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Among the many contributions that American civilization has received from the Christian faith is its system of higher education. That statement might seem startling in a day when the most prominent universities—whether state-supported institutions or private—are largely secular institutions where the Christian faith is peripheral at best. But the first great schools of this country were all religious schools, and the American university system is almost entirely a creation of its churches. The old Protestant establishment that once dominated these universities has given way, but the heritage of church-related higher education remains.

Under the theme of "A Blessed Heritage," three essays considering the contributions of American church-related higher education were presented to the Lilly Fellows Program National Conference held at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio, October 13–15, 2006. With the support of the Lilly Fellows Programs in Humanities and the Arts, the editors are pleased to publish these essays in this issue. A fourth essay, contributed by Jill Pelaez Baumgaertner and first presented to the Lilly Fellows Program Administrators Workshop held at Xavier on October 12–13, is also included.

The nearly endless variety of American Christian higher education cannot be captured in any short collection like this; however, our authors have made a fine effort to offer us as much as possible. From these pieces, we learn about the contributions of Anabaptists, Catholics, Methodists, Evangelicals, and many other Christian traditions, and we learn that these contributions have come in various forms.

In an essay by Douglas and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen, the authors argue that the "pluralistic" nature of American Christianity contributes an opportunity for different branches of the faith to learn from one another in ways that allow each to be more faithful to its own Christian calling. Baumgaertner's essay examines the efforts of one Christian school, namely Wheaton College, to maintain its unique Christian identity, and how, because of these efforts, it has a unique intellectual perspective to contribute to a largely secular American academy.

In essays by C. Walker Gollar and David J. O'Brien, we find a Christian contribution distinguished more by social and political engagement with the broader culture. Gollar chronicles the contributions of five Midwestern Christian schools to the abolitionist movement before the Civil War. O'Brien focuses on the period after the Second Vatican Council, when Catholic educators worked to cultivate a generation of young Catholics who were well prepared for leadership roles in their communities.

A common thread among all four essays is that contributions move in both directions. As each tradition has given, it has received. At times, American religious freedoms and tolerance have allowed these traditions and their schools to thrive. At the same time, the very openness of American culture has complicated their efforts to maintain a particular vision of identity and mission. And on occasion, especially for the young abolitionists we meet in Gollar's essay, American culture presents an overt threat to some forms of Christianity and to Christian schools. These essays show us how several religious traditions and their schools have sought out their own places within the American landscape, and how they have been transformed in the process of doing so.

Finally, these essays demonstrate that faculty and administration of church-related colleges and universities remain committed to various forms of engagement with the church, the nation, and the world. Their contributions are truly a blessed heritage, and it is a blessing that will continue.

—JPO
Vanity, Variety, Vision
Protestant Universities and American Experiences

Douglas Jacobsen and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen

HOW HAS PROTESTANT HIGHER EDUCATION influenced America? The question might call forth some grand claims, but it also immediately signals a major difficulty. Protestantism is not one entity but many. Can any description of Protestantism and its universities encompass the whole? Our approach will be first to divide and then, not to conquer, but to provide points of reference for a conversation that includes both Protestants and Catholics involved in higher education.

The title provides a road map for this essay. The first section discusses “vanity,” a serious temptation that has bedeviled Protestant higher education from the beginning, and we link vanity to the misguided desire for monolithic Protestant influence. The “variety” portion of the essay underscores the historically pluralistic character of Protestantism and its schools of higher learning. Finally, the “vision” section articulates a “pluralithic” (yes, that’s pluralithic not pluralistic) understanding of our calling as Christian—not just Protestant—scholars, teachers, and administrators. Pluralithic Christian higher education recognizes and honors our many particularities, but also confesses the unity for which we long as followers of Jesus.

Before we begin, a word of self introduction is appropriate. Protestantism is never generic, and the two of us are Protestants of a distinct kind, or at least of a distinct mix. Between the two of us, we have one set of grandparents who were German Lutherans, but the other three sets were all Scandinavian Pietists who would have felt right at home with the puritanical and devout worshipers portrayed in the classic film Babette’s Feast. Of course, America influenced them, and here they became much more revivalistic and dispensational than if they had stayed in the Old Country. Still, they were warm-hearted and sincere Christians, and in large part because of them we still remain, in many ways, evangelicals even if our church membership is now in the mainline.

If you really want to know our predispositions, however, it might be more instructive to look at our institutional affiliation, for our convictions and habits of faith have been deeply shaped by the place where we work. For the past twenty-three years we have taught together at Messiah College, where the heritage is a mix of Anabaptism, Pietism, and Wesleyanism. This means that while personal faith (Pietism) is important at Messiah, so is social holiness (Wesleyanism) embedded in concerns for peace, justice, and reconciliation (Anabaptism).

Exposure to Anabaptism has been especially significant for us. Like every tradition, Anabaptism has its good points and its weaknesses. Anabaptists, at their worst, can sometimes think of themselves—very humbly of course!—as better Christians than anyone else. But more typically, and at their best, Anabaptists see themselves as playing only one role among many different roles that need to be represented within the overall matrix of (in biblical language) the body of Christ or (in contemporary theological language) the public practices of Christianity. They know very well that Christianity is a complex and diverse affair, a subject about which generalization is almost impossible. Similarly, this essay undoubtedly will reflect our Anabaptistical particularity, but we hope that it also respects other perspectives and invites broad conversation.

I
Vanity: Monolithic Protestant Higher Education

The word “monolith” is not hard to translate. It means “one rock.” For Christians, referencing “one rock” may bring to mind a host of religiously associated imagery: perhaps the old hymn “Rock of Ages,” or the New Testament passage where
Jesus calls Peter a rock, or the parable about how the wise man built his house upon the rock and not upon the sand so that when (as the children's chorus says) "the rain came down and the floods came up, the house on the rock stood firm." But the term monolith might also have a somewhat negative connotation: something big and old and unmovable; something stuck in the ground; something that would like to discard but is just too heavy to move. Protestantism in America has been a monolith in both senses: it has been a foundation on which to stand and a cumbersome, old rock that has not always served either Christian faith or the nation well.

At first glance, of course, Protestantism in America does not look monolithic at all; it looks like a motley collection of boulders and pebbles all thrown together. And in many ways, that is what Protestantism is: a moraine of rocky rubble thrown up by glacial religious movements of the past that have, in many cases, long since melted away.* This jumbled reality of American Protestantism includes the seventeen-million-member Southern Baptist Convention and the eight-million-member United Methodist Church as well as the Church of God in Christ, the National Baptist Convention, USA, Inc., and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, which claim just about five million members each. These are the five largest Protestant denominations in America according to the latest edition of the Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches (Lindner 2005). But American Protestantism also includes the Assemblies of God, the Unitarian Universalists, two big Presbyterian Churches ("USA" and "in America") as well as many smaller ones, the Mennonites, Moravians, Missouri-Synod Lutherans, and historically about 250 separate groups that have called themselves "the Church of God." Going down the list in order of size one finds the 25,000 member Brethren in Christ church that founded Messiah College, the even smaller United Zion Church that split from the Brethren in Christ in 1855, and finally, near the bottom, the optimistically named Universal Church of Christ, whose membership worldwide is less than one thousand. This ecclesiastical stew is Protestantism.

American Protestantism has been fragmented and diverse for a long time. That is its genius, but also its abiding flaw. More than 150 years ago the Reformed pastor and teacher, John W. Nevin, sitting back and observing the panoply of American Protestantism from his seminary office in the neat and tidy town of Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, said that what he saw was not pretty. Nevertheless, he hoped that in due time Protestantism might eventually surmount its chaotic confusion and "stand forth redeemed, and disenthralled from the evils that now oppress it, to complete the Reformation so auspiciously begun in the sixteenth century." He continued, "Only as we believe that Protestantism is itself a process... does it appear possible to be intelligently satisfied with the present posture of the great experiment" (Nevin 41, 49; emphasis added).

For Americans, the language of "experiment" does not apply merely to Protestantism, of course. From the earliest period of colonization, English settlers in particular called North America a great experiment in human history and government. Most famously, Roger Williams termed his colony of Rhode Island a "lively experiment" in democracy and religious freedom, and further south in the Mid-Atlantic region William Penn branded his sylvan lands a "holy experiment" unlike any other. But perhaps the most accurate terminology comes from a more obscure source, Samuel Smith, who wrote a history of New Jersey in the year 1765. He called his own small colony an "unprov'd experiment," because no one knew how it would turn out (Smith viii).

In some sense, we still do not know how the American experiment will end, and the same can be said of Protestantism. The clock is still ticking. But we do know that the confluence between these two great experiments is not accidental. America was founded, not entirely but largely, by Protestants who were seeking freedom to pursue their own particular brands of Protestantism. Even though the Founders were not all devoutly Christian themselves, virtually all of them had internalized Protestantism's principle of religious freedom along with the pluralistic implications of such freedom. They were not content with pluralism alone, however, because they also valued the common good. Thus they sought to create a system of government and a national culture that combined the many and the one (e pluribus unum).
In their concern for unity as well as diversity, the Founders (i.e., those in the political realm) were in some sense significantly ahead of the nation's Protestant religious leaders who were often more focused on heaven and their own particular group's earthly well being than they were on the good of the nation as a whole.

Educators—most of them Protestant—clearly played a role in shaping the new American nation. In his book Creating the American Mind, J. David Hoeveler argues that in the years leading up to the American Revolution “evidence abounds of the academic role in shaping Americans’ ways of thinking about themselves as a people and as political players.” He says that the American colonies were gifted with a group of leaders who often “drew on learning... from their college days” as they struggled to create a new nation founded on the principles of freedom, democracy, and equality. Going even further, Hoeveler suggests that the entirety of early American history was shaped by the intellectual culture created and nurtured by the nine Protestant colleges of the colonies (Hoeveler 242).

When describing such expansive social experiments as the creation of a new form of government or the perfect church, it is difficult to avoid vanity when some success is achieved. Patriotic flourishes of pride accordingly have become almost standard fare in writings about the founding of the nation, and Hoeveler's book transfers some of that glory to the history of Protestant higher education. And who among us would not be happy to join in that celebration? It is nice to be praised once in a while. But is this justified pride or mere vanity? Webster's Dictionary describes vanity as “exaggerated self love: inflated pride in oneself or in one's appearance, attainments, performance, possessions, or successes.” A historian using our college catalogues as primary source documents likely would conclude that more than a bit of vanity is in evidence. Schools often portray themselves in glowing colors with warts and wrinkles all carefully airbrushed away. Is there any harm in that kind of individual institutional preening? Probably not; but when the scale is enlarged to include all of Protestant higher education, the dangers of vanity become evident.

Up until the late 1950s, this more dangerous kind of vanity was evident in the Protestant pride and privilege that dominated much of American higher education. Thus when William F. Buckley wrote God and Man at Yale in 1951, criticizing the institution for its inattentiveness and general disrespect for religion in the classroom, the Yale faithful did not focus on the merits of his jeremiad. Rather, they were aghast that a Catholic like Buckley was critiquing the Christian—i.e., the Protestant—character of the university. Their logic was that Yale was a quintessentially American Protestant college, so by definition it was committed to freedom, democracy, and faith. Yale set the standard for what American higher education should look like, and Yale did not need any upstart young Catholic—a member of a church still locked in the jaws of medieval authoritarianism—telling its faculty what they should or should not be doing (Marsden 10-16).

Such obvious Protestant national vanity is largely a thing of the past, but not entirely. Few politicians or church leaders now tout Protestantism as the defining religion of our country, but Protestantism remains the majority faith of the land, and the United States remains overwhelmingly Christian. According to a recent Pew Forum survey, fully 67% of Americans believe that the country was founded as a “Christian nation” (Newsweek, 11 September 2006). What that means is a matter of debate, but it at least infers that the notion of Christian America still packs a political punch. Most of the people punching that theme are Protestants, and many of them would see great appeal in the ideal of a monolithic Christian nation.
supported by a phalanx of proudly “Christian” (read “Protestant”) universities.

But Protestantism itself problematizes that kind of monolithic vision of nation and faith. Protestantism is and always has been an odd jumble of movements and organizations. The movement’s inherent diversity and its inability to reconstitute itself as the one true church has, in fact, been called “the Protestant problem.” Yet that very diversity with its implied critique of monolithic ideology might also be envisioned as a gift, perhaps even the most important gift that Protestantism in general and Protestant higher education in particular has bequeathed to America.

Ironically, the most articulate description of the positive merits of Christian diversity may come from a person who is neither Protestant nor American, but a Polish Catholic, the late Pope John Paul II. In his book Crossing the Threshold of Hope, John Paul admits that the current divisions of Christianity—divisions that are largely Protestant in nature and origin—“are certainly opposed to what Christ had in mind,” but he immediately adds that “these different approaches to understanding and living out one’s faith in Christ can, in certain cases, be complementary; they do not have to be mutually exclusive.” Going further, John Paul wonders whether Christian diversity might actually be a positive good, musing, “Could it not be that these divisions have also been a path continually leading the Church to discover the untold wealth contained in Christ’s Gospel and in the redemption accomplished by Christ? Perhaps all this wealth would not have come to light otherwise.” Might not the need “for humanity to achieve unity through plurality, to learn to come together in the one Church, even while presenting a plurality of ways of thinking and acting... be, in a certain sense, more consonant with the wisdom of God” than simple unanimity? (John Paul II 147, 153).

What Pope John Paul describes is no longer just a Protestant concern. Rather, this “problem of Protestantism” is now a global Christian phenomenon in which all Christians—Catholics, Protestants, and Orthodox alike—participate. And if John Paul is right, this “problem”—and there is no doubt it is on some level a problem—may simultaneously be a gift.

II
Variety: Pluralistic Protestant Higher Education

Retrospectively, it seems clear that diversity and variety are inherent in Protestantism, but Protestants did not originally set out to produce variety in faith. They set out to be right. They intended to reform the one, true faith every Christian should follow.

Things fell quickly apart. The date was 1529, only a dozen years after Luther had posted his famous Ninety-Five Theses on the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg. The place was Marburg, a smallish town in central Germany about fifty miles north of Frankfurt. The meeting involved Martin Luther and Ulrich Zwingli. These, the two most prominent leaders of the very young Protestant movement (so young it was not yet called Protestant), agreed on fourteen of fifteen proposed points, but that was not enough. They differed over how to understand the Eucharist, so they felt compelled to part company and go their own separate ways. Luther said famously, “We are not of the same Spirit.”

Protestant groups have been multiplying ever since, and their divisions often have been laced with the kind of antagonism, even hatred, that only small differences of opinion can produce. This diversification led quickly to violence. Early Protestant practice often included the religious cleansing of the land, driving out those with dissident views and putting to death those who failed to stay away. So Anabaptists—the wrong kind of Protestants—were killed in Holland, and the Unitarian Michael Servetus was executed in Switzerland through the cooperative efforts of John Calvin and the Catholic inquisition, because Calvin thought free-thinking Protestantism was a greater danger to his Genevan experiment than was the Roman Catholic Church. In England, both Puritans and Catholics were harried out of the land by the simultaneously broad and intolerant Church of England under Queen Elizabeth’s rule. And, in America, Quakers were hung on the Commons in Boston because the Puritans had come to the New World precisely to get away from heretics like them, and the Puritans were not about to let the Quakers or anyone else spread false doctrine in their “New” England, where
everything was to be done decently and in order and all in unison.

With time it became apparent that no particular Protestant group could hold everyone else at bay, even in places like Anglican London or Calvinist Geneva or Puritan Boston. So grudgingly, reluctantly, Protestants learned to live side by side with those different from themselves. This took place everywhere, but the epicenter was America, the only nation that had made religious freedom a basic right of citizenship. Puritans in the northern colonies and Anglicans in the South slowly accommodated to the presence of Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Unitarians as neighbors and even occasionally as friends. And, with time, they learned to live peaceably, if sometimes uneasily, with an ever widening assortment of faiths, most of which were new versions of Protestantism.

This process of accommodation to Protestant pluralism has a name: denominationalism. Protestant denominationalism, at least as it originally evolved, was the belief that even though you are less right than me, I will still consider you and your church Christian in some limited sense, and I will desist from trying to eliminate you by either physical violence or legal pressure. In certain circumstances, I may even cooperate with you if our purposes overlap. But generally, I see the two of us as religious competitors, and my fervent hope is that my own church will be the victor over yours.

It was that kind of competitive denominationalism that John Nevin found so unfortunate when he was writing about American Protestantism in the mid-nineteenth century, and in response he championed an alternative “Catholic and Reformed” ecumenical vision of what Protestantism could become. But Nevin’s kinder and gentler vision of Protestant faith was not to rule the day. Instead Protestant denominational competitiveness continued and intensified as the decades rolled on during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and that denominationally competitive ethos defined the environment in which many of America’s Protestant colleges and universities were formed.

Rather than being created first and foremost to serve either the advance of the gospel or the benefit of the nation as a whole, many Protestant colleges and universities, probably most, were founded with rather more narrow denominational concerns in mind. Higher education was a handmaiden of the American Protestant inter-denominational struggle, and colleges had two essential roles to perform. First, they trained future leaders, denominational leaders who would hold high the standards of their own particular faith in the competition for the souls of American citizens. Second, denominational schools provided safe havens where young people from the denomination could receive an education without being tempted away from church membership. That is, denominations developed their own institutions of higher learning out of fear that their own young people would otherwise attend schools sponsored by competing denominations. In such circumstances, young Baptist men might become Presbyterians or young Lutheran women might become Methodists. God forbid! Each church clearly needed its own school.

And it was not just formal denominations that joined this higher educational competition. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries a variety of new fundamentalist/evangelical organizations and social networks emerged that functioned in much the same way as the older denominations. A number of new Protestant colleges and universities were founded to serve this clientele, and they were as competitive in spirit as any denominational college or university.

While Protestant denominational and non-denominational competition remains a factor in the overall American religious scene, the majority of Protestant schools are no longer heavily invested in that contest. Many Protestant colleges have enlarged their older religious identities to become more ecumenical and more embracing of Christian and human difference. Some schools have not stopped there, however, but have opted to become ever more generic, speaking only vaguely about being committed to Christian “values” or to Judeo-Christian principles or to education that somehow serves the common good, and many of these schools no longer seem religious at all. The driving force behind this change often was the desire for more influence in society, and such influence was perceived as inversely related to religious particularity. Having more of one meant having less of the other. This narrative of chasing after “influence” and of thinning and disappearing
Christian identity has been compellingly and pessimistically recounted by George Marsden and James Burtchaell. Their descriptions apply to the history of many now Protestant-in-name-only colleges and universities, but this sectarian to secular plot line is not inevitable.

Many Protestant schools opted to keep their religious identities alive and intact, and the stories of some of these colleges have been recorded in books like Richard Hughes and William Adrian's *Models for Christian Higher Education: Strategies for Success in the Twenty-First Century* and Robert Benne's *Quality with Soul: How Six Premier Colleges and Universities Keep Faith with Their Religious Traditions*. The colleges and universities discussed in these two publications clearly value their specific Christian identities, but they have broadened their scope and vision of faith beyond mere sectarianism.

Benne says (borrowing the language of Freud) that the strength of these schools is found in the fact that they have rejected the religious narcissism of small differences, yet they have retained a commitment to both their specific traditions and the "Great Tradition" of Christian faith which he describes in terms of a C. S. Lewis style "mere Christianity" (Benne 184, 199). Hughes and Adrian underscore the significance of particularity even more strongly, asserting bluntly that "there is no such thing as generic Christian higher education" (Hughes 3). The schools included in these studies have not jettisoned their past; instead, each has embraced its own past in new and creative ways. And that newness and creativity is important. Rather than passively following the lead of their denominations or supportive constituencies, these schools have become active and constructive agents in the process of traditioning—the process of passing on the faith to future generations in, if anything, better shape than it was inherited.

Every Christian tradition at its best has something positive and distinctive to contribute to the general conversation of faith, to national conversations about policies and values, and especially to Christian higher education. This is precisely what Pope John Paul II suggests in his book *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, and it is also the main thesis of our book *Scholarship and Christian Faith: Enlarging the Conversation*. How can we as Christian scholars from many different traditions affirm our particularity and yet talk with each other intelligently? How can we learn from each other more effectively? How can we maximize our pooled resources for honoring God, thinking about the world, and caring for those who most need our assistance? These are very Protestant questions made necessary by Protestantism's internal diversity, but more and more these are questions that all Christians—and especially those in higher education—need to ask and answer together.

Each Christian tradition has something to share and something to learn from the conversation. Our book discusses some of the ways that various ecclesiastical and spiritual traditions contribute to the scholarly enterprise, and we contend that universities associated with different Christian traditions will and should bring different particular emphases to their educational priorities and scholarly work. But particularity is only half of the story. The other half is a willingness to reach beyond particularity, seeking to honor and affirm that common calling we share as Christians. It is the joint commitment to both particularity and unity that we label "pluralithic."

**III**

**Vision: Pluralithic Christian Higher Education**

Pluralithic Protestantism, pluralithic Christianity, understands the value of particular traditions, but nurtures those particular traditions on behalf of and for the sake of the Christian faith as a whole and the world as a whole. If monolithic Christianity seeks to speak with one voice and drown out all others, and if pluralistic Christianity sometimes seems to produce a tuneless cacophony, then pluralithic Christianity hopes to nurture something harmonious out of diverse voices. An image from the New Testament may be pertinent. The author of 1 Peter describes the church at one point as "living stones" arranged into a "spiritual house" that is then equated with a "holy priesthood." That vision of living stones cooperating together for the sake of the gospel and the good of the world is a fitting image for how our different missions and identities as Christian schools might be seen as complementary rather than competitive.

The goal in all of this—the reason for our mutual appreciation and cooperation—is not
"influence" but faithfulness. For Christian scholars, being faithful means being true to our own best intellectual insights about how the world is put together and simultaneously being true to the teachings and example of Jesus. In the long history of Protestant higher education, the desire for influence and for increased praise and prestige has too often been a siren tempting institutions away from their roots and the particular communities they were founded to serve. Like other universities, our institutions have yearned to draw the best and brightest students from across the country and, if possible, from around the world, making our campuses as cosmopolitan as possible. We have wanted to teach as many courses and subjects as possible, sometimes for no higher purpose than gobbling up more "market share."

