quest and exploration.

The vocation issue cuts even more broadly when it comes to marketing our institutions to non-Lutherans and to those outside of a formal faith background. For in its most generic form, vocation is about living life with a sense of purpose—and that, I believe, is a universal human urge and need. So I find that prospective students and their families are very interested in these issues, regardless of their religious or faith background.

Well, there's much more that could be said, but I believe these are five callings taken seriously distinguish us as colleges and universities seeking to be faithfully Lutheran and to live out our mission, with great importance and effectiveness, in a world that more and more looks like the "none" zone. Together these callings have the capacity to shape our public witness on behalf of the Church as places of exceptional intellectual depth and richness, spiritual growth, ecumenical service, global vision, and vocational discovery. Beyond that, these callings inform us as we work to educate a new generation of able and committed "public" servants.

Before I close, however, this exciting vision must be qualified by the sobering reality of the growing distance between our schools and the church.

### **A Relationship in Peril**

The history of church/higher education relationships in the United States is not encouraging. Most such relationships have dissolved, or they have been dramatically marginalized. In that regard, our Lutheran experience of a continuing strong, informing, and trust-filled relationship between church and college is almost unique and, in relative terms, it is still mainly a good news story. Our theological tradition has helped immensely; strong leadership has been a major factor as well.

But change is all about us, and, particularly since the formation of the ELCA, the Church, preoccupied by other issues, challenged organizationally and financially, has been in retreat from this relationship. Colleges, it is reasoned, have great resources and can take care of themselves. So while the church has backed away, the colleges, for the most part, have not (and that, too, is a uniquely Lutheran story). Today we gather to discuss our vocation and public witness as Lutheran colleges and universities at a time when the church is seeking to reorganize in a manner that will diminish the voice of education and takes another major step toward the elimination of financial support.

For many of us, our Lutheranness is not a matter of church-wide support or money; it is, at the heart, a matter of mission and calling, of institutional identity, of educational distinction. So the relationship is both natural and essential! But in the long run, it also must be mutual and reciprocal if it is to endure the tests of distraction and competing interests, of institutional quest for survival and progress, and future leadership change. My personal belief is that the die is cast on this issue, the direction of the ELCA at the synod and national level is clear. So what are we to do as colleges and universities, for the issue belongs to us!

At PLU we are, in effect, shifting from a program of Church relations to an emphasis of Congregational relations. This fall, we are launching a new program of "partnership" congregations in an effort to establish direct and supportive links with vibrant interested congregations, many which are growing, all who care deeply about Lutheran higher education. These congregations, we believe have the capacity to be valuable colleagues in student recruitment and financial support, as well as institutional grounding, self-understanding, and identity with the church. As both synods and national church withdraw, we look to these congregations as our natural Lutheran partners and foundations for the future.

We are also establishing a new Center of Religion, Culture and Society in the Western United States. This will be a research center that employs our primary resource, the intellectual capital of our faculty. The goal is to work with ministry practitioners in doing applied research that will illuminate religious life and inform ministry practice toward greater effectiveness in the "none" zone. Efforts such as the Center also have the capacity to build a new model for future church relationships.

If we continue in present directions, I believe that the future of our identity as Lutheran colleges and universities is at significant risk. So, perhaps, as we work together in this conference, we might articulate a sixth calling: to formulate a new compact of relationship

between our schools and the ELCA. The task belongs to us, for, as Robert Bertram concluded 29 years ago, we are free [still free] to ask the question, "What does it mean to be a Lutheran college?"

---

*Loren J. Anderson is president of Pacific Lutheran University in Tacoma, Washington.*

## SPRIGS OF MINT

Caitlin McHugh

Three light green mint stalks are dying  
in a plastic cup of water  
in my window frame's  
shadow. Their former brothers,  
neglected, lie smashed into wasteland,  
their soggy brown exteriors  
polluting the liquid life force that keeps  
the rest of them alive.  
They're stacked, like the tainted papers  
I have also neglected. Façades  
of beautiful leather-bound journals,  
journals rotting, like my mint,  
due to lack of sunlight.  
If I cleaned them out now,  
watered them, placed them  
in a warmer region full of illumination,  
they might take root and be salvaged.  
Once rooted, the journals and their  
contents could sprout, branch out,  
fill in, and produce good fruits,  
which taste better than any I've reaped.  
I could trim the rotten parts,  
retain in them what might be salvaged  
and let them flourish in beauty again.  
All it would take is time—  
all the time that is holding me back  
is the time that drives me forward.

---

*Caitlin McHugh is an English literature major and creative writing minor at Capital University.*

## FINDING WORDS THAT MATTER (PROVERBS 1:20-21; 4:10-13)

Harvard Stevens Jr.

Are we merchants of wisdom? I know well that we want to be mentors, teachers, and advocates, but the word *MERCHANTS* is helpful because it reminds us of the marketplace of values and ideas. The Book of Proverbs says: "*Wisdom cries out in the street... at the busiest corners... at the city gates.*" And yes, we have our own booths, well-manned and well-womanned, and from them we cry out: *Lutheran Higher Education, right here!*

We know that the wisdom tradition of Hebrew scripture was always very cross-cultural, reflecting a wide range of authorities, voices, and traditions. This is even truer of some wisdom sources today. Can you say *internet*? Can you say *cable TV*? Can you say *urban rap music*?

Biblical wisdom has always offered us skills for living, but today's wisdom market almost frightens us, because it offers its own versions of independent studies, seminars, and work study experiences—and some of the topics may as well be: *Hedonism 101*, *Advanced Voyeurism*, *Neo-Racism*, *Applied Sexism*, and *Pure Escapism*.

Often our students are the ones who help us face our fears. Last October, I was invited to a meeting of a student poetry club at Carthage. Young poets, rappers, and philosophers with dreadlocks, curls, and shaved heads gathered in a small classroom. They were a diverse multicultural group, from cities, suburbs, and farms. All of them were navigating together through the

marketplace of wisdom, and I am proud to say, all of them were doing well in school. They were magnificent representatives of a generation that actively seeks wisdom in profound ways and who hunger and thirst for a way to live a good life.