This quest for influence and prestige comes with a cost. Some critics say we no longer educate students to be persons who are genuinely capable of being responsible for any particular cause or any specific place, but rather produce "itinerant professional vandals" (Berry 50) who are oblivious to the concerns of real people living in local communities of faith and life. Of course, there is a need for universities that are national and international in composition and scope, and of course all campuses must value diversity along with the lessons of reconciliation and insight that only diversity can produce. But some of our schools may simultaneously be called to particularity, to remembering our roots, to being mindful of a specific calling, and to caring for one place.

How does a church related school determine how to proceed? What compass can help us negotiate that terrain? Once again, Pope John Paul II provides guidance, though in this case his wisdom is refracted through the Protestant pen of Martin Marty in his book The Public Church. Quoting from the writings of John Paul before he became pope, Marty highlights the principle that every church possesses both "a special interiority and a specific openness." Explaining that phrase, Marty says this "special interiority comes from... the faith its members hold in common." Taken by itself this emphasis can lead to "introversion and the church [can] become a company of people huddled together with their backs to the world," but combined with a commitment to "specific openness" this should never occur. The goal for each church is to nurture a "mediated, focused, and disciplined" connection with the larger world, a connection that is, because of each church's special interiority, necessarily particular and selective. The alternative, says Marty, is to "sprawl and spill [ourselves] until all [our] substance is gone" (Marty 4).

A few years ago one of us had the privilege of writing a short theology book, a book entitled Gracious Christianity: Living the Love We Profess, with our good friend and former president of Messiah College, Rodney Sawatsky. During the time that book was being written, Rod was in the process of dying from a very aggressive form of cancer. Much conversation went into that book—long hours talking about priorities related to faith and life. In those conversations, one thing finally seemed clear, "God for the most part has chosen to change the world by layering small grace upon small grace" (Jacobson and Sawatsky 26). God works a little at a time; the kingdom of God puts down roots slowly in the soil of human existence. That conclusion may not be surprising coming from two Anabaptists, since Anabaptists are prone to assume that God operates close to the ground. But maybe an Anabaptist vision of faithfulness construed as many small acts of graciousness is a helpful antidote to overly grand visions of how Christian scholars and schools can influence the world. The shared goal is not, after all, "influence," but rather faithfulness.

The well known social activist Paul Loeb writes something similar in his book Soul of a
when he says that the best way to stave off both vanity and cynicism is to put our efforts into small things. Over time, he writes, “cultures shift, bit by bit” and those small changes layered one on top of each other sometimes produce “global ripples” of influence that can change attitudes and actions in remarkable ways (Loeb 98, 109). We remember and honor social activists and visionaries who have made huge leaps of imagination and grand and noble gestures of defiance, and well we should. But that is not the role destined for most of us, and, if we would look at the lives of even the most revered activists and visionaries, we would likely see that their lives too were made up of many small acts of courage, grace, justice, and love that slowly over time made them the people they were.

The many tiny, almost invisible, ripples of good set in motion as we attend faithfully to our different and distinct institutional purposes may be the best measure of our faithfulness as well as the most fruitful way we can contribute to the world. Whom specifically are we called to serve, in what ways, for what purposes? What special responsibilities do we have to the religious communities that founded our institutions and to the local communities in which our schools are situated? What academic goals and tasks might fit best with our particular callings as institutions of Christian higher education? What micro processes of grace should we be paying attention to as we seek to teach and nurture students into lives of meaning, responsibility, and faithfulness in the world?

Many Christian universities were founded with clear notions of their special interiority and their specific openness, but some have lost touch with those points of reference—or at least their grip has been decidedly loosened. Has real benefit accrued, or have some Protestant (or Catholic) universities merely sprawled and spilled themselves until all their religious substance is gone? Paying attention to institutional particularities, paying attention to our different senses of interiority and openness, is not a script for renewed sectarianism. Nor is it a recipe for fundamentalist revolt. Quite the contrary, it is an invitation to reaffirm the particularity with which God has gifted us and to serve with new energy the people our institution, and perhaps no other institution, is in a position to help. Those kinds of ripples of Christian grace can truly change the world.

We conclude by citing one recent, very visible example of how the special interiority and specific openness of a Christian subgroup can surprisingly influence, faithfully influence, the world. Not long ago, a deranged man entered an Amish schoolhouse in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, and shot to death innocent Amish girls. The national news was saturated with clips of horses and buggies and bonneted women in black. And under the harsh scrutiny of public attention, the Amish community sent out one clear message: we forgive. We forgive the man who did this. We will not seek any kind of retribution. We will reach out in love to his family, because Christ is love and we are followers of Christ. We will mourn the loss of our daughters, but we will not hate. The Amish are sectarian to an extreme. They clearly value their special interiority. But openness to others? Yes, in spite of their commitment to separateness, their willingness to forgive has become a ripple of faithful influence for good around the world.

The Amish educate their children only through eighth grade, so they cannot provide any direct advice about Christian higher education. Their role in the kingdom of God is very different from ours as intellectuals. Christians who are called to intellectual tasks will sometimes be required to ask difficult questions, to stir up curiosity, and to push at the edges of what we think we know about God, ourselves, and the world. None of that is very Amish at all. But, like the Amish, each of us is called, regardless of our disciplinary expertise, to do our work in ways that take seriously the special interiority and the specific openness of the particular faith communities to which we belong and of the particular institutions of higher learning with which we are associated.

The goal is not to create a new Protestant monolith, nor is it to create a new and expanded Christian or even Judeo-Christian monolith. The goal is not to have our voices as Christians become so loud they silence everyone else. At the same time, the goal is not simple pluralism, each of us expressing our own individual views with no regard for what other Christians and other scholars might think.
The goal, then, is for Christian higher education in America to honor the particularities of our various and varied communities of learned faith, while simultaneously acknowledging the limitations of every particular Christian tradition and the need to learn from others. We have called this a pluralistic vision of Christian higher education: a vision that combines conviction with conversation and that mixes faith with hope. And our hope is this: That the small ripples of goodness, beauty, and truth we create each day through our teaching and research—the small graces of insight and love that we communicate to and receive from each other and our students—might ultimately flow together by God’s grace, slowly improving our schools, our churches, our local communities, our nation, and perhaps even the world as a whole.

Douglas Jacobsen is Professor of Church History and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen is Professor of Psychology at Messiah College.

* We are indebted to L. DeAne Lagerquist of St. Olaf College for this image.
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Developing American Saints
The Contribution of Catholic Higher Education
to the American Experience

David J. O’Brien

I have in recent years been more than preoccupied—my friends would say obsessed—with the public responsibilities of my own Catholic community. In addition, I am proud to say that I am a Catholic Americanist, a title perhaps unfamiliar to many. Most simply, it means that I believe that our American experience tests our faith quite as properly as our faith tests our American culture. More broadly, my brand of Catholic Americanism arises from the judgment that the Catholic experience in the United States has been a story of success, not failure, a story of liberation from poverty and marginalization, not a story of passive surrender to an alien culture. Catholic aspirations gave and still give birth to rich, diverse subcultures. Those in turn are permeated by the surrounding culture, at least in part because of the very American aspirations of Catholics themselves. They “become American” by choice, and as a result, they share responsibility for this land, which is truly their own. I am one of them. So my subtitle should perhaps not be “The Contribution of Catholic Higher Education to the American Experience” but “Catholic Higher Education as American Experience and American Responsibility.”

Where to begin? On 22 September 2006, my wife and I were at the halfway point of an eight-day commitment to care for two of our remarkable grandchildren while their parents vacationed in Florida. I had fallen asleep on the family couch while thinking about preparing this presentation. I dreamed. In my dream, Alan Wolfe of Boston College’s Center for Religion and American Public Life invited me to visit a seminar discussing religion, politics, and Catholic higher education. After fretting about what to say, I decided I would simply enter the seminar, hold aloft a copy of Robert Ellsberg’s “reading a day” book All Saints and tell the Boston College scholars, “Here is all you have to know!” There my dream ended. I awoke convinced that this is what I should tell you here.

Ellsberg’s “cloud of witnesses” ranges from Hebrew prophets through traditional Christian saints, with exciting stories, to modern resisters, pacifists, and rebels, not all of them Christian, or canonized, but all united by their dedication to the beloved community we Christians call the reign of God. Christian higher education like all higher education is measured by the lives of its graduates, citizens, and, perhaps, disciples. In both cases, citizenship and discipleship, they, our graduates, and we, their friends and mentors, are called to be saints; I would add American saints.

Our question, then, is the role of Catholic and other church-related higher educational institutions in developing American saints. First, some history.

The story of American Catholic higher education has been well told by historians Philip Gleason and Alice Gallin, OSU. Gleason’s definitive history covers the period before the Second Vatican Council, while Sr. Alice tells the story of the years since, years in which she herself has been a key history maker. Gleason’s Catholic colleges and universities took shape within the American Catholic subculture where they assisted the movement of American Catholics into the centers of American society and culture, all the while finding their distinctive rationale by “contending with modernity” in its American forms. They were American, without question, but they were Catholic because they were, as they were told to be, “certain and set apart” from secular America. Of course, in American fashion, they never hesitated to make use of the best that secular America could supply. And, thank goodness, their contention with modern culture, Gleason’s rationale for Catholic higher education, was always a bit of an American promotional pose.
When the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, the American bishops immediately placed at the disposal of President Roosevelt their institutions and their “consecrated personnel.” Catholic campuses soon filled with officers in training. That near total self-sacrifice of Catholicism and Catholic higher education to American society carried over quite smoothly through the Cold War and beyond when, as we like to forget, we prepared as best we could to end human history, if we had to. Catholic intellectuals and institutions might “contend with modernity” and decry accommodation to secular culture, and a few prophets might mean it. But most of us, most of the time, had no trouble adjusting to American ways of war, race, and profit. Nor, to our credit, did we hesitate to make our own American dreams of “liberty and justice for all,” including us.

Academically, Catholic higher education’s antimodernism also had its limits. University leaders eagerly joined accreditation networks and, only a bit behind schedule, embraced the standards of academic freedom and the professional practices of the American academy, including what David Reisman and Christopher Jenks called “the academic revolution.” They did all they could to enable their students to enter American economic, social, and cultural centers, including secular graduate and professional schools. Gleason and other commentators worry that these adjustments put the Catholic integrity of these institutions at risk. And they did, of course. American hunger (was it for acceptance or a share of responsibility for our country’s history?) could subvert distinctive Catholic identity, both personal and institutional. Still, Catholic higher education’s Americanizing adjustments well served ambitious Catholic constituencies. For, contrary to common belief, immigrant Catholic subcultures were not old world enclaves engaged in a doomed rearguard action against modernity. Instead, they were communities of commitment shaped by “folk memories brought to bear on new aspirations,” to use a phrase of the late Timothy L. Smith. Catholic colleges and universities, while proclaiming a trans-ethnic Catholic loyalty, embodied those aspirations, which exploded after the Second World War. As Catholics broke out of city parishes and neighborhoods to claim their places in boardrooms and suburbs, their colleges and universities were there to help, and to affirm this self-initiated Americanization as a very good thing. Some might call it liberation.

Americanism, the belief that active sharing of responsibility for America’s common life was good, gave meaning to Americanization. The answer to the question of the Catholic contribution to the American experience was evident when I attended Notre Dame in the 1950s. By simply doing their job as American universities while trying to turn us into intelligent Catholics, Notre Dame and its counterparts were fulfilling their American responsibilities. At my graduation in 1960, President Dwight Eisenhower delivered the commencement address, Cardinal Montini of Milan, later Pope Paul VI, celebrated the baccalaureate Mass and actually handed me my diploma, and our loudest cheers went to honorary degree recipient Dr. Tom Dooley, the idealistic Catholic, anti-communist medical missionary in Indochina, then within a few months of death from cancer. Over the doors of the chapel at Notre Dame are the words “God. Country. Notre Dame.” That day the answer to our question was altogether clear: Notre Dame’s contribution to American society was—us.

Over the doors of the chapel at Notre Dame are the words “God. Country. Notre Dame.” The answer to the question of the Catholic contribution to the American experience was altogether clear: Notre Dame’s contribution to American society was—us.
aspirations and affirmed by the spirit of solidarity of the Second Vatican Council, came in the late 1960s when an energetic set of college and university Presidents persuaded their religious communities to turn over charters, property, and heritage to independent boards of trustees. That altogether unprecedented move—almost all religious orders of men and women entrusted the schools they had built at great sacrifice to the Catholic community at large—should be a subject of reflection in every orientation program for new faculty and staff at Catholic colleges and universities.

As academic leaders explained separate incorporation at the time, these were genuine universities and as such required “institutional autonomy and academic freedom.” They should be self-governing institutions, not branch plants of religious orders whose leaders had primarily apostolic responsibilities. Already most Catholic colleges and universities accepted prevailing standards of academic freedom; later they would not altogether happily accept professional standards of academic governance. The revolution of separate incorporation involved what Alice Gallin calls a “new partnership” between religious orders and the Catholic laymen and women who would now direct the affairs of colleges and universities. Without exception, the new Boards pledged to ensure that their colleges and universities would remain Catholic. Catholicism, they said, would be “perceptibly present and effectively operative,” a promise they thought could be best kept by bringing academic theology out of the seminary and into the college and university. Together with pastoral ministry, academic theology would help American Catholics become intelligent and responsible citizens and disciples. Historically, these moves, they were confident, would enable American Catholicism to give meaning to its liberating journey from margin to mainstream and enrich American life with Catholic wisdom and resources.

The Vatican, always suspicious of Americanism, never accepted this new arrangement and, from time to time, intervened to insist on accountability to the Catholic hierarchy and the Vatican. Academic leaders resisted external control, but they manifested their continuing Catholic commitment through formal statements, development of academic programs in theology, heavy investment in pastoral ministry, and dialogue with the bishops. The American bishops, until recently, were completely sympathetic and mediated disputes between Catholic universities and the Vatican. It was, it remains, a uniquely American arrangement, blurring boundaries between church and academy for the sake of the church’s life and mission, just as we so often blur the boundaries between church and state for the sake of public purpose.

What are we to think of this history? My colleague and friend Professor Gleason and I have disagreed about this question for thirty years. Recently, Catholic cultural politics have gone his way, and he has, for now, the best of the argument. Gleason thinks that separate incorporation and the multiple adjustments that accompanied it cost the Catholic colleges and universities their integrity as Catholic institutions. He believes that the Presidents and professors who shaped Catholic higher education for the last thirty years were hell-bent on “assimilation” and “Americanization” and unwittingly gave away the Catholic game. Intent on imitating secular academia, they hired anybody who showed up with a good degree, ignored the Pope, and turned their backs on neo-scholastic philosophy. Fortunately, according to Gleason, in recent years “Ecclesiastical authority” (italics in a recent Gleason text) has helped “stem what might have become an unintended slide into the kind of secularization experienced by Protestants a century ago.” Protestants and their colleges then (you will recognize references to the work of George Marsden), Catholics and their universities now, Americanization as loss and defeat. But Catholic higher education might yet be saved from secularization and salvage its integrity by the intervention of the Pope and his many supporters at home and abroad.

As you may have noticed, Gleason’s anti-Americanist position now dominates Catholic discourse. This explains the shocking defensiveness of Catholic college and university leaders during the last few years, steering clear of the sex abuse crisis, avoiding controversial questions such as abortion, homosexuality, and the role of women in the church, and nearly breaking down over the Vagina Monologues. Many reputable commenta-
tors now blame the Vatican Council (or supposed misinterpretations and misapplications of the Council) for the supposed loss of Catholic identity among American Catholics. Others, a growing number, combine that revisionism with Gleason’s explanation of Americanization, as if the Council was interpreted in ways that simply lent legitimacy to the desire of Catholics for acceptance and belonging among their non-Catholic neighbors. The near consensus now is that the church of the past should have been, and the church of the future must be, countercultural, that is to say non-American if not at least selectively anti-American. The reasons for that consensus, I would argue, have less to do with theological judgments than with the decline of the Americanist impulse, Smith’s “aspirations,” that long shaped so much of American Catholic self-consciousness.

The retreat from Americanism has been a long process. It is perhaps best illustrated by a text that for some of us marked a high point of responsible civic discipleship, the 1983 pastoral letter of the American bishops on nuclear weapons. In that text, the bishops spoke of two styles of teaching: one evident in their theological section where they spoke of the nonviolent Jesus, the other in the long body of the text where they engaged in a process of moral dialogue with the Pentagon, concluding with a “strictly conditioned moral acceptance” of nuclear deterrence. This bilingualism, struggling with conflicting demands of Christian discipleship and common citizenship, seemed to correspond to the moral struggles of many thoughtful Americans, not just Catholics. But then, in a move few noticed, the bishops launched into a moral jeremiad against their country not heard from American bishops since the formalistic denunciations of secularism in the 1920s and 1950s. They described the United States as a country dangerously “estranged from Christian values”; in early drafts they called it “neo-pagan.” Faithful Christians might well expect persecution and martyrdom comparable to the early church. This was anti-Americanist “knocking” (the term is Charles Taylor’s) of modernity with a vengeance. The passages were drawn almost word for word from an essay by theologian, later Cardinal, Avery Dulles, then moving from the reformist to the neo-conservative camp. It signaled an important shift in American Catholic thought.

O

VER TWO DECADES, THE DECLINE OF CATHOLIC America and the rise to dominance of countercultural language and sub-cultural strategies have drained the foundations of conciliar reform, destroyed the American church’s center, long represented by Joseph Cardinal Bernardin (see Peter Steinfels’s *A People Adrift*), and shattered the intellectual foundations of the Catholic academic revolution. Leaders like Theodore M. Hesburgh, CSC and Paul Reinert, SJ, were disciples of John Courtney Murray, who formulated the bilingual approach that allowed for, indeed insisted upon, both faithful Christian discipleship and responsible American citizenship. Such bilingualism is nothing more than our daily Christian practice of using one language among our Christian friends, where we ask what God, revealed to us in Jesus and present to us in God’s spirit, would have us do, and another, common language used in marketplace and city square, in classroom and laboratory, in all areas of shared responsibility. Hesburgh and Reinert and people we meet every day bear witness to the fact that ambiguity need not be heresy, that the tension between discipleship and citizenship can shape a fruitful public church and can inform lives of integrity, even produce American saints.

Still, it is a position made vulnerable by the disciplines of democratic pluralism, as debates like that over nuclear weapons, and over abortion, make clear. It is also challenged by the felt need of the church, of every church, to establish its difference and distance from others. To do that it is important to insist upon not just the distinctiveness but the superiority of its own claims. So it is that advocates of the model of responsible public Catholicism embodied in American Catholic higher education have found themselves on the defensive as important church leaders have identified particular moral issues as definitive of faithful Catholic discipleship. Their defensiveness reveals that modern Catholic higher education’s contribution to American life, its Catholic as well as academic contribution, depends upon the presence in some form of Americanism. Our capacity in Catholic colleges and universities to empower one another and our students to live a Christian vocation, as disciples and citizens, turns on our answer to the American question: What do we make of the
participates in the whole church’s service to the human family, touching not just Catholics but everything and everybody. Thus while we resist external control, our colleges and universities and those of us who practice our vocations within them affirm our share of responsibility for the life and work of the church.

And far less securely established is an academic and intellectual solidarity that regards the “us against them” of countercultural religion with the same suspicion it directs at tribes and nations. Intellectual solidarity requires that we regard the problems facing all serious scholars and teachers as our problems as well. Intellectual solidarity informs the academic work of committed Catholics. It is the essential ingredient, I think, of responsible resistance to countercultural Catholic claims.

This institutional balancing of academic, political, and religious responsibilities has pedagogical and pastoral counterparts. Our students, in their future, similarly will have to balance professional, civic, moral, and religious responsibilities, and we hope to help them do that with intelligence and integrity. We hope they will be competent professionals, conscientious citizens, intelligent disciples. And our hope for them expresses our aspirations for ourselves. All of us are at once scholars and teachers, citizens of complicated civic communities, and, in some cases, active participants in communities of faith, in all cases people of conscience and commitment. What the Second Vatican Council said of ordinary Catholics could be said with only slight modifications of all of us: “the laity, by their very vocation, seek the Kingdom of God by engaging in temporal affairs and by ordering them according to the plan of God. They live in the world, that is, in each and in all of the secular professions and occupations. They live in the ordinary circumstances of family, and social life, from which the very web of their existence is woven” (Lumen Gentium, paragraph 29).

I END WITH OUR STUDENTS, THEN, AND IDEAS ABOUT their future we often talk about but perhaps think about less critically than we should. First, vocation. When students leave your school or mine, fired by a deeper faith and awakened social conscience, where are they to go to find a community of shared faith, mutual support, and common commitment, the kind of community they might have enjoyed at school or on a summer or overseas service project? Will they find a community of conscience and commitment in the workplace? Will they find it in your religious congregation or in mine? Where will they turn when they are asked for the first time to share in work of limited or negative social benefit? Will they find communities of shared faith and friendship appropriate not just to acts of mercy and justice but to a lifetime oriented toward service to the human family? To whom will they turn when they realize in their hearts the enormity of inequality and injustice, the mass of systemic irresponsibility of our emerging global marketplace? For the Christians among us, after a century of multiple social gospels, can we say that the piety and culture of our local congregations and religious movements nourishes courageous conscience and an informed ability to read experience in light of faith? And of course, we pose these questions in the perspective of our students, but they are really our questions. Have we found such communities and congregations of conscience and commitment? And, if we answer “yes,” need we not ask “why” most of the time most of us, and certainly me, are so comfortable?

Second is an element of vocation, citizenship. We read Martin Luther King Jr.’s first book and his last. The young minister schooled in the social gospel of love, disciplined by a clear analysis of power, confronted the reality of racism in Montgomery. Sadly, he had only thirteen years before he wrote his last book. The commitment to loving service burns brighter than ever, but the problems seen now in what he calls the “world house” are more complicated and intractable than he had imagined in the days of the bus boycott. Power is not power with a small “p” but with a capital “P” as in Powers and Principalities. And he is gravely worried, in part because the political options available in 1967 are so inadequate to the problems people confront across the globe. His call to action is clear, but sober and modest. So, you and I issue our invitation to civic responsibility. Where do we go to carry out those responsibilities? Yes, there is the Catholic Worker and Bread for the World and Habitat for Humanity and Greenpeace and thousands of national and inter-
national NGOs. They help us do our duty, but do they really give direction and hope to our lives? Are they adequate to the level of our responsibility? You and I are here following two, three, and four generations of poor immigrant, marginalized outsiders who chose the burdens of self-government and personal responsibility. And, they gave us these gifts: material security, education, respect, and access to power. And they gave us these schools we serve. And, what is the quality of the political culture we are making by our choices each day? What is the feeling in our hearts and the look on our face when talk turns to the United Nations, to the Congress, to the elections? And how do we feel, how do we really feel about our fellow citizens in the United States? Can they be trusted with self-government? Can we? In the end, who really is responsible for the public life and global action of this last superpower?

So there you have it. Does responsible Americanism preclude serious religious commitment? Does the quest for common ground, and a common good for all of us preclude serious religious commitment? And how do we feel, really feel, about this people among whom we live? The future of Catholic higher education will be determined by Catholic responses to such questions. The arguments are important, not just for American academic life but for American public life, as Catholics constitute a very important component of American society and culture. A lot is at stake. The mission and identity questions really do matter.

I have tried to argue an Americanist case. Michael Harrington's characterization of the impact of his Jesuit education was that “ideas have consequences.” Harrington was not referring to a pragmatic epistemology or Ignatian discernment but to something altogether different; he was referring to Jesuit priests who lived strange lives of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and devoted themselves to their students day and night because they actually believed the ideas they taught in class. If something is true, you are supposed to live that truth. So for we American Catholics. This is our land, indeed, and these are our people and, as the result of our remarkable history, we as a people and as a community can choose whether to embrace our American responsibilities or reconstruct a subculture defined by distance and difference. The future is, as it has always been, in our hands.

David J. O'Brien is Loyola Professor of Roman Catholic Studies at the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, Massachusetts.

PLEA

Beat against this barren earth,
O blasting winter wind—
turn bones to stones
that chastened flesh
might learn to praise
again!

Joel Kurz
In the summer of 1831, a Kentucky slave named Tice Davis ran away. His master ran after him. Upon reaching the southern bank of the Ohio River, Tice jumped in. His master looked for a boat. Within a short while Tice pulled himself out of the water onto the northern bank of the Ohio River at Ripley, Ohio (about fifty miles east of Cincinnati). By the time Tice’s master made it across the river, Tice had disappeared. After searching up and down the riverbank, the master muttered, “He must have gone off on an underground road” (Siebert 57).

Like Tice’s master, many slaveholders feared that their slaves would run away. Unwilling to accept the fact that slaves might be discontent with slavery and reluctant to admit that slaves had the courage, intelligence, and faith to escape on their own, frightened slaveholders conjured up the idea of an organized system run by white abolitionists who aimed to steal away slaves. This organized system slaveholders called the Underground Railroad. In essence, the term “Underground Railroad” was coined and promoted by frustrated slaveholders.

Slaves generally knew nothing about any Underground Railroad. The vast majority of slaves simply did not run away. In border states like Kentucky, whose northern boundary was separated from free soil only by the Ohio River, less than one percent of slaves ran away. Even in border cities like Covington or Newport, both of which lie directly across the river from Cincinnati, very few slaves dared to run away. Individuals who helped those rare runaways were even more scarce.1

Slaveholders nonetheless had real reason to fear that they might lose their slaves.

Though secret tunnels, hidden codes, and vast networks of so-called “safe houses” for the most part did not exist, other more powerful institutions surely threatened the continuance of slavery. Slaveholders saw these more powerful and more threatening institutions take root on both sides of the Ohio River. These institutions assaulted the intellectual and theological foundations of slavery. More simply put, these institutions challenged the way people thought about slavery. What happened at these institutions fueled slaveholders’ fears that their slaves would be led to freedom. These institutions were Christian schools of higher education.

Along the Ohio River in the Midwest—which in the early-to-mid nineteenth century really was the West, with the area around Cincinnati being perhaps the Middle of the West—five institutions of higher education gave slaveholders reason to fear.

Augusta College (1822)

Forty-five miles from Cincinnati up the Ohio River lies the quaint town of Augusta, Kentucky. Augusta is one of northern Kentucky’s oldest towns. As early as 1795, Augusta boasted a fine public landing. Commerce coming up and down the Ohio River often landed at Augusta. Products unloaded at Augusta were trucked down early roads into the Bluegrass Region of Kentucky in and about Lexington.

Augusta boasted an early public school for boys called Bracken Academy. Terms were used loosely throughout the early nineteenth century, but an academy such as the Bracken Academy at Augusta generally meant a primary or grade school.

In 1822, the Ohio and Kentucky Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church voted to purchase Bracken Academy and transform it into an institution of higher learning. While church-related colleges dominated higher education in this period, such institutions were rare in the Midwest, and nonexistent in the Methodist Church. Augusta College was the first Methodist institution of higher learning in the world.2

Boys as young as twelve years of age were accepted in the preparatory department at Augusta College, but most students were older. Boarders came from Michigan, New York, Virginia, Maine,
Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Mississippi, Indiana, Tennessee, Ohio, and Kentucky. Graduates went on to become lawyers, bankers, doctors, ministers, businessmen, military leaders, and college presidents.

The president of Augusta College was a prominent Methodist minister, Joseph S. Tomlinson. President Tomlinson’s nephew, a boy named Stephen Foster, occasionally visited Augusta. While in Augusta, Stephen Foster was inspired by the songs coming down from the black church high on the hill. These melodies undoubtedly influenced his subsequent song writing.

President Tomlinson encouraged the formation at Augusta College of two debating societies, which were presumably for the older and younger students, respectively. Debating societies were extremely common at this time. Virtually every college in the first half of the nineteenth century had one. At Augusta College each debating society met for at least an hour (sometimes four hours) on Friday evenings throughout the school year. Meetings were held at the College. Faculty members were invited to attend, but they generally did not come. Students consequently organized and ran each meeting, which usually included about twenty attendees.

The meetings of the two debating societies helped students hone their speaking skills. Students read original works of poetry and prose, as well as debated prearranged topics selected by the group. After each debate, members voted on which side had the best argument. Votes may have occasionally reflected the quality of the debaters, as much as the substance of the debate. Each decision for the most part nonetheless seemed to reflect the mind of the student body.

Throughout the 1820s, 1830s, and 1840s, many topics chosen for debate dealt with questions of virtue. For example, students twice debated “Which has the most influence over the human mind, Love or Anger?” The students decided, Love. On another occasion they asked, “Which is the most desirable, Wealth or Fame?” The students decided, Fame. Several times they asked, “Which is the most happy life, Married or Single?” and after each debate on this question they voted in the same fashion. The students consistently chose, Married. But in another debate students concluded that married life weakened the mind (Minutes of the Jefferson Literary Society, hereafter JLS: 5 December 1828 and 5 May 1829, 16 January 1829, 9 January 1829 and 18 November 1831, and 24 October 1847).

From early on the boys at Augusta College concluded that women were mentally inferior to men. At the same time women were consistently judged to have contributed more to the “refined state” of society. In other words, what women lacked in the mind, they made up for in the heart. Such beliefs, which reflected society in general, help to explain why virtually no institution for higher learning was opened for women in the antebellum West (JLS 19 December 1828, and 6 November 1829; 12 May [source of quotation] and 17 November 1848, and 1 June 1849).

After a Female Academy opened in Augusta in the 1830s, the boys at Augusta College debated, “is a frequent intercourse with the Ladies [Ladies, that is, the] more refined and virtuous of the other sex, calculated to preserve a young man from the contamination of low pleasures or pursuits?” More
simply stated, several other times the boys asked, "Should students visit the ladies?" Their debates on this matter were split (JLS 16 July 1847; Minutes of the Union Literary Society, hereafter ULS: 30 May 1847 and 11 August 1848).

Many debates dealt with politics, a few touched on foreign matters, and about 10% revolved around large social concerns. Early on, these large social concerns included four things: capital punishment (thought to be justified), the treatment of Native Americans (removal of them was supported), prisons (deemed necessary), and slavery. By the late 1840s the large social concerns debated by the students were only two, capital punishment (which the students now opposed) and slavery.

Located in the borderland between the North and the South, Augusta College reflected not only the general tension over slavery but also rising turmoil within the Methodist Church. The Methodist Church officially forbade the buying and selling of slaves, but not slaveholding itself. Reflecting this position, many Methodists believed that slavery, though distasteful, was a political and economic problem, not a religious and moral one. Northern leaders hesitated to comment on the issue for fear it would split the church. Some Southern Methodists moved to the North to distance themselves from slavery, while a few, including the Wesleyan Methodists (later the Wesleyan Church) and the Free Methodists, became staunch abolitionists.4

Like the Methodist Church, the students at Augusta College were initially split over slavery. In various early debates some students concluded that slavery was just while other students voted that slavery should be abolished. One student leader once went so far as to argue that slaves should rise up in rebellion (JLS 14 November 1828, 6 December 1831, 28 May 1830).

President Tomlinson may have agreed with this one student leader who advocated slave rebellion. Tomlinson clearly opposed slavery. Reflecting his anti-slavery stance, Tomlinson placed Augusta College solely under the auspices of the anti-slavery Ohio Conference. Augusta College was the only Methodist institution in the state of Kentucky to separate in this fashion from the pro-slavery Ohio Conference of Methodists. As a result, in 1842 some of the faculty of Augusta College withdrew to the pro-slavery Transylvania College in Lexington. Some Augusta students may have followed these professors to Transylvania.5

Then in 1845 at Louisville, Kentucky, the Methodist Church formally split over slavery. Methodists in support of slavery became the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Those opposed to slavery were commonly called the Northern Methodist Church. Revealing which branch of Methodism Augusta College would support, six times from late 1847 to the middle of 1848 Augusta students debated slavery, each time advocating immediate emancipation. Augusta College was firmly planted in the Northern anti-slavery Methodist Church (See JLS 19 and 26 November 1847, 11 February 1848; ULS 12 February, 21 March, and 14 July 1848).

Then in early August 1848, a man who claimed to be a Methodist minister, E. J. Patrick Doyle, led a group of runaway slaves roughly along the old road from Lexington toward Augusta. He must have thought he could find assistance at Augusta College. But before reaching the town, in a hemp field near Waller's Mill, Doyle and the runaway slaves were surrounded and soon captured. A Lexington newspaper sounded the alarm "That Abolitionists are in our midst...[their] business is to tamper with and run off our slaves..." (Lexington Observer and Reporter, quoted in the Western Citizen, 11 August 1848).

Before the year was over, Doyle was convicted of enticing slaves to runaway and sent to the Kentucky state penitentiary, where he would die. Another newspaper meanwhile observed, "It is time in all conscience, that the abolitionists of the free states, cease to tamper with the rights and property of Kentuckians, and we hope that the fate of Doyle may teach others to know that Kentucky is dangerous soil for abolitionists to tread upon" (Campaign Flag, 18 August 1848).

In early January 1849 students at Augusta College formally debated slavery for the last time. The minutes recorded that it was a "short debate," which nonetheless ended, as did most other recent discussions, firmly against slavery. By this point in time the students and faculty of Augusta College were generally labeled abolitionists. The summer of 1849 the Kentucky legislature reacted to the college's stance against slavery by revoking the school's charter. The government had determined
that it could ill afford to maintain in the state of Kentucky an institution of higher learning with abolitionist tendencies. Serious intellectual discussion had cost Augusta College its license to exist. After twenty-seven years of operation, the school closed in 1849 (JLS 19 January 1849).

Lane Seminary (1829)

At the end of 1828, Ebenezer and William Lane offered $4,000 to start a Presbyterian seminary somewhere in the vicinity of Cincinnati, Ohio. A Cincinnati family then donated an old academy and sixty acres of land in Walnut Hills three miles north of Cincinnati. With just one professor and a handful of students, Lane Seminary opened on 18 November 1829.

After lengthy deliberations, one of the best-known clergymen of the day, Lyman Beecher of Litchfield, Connecticut, was appointed President of Lane Seminary. Beecher's appointment resolved whether Lane would reflect the Old School or the New School of the Presbyterian Church. Among other things, Old School Presbyterianism emphasized strict Reformed theology. The Old School was consequently suspicious of revivals. New School Presbyterianism, on the other hand, was open to theological innovation and welcomed revivals. Lyman Beecher was of the New School. After his appointment was announced, some Old School Presbyterians feared Lane would become a "revival seminary."6

In his inaugural address of 26 December 1832, Beecher spoke like a revivalist. Lane Seminary aimed to train ministers who would be

inspired with zeal, enlarged by comprehensive views, [and] blessed with a discriminating intellect,... With a clear mind and full heart [Lane students will be able] to look saint and sinner in the face with an eye that speaks, and a hand that energizes, and a heart that overflows, and words that burn.

At Lane there would be no separation between preparation for the ministry and immediate involvement in saving the world. Students were encouraged to make a difference (Beecher 206).

Beecher's inspiring vision for Lane drew talented students from across the country, including thirty-year-old Theodore Weld. Along with about twenty other graduates of the anti-slavery Oneida Institute in upstate New York, Weld enrolled at Lane Seminary in June 1833. As he confided to a friend, Weld had moved to southern Ohio because he intended to "introduce antislavery sentiments, and have the whole subject thoroughly discussed" at Lane (Weld to Tappan quoted in Beecher 235).

But Weld never intended to debate slavery at Lane Seminary. Unlike the Augusta College debates, where students carefully argued both sides of the issue, Weld aimed to promote only one side, namely, that slaves should be set free immediately. As most Lane students did not initially support immediate emancipation, upon arriving at Lane Weld began to work on changing their minds one at a time.

After bringing most students over to his side, Weld then proposed a public forum to discuss immediate emancipation. The eighteen days of discussion beginning on 5 February 1834 often have been called the Lane Seminary Debates, but what occurred should more accurately be labeled the Lane Seminary Anti-Slavery Revival.7

Most of the students, along with some of the faculty including Lyman Beecher, attended the Anti-Slavery Revival. For the first nine evenings, the topic was "Ought the people of the Slave holding States to abolish Slavery immediately?" Eighteen students, all of whom had been born or raised in the South, and some of whom were slaveholders, spoke in favor of immediate emancipation. None spoke against it.

Among a number of testimonies, the most riveting came from James Bradley, the only African American student then enrolled at the school. Over nearly two hours Bradley told how he had been kidnapped from Africa and then brought to the United States at the age of two. For the rest of his life, he had been haunted by nightmares. Despite such torment, over a decade Bradley worked in his spare time to earn enough money to purchase his freedom. Bradley then enrolled at Lane Seminary.

After Bradley told his story, the students voted unanimously in favor of immediate emancipation. With this vote, slavery was declared a sin against God, for God had created human beings as free moral agents. The next nine evenings, which discussed the idea of sending slaves back to or
colonizing them in Africa, proved anti-climatic. A number of students originally had planned to speak in favor of colonization, but after the strong vote advocating immediate emancipation, only one student, the son of an agent for the Colonization Society, actually came to the podium. On the eighteenth and final day of the revival this student, alone, voted in favor of colonization.

Upon the conclusion of the Lane Seminary Anti-Slavery Revival, one student withdrew from the school so that he could open a school for blacks in Cincinnati. Moved to tears, President Beecher gave this student his blessing. A week later, the remaining Lane students formed an anti-slavery society. This society assisted in the black school, disseminated pro-abolitionist information, and curiously wore out a horse. The owner of the horse explained, "It was understood that that horse might be taken without question by any brother, who had on hand 'Business of Egypt.'" Some brothers of Lane apparently were assisting runaway slaves (Huntington Lyman to Theodore Weld, 16 November 1891 in Lesick 90).8

Most Cincinnatians knew nothing of the revival at Lane Seminary, that is, until one newspaperman complained that seminaries should not meddle in political matters such as slavery. Theodore Weld strongly objected. Why, Weld asked

should not theological students investigate and discuss the sin of slavery? Shall those who are soon to be ambassadors for Christ—commissioned to cry aloud—to show the people their transgressions—shall they refuse to think, and feel, and speak... Is it not the business of theological seminaries to educate the heart, as well as the head?... If not, then give Lucifer a professorship. He is a prodigy of intellect, and an encyclopedia of learning.

Inspired by Weld, and despite some opposition, Lane students continued to discuss slavery, educate blacks, and disseminate pro-abolitionist material (Cincinnati Journal 30 May 1834). But they also went one step further. Lane students treated African Americans as equals. Students visited black homes and entertained blacks at the seminary. Then on one occasion the students reportedly "brought a colored woman into church, and seated her beside one of the most prominent white ladies in the city." Not realizing the public outrage that this act caused, President Beecher merely tried to dissuade students from having any further close contact with African Americans. After the school term, Beecher left Cincinnati on 19 July for a fundraising trip to the east coast (See Lesick 92).9

In his absence, students were threatened, ridiculed, and cursed by many, and then chastised by the Lane Board of Trustees. Though many Cincinnatians recognized that slavery was unjust, Cincinnati essentially was a southern town, especially since its economy was largely dependent upon trade with slaveholding Southern states. Several Trustees of Lane, moreover, were prominent Cincinnati businessmen whose livelihood depended on southern commerce. Concerned that conflicts over slavery would alienate the Southern trade, the Board of Trustees ordered that the students' anti-slavery society be abolished, that students not discuss slavery anymore (even in private), and that the leading professor of the seminary, John Morgan, be fired. Morgan was the only professor who openly supported the students. Only one trustee, Asa Mahan, opposed these measures of the Board.10

Shortly after the Board's orders were publicized in local papers, four blacks rode out to Walnut Hills to visit the Lane students. The Board then closed the school for the rest of the summer vacation. As the next school year approached, the Board threatened to dismiss any unruly student. The Board also passed resolutions that restricted student movement. In particular, no horses were allowed on the school grounds except those owned by the seminary. The Board apparently had learned about the students' worn-out horse.
When President Beecher returned perhaps on 14 October, that is, the day before the fall term was to begin, he “found all in a flurry.” The students gathered, and the faculty announced the new regulations. One student leader rose and proclaimed that “the most solemn convictions of duty to [my] God, [my] conscience, [my] country, and the race, constrained [me] to say, that [I] could not longer continue a student of Lane Seminary.” Within a short while seventy-four students joined him. Lane Seminary had lost three fourths of its student body (See Beecher 246; Lesick 130).

Most of the seceding students returned home or went to other schools. About a dozen, including Theodore Weld, moved about four and a half miles away to the small village of Cumminssville. These students were allowed to use a building in which to live and study. Many reported newfound enthusiasm for learning. At Cumminsville they published *A Statement of the Reasons Which Induced the Students of Lane Seminary, to Dissolve Their Connection with that Institution*. This document adamantly defended the right to free discussion.11

President Beecher meanwhile worked to revise the regulations of the Board of Trustees, hoping that this would draw students back to his nearly empty Seminary. But at the end of October, the Board closed the school. About a year later, Beecher delivered an angry address at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, in which Beecher chastised college students for challenging authority. Beecher then changed his earlier views, namely, that there be no separation between preparation for the ministry and immediate involvement in saving the world. At Miami, Beecher proclaimed that education should be “regarded as a preparation for public action [not] the commencement of it” (Beecher quoted in Lesick 141).12

Lane Seminary eventually reopened under Beecher’s jurisdiction, though it never again included such assertive students as those led by Theodore Weld. Weld and his followers nonetheless had left their mark, including on the Beecher family. Lyman Beecher’s daughter, Harriet, eventually married Lane Biblical Professor, Calvin Stowe. Harriet Beecher Stowe’s views on slavery were formed while living in Cincinnati and undoubtedly were influenced by what she had learned from the students at Lane.13

In the Spring of 1835, Weld and about thirty of the former Lane students transferred to Oberlin Collegiate Institute, which had been opened in northern Ohio about a year earlier. Their transfer had been contingent upon Professor John Morgan and trustee Asa Mahan, both of whom had been let go from Lane because of their anti-slavery views, becoming professor and president, respectively, of Oberlin.14

The majority of former Lane students went on to become ordained ministers, mostly in the Presbyterian Church. Many worked for the rest of their lives against slavery, and/or for free blacks. In such work, the former Lane students routinely faced mobs. One was whipped, and another was tarred and feathered.

In 1837 the Presbyterian Church formally split, mostly over theological differences. But members following the Old School generally supported slavery. The New School typically denounced it. Yet these distinctions were not absolute, as some Old Schoolers opposed slavery and some New Schoolers admitted slaveholders. As a result, the Free Presbyterian Church formed in 1841 to unambiguously oppose slavery.

By this time, however, some of the former Lane students had grown discontent with organized Christianity. Frustrated that the Church seemed unable or unwilling to make a real difference regarding slavery, Theodore Weld, for example, in his latter years focused on his personal relationship with God. Reform, he concluded, could only occur within the individual soul.15

**St. Xavier College (1831)**

The first Catholic College of the Old Northwest Territory opened as the Athenaeum in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1831. Eight years later classes at the Athenaeum were suspended largely due to inept leadership. Then the Jesuits took over. They immediately renovated the school building, changed the name to St. Xavier College, and reopened the school in the Fall of 1840. A Kentucky Jesuit was especially pleased with this move for in his estimation Ohio was the “chef-d’œuvre [masterpiece] of American colonization, without slaves and without assassins” (William
Though located in the heart of the American West, St. Xavier College followed various European models. Like many German and French schools, for example, Xavier offered a six-year course of studies. The first three years focused on classical languages, history, and English, while the last three added poetry, rhetoric, and philosophy. These six years eventually would split into what we now know as high school and college.

From the beginning, non-Catholics attended Xavier. In fact, non-Catholics were in the majority in the early years. Any qualified boy at least eight years of age (though more commonly about fifteen) could start the six-year classical course of studies at Xavier.