That night we were given an assignment to take fifteen minutes and write a poem in a style that was different for us. We all wrote, and then shared the results of our creative process. That night, this is what wisdom whispered into my ear.

Being close like this—to you and you—  
gives me more than words can say.  
Yet it was words that made me pass this way.  
Words: invitation—collaboration—inspiration—  
new creation—the next generation—  
right here before my eyes.  
What a surprise.  
No need for disguise.  
Just realize—this is the prize.  
Being close like this,  
making words that matter...  
A higher cause than chatter, chatter, chatter.

For the high calling to teach the fruits of wisdom, for words that matter, and for the promise that our students bring before us each day, let us give thanks to God Almighty, the source of all wisdom and truth! Amen.

---

*Harvard Stevens Jr. is the dean of Siebert Chapel at Carthage College in Kenosha, Wisconsin.*

# MONEY, SEX AND POWER: AN EXPLORATION OF SOME CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES IN THE PUBLIC WITNESS OF THE CHURCH

Pamela K. Brubaker

As a professor and practitioner of Christian ethics, I am well aware of the controversial character of some issues in the public witness of the church, particularly those having to do with sex and money. Beverly W. Harrison claims that “all basic theological and moral questions are about power-in-relationship” (55). Thus we cannot talk about the public witness of the church without also talking about power.

I will first discuss some issues around the public witness of the church and then turn to the vocation of Lutheran colleges. I will explore two controversial issues in the church’s public witness—homosexuality and economic life—and the challenges they present for church and college.

## Part One: Public Witness of the Church

When I speak of the public witness of the church, I am thinking primarily of the prophetic voice of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) and the ecumenical movement on social issues and public policy. This is sometimes called the social witness of the church, to contrast it with a more evangelical witness aimed toward personal conversion. Issues of power permeate this witness: Who has authority to speak for the church? Who decides what will be said? How does the church use its voice and power within the public arena? As you may know, these issues are fiercely contested.

There are those both within and without the churches who object to the church speaking on matters of public policy. Some within the church do not see matters of politics and economics as part of the “core vision” of Christianity. I understand this to be the position of our colleague Robert Benne. Writing in the volume *The Promise of Lutheran Ethics*, he contends that only in special times on special issues (which he does not specify) should the church stand for or against particular public policy issues. I see this as a conservative objection to a broad public witness of the church—the “core vision” of the church is to be preserved.

A more liberal objection is rooted in the Enlightenment understanding of public and private. In this view, religion, like the family, became a domain excluded from the purview of the public. As Elizabeth Bounds points

out, this mutes the voice of religion within the public arena and circumvents attention to power relations within the church. She concludes that mainstream Christian ethics “has used the privatization of religion as a shield against the possibility of publicly contested morality,” assuming “the capacity ... to separate reality neatly—(a privatized) faith from social life, politics, and consequently, from issues of power” (16). There are, though, increasing numbers of liberal and conservative Christians who enter the public arena to contest social and ethical issues.

This political activism, particularly of religious conservatives, has led some to claim that legally religious people should not speak on public matters. They appeal to the two religion clauses of the U.S. Constitution’s First Amendment, the second of which became interpreted as “the separation of church and state,” to support this position. In other words, they interpret the establishment clause in a way that privatizes religion. This interpretation is not persuasive to me. Although I do not personally agree with many of the religious right’s positions or tactics, I believe that the religious liberty clause, as well as other First Amendment rights like freedom of speech, permit religious believers to participate in public debate.

However, there are valid concerns about the public role of religion. The imposition of particular religious beliefs on the body politic is, in my judgment, a violation of religious liberty. The question about how the church uses its power is pertinent at this point. Does it attempt to impose its beliefs or to persuade people of the rightness of its positions?<sup>1</sup> On the one hand, religious liberty gives religious people the right to speak; but on the other hand, it protects us from an imposition of religious beliefs.

In *Religion in Public Life*, Ron Thiemann articulates a credible place for religious traditions in public discourse.

Insofar as democratic societies are historical, they will remain fallible in their grasp and exemplification of democratic ideals. From time to time these societies need to be called to account by reference to a higher standard of justice than that to which they ordinarily give allegiance. Religious traditions are often the

source for those standards, and religious discourse will often be the vehicle for both critique and renewal (88).

He concludes that when religious traditions are used in this way, “they become part of the proper public discourse of democratic societies.”<sup>2</sup> Bishop Hanson’s statement against a preemptive war with Iraq is an excellent example of this.

In her discussion of *Religion, Theology, and American Public Life*, Linell Cady contends that for theologians “to achieve a public form of argumentation,” they must respect the Enlightenment distinction between open inquiry and dogmatic citation and work to combat the authoritarian traces that linger on in contemporary theology.”<sup>3</sup> She also insists that “the impossible pretensions to neutrality and universality that underlie the Enlightenment understanding of public, and the public exercise of reason” (64) must be unmasked.

Cady thus shares the communitarian and postmodern critique of certain forms of liberalism. However, both she and Thiemann are working to reform liberalism. They do not take the communitarian turn some other theologians advocate. Elizabeth Bounds cautions against the appeal of communitarian thinkers like Richard Neuhaus and Stanley Hauerwas, who “in their criticism of liberalism, throw out valuable parts of the liberal Protestant heritage: commitments to public participation, justice, and critical reflection on inherited traditions” (118).

Bounds calls for “new forms of Christian citizenship, emphasizing our responsibilities to the entire community, nation, and world, and the necessity of acting humbly as one among many to bring about such changes in this world community” (119). Cady 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). This turn to notions of citizenship can also be a turn to the vocation of the colleges.<sup>4</sup>

## Part Two: Vocation of the Colleges

I believe that a primary purpose of liberal arts colleges is to educate for citizenship in a democratic society, what I call “critical citizenship.” Church-related colleges, I believe, share in this responsibility. In addition to the scholarly disciplines, they bring the resources of Christian faith to this task. Marcia Bunge points out that

there is a synergy between the emphasis church-related colleges place on questions of religion and ethics and the current concern within the discipline of religious studies (see Plaskow, 534) to connect the knowledge and insight from religious traditions “to the real problems of society”(3).