At first Xavier students were mostly of English, Scottish, or Welsh descent. Even after immigrants flooded Cincinnati in the mid-nineteenth century, with the Xavier student body growing to include huge influxes of German and Irish day students, boarders at Xavier continued to be predominantly from the South. In 1850 Louisiana students comprised nearly half of the school's boarders.

Some of these Louisiana boarders were of mixed heritage. According to the legal standards of the times, these students could have been classified as black. But college officials overlooked such distinctions and treated all Xavier students as white. In this fashion, Jesuits typically avoided potentially contentious issues.

Students were not necessarily as careful. The first year the school was under Jesuit control, some upper-class students formed a debating club. Completely run by students, Xavier's debating club addressed many of the same topics covered by the debating societies at Augusta College. Xavier's club also debated several issues unique to Xavier, including the impact of German and Irish immigrants and the related rise of anti-Catholicism.

Catholics typically avoided discussing the burning issue of the day, that is, slavery. One reason for this avoidance was the fact that the antebellum Catholic Church was largely a Southern institution, with strongholds in Louisiana, Maryland, and Kentucky. Maryland Jesuits had owned slaves before they somewhat callously sold them to Catholics in Louisiana. In Kentucky, every antebellum Catholic bishop, priest, and religious woman either owned slaves or lived with someone who did. While a few Catholics advocated gradual emancipation, no Catholic bishop denounced slavery outright. The only possible exception was the ex officio President of the Board of Trustees of St. Xavier College, Catholic Archbishop John Baptist Purcell of Cincinnati. But Purcell did not speak out against slavery until after the Civil War began (for an overview of Catholics and slavery, see Gollar 27–54). Following Catholic precedent, Jesuit superiors had instructed that so-called political matters such as slavery not be discussed at Jesuit institutions. Some students evidently did not get the message. The Xavier debating club entertained several debates on slavery. And later, after Jesuits had been ordered to remain neutral during the Civil War, students at Xavier debated secession from the Union. The results of these student debates were not recorded, yet they certainly did not provoke any action. As one historian has noted, the Jesuit faculty evidently had successfully turned the minds and hearts of the 132 St. Xavier students from the activities of the battlefields of Bull Run and Shiloh...[and] from the speeches of the political leaders of the North and South to the orations of Cicero...

Jesuits at St. Xavier College educated students in classical culture but did not encourage immediate engagement in American affairs (Bennish 68).

Western Baptist Theological Institute (1845)

A number of Baptist institutions of higher education operated in the antebellum Midwest, including what is now Dennison University outside of Columbus, Ohio, and Georgetown College near Lexington, Kentucky. Differing views on slavery distinguished these and other Baptist schools. In 1833, Baptists meeting in Cincinnati hoped to bring Northern and Southern Baptists together by organizing a new Baptist school that would remain neutral over the issue of slavery.

In 1835 Baptist leaders purchased nearly 350 acres of land in Covington, Kentucky (across from Cincinnati) for the proposed Baptist school. The cornerstone for the first building was laid in 1840. Suggesting that the school would be neither
Northern nor Southern in sentiment, it was christened the Western Baptist Theological Institute. But this institute would not open for some time due to financial problems, as well as to tensions within the Baptist Church.19

No one wanted to be President of this supposedly neutral Western Baptist Theological Institute. Three prominent Southern Baptist ministers and one prominent Northern minister turned down the job. They evidently did not want to become the focus of the slavery debate.

Then other factors complicated the search for a president. In 1844 the Foreign Mission Society of the Baptist Church refused to allow a slaveholder to become a missionary. In response, on 8 May 1845 Baptist delegates from southern states withdrew forming a separate church, the Southern Baptist Convention. A fundamental principle of the Southern Baptist Convention was that the Bible sanctioned slavery.20

A Board member of the Foreign Mission Society, Reverend Robert Everett Pattison of Boston, then accepted the position of President of the Western Baptist Theological Institute. The school opened in September 1845. In October the Kentucky General Association of Baptists formally joined the Southern Baptist Convention. A fundamental principle of the Southern Baptist Convention was that the Bible sanctioned slavery.20

A Board member of the Foreign Mission Society, Reverend Robert Everett Pattison of Boston, then accepted the position of President of the Western Baptist Theological Institute. The school opened in September 1845. In October the Kentucky General Association of Baptists formally joined the Southern Baptist Convention. Some Kentucky Baptists next resolved not to support the Western Baptist Theological Institute “on account of the suspicion respecting its president upon the subject of slavery.”21

Fueling fears that the Western Baptist Theological Institute would become an abolitionist school, twenty-three of the twenty-six students in the initial class were from the North. Northerners similarly dominated the Board of Trustees. Reflecting Northern sympathies, President Pattison and some of the faculty attended an anti-slavery Ohio Baptist Conference in 1847. Rumors soon spread that the Board of Trustees would move the Western Baptist Theological Institute to Cincinnati.22

The few Southerners on the Board responded by petitioning the Kentucky legislature to amend the school’s charter. According to the proposed amendment, sixteen new members, all Kentuckians, would be added to the Board. The legislature passed this amendment without consulting the entire Board of Trustees. The Northerners on the Board responded by filing suit. A Kentucky judge ruled in favor of the amended charter and against the Northern Trustees. President Pattison, along with some of his faculty, subsequently resigned. Southerners took their place.

The Northern Trustees meanwhile appealed the court’s decision against them. After bitter debate, during which time donations to the school ceased and enrollment plummeted, an arbitrator was assigned to resolve the conflict. To the satisfaction of both sides, in August 1855 the arbitrator sold the school and divided the assets. The Kentucky contingent donated its share to the pro-slavery Georgetown College. The Northern group gave its portion to the anti-slavery Granville College, now Dennison University.23

Wilberforce University (1856)

In 1853 the Cincinnati Conference of the Methodist Church asked, “What can best be done to promote the welfare of the colored people among us.” A year later the Conference proposed the formation of an institution of higher learning exclusive for blacks. Named for the English statesman who adamantly opposed slavery, Wilberforce University opened about midway between Cincinnati and Columbus in Xenia, Ohio, in 1856.24

The white Trustees of Wilberforce University described the school as an “experiment” in higher education. A local black minister rebuffed the white Trustees, informing them that “God does not make experiments.” One of the few black Trustees, AME Bishop Daniel Payne added that Wilberforce should not be called a “university.” Payne pointed out that Wilberforce’s proposed course of studies were elementary in nature. While Wilberforce’s charter denounced discrimination, its earliest practice suggested strains of racism (Payne 151, emphasis added).25

With a white president and white teachers, Wilberforce nonetheless addressed the academic needs of many blacks, both in the state of Ohio and elsewhere. After Cincinnati began to enforce some of Ohio’s so-called Black Laws, which ran many blacks out of the city, a number of blacks relocated in the rural parts of Ohio, including the area around Wilberforce. But most of the school’s patrons came from the South, including as far away as New Orleans. In 1859 the student body consisted of 207
persons, the majority of whom were natural sons of white Southern planters.

The outbreak of the Civil War cut off this patronage from the South, and Wilberforce closed in June 1862. About the beginning of 1863 the Methodist Church decided to sell the property. But Bishop Payne was not willing to give up on Wilberforce. Though he had no money, Payne offered to buy the school for his denomination, the African Methodist Episcopal Church. And, as one historian put it, the white trustees “decided to give the race a chance.” Payne declared, “In the name of the Lord I buy the property of Wilberforce for the African Methodist Episcopal Church.” The white trustees cried out, “Amen, amen, amen!” (Brown 82; Payne 152).

Payne reopened Wilberforce University with only a handful of students in July 1863. Payne served as President. Fearing what a black school with a black president might do, incendiary hands set the main building on fire the day Lincoln was shot, 14 April 1865. Payne was out of town at the time. Upon returning to see the ruins, he exclaimed, “From these ashes a nobler building shall rise.” Payne not only rebuilt the main building but also firmly established Wilberforce as a university. During Payne’s thirteen years as president, the school’s debt was erased, the student body increased, and the quality of the curriculum was enhanced (Payne 154).

Wilberforce now boasts of being the nation’s oldest private African American university. In 2007 Wilberforce celebrates its 148th anniversary. The success of Wilberforce University, along with other educational efforts for blacks, proved Bishop Payne’s contention that with the education of African Americans “the reign of slavery, darkness, and cruelty was passing away, and that of freedom, light, mercy, and love was dawning upon an outcast, outlawed, enslaved race!” (Payne 155).

Conclusion

One early historian claimed that “the greatest glory of Augusta College was its ending.” Such could have been said for three, and almost four, of the five institutions of higher education that I have discussed. Due to courageous stances against slavery, the charter of Augusta College was revoked, Lane Seminary closed, and the Western Baptist Theological Institute was disbanded. Wilberforce University was moreover burned and thus could easily have closed were it not for the faith and courage of its president (Rankins 23).

Of these five institutions, Wilberforce University and St. Xavier College, now Xavier University, alone still stand. I have a challenge for each. I first challenge Wilberforce to celebrate what has truly made it a noble university. In his reminiscences of Wilberforce, Bishop Payne never mentioned the Underground Railroad. Instead, he championed the freedom that Wilberforce offered through intellectual advancement. The first thing that leapt out for me when I recently visited Wilberforce’s web page was the loud proclamation that Wilberforce was a stop on the Underground Railroad. As far as I know, there is no evidence to suggest that Wilberforce actually was part of the Underground Railroad, as least as it is commonly understood. Bishop Payne never mentioned it. Why must it then be featured, especially when Wilberforce can boast of 148 years of realizing more certain freedom through the exercise of higher education? I hope that Wilberforce’s known accomplishments will not be obscured by the uncertain myth of the Underground Railroad.

This year my institution, Xavier University, celebrates 175 years of serving men and, more recently, women in higher-level intellectual advancement. With such a solid foundation, I hope Xavier does not fear to probe into some of its less admirable acts of the past. By effectively avoiding the issue of slavery, Xavier alone amidst the five institutions I have discussed survived unscathed by the slavery debates. Avoiding controversial issues seems to be a problem for the Catholic Church. Perhaps Xavier can demonstrate another approach by daring to discuss even the sins of its past.

I hope universities of today do not shy away from such power in higher-level critical thinking. ¶

C. Walker Gollar is Associate Professor of Theology at Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Notes

1. Estimating the number of runaways is difficult. Marion Lucas noted that census records revealed that very few Kentucky slaves ran away. Yet Darrel Bigham rightly pointed out that the number of runaways was surely greater than census records suggest. Bigham, who never gave any estimate of the number of runaways, nonetheless seemed to indicate that there were a relatively small number of fugitives even across the border region of the Ohio River valley (see Lucas 61–83; Bigham 22–25). The less than one percent estimate is based on my critical evaluation of every antebellum census report (including slave schedules) for the state of Kentucky, cross-referenced with newspaper accounts of slave runaways, court records, and other historical documents. A number of anecdotes suggest that even persons who did occasionally assist runaways were generally not familiar with any kind of organized system that might be called an Underground Railroad. For example, about the same time that Tice Davis had run away, a group of Kentucky slave hunters lost their way at Fountain City, Indiana. They then banged on the door of a Quaker businessman named Levi Coffin. “Are you the President of the Underground Railroad?” they asked. He replied, what is that? After they explained their notion of an organized system intended to assist runaways, Coffin said he never heard of such a thing. He nonetheless readily admitted that he routinely helped fugitive slaves who knocked on his door and would do so again. If such behavior merited Coffin the title President of the Underground Railroad, he declared to these slave hunters that he proudly would accept the honor (Coffin 126). After the 1893 exhibition at the World’s Fair in Chicago of Charles Webber’s painting, The Underground Railroad, followed by Wilbur Siebert’s publication of The Underground Railroad from Slavery to Freedom (1898), the “Underground Railroad” became part of American folklore.

2. The Methodist College in Cokesbury, Maryland, preceded Augusta College, but owing to a fire the Maryland institution’s existence was short-lived. Historians thus agree that Augusta College was the first established Methodist College in the world.

3. At Augusta College, these debating societies were called the Jefferson Literary Society and the Union Literary Society. Both societies kept minutes describing their meetings. Three antebellum volumes survive. These are the minutes from the Jefferson Literary Society 1828–1832, 1847–1849, and from the Union Literary Society 1846–1849. Augusta’s Knoedler Memorial Library has these three volumes. In a private publication for the library entitled, “Minutes—Jefferson & Union Literary Societies—The Augusta College” (2006) William A. Baker transcribed these volumes.

4. Concerning the Methodist position, see The General Rule on Slavery (1789) (of the Methodist Church).

5. That same year the Ohio Conference established Ohio Wesleyan College at Delaware, Ohio. With that, the Ohio Conference withdrew its support of Augusta College. For a time Augusta fell back tenuously under the auspices of the Kentucky Conference. The Kentucky Conference withdrew its support of Augusta College in 1846, after which the Ohio Conference once again became Augusta’s sponsor.

6. The phrase is from Beecher’s address to his congregation, early July 1832 (Beecher 206). Lyman Beecher somewhat naively believed that he could appease the Old School Presbyterians.

7. The historic record is not always consistent on the dates of the revival.

8. The student who withdrew to open the school was Augustus Wattles. He also induced many Cincinnati blacks to relocate on 30,000 acres of land he had acquired in Mercer County, Ohio. From 1836 to 1840 at least twenty-five emancipated slaves moved there. Wattles later moved to Kansas where he helped fugitive slaves, as well as associated with John Brown. By the end of the summer of 1834, the Lane students ran four black schools.


10. Many of the decisions against the students and against Morgan had been made by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, but the Board affirmed the decisions when it met in full on the eve of the next school year.

11. From Cumminsville the students also continued their work in the black community of Cincinnati.

12. In subsequent years, a number of other colleges faced similar conflicts between faculty, students, and Board of Trustees over slavery. These included Kenyon College, Illinois College, Amherst, Andover Newton Theological Seminary, Marietta College, Western Reserve, and Phillips Academy (Lesick 145–46).

13. Concerning Stowe’s time in Cincinnati, see: Hedrick (126).

14. Other dissenting students went to the Western Reserve College at Hudson, Ohio.
15. Concerning Weld, see Abzug. The last commencement of Lane was held in 1932, and the last of the main Lane buildings was razed in 1956. The only structure still standing that was associated with the school is President Beecher's manse, what is now called the "Harriet Beecher Stowe House."


17. Concerning the early black students at Xavier, see William Stack Murphy, SJ, to Superior General Roothaan, SJ, 25 July 1854 in Garraghan 196-197. Jesuit avoidance of contentious issues undoubtedly was fueled in part by their suppression from 1773 to 1814. This suppression had been invoked largely because of the perception that Jesuits recently had been too assertive against various secular authorities. (See Broderick and Lapomarda, especially 786–87).

18. Xavier's debating club was called the Philopedian Society. "Philopedian" comes from the Greek word meaning "those devoted to education." A Philhermenian Society, or Junior Literary Society, was formed during the 1841–42 academic year for younger students. Extensive records of the Philopedian Society are preserved in the Xavier University Archives.

19. At the cornerstone laying, Professor Calvin Stowe of the Lane Seminary delivered the primary address.

20. In its opposition to the slaveholder becoming a missionary, the Foreign Mission Society was supported by the American Baptist Home Mission Society.

21. The quotation is from the *Long Run Baptist Association, Minutes*, 1845. Though the evidence is not exactly clear, probably at this point four southern members of the Board of Trustees asked Pattison to declare publicly his views on slavery. He refused to do so. They then unsuccessfully tried to pass before the Board a resolution that spoke of slavery as divinely inspired.

22. Faculty members Asa Drury and Ezekiel Gilman Robinson joined President Pattison at the anti-slavery Ohio Baptist Conference.

23. Catholics eventually turned the buildings of the Western Baptist Theological Institute into a hospital. After moving what is now St. Elizabeth Hospital further south in Covington, the old Western Baptist Theological Institute was torn down in 1916. The only original building that now remains is the President's house, now called the Sanford House (after the original owner). This overview of the Western Baptist Theological Institute was gleaned from a critical review of the following sources: *Catalogue of the Trustees, Faculty, and Students of the Western Baptist Theological Institute, Covington, Ky., 1846–1847; Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle, vol. 3 (374–375); Licking Valley Register 25 May 1842 (p. 3), 4 June 1842 (p. 3), 31 May 1845, 23 August 1845 (p. 1); Covington Journal 24 August 1849 (p. 3), 22 November 1851, (p. 2), 12 August 1854 (p. 2); Kentucky Post 24 November 1916 (p. 1); Daily Times-Star 4 and 7 April 1925; James (n.d.); Ware (43–49).

24. Motion of Rev. A. Lowery, Methodist Episcopal Church, Cincinnati Conference, 28 September 1853, Hillsboro, Ohio (Brown 77). Blacks were educated in Ohio long before Lane Seminary students had opened their black school, but Lane Students did help to bring about higher education for blacks. At the insistence of the Lane Students, Oberlin College accepted black students after 1835. In 1847 some white ministers opened the country's first institution of higher education exclusively for blacks. It was called the Union College and Seminary and was located outside of Columbus, Ohio. In 1850 abolitionists opened the Eleutherian College just north of Madison, Indiana. This school accepted both women and blacks, including probably some runaway slaves.

25. Twenty of the twenty-four original trustees were white.
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Living with the “Non” in “Nondenominational” Hiring for Mission at Wheaton College

Jill Peláez Baumgaertner

One of the typical characters in the fiction of Flannery O’Connor, the southern Catholic writer of the 1950s and early 1960s, is the modern intellectual whose intense, analytical proclivities are often accompanied by a willful blindness to the truth of the gospel. This blindness is, admittedly, often exacerbated by the packaging the gospel has suffered at the hands of the cultural naïfs who preach it. O’Connor’s story, “Revelation,” opens in a physician’s waiting room that contains a cross-section of southern culture, including Ruby Turpin, a farmer’s wife who prides herself on her respectable demeanor but who is actually smug, self-righteous, and hypocritical. Sitting across the room is Mary Grace, a sullen Wellesley student disgusted by the small talk and pious clichés passing between her mother and Ruby Turpin. Mary Grace knows small-mindedness when she sees it, and so when Ruby Turpin says, “If it’s one thing I am... it’s grateful. When I think who all I could have been besides myself and what all I got, a little of everything, and a good disposition besides, I just feel like shouting, ‘Thank you, Jesus, for making everything the way it is!’,” Mary Grace hurls a book entitled Human Development at her, hitting her squarely over the eye. Thus the relationship between religion and higher education, O’Connor seems to be saying: nasty, brutish, and short (O’Connor 1978).

Forcibly restrained, Mary Grace is sedated, carted off in an ambulance, and disappears from the story. Ruby Turpin, however, dwells for the rest of the day on the blow she has received, especially Mary Grace’s hissed accusation that Ruby is a “warthog from hell,” and finally, in one of O’Connor’s most effective conclusions, the character realizes that she is both sinner and redeemed, both a warthog from hell and a respectable, upright woman. The college woman has had her effect on the church woman, unintentionally leading her to revelation. Unfortunately, however, so far as we know, the church woman has had no effect at all on the student. For O’Connor’s intellectuals, there is no possible wedding of faith and learning. In fact, these concepts are antagonists.

And so it has been for the past century. St. Anselm’s dictum, “I believe in order that I may understand” may have held sway in universities for several hundred years, but in today’s university culture, this integration of faith and learning appears to many to be hopelessly quaint. It is now a given that most new professors coming to Wheaton College, fresh Ph.D.’s in hand, have not experienced integrative thinking, even though many of them have chosen fields of study that would allow some personal connections between their faith and their disciplines, connections that usually must be kept private in the research university environment. The English department, for example, continually receives letters of inquiry from prospective teachers of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literature, an area of study natural for the Christian scholar because it includes the greatest devotional poets of the English language. But most, if not all, of these graduate students have been encouraged, in the name of scientific objectivity, to keep the personal out of the analytical. One of my own graduate professors, for example, commented on a paper I had written on the character of Sin in Milton’s Paradise Lost, “Watch your tone. It sounds as if you might believe this stuff.” Anselm’s declaration about the cohesion of belief and reason is, for all intents and purposes, dead in academia.

How did we end up in this predicament? Certainly the Reformers did not have this separation in mind. In fact, the Reformation, with its emphasis on a well-educated clergy able to equip a priesthood of all believers, was aided by the sometimes competing but often complementary influ-
ences of the Renaissance with its humanistic emphases on language training and the recovery of the classics. The scholar’s gown became the uniform of the Protestant minister. Harvard, founded in 1636 and by all definitions an American university of the Reformation, experienced a crisis in 1654 when its president, Henry Dunster, announced that he no longer could support the practice of infant baptism. As George Marsden says (in a prophetic statement he wrote in 1994), “There was no choice but for him to resign.... In the late twentieth [century], it would be like a Harvard president announcing opposition to equal opportunity for women.” So important was theology to the mission of the university that Yale University was founded in 1701 as a response to the suspicion that Harvard was losing its sense of mission in upholding theological orthodoxy (Marsden 37, 40, 52).

Even though there was strong clerical control of the universities in the New World, the American nation was itself not particularly interested in promoting religious agendas in education. The strongly humanistic orientation of Thomas Jefferson is a case in point. Interested in universal public education, he tried unsuccessfully to change William and Mary from a church college to a state school. It remained under Episcopal leadership for a while longer, even though in 1780 Jefferson did convince college leadership to eliminate their professors of divinity (Marsden 70).

This was not typical of the ethos at most colleges, however. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, hundreds of Christian institutions of higher learning, both Roman Catholic and evangelical, were founded. Thomas Trotter points out that the Methodists alone opened twelve hundred of these colleges, even though he also points out that only one in ten survived (Trotter 10). The clerical domination of these institutions was unquestioned. In fact, most college presidents were evangelical clergymen, and most of these regularly taught Bible courses in the college curriculum. As denominations began to found seminaries and divinity schools to train their own clergy, however, and as the Protestant colleges and universities began to emphasize less sectarian and more universal ideals, the direction and the curricular emphases of these schools began to change.