In his study of models of church-related colleges, Richard Hughes states that in a 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).<sup>5</sup>

Some ground the Lutheran approach to higher education in the dialectic between faith and reason characteristic of the Lutheran tradition (Brubaker). Others ground the Lutheran approach in what is called the “two kingdoms” or “two governances” doctrine (Solberg, in Hughes, 76). Note that in speaking of governance we are again speaking about power, particularly power-in-relationship.

Darrell Jodock contends that this teaching grounds the characteristic of serving the community and educating its leaders. This characteristic is not distinctive to a college related to the Lutheran tradition, but its grounding is (15). The first governance is rooted in the gospel—God’s mercy and forgiveness—and the goal is personal reconciliation. The second is exercised through social structures “to bring order and justice to the world.” College education is focused primarily on this second form of governance. According to Jodock, “Its purpose is to enable young men and women to discern what makes for justice and what preserves and enhances human dignity” (18).

In his introduction to Lutheran higher education, Ernie 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, “thus affirming diversity on our campuses.” The confessionalism side maintains the value of affiliation “by affirming that in the intellectual arena 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).

I would contend that the public witness of the churches is also shaped in dialogue between religious traditions as well as social and natural sciences. This is the case, for instance, in the development of the social statements of the ELCA. Committees that draft these statements for the consideration of the churchwide assembly include academics whose expertise is in the area under study—the environment, economic life, the death penalty, for instance—as well as theologians and ethicists. Although these statements are primarily for use in the public witness of the church, I think that they can be a useful resource in education for critical citizenship (Brubaker). It is important to remember, though, that the colleges have distinct roles and responsibilities. What then, should be the relationship between the public witness of the church and the colleges? I think that an exploration of some specific issues can help clarify this.

### **Part Three: Sexuality Debates**

A particularly difficult issue in relation to the public witness of the church—and the vocation of the colleges—is the issue of homosexuality. The ELCA, like most other mainline Protestant denominations, is deeply divided on this issue. Much is at stake for both sides—the authority and interpretation of scripture, the “core” or “heart” of Christian faith. The debate reveals the tension between the generally conservative role of religion in society and the continually reforming character professed by Protestantism.

This issue is one where money, sex, and power sometimes come together in unsettling ways. For instance, some members of the church constituency may threaten to withhold donations if certain topics are discussed on campus. Or the administration may reconsider whether the Gay Men’s Chorus should hold their concert in the Campus Chapel, the usual venue for concerts, for fear of donor backlash.

I want to speak about some situations that have arisen at California Lutheran University (CLU), as illustrative of the difficulties. (You may want to discuss what’s happening on your campus in small groups.) This spring we had some sharply worded letters to our student newspaper asking how a “Christian” college could permit a “Harmony Week” sponsored by the campus Gay-Straight Alliance. Although uncomfortable, this

challenge from some conservative students has been useful in helping us think about what it means to be a university “rooted in the Lutheran tradition of Christian faith,” as our mission statement declares. Since its founding in 1959, CLU has come to understand that “The Lutheran tradition cherishes education, faith and freedom of inquiry and encourages the noblest expression of Christian values. The University welcomes students of all beliefs and provides them the opportunity to explore religious issues as part of their formal education and to do so in the spirit of openness, reason and tolerance” (Wold and Swanson, in Hughes, 121). In this matter, I think it can reasonably be claimed that by hosting Harmony Week, the college is acting in a matter consistent with the public witness of the ELCA of non-discrimination against gays and lesbians and the expectation of colleges just articulated.

A few years ago, though, there was an episode in which the college seemed to some to be acting against the public witness—or at least the policies—of the church. This incident was prompted by the participation of Bishop Paul Egertson in the ordination of Anita Hill. As some of you may know, ELCA policy—like that of most other mainline Protestant denominations—limits ordination to celibate gays or lesbians. Hill, a self-identified lesbian, is in a long-term, committed relationship. After trying to change denominational policy, her congregation in St. Paul, Minnesota voted unanimously to ordain her.

The ordination service received heavy media coverage. Newspapers in Los Angeles gave front-page coverage to Egertson’s participation in the service and eventual resignation as bishop because of it, noting that he would return to his teaching position at CLU. President Luedtke wrote an eloquent opinion piece, published in the *Los Angeles Times*, responding to those who asked why the college would permit him to teach. Luedtke described the beginnings of the Lutheran denomination “in the fearless intellectual and spiritual discourse of the German university.” He declared that “church-related colleges and universities are not the church” but that “they provide extraordinary forums for nailing theses to the wall and using both faith and reason to interpret not only written texts but also the physical and human world that is revealed to us daily in all its beauty and complexity.” He identified four expectations of church-related colleges and universities, including “that the theological and social positions of the parent church be made known to members of the community ... [and that] within these contexts, the most rigorous, bold and unfettered debate be encouraged in all matters of faith and reason” (Luedtke).



I endorse this view of the relationship between the colleges and the public witness of the church.

There are other issues related to sexuality, such as the availability of condoms on campus or co-habitation in dorm rooms, which are perhaps more difficult for colleges related to the ELCA than those related to more fundamentalist traditions. The challenge is to determine what policies and practices take account of the realities of campus life and “enable young men and women to discern what makes for justice and what preserves and enhances human dignity?” in the words of Jodock.