As Marsden writes:

The very religious diversity of the American context thus was pushing American collegiate education in seemingly contradictory directions. On the one hand the decentralized atmosphere was conducive to free enterprise and sectarian rivalry. Each denomination started its own colleges. At the same time this centrifugal force toward fragmentation was always being countered by centripetal forces which fostered a degree of uniformity. No matter what the denominational identity and the theological issues in its background, each Protestant college had to deal with more or less the same American market. In such a free enterprise system a strong emphasis on theological distinctions could limit a college’s constituency and be a competitive disadvantage. Hence each college was more likely to emphasize the socially unifying aspects of its Christian tradition, especially its moral benefits, rather than theological peculiarities. (Marsden 80)

Soon college presidents were teaching courses in Moral Philosophy rather than Theology. As learning began to slide away from its earlier clerical sponsorship, the arguments of Enlightenment advocates began to make more sense. In 1871 the Reverend Noah Porter, in his inaugural address for the presidency of Yale University, criticized “old methods and studies” and called for “sweeping and fundamental changes” (quoted in Wind 14).

Wheaton College was founded in 1860, but it had existed for the preceding seven years as Illinois Institute, run by the Wesleyan Methodists and advertised as “an anti-slavery progressive school in a beautiful rolling rich prairie county” (The Wesleyan, 31 March 1853, quoted in Maas). By 1860, when Jonathan Blanchard, an ardent abolitionist, became president, the College was notably committed to educating women and African Americans. At this point, the majority of the Board of Trustees was Congregationalist, but over the succeeding few years the Illinois Congregational Association provided little financial support for the college. By
1874, Jonathan Blanchard was describing the school as Congregationalist but "unsectarian in its character... its classes comprise[d] of students of various denominations" (Maas 12). Within a few years, however, even the Congregationalist identity was compromised when Blanchard was kicked out of the denomination. His successor as president was his son Charles Blanchard, who converted to pre-millennial dispensationalism and formed close ties with Dwight L. Moody. President Blanchard also felt that the only true education was a classical education, and so, at a time when universities like Harvard were modernizing their curriculum, Wheaton remained tied through 1925 and Blanchard's death to an essentially nineteenth-century, classical curriculum.

In the early years of the twentieth century, then, Wheaton was committed to classical learning but essentially untouched by the upheaval of educational values brought about by scientific inquiry and the new science; specialization, professionalism, and the emphasis on technology that was creating a revolution in the American university. Furthermore, American intellectual culture was on the brink of a new era, and just as clerical domination had declined in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, so at the beginning of the twentieth, the emphasis on denomination in universities began to be replaced by a growing concern with discipline. By this time Wheaton, too, had moved away from denominational affiliation.

At Charles Blanchard's death in 1925, the fundamentalist pastor, J. Oliver Buswell, was named president. However, by 1940 his "militant fundamentalism" and "his insistence that evangelicals had to separate from mainline denominations" finally led to his firing. But Buswell's legacy was to prove central to later concerns of the college. Under his leadership all faculty had been required to agree with a nine-point fundamentalist doctrinal statement. In spite of what would appear to be a narrow, fundamentalist agenda, Buswell was also "fearless about using in the classroom books written from perspectives hostile to fundamentalist—and even Christian—viewpoints" (Hamilton and Mathisen 273). The trustees replaced Buswell with V. Raymond Edman, "who reaffirmed Wheaton's tradition of evangelical cooperation across denominational lines" (265).

Without a specific denominational affiliation, but with an intense interest in maintaining evangelical orthodoxy, Wheaton carefully had to guard its faith statement, and so it does to the present day. While many prefer to call Wheaton interdenominational or multi-denominational, the fact is that because of the plethora of denominations represented among the administration, faculty, and student body, the school tries to identify itself as broadly evangelical, and the faith statement that faculty and staff sign is designed to identify the school as committed to the tenets of classical evangelicalism apart from denomination.

Because of the plethora of denominations represented among the administration, faculty, and student body, Wheaton College tries to identify itself as broadly evangelical, and the faith statement that faculty and staff sign is designed to identify the school as committed to the tenets of classical evangelicalism apart from denomination. We use "nondenominational" to indicate that there is, in theory, no denominational competition on campus. In fact, while we keep statistics on the denominational preference of students, we keep no such statistics for faculty. While enrolled at Wheaton thirty-two percent of our students identify themselves as independent/non-denominational. The next highest percentage is, surprisingly, Anglican or Episcopalian, an affiliation claimed by fifteen percent of our students. Seven percent of our students are Presbyterian; five percent are Baptist. I do not have overall statistics for faculty, but let me describe one academic department, a central one for our purposes since it is our Biblical and Theological Studies faculty. In a faculty of twenty-five, eight identify themselves as...
Presbyterian, seven as non-denominational, three as Baptist, two as Pentecostal, one as Mennonite, one as Evangelical Free, one as Evangelical Covenant, one as Missionary Alliance, and one as Anglican. What is not always evident to casual onlookers is just how heterogeneous the Wheaton world is within its broadly Protestant, evangelical boundaries. Heterogeneity can often mean a lack of focus, and for that reason we have our faith statement, which affirms the sovereignty of God; the doctrine of the Trinity; the revelation of God in creation, the Scriptures, and Jesus Christ; the authority of Scripture as God’s inerrant word; the virgin birth; the resurrection of Christ; God’s direct creation of Adam and Eve; original sin; the defeat of Satan in the cross of Jesus; the substitutionary sacrifice of Jesus Christ; the forgiveness of sins through belief in Christ; the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; the strength of the holy, universal Church; the second coming of Jesus; and the resurrection of the dead. In addition, this faith statement is preceded by a preamble that “identifies the College not only with the Scriptures but also with the Reformers and the evangelical movement of recent years.”

Before a candidate for a faculty position at Wheaton can be interviewed, he or she must sign this statement and indicate where he or she might have questions. More questions come to me as Dean on the issue of inerrancy than any other feature of this statement. Wheaton’s position on this issue is highly nuanced and takes into account the variety of genres in which portions of Scripture may be written. We use the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy, produced in 1978 by a summit of hundreds of evangelical leaders and scholars. However, because of general agreement that this is an outdated document that needs considerable rethinking and revision, we use it as a point of discussion with candidates who may have questions about where Wheaton stands. In other words, we use the document critically, and we do not discourage such a critical stance among our applicants. We do not use this document as a touchstone. Many at the college and many we interview are not comfortable with the term “inerrancy,” which seems to carry with it considerable fundamentalist baggage. Nevertheless, our emphasis is on sola scriptura, and we hold to our high view of Scripture.

In addition to the faith statement, Wheaton also requires faculty to support the Community Covenant, which as of three years ago replaced our old Statement of Responsibilities, which was essentially a list of prohibited behaviors. The new Community Covenant has rallied the entire campus—faculty, staff, and students—around its positive emphasis on the Christian virtues and the goal of living, working, serving, and worshipping together as an educational community centered on the Lord Jesus Christ. Most famously, the adoption of the Community Covenant at Wheaton began a new era in which dancing was no longer prohibited and the consumption of alcoholic beverages was allowed for faculty and staff. The goal of the Board of Trustees and the President was to create a description of what it means to live a gospel-centered life and to base that description on biblical precepts.

The application for faculty appointment at Wheaton requires four essays. The applicant is asked first to describe her professional expertise within her discipline, her professional growth and development since the completion of her last degree, and any current research, writing, creative, and performance projects.

The second essay asks the candidate to explain his concept of liberal arts education, with attention to how Christian faith relates to such education. If the candidate is applying for a position in the Conservatory or the Graduate School, he is asked to state his understanding of the relationship of professional and liberal arts education. This is a highly important essay and can sometimes become controversial—for example, when a senior professor with many years of teaching experience in only evangelical seminaries applies for a graduate position in our Biblical and Theological Studies department. Unless such a candidate has a strong liberal arts background in his own education, it is most likely that there will have been nothing in his experience as a faculty member that would have encouraged him to consider a liberal arts education. Even our graduate appointments in our Doctor of Psychology program or our Evangelism program require understanding of, support of, and a clear ability to articulate the liberal arts vision. In fact, the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association has commended
Wheaton for keeping the liberal arts at the core of its mission, even in its new Ph.D. program in Biblical and Theological Studies.

The third essay asks the applicant to describe her understanding of the relationship of the Christian faith to her discipline and, where appropriate, to discuss briefly the relationship of some contemporary issue in her discipline to Biblical themes and teachings.

Essay number four asks the applicant to describe his commitment to Christ, including his initial commitment, subsequent spiritual growth, and the expression of his faith in the life of the Church.

These essays along with a complete dossier allow a fairly complete picture to emerge in print before any interviews occur, and they allow interviewers to create informed questions for interviewees. They also signal to the applicant the level of seriousness with which Wheaton takes the endeavor of the integration of faith and learning, and of faith and living.

The Protestant pluralism so evident among Wheaton's faculty, staff, and students creates an ethos distinct from that at an institution such as, for example, Calvin College, which requires all tenured faculty to be members of a Reformed church. On the other hand, Wheaton is also different from an institution such as Valparaiso University that maintains its Lutheranism but does not provide any formal directives to faculty or students about what the institution considers a normative belief. I myself am a Lutheran at an evangelical college. I continue to hold strong Lutheran convictions, embracing a “theology of paradoxes” at the same time that I am called upon by Wheaton to integrate Athens and Jerusalem. The process of understanding how to integrate faith and learning is ongoing, but I have learned richly from my colleagues at Wheaton—and from students who continually challenge me to bring learning and faith into the same arena. I hope, in return, my colleagues and students have learned something from me about living one's life on the edge of paradox in the midst of two kingdoms.

And this says a lot about Wheaton. I have never felt, at any point, that in the classroom or in my research, my poetry, my critical writing, or in my institutional service, I had to be less Lutheran in order to feel comfortable or to gain tenure or to be promoted. Wheaton, in other words, takes its pluralism seriously.

David Bebbington has identified four distinctives of evangelicalism: biblicism, conversionism, evangelistic activism, and crucicentrism (Bebbington 2-14). Like Harold Heie, I find Bebbington's fourth characteristic, crucicentrism, not terribly helpful in discussing the ways in which evangelicalism is distinct from other traditions, since so many other traditions claim that emphasis, too, and I have not found any distinctly "evangelical" way this emphasis works itself out in daily life at Wheaton. In addition, I am not entirely certain that an explicit theology of the cross describes our efforts in the integration of faith and learning (Heie 247). But the other three distinctives are evident in the ethos of Wheaton College and in the formation of our mission and our expectations for faculty.

To begin with, biblicism is certainly an emphasis at a school where the Bible requirement is a hefty fourteen hours. Heie's fear that biblicism deflects attention from serious study in the academic disciplines at evangelical schools is challenged at Wheaton by a curriculum that demands intellectual commitment. One of the benefits of having an academically astute student body is that faculty can assume that these students are intellectually ready for serious study. More than occasionally, however, their theological background, or lack of it, is problematic. The emphasis on biblicism in the culture that has nurtured these students means that they enter Wheaton with a certain biblical orientation, however unsophisticated it might be. But only a small handful of Wheaton students, usually those from Reformed backgrounds, enters with what could be called by any stretch of the imagination a theological orientation. Too often their theology is nothing more than a collection of Bible verses. This puts a burden upon professors to create an environment for students to think theologically about literature or sociology or history. Our faculty must be biblically and theologically astute. We recognize that this does not happen by osmosis. While many faculty come to us with formal theological training, many do not, and so we make an intentional effort to
educate them in the endeavor of faith and learning, giving all new faculty release time in order to participate in a weekly Faith and Learning seminar. By the end of their fifth year at Wheaton, they must have written a paper to demonstrate the integration of their faith with their discipline.

Another problem Wheaton professors face with students who have a biblicist background is the confusion of the theological with the personal, and we look for faculty who will be able to lead our students to deeper theological insights than the students would ordinarily be able to attain on their own. For example, in a seventeenth-century British literature class, students are often fascinated by the devotional poetry of John Donne and George Herbert, and they are eager to connect the poetry with biblical sources and their own spiritual struggles. This is an important first step in active reading, and it often creates a palpable level of excitement in the classroom, but it can also lead to naïve and incomplete readings if students stop too soon. Because of their experience in Bible studies that emphasize the self-interpreting nature of Scripture, students occasionally conclude that their own feelings and superficial analyses are sufficient, that putting Scripture or their studies in the context of an intellectual, historical tradition other than evangelicalism is unnecessary. Heie calls this approach a “questionable intuitionist epistemology” (Heie 248). Students must learn to move beyond themselves to larger intellectual and theological contexts. The integration of faith and learning, in other words, that happens in an evangelical classroom must move beyond the private to the public, beyond dwelling on one’s own personal relationship with Christ to looking outward to the concerns of the church everlasting. This requires spiritual discipline and intellectual rigor on the part of both students and faculty.

Bebbington’s second evangelical distinctive, conversionism, has led to some singular events in Wheaton’s history. “Bebbington uses the word conversionism to refer to the ‘belief that lives need to be changed,’ that persons need to ‘turn away from their sins in repentance and to Christ in faith.’ Some evangelicals emphasize the ‘deep feeling’ experienced when such a conversion takes place. Some evangelicals also emphasize the view that the tell-tale signs that such a transformation has taken place are a deep desire to immerse oneself in the spiritual disciplines, such as personal prayer and Bible study, and a renunciation of certain lifestyle habits deemed incompatible with the Christian faith” (Heie 251). In our candidates for positions at Wheaton we look for evidence of all of the spiritual disciplines, especially an active prayer life and a commitment to serious study of the written word of God in the holy scriptures.

The emphasis on the experience of conversion has led at Wheaton to a corresponding interest in revival and spiritual renewal, and we look for faculty who can provide wise leadership in this area. This is, by the way, where a stodgy old Lutheran such as myself can only cough and stammer. Revivals have occurred periodically on the campus, the most recent taking place during the spring of 1995. During one week of intensely felt movement of the Holy Spirit, hundreds on the campus participated in public confession and repentance. The spirit of reconciliation was strong. Many students expressed the desire to sustain an experience, which they referred to as a “spiritual high.” They did not want the experience to fade away. Like Peter during the Transfiguration, they wanted to sustain the moment, to build their huts for Moses and Elijah, to keep the mountaintop experience alive and real and tangible.

That this one week happened to occur during Lent, a very appropriate time for confession and
repentance, was largely unrecognized by the community because except for Christmas and Easter the evangelical world largely ignores the seasons of the church year. Such a recognition could have led to healthy results, especially to the understanding that spiritual growth occurs in seasonal spurts, and that confession and repentance always lead the Christian to the cross and then beyond the cross to the Resurrection. Lent leads us to Easter. Who, understanding this, would want to hang on to Lent and lament its passing?

But at Wheaton and in the evangelical world there is occasionally a resistance to the notion that we are a part of a tradition that has existed for two thousand years, not one hundred. The result is that we are tempted to remain centered on ourselves and our own spiritual health, and we need to be reminded, constantly, that our own individual story is part of a much bigger story that is the history of the church. If we are to be proactive in the integration of religion with higher education, we have to recognize this important truth. I am particularly interested in recruiting faculty who can help us negotiate between the worlds of the old fundamentalism and the mainline Protestant churches and who understand evangelicalism as a movement rooted in the history of the church.

Evangelistic activism, the third distinctive of evangelicalism, is readily apparent on the Wheaton campus in the emphasis on missions in day-to-day campus life and in the sheer number of extracurricular “ministries” that involve students in active evangelism in area churches, urban sites, prisons, youth hostels, overseas projects, and the like. To their credit, students do needed evangelistic work in these areas, often under the supervision of lay professionals. However, the emphasis on this kind of “doing” that focuses on the immediacy of results often creates a conflict for the young scholar whose studies also require a commitment. In discussing this issue, Nathan Hatch has referred to the evangelical heresy: the belief that God was in the creation business but he retired to go into full-time ministry. Faculty are expected to be active in their local congregations, and so we also look for active church involvement in applicants, requiring a letter of recommendation from the current pastor of the church they attend. For our faculty, this is just a way of life and they could imagine no other. In addition, many participate in an annual Faculty Missionary Project. One notable faculty couple, living out the Mennonite habit of hospitality, open their home to any student who wants to attend Thursday night dinner and discussions. Sometimes they serve ten; sometimes fifty.

Strong teaching, excellent spiritual modeling, a record of institutional service, and recognition as a scholar are the basic requirements for promotion and tenure at the College. Thirty years ago Wheaton professors could probably receive tenure based upon the first three criteria. Now, however, more emphasis than in the past is placed on strong scholarship. One senses the growing conviction that one must be a steward of one’s talents, and that intellectual, scholarly pursuits are proper and appropriate activities for a different kind of evangelism, one that pushes Christian scholars into the academic fray, bringing them face-to-face with scholars from the secular universities.

At this point, I would like to mention some of the challenges we face as we endeavor to hire for mission at Wheaton.

Our first challenge: We have considerable difficulty finding women for our Biblical and Theological Studies faculty. Presently we have the embarrassingly low number of three women out of twenty-five faculty in that department. In an important new book by Nicola Hoggard Creegan and Christine D. Pohl—Living on the Boundaries: Evangelical Women, Feminism, and the Theological Academy—the authors report on a lengthy survey they completed of evangelical women teaching in the evangelical theological academy. They discovered that most “evangelical women in the academy find themselves living on the boundary between feminism and evangelicalism or on the boundaries between the multiple forms of both feminism and evangelicalism” (12). They conclude that “evangelical academic women attempt to do theology in contexts not often open to feminist voices, contexts where the very presence of women as theological leaders can raise alarm.... Sometimes the effort required to stay in the conversation is all-absorbing. What theologically trained women are able to do must be accomplished between the cracks, so to speak, and will
be in some way a dialogue between a feminist consciousness and a biblically informed life-world. Looking back and forth across this divide, our theological intuitions are sharpened and the dialogue becomes richer as vertical and horizontal dimensions of faith are informed by evangelical understandings and feminist insights" (150–51). I hope that we are about doing just that at Wheaton; I am sure, however, that we can do it better. We are doing very much better in other departments. For years, the English department, for example, had only two women faculty out of twelve. That number is now seven out of twelve.

A similar challenge faces us in finding and keeping faculty of color. In spite of evangelicalism’s early identification with the abolitionists—and Wheaton’s—something happened in the early years of the twentieth century when social activism and evangelicalism parted company. At this point liberalism and social activism began to be linked more and more, and evangelicals became more identifiable as political conservatives. Now, of course, one of the problems evangelicals face is that they are often identified with white, middle-class suburbia in red states. Thus we face a challenge in making ourselves attractive to candidates of color who often are very much in demand at schools perceived as being more inclusive.

Another challenge: As David Jeffrey posited in a lecture a few years ago at Wheaton, the future of the Christian university or college depends upon the establishment of a strong theological core for the institution, not a small feat for an evangelical college struggling with the scarcity of systematic theologians to help support this ideal. The evangelical world is replete with biblical scholars, but we have not, traditionally, trained many strong theologians. This provides a most immediate challenge for any Dean of Humanities and Theological Studies at Wheaton. It is a truism that it is difficult to define evangelical theology precisely and that evangelical theologians are a rare breed. In decades past, the assumption at Wheaton was that philosophy filled the gap and provided the driving force for the integration of faith and learning, but we have become increasingly aware of the fact that the philosophical model often does not take us far enough. Wheaton’s future as a viable Christian liberal arts college depends on a new, central emphasis on Biblical studies and theology in partnership with philosophy and English and history and the sciences, to name a few, and an articulation of a pronouncedly evangelical Christology. The whole package is important. Wheaton College sees Scripture as the foundation and the core. Reasoning outward from Scripture requires all of the scholars in the Biblical Studies department, in some form or another, to be theologians, extending beyond Scripture to engage contemporary questions. The center of the effort to be a Christian liberal arts college should be a Biblical and Theological Studies department that works hard to become the core of the college. We have in recent years embarked on a campaign to hire more systematic theologians. Up until five years ago, we had only two systematicians. Now we have nine, but this year we will attempt to hire three tenure-track lines to replace three lines that have been filled with temporary appointments. The good news is that, evidently, there are scores of young evangelical theologians out there. So far, we have 150 applicants.

In being careful to preserve its identity, in guarding its statement of faith so carefully, in demonstrating a hyper-awareness over the past one hundred years of the trend of the American University to travel, as George Marsden put it in the subtitle of his book, from “Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief,” Wheaton risks insularity. We must be careful that in our zealousness to preserve our heritage we do not cut ourselves off from important conversations. One immediate problem we face is finding a medieval philosopher. The strongest candidates in this area are, predictably, Roman Catholic, but we do not hire non-Protestant faculty. Thus we are facing the tension between preserving our identity with the Protestant Reformation and remaining open to the kind of academic discourse that having Catholics on our faculty would allow us. As Walker Percy said in his essay, “How to be an American Novelist in Spite of Being Southern and Catholic,” “Catholic or Protestant, [the believing writer] is equally unhappy. He feels like Lancelot in search of the Holy Grail who finds himself at the end of his quest at a Tupperware party” (Percy 180).
Evident is an increasing level of frustration both within and outside the academy over its secular categories, and a growing recognition that the academy is poorer because no one within it is making truth claims. Now is the moment for evangelical Protestant Christian scholars to act: by publishing in the secular university presses, by strengthening their position within professional organizations, and by taking advantage of the help of foundations such as Lilly and Pew, which not only support in strong measure evangelical scholarly initiatives but which allow and encourage a conversation to occur among representatives from all of the schools that take their faith roots seriously. We must also realize that all of us, whether Catholic or Protestant, must confront the most familiar criticism of Christians that the secular world offers—that we are, all of us, hypocrites, saying one thing and doing another. Only those with no standards can say they are not guilty of hypocrisy.