#### **Part Four: Economic Globalization**

One might conclude from the focus on issues of sexuality in the churches that this is the primary focus of scripture, the primary source for Lutheran (and most Christian traditions’) theology and ethics. However, economics—wealth and poverty—receives much more consideration in scripture. The privatizing of religion discussed earlier is one reason for this discrepancy. Ethicist Garth Kasimu Baker-Fletcher draws on the work of Pierre Bourdieu to point out that although different values may be held in what may be called the micro-habitus of family, “the macro-habitus of consumptive, competitive, materialist hedonism has severely restricted the moral vision of all Western nations and peoples and constricted our capacity to grapple effectively with global problems of hunger, poverty, and environmental destruction” (59). In other words, our “culture” shapes the lens through which we read scripture.

Some think that churches do not have the expertise to speak on political and economic issues. Others think that these issues are not issues of faith, but extensions, at best, distractions, at worse. Karen Bloomquist, Lutheran theologian and ethicist currently working with Lutheran World Federation, writes that an issue of faith is clearly at stake ... “given the all-pervasive neo-liberal logic”—which prioritizes economic growth and profit—“that undergirds and directs economic globalization as a totalizing system...” (494).

Some mainline Protestant churches, among others, have begun to address these economic issues. For instance, one of the ELCA social statements is on economic life. It articulates a principle and vision of “sufficient, sustainable livelihood for all.” The Lutheran World Federation is engaging economic globalization as a communion and ecumenically with the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and the World Council of Churches, among others. These different traditions approach this

issue from particular theological perspectives, but have discovered common principles: “What we share in common is the quest for greater solidarity, love, compassion, and justice in the face of enormous power inequities” (Communique).

An example of ecumenical public witness growing out of this joint work is a letter The World Council of Churches, the Lutheran World Federation, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, and the Council of European Churches sent to the World Trade Organization and the Ministers of Trade from its member countries when they met in Cancun last fall for “the development round.” This letter is an example of raising standards of justice grounded in religious traditions, upheld by Thiemann as appropriate. It begins by pointing out that “the ecumenical community’s understanding of “trade and development” is rooted in spiritual, moral and ethical perspectives.” It then asks questions to evaluate WTO agreements: “Are they just and fair—especially to the vulnerable and impoverished? For these, we believe, God has expressed a preferential option. Do the agreements support right relationships between North and South, between producers and consumers, and between the powerful and the powerless? Are they friendly to God’s creation? Do they enhance and not diminish the planet’s capacity to sustain and nurture present as well as future generations of humankind and all other life forms? Do they affirm human dignity and care for life in all its richness and diversity?” A statement of principle follows: “international trade agreements should first and foremost respect, value and uphold the sacred nature of all life,” followed by a critique of “the economic agendas of some governments, especially Northern governments, [that] seem to be largely driven by corporate interests at the expense of economic justice.”

Not surprisingly, this analysis is controversial—particularly for many Christians in the global north who may work in transnational corporations or benefit in other ways from the current workings of the global economy. Karen Bloomquist suggests that if the global economy is a matter of faith, it presents an enormous challenge to churches. That is “to nurture people in the Christian faith in comprehensive ways that empower them to resist the logic and assumptions [economic growth and profit] underlying economic globalization” (494).

In what ways is this also a challenge to our colleges? Like sexuality, this is an issue subject to “rigorous, bold unfettered debate” (Luedtke). We also need “to make known” the ELCA and LWF positions on economic life. I think that perhaps more is asked if we are to be

accountable to our responsibility to educate for critical citizenship, or to use Jodock's words again, "enable young men and women to discern what makes for justice and what preserves and enhances human dignity." Given the hegemony of the neo-liberal model, it is crucial that students are encouraged to question its underlying assumptions—for instance, that the market should be the primary arbiter of value.

A few programs at CLU seem to me to be possible models; there may be others at your colleges. Our School of Business is striving to be a "business school with a conscience." One of its programs is a Center for Leadership and Values. A recent speaker in the Center's lecture series, jointly sponsored by the Religion and Political Science departments, was a union organizer from Mexico. She raised important concerns about worker justice in transnational corporations.

Some students, though, begrudge any questioning of "business as usual." A few openly confess that they only came to college because this is the route to an upper-middle class lifestyle. I see this response as a materialist challenge to the vocation of the colleges. It could also be described as a form of economic fundamentalism. Like religious fundamentalism, it resists the spirit of critical inquiry at the heart of liberal arts education.

## Conclusion

Both religious and economic fundamentalism present

serious challenges to education for critical citizenship. We tend, I think, to be more aware of the harm of the intolerance inherent in religious fundamentalism. However, neo-liberalism—a form of economic fundamentalism, challenges the basis of the public witness of the church—love of neighbor. F.A. Hayek, the "father of neo-liberalism," rejects the Christian ethic of neighbor-love as "unfit and unworkable in modern societies, for such an ethic is only a tribal, anti-commercial, and anti-capitalist ethic that poses a grave threat to civilization."<sup>6</sup>

In contrast to this interpretation, Lutheran 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).

As a practicing Christian ethicist, I affirm Rasmussen's interpretation. As a professor of Christian ethics, I encourage critical inquiry into and unfettered debate about this ethic, these two interpretations—and others. Along with Thiemann, I want these arguments—religious, moral, and political—to be governed by public accessibility, moral integrity, but most of all, mutual respect (140).

---

*Pamela K. Brubaker is a professor of religion at California Lutheran University in Thousand Oaks, California.*

## Works Cited

- Baker-Fletcher, Garth Kasimu. *Dirty Hands: Christian Ethics in a Morally Ambiguous World*. Fortress Press, 2000.
- Benne, Robert. "The Church and Politics: Hot and Cool Connections." *Moral Issues and Christian Response*. Ed. Patricia Beattie Jung and Shannon Jung. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Thomson Wadsworth, 2003. 17-23.
- Benne, Robert. "Lutheran Ethics." *The Promise of Lutheran Ethics*. Ed. Karen Bloomquist and John Stumme. Fortress Press, 1998.
- Bloomquist, Karen. "Engaging Economic Globalization as Churches." *The Ecumenical Review*. 53.4 (2001): 493-500.
- Bounds, Elizabeth M. *Coming Together/Coming Apart: Religion, Community and Modernity*. Routledge, 1997.
- Bunge, Marcia. "Introduction to Valparaiso University in the Context of Lutheran Higher Education." *The Lutheran Reader*. Ed. Paul Contino and David Morgan. Valparaiso University, 1999.
- Brint, Michael. "The Politics of Identity and The Culture of Global Technology." *Culture, Politics and Nationalism in the*

*Age of Globalization*. Ed. Reneo Lukic and Michael Brint. Ashgate, 2001. 3-28.