It has been fifteen years since Nicholas Wolterstorff defined the first two phases of Wheaton's history as “withdrawal from culture,” and “engagement with culture,” and then called for a new, third stage of “commitment to social transformation” (Bratt and Wells 42–43, quoting Wolterstorff 14–18). The obstacles have been articulated by Marsden and Noll, and there are many. In his 1995 inaugural address at Calvin College, Gaylen J. Byker spoke of the necessity for “embracing the tensions in Christian higher education,” not running from them (Byker 11–19). Comparing life in the contemporary Christian academy with the uncertainty, surprise, and tension of the parables, he challenged Calvin faculty to live the unknown endings, to embrace the tensions between piety and intellect, between teaching and scholarship, between the individual and community, between modern science and eternal truth. So it must be for Wheaton faculty as well. We spend much time trying to figure out God’s will for us and for our institution. We spend much time trying to resolve tensions that will not disappear. Instead, we must take seriously the command to love the Lord our God with all of our heart and all of our strength and all of our mind. We must learn to live and teach those conflicts that create the tensions between religion and higher education. We must engage the secular academic world with mind, body, and spirit. To that end, the Catholic novelist Ron Hansen gives advice, “We try to be formed and held and kept by Christ, but instead he offers us freedom. And now when I try to know his will, his kindness floods me, his great love overwhelms me, and I hear him whisper, Surprise me” (Hansen 179).

This kind of freedom is risky and often in tension with some of the evangelical distinctives. It is a freedom not necessarily comfortable for evangelicals. But it is a freedom that increasingly energizes Wheaton students and faculty.

In Flannery O’Connor’s novel Wise Blood, Hazel Motes is preaching his unusual sermon on the street in front of a movie theater.

“What church you belong to, you boy there?” Haze asked, pointing at the tallest boy in the red satin lumberjacket.

The boy giggled.

“You then,” he said impatiently, pointing at the next one. “What church you belong to?”

“Church of Christ,” the boy said in a falsetto to hide the truth.

“Church of Christ!” Haze repeated. “Well, I preach the Church Without Christ. I’m member and preacher to that church where the blind don’t see and the lame don’t walk and what’s dead stays that way. Ask me about that church and I’ll tell you it’s the church that the blood of Jesus don’t foul with redemption.”

“He’s a preacher,” one of the women said. “Let’s go.”

“Listen, you people, I’m going to take the truth with me wherever I go,” Haze called. “I’m going to preach it to whoever’ll listen at whatever place. I’m going to preach there was no Fall because there was nothing to fall from and no Redemption because there was no Fall and no Judgment because there wasn’t the first two. Nothing matters but that Jesus was a liar.”

The next morning he knocks on the door of a boarding house and the landlady answers. He announces that he is looking for a room.
“What you do?” she asked. She was a tall bony woman, resembling the mop she carried upside-down.

He said he was a preacher.
The woman looked at him thoroughly and then she looked behind him at his car. “What church?” she asked.
He said the Church Without Christ. “Protestant?” she asked suspiciously, “or something foreign?”
He said no mam, it was Protestant.

Non-denominational schools must guard against defining themselves with the negative: what we are against, what we do not do. We must move beyond the “non” in “non-denominational” and focus on our mission statement, which reads, “Wheaton College exists to help build the church and improve society worldwide by promoting the development of whole and effective Christians through excellence in programs of Christian higher education.” This mission expresses our commitment to do all things “for Christ and his Kingdom.”

Jill Peláez Baumgaertner is Professor of English and Dean of Humanities and Theological Studies at Wheaton College.
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SONG OF CONSUMING
(After Walt Whitman's Song of Myself)

I celebrate consuming
And what I consume you may consume,
For every item belonging to me can as well belong to you.

I have ordered the sand-washed shirts and cargo pants in tarragon and vintage rose that machine wash and dry to wear while walking the gentle slopes of Danehy Park.

I have charged the durable lagoon blue sandals with nubuck straps and rubber outsoles for traction to journey along the gray cement and redbrick sidewalks to Harvard Square.

I have craved the Shape Solver bathing suit with three times the stretch and slimming in periwinkle and eggplant to swim laps at Cambridge Rindge and Latin High School pool.

I have bought the tankini with supportive soft-cups and conservative leg openings in plum and cherry to sit in and sun on my four-foot deck overlooking the commuter rail tracks.

I wear the summer breeze tees and adventure pants with zip vents and invisible pockets in skylight and ink blue to ride the escalator down two building tiers to board the Redline T.

After I lose ten pounds I plan to squeeze myself into a pair of pencil-cut faded jeans with angled pockets and spandex for a forgiving fit and circle Fresh Pond counting mallards.

Failing to receive a mail order catalog be encouraged to access it by Internet and you can consume, too.

Molly Lynn Watt
I still remember being shocked during the opening scene of *Romancing the Stone*, a 1984 high-action romantic comedy. Kathleen Turner, the glamorous "It" actress of the early 1980s, looked not just disheveled but downright frumpy. Typing away at a romance novel in overwrought solitude, she plays a mousy writer who finds release by breaking open one of the many tiny alcohol bottles she has spirited away from assorted airplane rides. In my youthful naivety, I wondered how a beautiful actress could allow herself to look so plain. Soon, however, the film lived up to my Hollywood expectations. During a trip to Colombia, the wallflower novelist meets an intrepid soldier of fortune (played by a dashing Michael Douglas) and, getting pulled into his action-packed adventures, lives a romance more exciting than any she has ever imagined. Transforming into a gorgeous woman, she sports better hair and make-up in the jungles of South America than in the urban flat where the film begins. Imagine that!

*Ladies in Lavender* (2005) is everything that *Romancing the Stone* is not—though it begins somewhat similarly. Two frumpy sisters live in uneventful solitude when a handsome young man enters their lives and generates for them beauty and erotic desire. However, *Ladies in Lavender* is not a Hollywood film. Instead of focusing on the far-fetched adventures of an incipiently beautiful woman who has all her desires fulfilled, *Ladies in Lavender* focuses on the problematic nature of desire itself. One of the most beautiful films I ever have experienced, *Ladies in Lavender* presents beauty in another key.

The eponymous ladies in lavender are Ursula and Janet Widdington (the extraordinary Judi Dench and Maggie Smith, respectively), spinster sisters in their sixties who live along the coast of Cornwall in 1936. The difference between the sisters is revealed in the opening scene as they walk along the shore. Ursula, wading gleefully into the water while Janet sedately sits on shore, splashes her more reticent sister with ocean water. The very practical Janet lovingly rebukes her sister's childlike impetuosity, as she does throughout the film. She runs the house just as she cranks and drives the car, and Ursula is uninterested in the maintenance of either. But it is Ursula who bounds outside in bare feet after the rain sighing "Everything smells so fresh after the storm." Little does she know that something fresh will soon overwhelm her life.

The sisters' cozy tedium is interrupted when they discover that the storm has washed a twenty-something male onto the beach. Taking him into their house, the women show proprietary concern for the Polish stranger, Andrea, who speaks German but no English. Ursula, however, starts showing something more. On the very first night of his stay, she sits at the bedside watching the beautiful boy sleep. When he finally can eat, she drops a flower onto his food tray. While the practical Janet digs up weeds in the garden, Ursula secretly writes notes at a desk inside, which she later pins to various objects in Andrea's room in order to teach him English. When she holds to her chest a paper with "Ursula" spelled out, upside down, we realize that this Polish stranger has turned her uneventful life upside down. In contrast, Janet's only response is that Ursula's English lesson is "making holes in the furniture." In the next scene, the practical Janet states that Andrea will need new clothes, and that she will use her private inheritance to outfit him. Ursula's impassioned response is revelatory, "Why not our joint account?... I saw him first!"

The young man causing such upheaval is played by the luminescent Daniel Bruhl, the German actor whose smoldering innocence empowered *Good Bye Lenin!* (reviewed in *The Cresset*, Easter 2005). Bruhl's Andrea romances even the stony heart of Janet, offering gifts not only...
of flowers but also of teasing affection with convincing disingenuousness. After all, these white-haired, wrinkly spinsters are, most likely, older than his grandparents. We, the audience, understand his naivety, for Ursula's increasing desire is ambiguous even to us. Is hers the love of a woman for a child she never had? Does her passion reflect the intense affection teachers can develop for brilliant students?

Andrea's brilliance comes to light after he hears Janet's pedestrian piano playing and responds with ear-covered anguish. Signaling that he prefers the violin, Andrea is treated to a performance in his sickroom by a local fiddle-player. After politely listening to the amateur, Andrea gestures for the violin and proceeds to play with extraordinary skill, intensifying his physical beauty with heavenly sound. In a brilliant bit of filmmaking, the writer/director intercuts medium shots of Andrea playing the violin with low-angle shots from his side that cause the moving bow to fill the screen vertically as Ursula stands behind it, the bow moving up and down her frame. A metaphor thus becomes visualized: Andrea plays upon Ursula's heart strings.

At this point a more attractive love interest enters the film. Outside the Widdington house a gorgeous woman, distracted from her landscape painting by the mellifluous violin, yells "Bravo!" up to the window whence the music drifts. Conditioned by Hollywood convention, we know that this will be the one for whom Andrea falls. Indeed, in the next scene we witness the young woman, Olga, bathed in warm yellows, reds, and browns of firelight, alone in her cottage contemplating Andrea's beautiful music, which plays for us on the soundtrack. A romantic connection is immediately made between them.

As in Romancing the Stone, like most romantic comedies, various problems impede the budding attraction. The first obstacle is another potential infatuation. Andrea, finally walking and fitted with clothes, attends the village harvest festival, where he makes eyes at a plump redhead, totally oblivious to Olga on the other side of the room. However, warned away by a jealous boyfriend, Andrea directs his love toward the violin rather than the redhead, playing to the wonder of the whole room, and especially of Olga.

The next scene visualizes the impediment of a much more intense infatuation. Ursula and Andrea walk down to the shore, and, as they sit watching the ocean, Andrea lays his head in Ursula's lap. Though we recognize his gesture as directed toward a vicarious grandmother, Ursula's response is much more ambiguous. After lifting her wrinkly hand to her beating heart she lowers it toward Andrea's head, barely daring to graze his hair. It is a gesture of profound tenderness, that of an aged woman who has found either her long-lost son or, more heart-wrenchingly, a long-latent sexual desire. We discover it is the latter when later we are made privy to Ursula's unconscious: she chastely dreams that a younger version of herself is rolling around in a field of wheat, captured in Andrea's embrace. Immediately before she wakes, however, the face on the embraced dream-woman becomes that of Olga.

Before the dream, Olga finally had introduced herself to Andrea, bursting in on the ladies' private garden where he plays the violin for them. At this point, Ursula inscribes Olga with a metaphor of romantic impediment taken straight from ancient romance fiction: "[Olga] frightens me. She's like the witch in a fairy tale." The film thus sets up an unusual love triangle: Ursula sees Olga as a love impediment, we see Ursula as a love impediment, while Andrea, so far, sees only his violin.

Meanwhile, another obstacle develops when the village doctor who treats Andrea's injuries starts ogling Olga. Jealous of how Andrea has attracted the attentions not only of the geriatric sisters but also of the radiant Olga, the doctor suggests notifying the authorities about Andrea, a German-speaking stranger who has infiltrated 1936 England. Worrying over Andrea's vulnerability, Janet burns an intercepted letter in which Olga, another German-speaker, had introduced herself to him.

Despite all these stones in the pathway of romance, Olga and Andrea finally have a conversation alone, and she invites him to her cottage so that she can paint his portrait. We, the audience, sense that the denouement is at hand: a romantic love scene between two lithesome bodies rather than the loathsome image of Ursula's fruitless infatuation. Indeed, inside the cottage, as Olga paints and Andrea plays his violin, multiple shot-
reverse shots direct attention to their beautiful eyes, each intensely focused on the others—a common film convention alluding to sexual desire.

*Ladies in Lavender,* however, prefers to undermine Hollywood convention rather than fulfill it. As Andrea leans in to kiss Olga's full lips, she pulls back, saying "You must go." Andrea, as shocked as we are, leaves the cottage. What follows provides a telling commentary. We are given a shot of Olga seated alone in the cottage, her head and shoulders framed by a curtained window that provides the only light in the mise-en-scène. Surrounded by the framed white of the window, Olga's head thus looks like a portrait on a painter's canvas—much like the head of Andrea she has been painting on her white canvas. We are given a clue that this film addresses a different kind of beauty and desire than that of stock Hollywood fare.

The shot then cuts to Ursula in front of a window. Repeatedly throughout the film we see Ursula bathed in light as she looks out a window with melancholy longing. This motif operates as a perfect symbol for her experience: she is bathed in a vision of beauty and desire, its fulfillment inaccessible due to a pane-full barrier of glass—glass as old and wrinkly as she. The juxtaposition of these two scenes—of women in front of windows—summarizes the difference between these friends of Andrea: Olga, with the canvas window behind her head, is the beautiful object of Andrea's desiring eye, while Ursula, who looks through windows at what she cannot have, is the desiring subject, longing for Andrea's eye.

Another semiotic contrast between the two women appears not long afterwards. We see the practical Janet cut Andrea's hair, after which Ursula impetuously grabs and pockets one of the locks from the ground. The shot then cuts to a pub where Andrea joins Olga and the doctor at a table. Commenting on Andrea's haircut, Olga tenderly reaches up and smooths a lock into place. Not having seen Ursula's affectionate response to his hair, Andrea is now as baffled as we are by Olga's. Perhaps he (and hence we) will get the desired romance after all!

Indeed, Olga sends for Andrea and suggests an elopement. But it is not an ordinary elopement. Olga tells Andrea that her brother, the famous violinist Boris Danilof, is in London and that she wants Andrea to meet him. Because Andrea considers Danilof "a god," and since the train leaves in only a few minutes, he consents to leave without packing or preparing the sisters for his departure. Of course, when Ursula hears the news that Andrea and Olga have surreptitiously run off to London, she moans in despair. We see her crawl onto Andrea's bed and roll up into a fetal position—as though implying Andrea has left this bed to crawl into that of another woman.

The writer/director then gives us another significant juxtaposition. The shot cuts from Ursula on the bed to a postman delivering a package: it is Olga's painting of Andrea. An accompanying note apologizes to the sisters for Andrea's elopement, "I am sorry. You gave me life. Now I have a chance to use it," and he tells them to listen on 10 November, when he will be performing on the radio. This, we realize, is his new life, born immediately after we saw Ursula in a fetal position.

What happens next is the denouement, and if you want to experience it on your own, stop reading here. However, I cried just as much the second time I viewed the film as I did the first time, which suggests that knowledge of the ending does not destroy its beauty. This, in fact, foregrounds the whole point of the film: artistic beauty can far transcend the plot-driven desires of Hollywood convention.

After Ursula hangs the painting over the fireplace of Andrea's former bedroom, the shot cuts to scruffy villagers piling into the sisters' house. The camera then pans over the working class audience as they listen to Andrea's magnificent violin music over the wireless. Weathered, careworn faces register awe as they silently soak up the lovely sound, making visual William Congreve's famous line, "Music has charms to soothe a savage breast."

The camera then cuts to a very different audience, dressed in evening gowns and tails. Listening to the live symphony where Andrea plays lead violin, these people appear as enraptured as the Cornish villagers. Cutting back and forth between these two audiences, the film gives us an image of ourselves: no matter our class or education, we are audience to a film about the consummation of art rather than of sex. Significantly, as the camera pans the London crowd, not only while listening to the symphony but also during a reception after-
wards, we never see an image of Olga. She has dropped entirely out of the movie, for her role is over. She elopes with Andrea to marry him to his vocation, rather than to herself. When his art is consummated, she is no longer necessary. The writer/director refuses to give us even the merest glimpse of Olga, thus subverting any hope of a Hollywood ending wherein erotic love trumps all other desire.

Instead, as the camera pans the London crowd, we are finally given a slow tilt that reveals Janet and Ursula in the audience, listening rapturously to Andrea’s performance. The shot lingers on Ursula’s face then dissolves into a montage of earlier shots from the film that obviously comprise Ursula’s memories of Andrea. One memorial image, however, is new: Ursula stands at the edge of the garden and throws the stolen lock of Andrea’s hair into the wind. She has let him go, releasing him into the embrace of his greatest love: the beauty of his art.

The film closes with the sisters leaving the symphony hall, stop-action camera work placing them further and further along an arched hallway as they move toward a darkened exit. But then the shot cuts to them exiting from a similarly darkened arch of stone along their Cornish beach, their backs still to us. As we admire the sun-bathed, wave-washed, gorgeous rocky coast, we are struck with the beauty of their quiet lives—limited, yes, but beautiful nonetheless. This, perhaps, is the best denouement of all.

Crystal Downing is Associate Professor of English and Film Studies at Messiah College.

TWENTY-SEVEN WEEKS

You are so light,
your bones must be hollow
like a bird’s; if only you could fly,
but you are not ready to take to air.
You are more suited to swimming
in the salty sea from which you were
so rudely delivered yesterday.
Your skin is translucent like wings
of a butterfly as you lie pinned
behind the glass wall of the nursery.
I think you would fly, if only
you weren’t tethered by all this technology
and so many prayers.

Kelly D. Morris
N ot quite halfway through Alice McDermott’s novel After This, one of the central characters, Mary Keane, takes her daughter Annie to visit the World’s Fair in New York. We wait in line at one of the exhibits with the two characters in the hot evening air, impatient, restive, until suddenly we are inside the long-anticipated exhibit, where Mary and Annie are carried forward on a moving walkway. Through their still sun-dazzled eyes, we see a “white marble” statue, “the lifeless flesh of the beloved child, the young man’s muscle and sinew impossibly... still” in his mother’s arms, “her lap, as wide as it might have been in childbirth” (100). But before we can really take in the scene, we are borne up and away from it, transported with Mary and Annie away from this brief vision of Michelangelo’s Pieta and delivered with deliberate but still surprising speed back into the sweltering summer evening.

Throughout After This, characters repeatedly move toward and then away from similar moments of encounter and revelation. McDermott’s characters are tempted by but also wary of the grand narratives offered by art, by literature, and by history, and an air of obliquity pervades their dealings both with one another and with their historical moment. As in her other fiction, McDermott is writing here about working-class Irish-Americans, but After This is a novel less preoccupied with questions of identity and community than with the problem of achieving perspective on historical change and with the ways such change can blur and finally erode our knowledge of who we are and where we belong—how time, like a mercilessly moving walkway, carries us beyond any narratives we might craft to explain ourselves to ourselves. The Keane family lives through the optimism of postwar expansion, the upheaval of the Vietnam era, and the at-times unsettling changes of the sexual revolution, but this historical background is thrust to the margins of the novel. The narrative is in fact curiously lacking in significant dates, names, and events, mention of which might serve to tie the Keanes more tightly to a history they seem only tenuously to inhabit. In this novel, McDermott, elsewhere a meticulous chronicler of the detail of Irish-American life, seems to have decided consciously to exclude from her characters’ lives the familiar markers of life as lived primarily in and through shared, communal narratives of identity.

Nevertheless, McDermott’s characters continue to reach for meaning—but only tentatively, as if they cannot quite believe themselves truly worthy of the notice of any superintending powers-that-be. Especially in the first half of the novel, they balance between a faithful providentialism and a doubtful determinism. When one of the Keanes’ sons draws a low draft number in Vietnam, Mary and her husband John joke morbidly about contingencies that might have stayed this twist of fate. “Maybe if you’d married George,” John says (136). This is a lovers’ joke, and an inside joke for us, who accompanied Mary, at the very start of the novel, on a date with George. But in reaching back to that opening episode, the novel emphasizes its own insistent attention to what might have been and thus on the contingency of what is. At the outset of the novel, McDermott seems to want us to believe that we are located securely in the hands of a benevolent providence. We first meet Mary Keane, aged thirty, praying during her lunch hour for the soldiers overseas—the novel opens during the Second World War—and also for resignation and contentment on the path to spinsterhood. When she bumps into George outside the church and makes a date for dinner, we sense
novelistic conventions beginning to fall into place. McDermott does not scruple to build up the moment: there is the teasing brother, the slightly pained but loving father, the not-wholly-perfunctory kiss in the front seat of George's car. But McDermott also wants to resist the cosmetic loveliness of such a moment. It is John Keane, a man Mary meets in passing at a lunch counter after making the date with George, who unexpectedly resurfaces to claim Mary from spinsterhood as well as from George, loitering near Mary's lunch spot hoping to run into her, "the handsomest man on the block" (20). Yet if this looks like the substitution of one novelistic gesture for another—glamorous hero replaced by an equally-glamorous, true-hearted minor character—McDermott takes care to distance her characters from any comfortably familiar alchemy of plot. Throughout After This, she lightly but scrupulously suggests the diminishments to which married love, in the context of married life, is vulnerable. Mary Keane will recall moments "when love itself had seemed a misapprehension, a delusion... and marriage... simply an awkward pact with a stranger, any stranger, John or George, Tom, Dick, or Harry" (103). After This allows its readers, like its characters, to be seduced temporarily by the glamour of fate, but the novel seems more interested in mapping the spaces its characters traverse as they come to see the choices they once took to be destiny as "simply an awkward pact" with the disorderly and disordering forces of time.

Mary's truncated romance with George opens the book, and the narrative's apparently willful desire to lead us astray by charming us with the awkward but pleasant George looks, in retrospect, like a purposefully-aimed blow at our pretensions to readerly insight, or foresight. McDermott keeps us off balance for the rest of the novel, thwarting our desire to be treated to the leisurely unfolding of a carefully-crafted plot. Throughout After This, the Keane family—John and Mary, heavily pregnant with their last child, Clare, and their sons Jacob and Michael, and the older daughter, Annie—huddle in the family basement, waiting out a storm that threatens to topple a beloved willow tree in the front garden, sipping milk from paper cups in the candlelight. Instead of comforting his children, John Keane tells the story of Jacob's namesake, a young soldier he had known in the Ardennes whose company he had avoided and who subsequently had been killed. John's romantic, inarticulate desire to make amends with and honor that first Jacob has a ghostly afterlife in Jacob Keane's fate, and McDermott seems fascinated by the way our well-intentioned gestures reach for but do not quite attain significance, how John Keane's fervent but impotent hopes for his children skate along the surface of experience but fail finally to shape it in tangible ways. The scene in the basement, which functions as a kind of ironic restaging of a wartime raid on a minor scale, underscores the insubstantiality of the Keanes' postwar optimism, emphasizing instead the characters' sense that confidence and ease lie just out of reach.