Brubaker, Pamela, "'In, With and Under:' The Tradition and the Teaching of Christian Ethics." *Intersections*. 17 (2003): 3-7.

Cady, Linell E. *Religion, Theology, and American Public Life*. SUNY Press, 1993.

Chang, Yoon-Jae. "Economic Globalization, Neoliberalism, and F.A. Hayek: Does History Redeem Itself?" International Conference on Globalization, July 27-August 2, 2003, Payap University, Chiang Mai, Thailand. <[http://isrc.payap.ac.th/doc\\_conference2003.html](http://isrc.payap.ac.th/doc_conference2003.html)>.

Communique of the LWF, WARC, and WCC Consultation on Ecclesiology and Economic Globalization. "Ecclesial Entry Points for Addressing Economic Globalization." Dec. 11-14, 2002. Cartigny, Switzerland.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. "Current Policy on Sexuality." <[www.elca.org/faithfuljourney/policy.html](http://www.elca.org/faithfuljourney/policy.html)>.

Harrison, Beverly W. "The Fate of the Middle 'Class' in Late Capitalism." *God and Capitalism: A Prophetic Critique of Market Economy*. Ed. J. Mark Thomas and Visick. Madison, Wisconsin: A-R Editions, 1991.

Hughes, Richard and William Adrian, eds. *Models for Christian Higher Education: Strategies for Success in the Twenty-first Century*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 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. St. Olaf College, 1999.

Luedtke, Luther S. "Religious Colleges Aren't the Church." *Los Angeles Times*. 14 June 2001.

Plaskow, Judith. "The Academy as Real Life: New Participants and Paradigms in the Study of Religion." 1998 AAR Presidential Address. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. Sept. 1999: 521-538.

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

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

Thiemann, Ronald F. *Religion in Public Life: A Dilemma for Democracy*. (A Twentieth Century Fund Book). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1996.

World Council of Churches. Statement from ecumenical organisations addressed to the World Trade Organization (WTO) and Ministers of Trade gathered in Cancun, Mexico for the 5<sup>th</sup> Ministerial Conference of the WTO from Sept. 10-14, 2003.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Benne has a very useful discussion of these questions in his article entitled "The Church and Politics: Hot and Cool Connections."

<sup>2</sup> Thiemann makes the case that "Arguments that arise from religious beliefs or religiously based moral premises can meet the criteria of plausibility that should govern all public speech and action in a liberal democracy" (140).

<sup>3</sup> Cady helpfully articulates the relation of public theology and religious traditions: "public theology draws upon the resources of a particular religious tradition to establish a deeper sense of a common public life that demands commitment and nurturing in order to enhance human life and flourishing for both the self and the wider society. Through this task, which it executes in the spirit of open inquiry, it contributes to the ideological and practical reconfiguration of the public realm, thereby witnessing to the understanding that 'faith in God cannot become incarnate except in a universal community in which all walls of partition have been broken down'" (169). This understanding is particularly useful, in my judgment, in that it expresses a confessional form of witness which is not hegemonic in its intention.

<sup>4</sup> Thiemann's notion of "pluralist citizen" (113) is useful. See also Michael Brint's insightful discussion of cosmopolitan, culturalist/communitarian, and post-modern individualist perspectives on identity and culture.

<sup>5</sup> In my judgment, this is the Lutheran vision at its best. However, actually sharing power with faculty from diverse backgrounds can be a more difficult challenge than embracing pluralism.

<sup>6</sup> I am drawing on the work of Yoon-Jae Chang, whose Union Theological Seminary dissertation, *God and political economy: A critical appraisal of the late twentieth-century theological responses to capitalism, socialism, and ecology* (2003), included a section on Hayek. I am quoting from Chang's paper, which elaborates on Hayek's views, and is listed above.

# EDUCATION AS A CHRISTIAN (LUTHERAN) CALLING

Tom Christenson

## I. Christians in the Empire

Let us exercise, for the moment, our historical imaginations. We are living in one of the larger Mediterranean cities of the Roman Empire in the first centuries of the common era. This Roman world is diverse and pluralistic. In the cities we see people from Persia and Northern Europe and Africa. We hear hundreds of languages spoken, and daily hear about and see religious diversity of all sorts. Yet functionally everyone pays some kind of homage to the emperor, learning his language, paying his taxes, using his coinage, obeying his laws.

All of the political power, economic power and military might have a single focus, Rome and the person of the emperor. If we are a colonial people, we may not be happy about Rome, but we at least recognize that it calls the shots. Anyone who would wish for themselves a flourishing and successful life will finally have to plug in to the imperial power source. Rebellions occasionally occur but are short lived. Cynics mouth off but have little else to offer. Religious cults spring up constantly—most offer some kind of escape from the harsh realities of life in the empire.

We have heard about this group who call themselves Christians. They gather in people's homes or any space available to realize what they call *basileia tou theou*, the present reign of God. They follow the person and teachings of someone called Jesus, a Judean whom the Roman authorities crucified, whom these followers claim was raised from death. The stories they tell about him are quite unbelievable, yet unashamedly bold and wonderful.

What makes these Christians different and interesting is how they come together as a community. The distinctions that play such a large part in the normal world: whether one is free or slave, wealthy or poor, Roman or non-Roman, well or diseased, law maker or law breaker, even whether one is male or female, none of these things matter to the Christians. All that counts for status in the Roman world is counted for nothing in their midst. People who come there are invited to forget their past, to become as one people. They practice a kind of washing that makes them "die and be born again." Some of the most disreputable people come together there: prostitutes, peasants, lepers, Roman toadies. When someone hears that a Christian group is meeting nearby the common response is "there goes the neighborhood."