In After This, then, McDermott seems less interested in shepherding her characters toward meaning than in the way life both evades and exceeds emplotment. If the novel is occasionally unsparing in its depiction of the characters' awkward attempts to navigate their lives, it does not however leave them wholly without moments of grace. Especially in their encounters with what the family priest dismissively calls "modernity," the Keanes evince an openness to ambiguity, an unwillingness to reduce life to a manageable but false consistency, that lends them not just pathos but dignity as well. In her portrayal of her characters' tentative relationship to their faith and in the flash of tenderness with which her narrative illuminates Annie's coming-of-age, McDermott shows how her characters remain faithful to the possibility
that common experience, though dissatisfying, remains susceptible to an intensification that might permit transcendence.

If the Keanes do not fully understand their faith, its residual mystery compels their attention: Mary Keane dutifully exemplifies her own prescription to love the unlovable, to inhabit with hope a “world... without fair measure, without evenhandedness” (189). John Keane faithfully solicits contributions for the new parish church, a post-Vatican-II stab at religious relevance that Clare, years later, will compare to a flying saucer. However awkwardly, the church persists, because “[p]eople,” as Jacob Keane points out, “need a place to go” (115). In her portrayal of the younger Keanes, McDermott traces both their generation’s migration away from the dogma that John and Mary reflexively uphold, but she also shows how religion—refined or diminished to a kind of aesthetic, imaginative sensibility—continues to shape their children. The novel’s depiction of the sordid and not the alluring aspects of the sexual revolution and its aftermath has a faintly conservative overtone. McDermott depicts freedom’s unwanted consequences via Annie’s and Clare’s oblique brushes with abortion, and shows Mike’s ambivalent appraisal of sexual liberation in a portrait of the seedy bar he frequents in a down-at-the-heels upstate town. Mike is the unlikely source, in fact, of the novel’s title, for it is he who finds himself remembering, in the glow of a post-coital embrace, the words of the “Hail Holy Queen” that ask for some revelation to follow “after this, our exile.”

Even as they enter the era of self-fulfillment, then, McDermott’s characters labor within a sense of pervasive exile but continue to aspire to a plenitude of meaning. Of all the characters, Annie, in the course of a comically disastrous dinner party on a study-abroad trip to Cambridge, most concretely enacts McDermott’s own eschewal of the consolations of art. Annie is McDermott’s heroine precisely because she recognizes and accepts the unbridgeable distance between herself and the “life from a novel” by which her fellow students are seduced (228). In so doing, she reveals McDermott’s own novel’s attempt to articulate the value that ordinary experience attains despite, or because of, its failure to reach the perfection at which it aims. Reality is, finally, McDermott’s characters’ proper register. “[T]here would always be, the snag of disappointment—it would not be the life she had wanted,” Annie concedes (250). But by carving out a space of possibility within a life demarcated by diminishments, Annie and the other Keanes attain a grace that loosens, ever so slightly, the constraints within which they dubiously labor. If this sounds like a bleak sort of wisdom, it corresponds to McDermott’s consistently ascetic attitude in this novel towards the search for significance. Deep meaning is for her characters a sort of luxury item that threatens to undo their carefully-budgeted, carefully-allocated desires. But Annie’s clear view of her own ordinariness allow her, finally, fully to inhabit her own life and to begin to lay claim to the satisfactions—tentative, tenuous, but real—that it may offer.

At the very end of the novel, it is the family priest, Monsignor McShane, who, perhaps surprisingly, has the last word, and he reveals thereby how the world whose limits McDermott has so finely drawn is still capable of harboring a real capaciousness. Called upon to preside at an impromptu marriage, Monsignor McShane, alone in the modern church John Keane helped build, reflects that the building, “such a miracle... just a decade ago,” would soon represent “an old man’s mistaken enthusiasm for the wrong kind of future” (277). But if a mistake was made, it was a venal rather than a mortal error. Life, Monsignor McShane suggests, however awkward, however compromised, persists—not, as Annie has already observed, “the life [one] had wanted,” perhaps, but still a life that holds moments of provisional happiness and something close to joy. “It’s a gift, then,” Monsignor McShane opines at the very end of After This (279), pointing to the element of grace—of contingency and surprise and fleeting sweetness—that, McDermott’s novel suggests, illuminates even “this, our exile.”

Joanne E. Myers is a Lilly Fellow and Lecturer in Humanities and English in Christ College, Valparaiso University.
**music in our time**

**Opera Composer Makes History**

John Adams's *Nixon in China*

---

News has a kind of mystery:/When I shook hands with Chou En-lai
On this bare field outside Peking/ Just now, the world was listening...
Though we spoke quietly/The eyes and ears of history
Caught every gesture/... And every word, transforming us
As we, transfixed/ ...Made History.

—from Nixon's Act I aria

Grand opera, a genre developed in nineteenth-century Paris, is defined as “a serious work on a historical subject, in four or five acts, including chorus and ballet, with the text fully set musically.” Compared to earlier serious operatic types that looked to a more mythic past, grand opera subjects were chosen from modern history: Meyerbeer’s 1836 opera *Les Huguenots* on the sixteenth-century St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre, for example, and Rossini’s *Guillaume Tell* (1829). Although originally the term was applied only to those works suitable for performance at the Paris Opéra, its application was later extended beyond works by French composers and in the French language. Thus Wagner’s *Rienzi* (1842), Verdi’s *Don Carlos* (1867), and Mussorgsky’s *Boris Godunov* (1874) are all grand operas, depicting powerful historical figures taking action on a world stage and simultaneously revealing their inner experiences and private conflicts. Grand opera is associated with spectacular staging, massive special effects and pageantry, crowd scenes, large ballets, passion and violence, and high stakes for all the players.

When Richard Nixon undertook his historic visit to meet with Chairman Mao-Tse Tung and Premier Chou En-lai in Peking (as it was then called), thirty-five years ago, what ensued was a grand theatrical presentation crafted by both governments and the American media. And when, twenty years later in 1987, American composer John Adams, with librettist Alice Goodman and director Peter Sellars, premiered the new grand opera *Nixon in China* at the Houston Grand Opera, the subject still felt like news: not “ripped from the headlines” exactly, but current in feel and familiar in content. As Andrew Porter famously pointed out in his *New Yorker* review of that premiere, all the central players in the drama—Richard and Patricia Nixon, Henry Kissinger, and Madame Mao—could have attended the Houston opening had Madame Mao not been in prison at the time. Adams’s treatment underscores the theatries of the original historical event, the interplay between current and historical events, and the way one is transformed into the other.

In 1972 when the opera is set, China was remote and unknowable. Only a handful of Americans had visited China between the founding of the People’s Republic of China in 1949 and the Nixon visit. The opera’s libretto, based in great part on recorded words of the historical figures, has the Nixons comparing themselves to Apollo astronauts. And even in 1987 at the time of the opera’s opening, China was not yet so present in mainstream American life: compelling photographs from Tiananmen Square were still two years in the future, travel was still limited, Chinese language and culture were not prevalent in American educational curricula, and we did not yet watch double-high freight cars of Chinese goods rolling past us at train crossings on their way to Walmart and Target.

In 1987 John Adams was not yet established as an opera composer. With *Nixon*, his first, he demonstrated that grand opera could seem less like history than like our lives. The Houston premiere was followed by performances at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, the Kennedy Center, the Netherlands Opera, and the Los Angeles Music Center Opera. As premiered in 1987 and toured in 1988, the opera was not uniformly acclaimed, though it since has come to be considered one of the most important
operas of the twentieth century. The shift in its reputation is attributable to multiple factors: familiarity, of course, but also continued reworking and fine tuning of the work by its creators, and also by the changing audience constituency. The audiences in 1987–88 were attuned to Nixon’s Watergate history and resignation from office in 1974. Indeed some of the early negative criticism of the work charged it with lack of purpose and ambiguity about its subject, with critics seeking a different and more pointed politicalism than the opera seemed to offer.

A second Adams-Goodman-Sellars operatic collaboration lacked the irony and drama giocoso elements of Nixon, but also treated a subject in recent memory: the 1985 terrorist hijacking of an Italian cruise ship and the murder of passenger Leon Klinghoffer. Death of Klinghoffer, composed in 1990–91 during the Gulf War, shortened the lag time between headline and stage, and it commented more broadly on contemporary events. (Adams has suggested that expressively Klinghoffer owes more debt to the Bach Passions than to the French grand opera tradition.) By contrast, El Niño of 1999 is a composite of biblical texts with Spanish, English, and Latin poetry from many eras on the subject of the Nativity. Next season, the Lyric Opera of Chicago will include Adams’s Doctor Atomic, premiered in San Francisco in 2005 (libretto and stage direction by Peter Sellars) on the subject of Robert Oppenheimer and the Manhattan Project at Los Alamos. This libretto is fashioned from pre-existing texts including the Bhagavad-Gita and poems by John Donne and Charles Baudelaire, as well as primary historical sources such as journals, technical papers, and government documents. For Doctor Atomic, set in 1945, Adams (born 1947) worked at a greater personal remove from history than in Nixon and Klinghoffer. Most recently, a new collaboration of Adams and Sellars called A Flowering Tree, premiered late in 2006 in San Francisco, a stage work on an Indian folk tale, reported to have parallels to Mozart’s Magic Flute. Adams’s large output of other works, including orchestral, choral, and piano solo music has now positioned him as the most prominent composer of classical music among living composers.

Nixon in China is musically eclectic, as is Adams’s output generally: always tonal, sometimes melodic, usually driven by rhythm, sometimes minimalist, sometimes traditionally operatic, and sometimes mixed with popular idioms. The score-prescribed selective amplification for both voices and instruments is a significant departure from tradition. His acknowledged compositional influences include both Arnold Schoenberg and John Cage, the towering figures at the opposite poles of musical modernism—the former representing formula, form, and logic, the latter valuing spontaneity and a blurring of distinction between art and life. More directly, Adams is influenced by the American minimalist style associated with Philip Glass, characterized by mechanistic repetitions of small rhythmic and melodic patterns, evolving slowly over extended time frames. And like Charles Ives, that quintessential American sound sponge, Adams collects and recombines the sounds of American experience into new and surprising juxtapositions. Nixon is also text rich, Goodman’s libretto constructed entirely of poetic couplets. As such, it is more rewarding to read than most opera libretti but also more difficult to grasp in performance, even with the sung repetitions. It is typically produced with projections of the English language text.

Impressions of the opera offered here are based on the James Robinson production of the opera as performed at Opera Theater of St. Louis in 2004 and at Chicago Opera Theatre in 2006, compared with the televised Houston Grand Opera production from 1987. (Walter Cronkite, who was present when the Nixons landed in China, served as the host for the television broadcast of the Houston production.) The more recent Robinson production reflects numerous revisions in the work since its opening, and the twenty-first-century interpretation seems more historically self-conscious, harder-edged, and more “techno.” The opening spectacle in the more recent production is not the landing of the United aircraft (“Spirit of 76”) on the Houston stage but rather banks of television screens showing actual footage of that landing in Peking. Some of the sets malfunctioned with diagonal lines across the screens, adding period realism for those who grew up with massive wooden cabinet television sets with prominent “vertical hold” adjusting dials, and without remote controls.
The central characters are depicted variously with dignity and wry humor, except for Chou En-lai who is treated only with dignity, and Henry Kissinger who is treated with no dignity at all. The requisite grand opera opening pageant is presented by the throng of Chinese people watching the sky, incessantly rising modal scales depicting anticipation and uncertainty. Their song, derived from a Red Army ballad, is, however, quite certain: “The people are the heroes now/ Behemoth pulls the peasant’s plow.” The large opening chorus is followed, as is typical in grand opera, with an entry aria by a central character. Richard Nixon, descending from the airplane’s ramp, cognizant of his role: “It’s prime time in the USA/ Yesterday night. They watch us now;/ The three main networks’ colors glow.” In the extended ensemble of major characters in the second scene, divergent philosophies are expressed by the heads of state, another operatic specialty, permitting multiple points of view to be expressed simultaneously: (Nixon) “History is our mother we/ Best do her honor in this way./ (Mao) History is a dirty sow:/ If we by chance escape her maw/ She overlies us. (Nixon) That’s true, sure;/ And yet we still must seize the hour.” The third and final scene of Act I follows the grand opera convention of festive production numbers, here with a formal state banquet, gradually unraveling into dancing and revelry. Act I is weighted towards exploration of the male characters acting their roles in the public eye, underscored in the Robinson production by occasional “shots” of the viewing audience back in the States, gathered round the TV news while eating their dinners. During the diplomatic scenes, Chairman Mao’s three secretaries (now known as the “Mao-ettes”) serve as his back-up singers.

Act II’s focus on Pat Nixon’s day of staged tourism in Scene 1 and on her viewing of the staged ballet in scene 2 employs the traditional stage device of the play-within-the-play and meets the grand opera requirements of major ballet and violence. Scene 1 (the tour) provides a major operatic scena for Patricia Nixon, a naïve but highly sympathetic prima donna, and Scene 2 includes a heroic aria for the opera’s “second lady” Chiang Ch’ing (“I am the wife of Mao Tse-tung/who raised the weak above the strong”), indignant at Mrs. Nixon’s emotional misreading of the ballet. Chiang Ch’ing’s ballet, The Red Detachment of Women, which was actually performed for the Nixons in 1972, was based on historical events in which a troop of women soldiers successfully defeated autocratic landowners and sympathizers of Chiang Kai-shek. Early in the drama a peasant girl is lashed by a foreman (played by the same singer who takes the role of Kissinger: “Doesn’t he look like you-know-who!”) and Pat takes to the stage in an effort to alter the outcome. She does not, but both she and Dick are drenched in the rainstorm occurring in the staged play.

Act III, as in many nineteenth-century operas, retreats from the spectacle and focuses on private relationships, memories, dreams, and reflections. The final speech, sung by the aging Communist Chou En-lai asks, “How much of what we did was good? Everything seems to move/Beyond our remedy…”

Nixon in China is an opera and a fantasy. It articulates images that shape our recollections of history as it might have happened. As audiences are ever further removed from memory of Nixon as a living president, his legacy may take on more elements of this—or some—grand opera. A student in my music history class last year, writing on the “Red Detachment of Women” ballet in the context of Adams’s opera, was born years after Nixon left office. She brought no particular memories or agendas to the project. She learned about the formation of the People’s Republic of China, about the Cultural Revolution, about the Maos and the Nixons, and she wrote a good paper about the breakdown of the frame around the ballet when Patricia Nixon rises from the audience. When Pat rushes onto the stage joined by a reluctant Nixon to aid the oppressed girl, they cross the imagined line separating the real and the illusory, historical facts and fantasy. And with this move, the transformative character of the trip, and the opera about the trip, is achieved. My student attended the Chicago performance, and I suspect her enduring images of the Nixons are greatly influenced by the characters as they were portrayed there. And likely the same is true for others who do remember the Nixon presidency and that earlier time, when Watergate was just a hotel. ♦

Linda Ferguson is Department Chair and Professor of Music at Valparaiso University.
I confess. I used to be a Lutheran snob. Here come the rationalizations. For one thing, I am one of that breed legendary for its quirks and extremes, that is, a Pastor's Kid. Passions are fierce and loyalties unquestioned, at least before adolescence, in the PK. My own passions and loyalties were expressed by squalling with the daughter of a—real or perceived, I'm no longer sure which—rival of my dad's; or snidely correcting the foolish misperceptions of my sixth-grade comrades: No, my dad is not a priest. No, my mom is not a nun. During Black History Month in fourth grade, I was the first one to shoot my hand in the air in response to the teacher's request for information about Martin Luther King Jr. "He's named after Martin Luther," I proclaimed. "Yes," said the teacher, blinking, "he's named after his father, Martin Luther King Sr."

Another rationalization. Ours was the only Lutheran church in the old burned-over district of upstate New York, in a county larger than the state of Rhode Island, and as such Lutherans were a tiny bit exotic. We had this darling little Catechism, and big parties with huge cash hauls for confirmation. Expertise in fire and candles was the reward for acolyting at hundreds, no thousands, of midweek services and minor festivals. Ascension was my personal favorite, chiefly because it sometimes fell on my birthday. Our congregation celebrated Oktoberfest with brats and beer in the church basement to curious folk songs full of "val der ee" and "val der ah." And above all we Lutherans guarded this stupendous secret that it wasn't being good but trusting in Christ that got you to heaven.

I was a snob simply because I couldn't fathom why all people were not Lutheran. At the most they could be excused on the grounds of ignorance, but once they learned about us, surely they'd want to join up. What was preventing the maddening crowds of the world from beating down our bright red doors?

Sarah Hinlicky Wilson

Then, gaining in years and worldly wisdom, my snobbery drifted in the other direction. There were times when Lutheranism looked kind of... dowdy.

First, there were these irritating institutions calling themselves by acronyms in cryptogrammic permutations that always included an L for Lutheran, and the institutional L demanded some measure of loyalty from the human L no matter how unseemly the former's collective behavior.

Then I gradually cottoned on to the fact that lots of Lutheran people identified being Lutheran more with (for instance) the green book page seventy-seven than with the aforementioned stupendous secret. This is pretty tame stuff, especially if you are a romantic young Anglophile reading about curates, rectories, and campanology. What is a green book compared to a Prayer Book, complete with capital letters? And why drink beer when you could drink sherry?

But that is just the tip of the exotic-Christian iceberg.

How about those Easterners? Seething with smells, all that kissing going on, attending to wisdom, some solemn mystery lurking behind the iconostasis inaccessible to run-of-the-mill Lutherans.

Or, if you head south instead of east, you discover that some people won't be singing "This is the Feast" for the billionth time this week. No, they will be obeying the charge of the psalm to sing to the Lord a new song—and in tongues at that.

And whatever else a young Lutheran may think of Rome, you at least have to give it this: it's big.

Of course whatever is familiar is dull, and whatever is foreign is exotic, and the helpful post-colonialists have taught us to label this dalliance with the exotic "orientalism" and acknowledge our romantic tomfoolery for what it is. If you are a New York Lutheran, Minnesota can be pretty darn
exotic too, to the point of discomfort. It's not the jell-o; I assure you there's plenty of jell-o out east too. It's the ubiquity of the Lutheran churches, where Lutheran means culture more than confession to the populace at large, and everyone says “I'm sorry” as a kind of social grease. (On my first visit to the Gopher State, I said, “No really, it's ok” dozens of times to the “I'm sorry” liturgy until my soon-to-be sister-in-law informed me that I could just ignore it. People said it as a matter of course, not as a matter of apology.) Whatever Lutheranism meant out there, it was exotic and unfamiliar to me.

And sure enough I have found that, to non-Lutherans, Lutheranism turns out to be kind of exotic too. It revolves around the four cardinal points of 1) Garrison Keillor 2) beer 3) quietism and 4) disbelief that Luther really said “sin boldly.” Sometimes they wonder if we still hate Jews. (We don't.)

But all this is very foolish. I was not baptized into Paul or Cephas or Apollos or Martin Luther either; I was baptized into Christ. We do a joyful exchange with each other just as Christ does with us. What happens to one member happens to the whole body. Thus: I claim and rejoice in the trinitarianism of the Cappadocians, the flying buttresses of Gothic cathedrals, the Azusa Street revival, Chinese house churches, the little monks in little cells illuminating fat tomes, the frontier preachers, African exorcists, solemn Puritans at their solemn prayers, Julian of Norwich, the martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicity, the Jesus prayer, and hymns by the Wesleys, every bit as much as I claim and rejoice in the stupendous secret made gloriously public in the Augsburg Confession.

And similarly I claim and confess: the pogroms, the Inquisition, the Crusades, black slavery in the Americas, the conquista, instructions for wives to return to abusive husbands, indulgences, burned books, and all schisms from 1054 to the present, as my own sins in my own body, every bit as much as I claim and confess those of the Lutherans who slaughtered Anabaptists, collaborated with the Nazis in Germany, and are currently committing sins today, seen and unseen. I am done with the competition and the comparisons. We are all Christ's body.

And yet. I'm a Lutheran. There is no untagged Christian any more. We are all Christian plus. I was given the Lutheran tag with my family heritage. I grew up, took it off, examined it at length, and ended up putting it back on. Here's why I did.

The only reason to follow Luther, as far as I can figure, is because Luther followed Christ. I have read lots of theology and talked to lots of theologians, from all over the map. The books are stimulating, the people are kind, and with astonishing frequency neither have anything to say about Christ. Even those who say “Lord, Lord” are not always talking about their Lord. I read Luther and, the vast majority of the time, when Luther isn't getting in his own way, I get Christ. Nobody feeds me a steadier diet of my Lord Jesus. The Jesus I get in scripture and sermons and hymns and sacraments is there because Luther told his evangelical followers to give Jesus away freely in them. I became a pastor because Christ told me give him away freely too.

Blessedly there is lots of Christ to be found outside our little Lutheran world. How terrible if only Lutherans remembered to preach Christ! We forget him too often as it is. But in giving out Christ, Luther discovered one of Christ's benefits, one that I find to be quite a bit rarer than our Lord himself in the church—and that is freedom: true, bold, daring, daunting, evangelical freedom. For freedom Christ has set us free. It was not the establishment of a new law, or the revelation of an old one, that Christ was up to. Baptism does not plunk me safely into a pre-appointed place in the universe where I enact the roles and duties prepared for me from the foundation of the world. Christ did not die to spring the mechanism in a cosmic forgiveness machine. He laid down his life, and took it up again, freely and willingly. He sent his Holy Spirit to blow where it will. Christian life is freedom and the air here is so brisk that at times I can barely breathe. But nothing will persuade me to leave.

Fittingly if a little ironically, it was the evangelical freedom I learned from Luther that taught me to drop my snobbish boundary lines. In Presbyterian Princeton, at first all I could see was the difference in sacramental teaching between us and them. Now I can see the genuine piety the Reformed bring to the table; I recognize and share
it. I am awed and humbled by the mobilized energy that American evangelicals summon to convert the world to Christ. At one time I only saw bad songs and silly science, but that's because of the log in my own eye. I do not desire the exotic in the Christian other anymore because it is exotic; I desire it if and when it points me to Christ.