It's like a recovery group, a start over group, a new life group. They are radically egalitarian, radically pacifist, radically communitarian, radically welcoming and radically forgiving of each other. It's a rather scary concept, but that's what makes them interesting.

## II. Rethinking Church

I wanted us to take that little imaginative historical journey to get a little different view of what it might mean to be the church, the community of the Spirit. When we think about the word "church," at least in our present historical context, we are most likely to think institutionally. Often we envision a steepled building in some nice neighborhood, where very respectable people gather and run education programs in the hope that their children will also grow up to be nice and respectable. This pursuit of niceness and respectability is not completely innocent. These people avoid issues that require serious self-examination or that require challenging the status quo. Wendell Berry writes, "...modern Christianity has [as a consequence] become willy-nilly the religion of the state and the economic status quo. Because it has been so exclusively dedicated to incanting anemic souls into Heaven, it has been made the tool of much earthly villainy."

So, in thinking through what a Christian program in higher education might look like we need first to do some adventuresome thinking about who these Christians were, who we are as Christians, and what kind of thing church is.

May I be so bold as to attempt an answer to that latter question. The church is a community:

- sharing and celebrating and stewarding giftedness—in nature, in persons, in bread and wine, in renewed life.
- oriented to the paradigmatic figure of Jesus, the crucified one.
- called to challenge the grip of dominant paradigms of power, wealth, control and status.
- called to be suspicious of and critique all the world's claims to ultimacy, to recognize and name the sources of illusion and fear.

- called by the deep needs of others, to realize a love that leads beyond a preoccupation with self.
- engaged in the continuing, open-ended project of realizing God's governance of the world.

Christians are called into such communities; in fact, we are all called to *be* such communities. Moreover we are called to serve the needs of the world by being such communities.

My question to all of us—How could such a community help but be a place of serious discussion, a place of liberated learning, a place of Spirit, a place for the transforming of persons and the imagining of new worlds for new persons? If this isn't a community with an educational vocation then I don't know what one looks like.

### III. Called to Education

So, if I am right, that the enterprise of education is a natural calling for a Christian community, what should the realization of such a calling look like, in the U.S. at this point in history? That is, to what sort of educational endeavor are *we* called?

There are two temptations for contemporary American Christian higher education. One is to become a parochial, doctrinaire, narrowly moralistic Bible School. This is an alternative but not a live option for most of us. The other temptation is to become a generic secular college or university. [Note, please, that I'm not saying there are only two *options*. In our rush to avoid being the former, we often fall into the trap of assuming that we must, therefore, be the latter. What I am arguing is that we should be neither. Both are *temptations*.] I think the latter temptation is a live option for many of us, and therefore it's the temptation I want to focus on today.

I recently talked with a former student of mine. He's just been employed by a recently-founded Buddhist university located in the East Bay area of California. He moved there from a position at Montana State where he had taught for five years. I was fascinated to hear about this new institution and what it was like to teach there. Here's what he had to say: "It's very much the same as Montana State. The biggest difference is that more of the students here are of Asian ancestry, there's no school of agriculture, no football team, and, unlike MSU which was spread out over hundreds of acres, this University is completely located in two eight story buildings. Otherwise it's exactly the same; the same generic

departments, the same generic subjects, taught by the same generic academic types, to the same generic university students."

When I heard that, I let out an anguished wail. I asked, "Isn't there anything that goes on there that indicates it's a Buddhist university?" He responded, "There's a meditation room on the top floor of my building, and they offer Tai Chi classes to staff at lunch everyday. But from what I hear even the state schools do that out here. After all, this is California."

From my point of view, though this institution may be a financial (and academic) success, this story is a tragedy. What is there in Buddhism that calls them to recreate another generic university? Particularly when the Buddhists have so much to offer that the world so desperately needs. That's why the fact that the Buddhist founders recreated an East Bay version of Montana State is a tragedy—because of what it is, because of what it could have been, and because of what we, in this culture at this time, need it to be.

But of course exactly the same thing can be said about Christians. What an incredible tragedy if Christians engaged in education simply end up reproducing Generic U. This is particularly so if you believe, as I do, that Christians have so much to offer that the world so desperately needs. Yet, if we think of a college or university as a collection of generic disciplines, where generic professors teach generic subjects, then I think that is what we end up with.

At this point, you will want to know exactly what it is I am proposing. If a Christian (or Buddhist) university should not be just a collection of generic disciplines, then what should it be?

The problem is not solved just by adding a department of Christian (or Buddhist) studies, though as I will indicate, that might be a step in the right direction.

The problem is not solved by adding a chapel or worship time and venue, though that too might be a step in the right direction.

The problem is not solved by adding a whole mess (or some quota) of Christians to the faculty, though that too might be a step in the right direction.

None of these is sufficient because they simply add something to Generic U. Christian U then becomes Generic U plus chapel, or Generic U plus courses about Christianity, or Generic U plus a certain quota of



Christians.

My friend, Sig Rauspern, likes to compare an educational institution to a tree. It has many branches of knowledge. Some produce interesting leaves, some flowers, some fruit, some are pretty much bare. But a tree is always more than that. It's also a trunk (the place where all those branches hold together) and a root system. We tend, in academe, to focus all our attention on the branches, pay little attention to the trunk, and no attention to the roots. The temptations we just talked about seem to me to be Generic U plus a few new branches grafted on. My point is that a university is Christian because of the character of its trunk and roots, not because of any new department, or administrative office, or chapel that might be added on.

What I would hope of such an institution is that the ways of inquiring, the ways of understanding the tasks of teaching and learning, the ways of being a community would be shaped in some deep and essential way by the founding tradition. Thus, though economics is pursued at Christian U, it is pursued in deep dialogue with a point of view that sees the world not as the possession of humans, but sees us as stewards of a gift, not owners of a piece of property, that sees flourishing life as the measure of wealth, not wealth as the measure of flourishing life. Business courses may be taught at Christian U, but they include occasions for discussion of how the Christian idea of vocation changes our understanding of business success. How is business pursued by persons who realize that the bottom line is always something more than numbers? That accounting must take account of how well the needs of people are served? How is management taught by persons who have good reason to see the artificiality of the management/labor distinction? By persons who see each other as essentially brothers and sisters?

Biology will certainly be pursued at Christian U but pursued by those who stand in deep wonder and appreciation at the world, called to steward it rather than those who are determined to conquer and control it. Law may be learned at Christian U as well but it will be studied in a context tempered by the critical ideas of justice and mercy and service. There may be a military officer training program at Christian U, but no student should pass through it without considering what Walter Wink has called "Jesus Third Way" of responding to violence. Every student should have studied the debates about the possibility of just war and should have read Bonhoeffer on discipleship. Even religion may be taught at Christian U, but it will be informed by Jesus story, usually called "The Good Samaritan," one point of which

is that being religious is not always the answer and sometimes is the problem. In all of these cases the dialogue that ensues should shape both how the inquiry is pursued, how it is taught and what is taught, the kinds of assignments students receive, but mostly the kinds of discussions that are focal, the things faculty and students spend their time arguing about, the deep issues we all wrestle with.

The second point to make is that a Christian college/university is a place that takes seriously the fact that what one learns ends up influencing the person one becomes. Generic secular universities tend to deny or avoid this fact. Christian universities need to explicitly recognize that they teach subjects, but also, and at the same time, they teach human beings. We need to be clear that a person may be profoundly changed while studying astrophysics, agriculture, nursing, and music. Christian U is unashamedly and deliberately a place of human transformation, human growth; it offers an educational paradigm that is paideutic. It is a place where it makes very good sense to talk about faculty as mentors as well as instructors. Recent studies on collegiate learning show us that it is such transformative learning that really sticks.

Now perhaps you understand why I said that chapel services, the number of Christians on hand, and a faculty that teaches about Christianity might be "steps in the right direction." They are in the right direction if they end up influencing the quality and quantity of serious dialogue that takes place there. If economists and biologists and business and law faculty are more likely to engage the tradition seriously because of the presence of faculty teaching about Christianity, then it is a step in the right direction. Yet I think we can all imagine a situation where it wouldn't be.

#### **IV. The Lutheran Contribution**

Until now I have been talking about Christian communities and their call to engage in learning communities. But I haven't specifically mentioned Lutherans. There are two reasons: i) Lutherans never intended to be anything but Christians—Christian reformers. That there are Lutherans is an historical fact, but had they succeeded in their argument for reform, there would not be. ii) The most important things that Lutherans have to offer are truths they share with other Christians.

But in spite of that I do think that Lutherans bring some particular emphases to the Christian educational calling. I will only mention some of these things here.

1. Lutherans should practice something that Luther

embodied so well but that the world understands so poorly: faithful criticism. Luther was extremely critical of the Church, some parts of the ecclesiastical tradition, the political order, his theological opponents, and himself. Yet in all these cases his critique was not meant to tear down but to reform. His love and faithfulness took the form of being critical, of calling the Church back to some things it had lost sight of.

Luther was suspicious of many things: ecclesiastical authority, philosophy, theology, ethics, princes, peasants, and even reformers. Yet in every case his suspiciousness was not cynical but thoroughly engaged. He was involved in these enterprises even as he was suspicious of them. These two ideas, faithful criticism and engaged suspiciousness, are two peculiarly Lutheran habits of mind. The world needs both of them as much, if not more, than it ever has.

2. Luther had two theological ideas that played an important role in his thinking: a) that we are *simul justus et peccator*, i.e. at the same time (and in the same way?) both saints and sinners; b) the theology of the cross. These two ideas together (should) have kept Lutherans over the years from becoming too enamored of ecclesiastical or theological chauvinism, i.e. that *they* have got it wrong and *we* have got it right; that *we* have nothing to learn from *them*; that *they* are children of darkness, and *we* are children of light.

Lutherans believe in *ecclesia semper reformanda*, that the church is always in need of reformation. We have not arrived, we are not the specially sanctified brethren, and our temptation to think so is the best proof that we are not. These theological ideas or attitudes have profound implications for how we pursue learning, how we value the voices of “outsiders,” how we welcome criticism, why teachers are also in continual need of learning, and why Lutheran theology is so bold, so varied, and so argumentative. It also explains why we envision the successful Lutheran academy as a place of lively dialogue, not as a place to disseminate a univocal world view.

3. Such theological roots are a reason for Lutherans to have a particularly honest, holistic, yet amazingly hopeful view of what it means to be human. This view is one of our gifts, one we are called to share because the world badly needs to hear another view than the one that dominates our age. Douglas John Hall sees Christians (and in fact all of humanity) as engaged in a struggle. “It is a struggle,” he writes, “for a new image of what it means to be human.” We are living in a time that has seen the intellectual reduction of reality and the human.

Academe has played a large part in that reductionism.

This last year we had a U.S. poet laureate on our campus, Robert Pinsky. He read some poems and talked a bit about the public importance of poetry. Though there were a couple hundred students present to hear him, there were only about a dozen faculty representing, at most, five departments. I leaned over to a psychology colleague and asked her, “What do you think accounts for the small number of faculty?” She responded, “Some of our specialties encourage a shrunken humanity.” I have to admit that her metaphor stuck with me more vividly than any of Pinsky’s did.

The daughter of a colleague wrote about her university professors:

My professors are knowledgeable as long as one stays in their field of expertise. Some are even academically famous... But as persons they are a great disappointment. When I have asked them questions that relate learning to larger issues or relate learning to life... I find them to be less mature than I am! I get the impression that they have never asked themselves these questions at all, and consequently have never answered them.

Is that what we have learned in the process of becoming academic specialists—to shrink ourselves to fit the narrow boxes our disciplines demand? Is that the unannounced curriculum of academe—to come away with a diminished sense of reality and of ourselves? One of the things that excites me about the prospect of Christian (and particularly Lutheran) higher education is that we have something better to offer, something that the world desperately needs and that we have the freedom to give. Imagine an education that enlarges both one’s view of the world and the self that inhabits it!

4. These Lutheran gifts—faithful criticism, a rich theological tradition informing an honest, holistic and hopeful view of humanity—these things also influence the way we approach human knowing; they suggest what I have dared to call a Lutheran epistemology. They provide us with a rich, love-related, answerable and fallible approach to knowing. This approach to knowing ought to challenge the paradigms of knowing built into many of our disciplines. It ought to challenge the temptation toward reductionism, challenge the facile distinctions between objective and subjective, facts and values, and challenge the caricatures and phobias that shape so much academic thinking.

In my book, *The Gift and Task of Lutheran Higher*

*Education*, I delineate eight “epistemic stances” that I believe characterize a Lutheran epistemology:

Wonder	Open-ness
Connectedness	Freedom
Critical Faithfulness	Service/Vocation
Engaged Suspiciousness	Hope

I don’t want to talk about all of these now—but perhaps an example shows how they cluster to make a difference.

Jacob Bronowski in the old TV series, *The Ascent of Man*, said, “There seems to be a kind of knowing that actually closes the mind.” In one of the final episodes of the series Bronowski is seen squatting near a shallow pond of water. As he speaks the camera pulls back slowly to show the context. He says:

This is the concentration camp and crematorium at Auschwitz. This is where people were turned into numbers. Into this pond were flushed the remains of four million people. And that was not done by gas. It was done by arrogance. It was done by dogma. It was done by ignorance. When people believe they have absolute knowledge... this is how they behave. This is what men do when they aspire to be gods... when the loud voice of their answers drowns out the voice of the questions.

Totalitarianism, whether in its overtly political or more subtle varieties, is what occurs when a limited vision no longer recognizes its own limits. It is a theory, or discipline, or technique gone crazy. We have just lived through a century filled with examples of such insanity. Are we sure there won’t be more?

To a humanity frequently suffering from such insanity Wendell Berry offers a warning:

We have to act on the basis of what we know, and what we know is incomplete. We keep learning more ... but the mystery surrounding our life is not significantly reducible. And so the question of how to act in ignorance is paramount. ... If we lack the cultural means to keep incomplete knowledge from becoming the basis of arrogant and dangerous behavior, then the intellectual disciplines themselves become dangerous.

Douglas John Hall refers to the dominant modern view of the human-as-knower by the term “mastery,” the

assumption that in knowing the world we humans were coming to master it. He writes:

... the concept of mastery contained an enormous lie from the outset. We simply are not masters...just at the point where human mastery [in the technological sense] has become a real possibility, the world shows terrible evidence of our lack of wisdom and goodness. It does not require great powers of observation or insight for anyone today to draw the conclusion that the self-appointed masters of the world have almost ruined it.

How do we, as inquirers and sharers of knowledge, proceed with these three warnings ringing in our ears? We proceed the opposite of arrogantly, the opposite of reductionistically,—I would say we proceed critically and self-critically, humbly, suspiciously, subjecting our knowing to the critique of service, care, open to wonder, answerable to all, including future generations, who will be affected.

Imagine the exciting and fertile discussions that would ensue if we could get all of our colleagues to dialogue about this new paradigm of knowing.

## V. Conclusion

What I hope is that faculty who have recently come to teach at our institutions, when they are asked by their friends, “So what’s it like to teach at a Christian (Lutheran) college/university?” will not have to answer, as my former student did, “Oh it’s just like Generic U.” I would be ever so pleased if, instead, they were compelled to answer:

“I have come to question a whole bunch of assumptions I came with—assumptions about what it means to be human, about which distinctions are essential and which are artificial, about what agendas shape my discipline and the ways I have thought about knowledge and teaching & learning. I have come to recognize and challenge the ultimacies our own culture (and academic culture) presents to us and to our students. I have been pushed to ask these questions by my colleagues, by my students, by opportunities for discussion sponsored by my department, my school, my university. This has been an immense learning year for me. Not only am I a better (economist, psychologist, philosopher, professor of law) for having come here. I am also a larger, more multi-dimensional person. These Lutherans really take education seriously. This is a great place for a learner to be.”

# ELCA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES



**Augsburg College**  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

**Luther College**  
Decorah, Iowa

**Augustana College**  
Rock Island, Illinois

**Midland Lutheran College**  
Fremont, Nebraska

**Augustana College**  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

**Muhlenberg College**  
Allentown, Pennsylvania

**Bethany College**  
Lindsborg, Kansas

**Newberry College**  
Newberry, South Carolina

**California Lutheran University**  
Thousand Oaks, California

**Pacific Lutheran University**  
Tacoma, Washington

**Capital University**  
Columbus, Ohio

**Roanoke College**  
Salem, Virginia

**Carthage College**  
Kenosha, Wisconsin

**St. Olaf College**  
Northfield, Minnesota

**Concordia College**  
Moorhead, Minnesota

**Susquehanna University**  
Selinsgrove, Pennsylvania

**Dana College**  
Blair, Nebraska

**Texas Lutheran University**  
Seguin, Texas

**Finlandia University**  
Hancock, Michigan

**Thiel College**  
Greenville, Pennsylvania

**Gettysburg College**  
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

**Wagner College**  
Staten Island, New York

**Grand View College**  
Des Moines, Iowa

**Waldorf College**  
Forest City, Iowa

**Gustavus Adolphus College**  
St. Peter, Minnesota

**Wartburg College**  
Waverly, Iowa

**Lenoir-Rhyne College**  
Hickory, North Carolina

**Wittenberg University**  
Springfield, Ohio