In short, at one time Luther and Lutheranism were things I intended to guard fiercely, zealously, in their shining purity. Now I intend to give them away promiscuously. I am a trustee of rich treasures: my crown is the Book of Concord, my sword is “The Bondage of the Will,” my scepter is “The Freedom of a Christian.” It is only at peril of punishment that I bury these talents in the ground anymore, clean and safe from unworthy hands. What would I do if I built more Lutheran barns, filled them up, hermetically sealed them, and then found my life was required of me that same night? I dare not. I honor the trust given to me best by giving it away, not abandoning it but distributing it. It is a gift freely given to me, and to be given freely, by me, to others.

What, finally, is more Lutheran than that?

Sarah Hinlicky Wilson is pastor at St. John Lutheran Church in Trenton, New Jersey. She is a doctoral candidate at Princeton Theological Seminary and Editor Elect of Lutheran Forum.

ON CRUCIFIXION DAY

I saw a tree turn
Into a man planting
Seeds below

Into long generations
Of growth and shadow,
Arch and archway.

His hands held bloody roots
Afire with night journeys
Also supernova dawns
Bursting the sky
With great orange suns.

In his thirst ran rivers
Of forgiving rains
Furrowing the space between
A rocky-tilled earth
And the lush vineyards beyond.

Philip C. Kolin
Some Words on Behalf of Creation

If God created the earth, so is the earth hallowed: and if it is hallowed, so we must deal with it devotedly and with care that we do not despoil it, and mindful of our relations to all beings that live on it. We are to consider it religiously: Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.

Liberty Hyde Bailey, The Holy Earth

Those words of the great agriculturalist, first penned in 1915, assert the sanctity of creation more forthrightly than many astute theologians or devout parishioners are willing to do. Hence the crux of a significant problem in modern Christianity—to speak in such a way often brings the label of environmentalist or New-Ager, when one is simply elaborating on the historic creed’s first confession of God: “Creator of the heavens and the earth... of all things, whether seen or unseen.” Indeed, Scripture is replete with passages declaring the goodness of the earth and the divine glory it declares (see Genesis 1, Psalm 33:4-9, 1 Corinthians 15:39–49, and Colossians 1:15–17). How then can one profess such faith in a Creator while treating the creation (of which we are a part) with reckless abandon?

Although certainly not definitive, there is an element of truth (and irony) to be found in the stereotypes that picture “irreligious evolutionists” approaching the earth with cautious care as “creationist Christians” trash the planet in rejection of pantheism. However, creationists belie the sanctity of the first six days if they spend all of theirs diminishing “the work of God’s hands,” just as evolutionists who deny a creator miss the very source of reverence they have for this world.

As a Christian who acknowledges the sacredness of creation, I never cease to be amazed by “fellow-believers” who balk at the suggestion of recycling or refuse to change wasteful behaviors as some sort of “statement of faith.” They might lack firsthand knowledge of the devastation wrought by forest clear cuts, or of toxic runoff’s deadly effects on watersheds, or mountaintop coal mining, or even of the mountainous accumulations in landfills, but secondhand reports should be enough, as should basic awareness of God’s holy earth.

Much of the problem lies in the reality that faith and life have been divorced from the created realm. We are so much more at home with money and machines and the products we can buy. We are so much more attuned to an electronic image on a screen than to the actual ecosystems of soil and sky and water... of insect, animal, and human... of grass and plant and tree. We have been uprooted from the substance of our subsistence. Even Christians with a high regard for the Eucharist fail to see what the bread of Christ’s body and the wine of his blood have to do with the creation from which they emerge.

No better assessment of our dilemma has been proffered than by Philip Sherrard:

It is not first of all a crisis concerning our environment. It is first of all a crisis concerning the way we think. We are treating our planet in an inhuman, god-forsaken manner because we see things in an inhuman, god-forsaken way. And we see things in this way because that basically is how we see ourselves.... Having in our own minds desanctified ourselves, we have desanctified nature, too, in our own minds: we have removed it from the suzerainty of the divine and have assumed that we are its overlords (2–3).

We diminish the earth because we see ourselves in a diminished and falsely exalted way. We are used to denatured existence and to acts of denigration.

In sharp contrast to our contemporary perception, Sherrard suggested this alternate reality:
...the mediaeval Christian world was an organically integrated world—a sacred order established by God in which everything, not only man and man’s artifacts, but every living form of plant, bird or animal, the sun, moon and stars, the waters and the mountains were seen as signs of things sacred (signa rei sacra), expressions of a divine harmony, symbols linking the visible and the invisible, earth and heaven (33).

It is, therefore, not only interesting but helpful to consider the origin and value of Rogationtide, which emerged in that very era.

The three days between the last Sunday of Eastertide (Rogate—Pray!) and Ascension Thursday, known as Rogation Days, are penitential days historically set aside for litanies and processions. Instituted by Bishop Mamertus of Vienne in late fifth-century France as a response to a devastating period of earthquakes, pestilence, and famine, these days took the form of processional prayers through the countryside invoking God’s blessing on fields and pastures and waters in anticipation of abundant harvests. The Rogation Days became ecclesiastically binding on Gallican parishes in 511 and found later adoption in England in 747 and in Rome under the 795–816 papacy of Leo III (Horn 217).

It was obvious to the Church in that time and place that the earth and the lives that depend upon it are vulnerable and fragile—in need of stewardship and safekeeping. Martin Luther encouraged people to pray (in his 1519 pamphlet, “On Rogationtide Prayer and Procession”):

...that God may graciously protect the crops in the fields and cleanse the air—not only that God may send blessed rain and good weather to ripen the fruit, but rather that the fruit may not be poisoned, and we, together with the animals, eat and drink thereof and become infected with pestilence...(49:21)

We do well to heed those words today as we know our share of soil and water and air pollution, not to mention the illness and unrest that plague in result; as well as the troubling signs of a warming planet. Our faith should be at home with this earth, which after all is the realm of the new creation through Christ’s work of redemption. The great naturalist Henry Beston summarized this ultimate reality in these words from 1935:

This earth... is the true inheritance of man, his link with his human past, the source of his religion, ritual and song, the kingdom without whose splendor he lapses from his mysterious estate of man to a baser world which is without the other virtue and the other integrity of the animal. True humanity is no inherent right but an achievement; and only through the earth may we be as one with all who have been and all who are yet to be, sharers and partakers of the mystery of living, reaching to the full of human peace and the full of human joy (4–5).

Looking back to the days of full Rogation and harvest observance, the English countryman H. J. Massingham observed that the church was in the fields and the fields were in the church, achieving an integration “true to the nature of the universe” (210). May Christendom once again assent to that! May our prayers be sacred words that inform wise action so that we might, as Bailey counseled, deal with the earth in a way of holy devotion—treated it as the sphere of our religion; taking care not to spoil but rather sustain what God has fashioned to sustain us. ♦

Joel Kurz is a freelance writer and a Lutheran minister.
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The Age of Distraction and Its Possible Remedies

Robert Benne

For the first time in my forty-some years of teaching I had to tell a student to turn off an electronic device in class. She sat in the back row even after I asked the small class to come forward toward the front. Despite the strong signal I had given her to join in the dynamics of the class, she had her cell phone in her lap. Every now and then she would fiddle with it so I guessed she was doing some text messaging and asked her to put the cell phone away.

I suspected that such an ongoing distraction would make it very difficult for her to absorb and understand the lecture I was giving. My hunch was right. She received a C-minus on our first exam. My next syllabus will have rules prohibiting any cell phone use in class whatsoever.

Of course, text messaging is merely one of many functions those hand-held instruments can do. They serve as telephones, computers, cameras, sources of music, and what not. They are a ready source of distraction from any activity that demands attention, such as driving, conversing with others, watching movies and sports, let alone reading or listening to lectures.

I no longer try to gain eye-contact with students whom I meet on campus because most of them are chatting on cell-phones with their minds and eyes on everything but me. Once in a while one is presented with the hilarious sight of a clump of students walking together while all of them are talking to someone else on their phones. Right after class—and sometimes during class—students pop into the hallways and pull out their cell phones to begin their talking with whomever.

Academics also accommodate to short attention spans. Professors have to be entertainers to keep their students' attention. They entertain with videos, DVDs, Power Point, and pictures. While some of this electronic input has important educational value, a good deal of it provides a way to avoid serious encounters with classic texts that may be both lengthy and difficult to read. Instead we give them visual images and snippets of this or that text.

The upshot of all this is to lament these developments and to connect them with a decreasing capacity for serious reading on the one hand, and...
the lack of capacity to make sustained arguments on the other. Of course, such complaints are legion. For example, a distinguished professor at a college that would be the envy of most colleges because of its high reputation and bright students observes that “Reading is the great lost art of our time. It often seems that virtually no one knows how to read a book carefully, thoroughly, and responsibly.”

Reading and comprehending texts of serious depth and length are possible only if people read actively from an early age, and such reading is by no means assured. A few years ago the National Endowment for the Arts released a report entitled “Reading at Risk.” For the first time in modern history, the report alleges, less than half of the adult population now read literature. This decline has happened across all races, education levels, and age groups. The decline is ominously most pronounced among college-age people. The report goes on to correlate the decline in literary reading with a decline in cultural and civic participation.

Lack of reading translates further into a diminished capacity to write, for the two go together. And while some students are able to master the rules of grammar and are capable of clear writing, I find that the vast majority of them cannot construct a sustained and coherent argument.

Our Religion and Philosophy department has a required thesis for each of its majors. Students are expected to construct and execute an argument and then undergo an oral exam over their thesis. While I no longer advise a great number of these students, I do get requests by good students to advise them on their theses. Among the tasks I have them do after they have read widely in their thesis area, are to take some time to think about what they are going to argue, write that up in an introduction, and then construct an outline.

It is amazing how difficult those tasks are for students. They often come up with jumbled thoughts that are neither coherent nor sequential. It would take me only about five minutes to put this all in order, but most of the time I let them struggle with the task over several sessions. Even then it is necessary to help them give final shape to the argument.

III

What to do about all this? For one thing, if I were the parent of young children I would read to them as much as possible, especially at bedtime. I would surround them with attractive children’s books and limit television or video viewing drastically. Perhaps I would offer rewards for books read. I would resist getting them cell phones for as long as possible, certainly into high school. Then I would make their use of cell phones conditional upon reading a prescribed number of books, about which I would converse with them. I would also couple the viewing of good television or video stories with reading the written version, with conversations about the difference.

A next step would be to find a school that was light on the electronics and heavy on the basics of reading, writing, and math. I have such a school in mind. I am on the school board of a Christian classical school, which combines strong instruction in Bible and Christian history and doctrine with a classical approach to learning. These schools have reappropriated the “trivium,” which is still used in elite schools in Britain. The trivium consists of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric. At the first stage of school and in the first stage of each subject matter, students learn grammar. In English and other languages that means spelling and grammar; in other subjects it means learning the basic facts. At the next stage, students are encouraged to make connections among the facts and also among the fields of study. Finally, they are expected to use their grammar and dialectic in making persuasive arguments—rhetoric.

These schools insist that students read full texts and then rely on faculty-student dialog rather than the straight lecture method. (During one of my visits to a sophomore religion class at our school, I found the young people reading a church history text by Justo Gonzalez, which is generally used in colleges and often in seminaries. After reading the relevant sections, they were carrying on a lively discussion about the difference between Jerome and Augustine!) Discipline and a dress code are enforced, and cell phones must be parked at the door for the day.

Students are taught to analyze and criticize arguments, as well as to develop a major one of
their own for a high school senior thesis. Further, they are taught to think critically from a Christian point of view and to engage secular learning and Christian teaching. The schools, being quite lean economically, are understandably light on fancy equipment, sports, and electives. But the young people graduating from these schools go on to fine colleges and participate critically in the education offered by those colleges and universities.

After such a rigorous primary and secondary education, which I believe some public schools are able to offer as well, the next step is to find a college where serious reading and writing are required, and where students must construct arguments on a regular basis. Though one would think these are banal requirements, they are not. Parents and prospective students must look carefully for these sorts of schools.

Does this sound like the ravings of a Luddite who refuses even to own a cell phone? No, not quite. We own cell phones but use them only when we travel long distances by air or car. Then it is very handy to be able to communicate with the people involved. But beyond that I have no desire to have my private quiet time interrupted by yet more telephone calls or text messages, as well as the seemingly unending river of emails we all receive each day. (At least those can be answered when one wants to.)

I cherish the uninterrupted time I have to read, think, and write. Those are the times when I think I am doing what I am supposed to be doing. I only wish young people would learn to cherish such swatches of time. They are good for the mind and the soul.

Robert Benne is Director of the Center for Religion and Society at Roanoke College.

Winner of the 2006 Lilly Fellows Program Book Award

The Lilly Fellows Program in Humanities and the Arts is pleased to announce the winner of the inaugural Lilly Fellows Program Book Award: *Educating for Shalom: Essays on Christian Higher Education* by Nicholas Wolterstorff, Noah Porter Professor Emeritus of Philosophical Theology and Fellow of Berkeley College at Yale University. Wolterstorff is not only a premier Christian philosopher, but over the past twenty-five years at Calvin College and then Yale University he has been one of the most astute thinkers shaping the conversation on Christian understandings of learning and higher education. This volume, edited by Clarence W. Joldersma, Professor of Education at Calvin College, and Gloria Goris Stronks, Professor Emerita of Education at Calvin College, collects nineteen of Wolterstorff’s most important essays on religion and education, providing an introduction to his thoughts about faith-shaped learning and an outline of the way he connects a Reformed, confessional outlook to a progressive social pedagogy. The result is an understanding of learning that draws on the best of Christian humanism or intellectualist models of education with an aim to cultivate such character that can introduce the healing power of *Shalom*—which encompasses ethics, justice, and human flourishing—to students, classroom, school, and society.
In 2005 a sharply divided U. S. Supreme Court held that the government, when acting to spur economic development, may take property from one private owner and transfer it to another. Put more concretely, the ruling allowed the City of New London, New Hampshire to force long-time residents to sell their homes so the lots could be used by a private real estate developer, simply because the planned development would be a more valuable use of the land than the existing private homes. The Court’s decision in Kelo v. City of New London provoked two strong dissenting opinions, and outrage among a wide range of political leaders and commentators. President Bush responded with an Executive Order that limits the involvement of federal agencies in “economic development takings,” both houses of Congress considered legislation to deny federal funds for such takings, and over a dozen states have now adopted bans on the practice.

The reactions to the Kelo decision are understandable. None of us would like to be evicted from our homes for any reason, although we all might acknowledge circumstances in which the displacement would be justified. If, for example, the government needed the property for a new airport or to enlarge an existing public park, we grudgingly would acknowledge the government’s authority to force us to sell the lot. The legal authority arises from the Takings Clause of the Constitution’s Fifth Amendment, which provides that “private property [shall not] be taken for public use, without just compensation.” The new airport and enlarged public park are “public uses,” so the Takings Clause empowers the government to take private property for those projects, on payment of “just compensation” to the landowners. We might feel quite differently, however, if the property was turned into a private office building—or, as planned in Kelo, a retail store’s parking lot. The loss of one’s home for a needed military installation may seem like a sacrifice for the common good, but losing one’s home for a developer’s profit seems like robbery.

Although that intuition strikes a strong chord, the Court’s decision in Kelo may not be as blameworthy as it first appears. To appreciate the decision’s plausible merit, it is useful to recall the legal context for the decision. The Takings Clause both authorizes and limits the government’s exercise of eminent domain. Ordinarily, property owners are free to decide if, and on what terms, they will sell or otherwise transfer their property. But in the exercise of its eminent domain powers, the government may compel unwilling owners to sell their property, and the sale price is determined by the objective “fair market value,” which is invariably less than what the unwilling sellers would have asked for their property. (As a practical matter, the exercise of eminent domain usually follows attempts to negotiate voluntary purchase of the property. The taking follows only when negotiations have failed.)

The Takings Clause imposes two limits on the exercise of eminent domain. The government must pay “just compensation” and the government may only take property for “public use.” Kelo involved only the “public use” limitation. In the case, New London adopted a plan to revitalize the city, which had been classified by the state as “economically distressed” because of high unemployment and declining population, due in part to the closure of a large military base. The city’s plan centered on an extensive and integrated development that included residential, retail, and commercial uses. Although much of the new development was situated on publicly-owned land, the plan also encompassed a number of privately-held lots, which the city deemed necessary to carry out the plan. Some of the private owners sold voluntarily, and the city sought to exercise its power of eminent domain to acquire the remaining lots.
In response, the owners of the remaining lots claimed that the city's proposed taking violated the constitutional requirement of a "public use." Under the city's economic development plan, they argued, the acquired lots would be turned over to private real estate developers. Those developers would receive the direct economic benefits under the plan, and the city's only benefit would be indirect, in the form of additional taxes. Thus, the owners argued, the city was improperly exercising eminent domain for a private, not a public, use.

Despite the intuitive appeal of the lot owners' claim, the Supreme Court long has held that some compelled transfers of property from one private owner to another fall within the meaning of "public use." For example, the Court rejected challenges to the exercise of eminent domain for the benefit of privately owned railroads, electric and other utilities, and even sports stadiums. The Court also has upheld schemes for urban redevelopment of blighted areas (so-called "slum clearance") even though the cleared properties were conveyed to private entities for redevelopment, and not all the buildings within the condemned area were actually unfit for their existing use. The Court also approved a plan to break up the concentration of real property ownership in Hawaii, where most of the land on the islands was held by very few owners.

It is possible, of course, to distinguish these takings from the New London plan. Public utilities, railroads, and stadiums are open and available to the public. Urban redevelopment and Hawaii's redistribution scheme addressed alleged harms arising from existing ownership patterns. On closer scrutiny, however, the distinctions turn out to be differences more of degree than of kind. Under the law of many jurisdictions, every business must be "open to the public." That is, businesses must offer their goods and services on equal terms to all potential customers. Moreover, New London's development plan suggests that the existing pattern of property ownership in the city represents a kind of harm—a serious impediment to the comprehensive revitalization the city believes is needed for its revitalization.

Even if the response is not entirely persuasive, it points toward an even more important feature of current law and governance: the pervasive blurring of public and private realms. In addition to the laws requiring equal public access to businesses, recent years have seen a dramatic increase in public-private partnerships for the delivery of a wide range of human services. From education and welfare case management to job training and correctional facilities, cooperation between government and private entities is the norm, rather than the exception, in contemporary public administration. Such partnerships go well beyond human services. Indeed, joint public-private economic development strategies can be found at all levels of government, from the restoration of a farmer's market to a multi-billion dollar facility for biotechnology research. These partnerships suggest that the government routinely works through private agencies to serve public needs, and the partnerships provide direct benefits to the private entities as well, usually in the form of profits.

If no categorical line may be drawn between public and private, why should economic development takings be treated as constitutionally suspect? Does the goal of economic development lack sufficient weight to justify the exercise of eminent domain? Perhaps, but that is unlikely to be the response of those who live in economically depressed areas, for whom development can bring the opportunity to work and receive improved public services, made possible by an expanded tax

---

The most pressing threat represented by economic development takings is not the use, but the abuse, of eminent domain for that purpose. We worry that those who are already vulnerable will be forced from their homes by covetous real estate developers, powerful enough to spur elected officials to use eminent domain for the developers' private advantage.
base. Surely the hope of economic development is at least as important to them as a publicly supported stadium is to sports fans.

The most pressing threat represented by economic development takings is not the use but the abuse of eminent domain for that purpose. We worry that those who are already vulnerable will be forced from their homes by covetous real estate developers, powerful enough to spur elected officials to use eminent domain for the developers' private advantage. We also worry about the wisdom of the economic development projects, out of concern that the alleged public benefits will never outweigh the harms done to those displaced, or perhaps never materialize at all.

The question, then, is how best to protect against the threat that government will abuse the power of eminent domain for economic development. Some argue that the risk of harm is so great that the power should be withdrawn entirely. The *Kelo* majority rejected that argument, for a reason that is deeply rooted in our constitutional history. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Supreme Court consistently struck down economic legislation, such as limits on working hours, as infringements on the rights of private property and contract. It was only President Franklin Roosevelt's plan to expand the Court's membership that finally opened the door to the New Deal's social welfare legislation. Since that time, the Court has accorded strong deference to the economic judgments of elected bodies, and the *Kelo* decision continues that tradition.

Most importantly, the Court's decision leaves other political bodies free to impose more restrictive limits on economic development takings, and a number of states have done so. Some communities may decide that protecting the security of property holders outweighs the public benefits that may be realized through development takings, or that the risk of abuse is so great that a complete bar on such exercises of eminent domain is necessary. The *Kelo* majority was not willing to remove those choices from more politically responsive bodies.

Nonetheless, the Court's ruling does impose some limits on abusive exercise of eminent domain. Government plans for economic development will receive significant but not absolute deference. *Kelo* suggests that courts should scrutinize economic development takings to determine if the public purpose is a mere pretext for private benefit. For example, heightened scrutiny may be appropriate if a particular private entity has been promoting, and will benefit from, the taking. As the *Kelo* majority recognized, this approach does not provide robust protection against abuses of eminent domain, but such protection would come at a significant cost: the removal of an important tool for economic development. Others may decide that this protection is worth its cost, the Court reasoned, but that decision should not be made by the least politically accountable branch of government—the federal judiciary. ♦

Robert W. Tuttle is Professor of Law and David R. and Sherry Kirschner Berz Research Professor of Law and Religion at George Washington University Law School.

For three decades, Nicholas Wolterstorff has been among the most original and important scholars who have examined the aims and ethos of Christian higher education. In *Educating for Shalom*, Clarence W. Joldersma and Gloria Goris Stronks collect nineteen of Wolterstorff's most important essays addressing this question. The book also includes a Preface and Introduction to Wolterstorff's thought on these issues by Joldersma and Stronks as well as an autobiographical Afterword by Wolterstorff.

The essays are certainly wide-ranging, offering, among other things, an historical and critical survey of the different approaches to Christian higher education and a survey of epistemological, theological, and hermeneutical reflections on learning ranging from Augustine, through Descartes, Kant, and Locke, and on to Kuhn, Popper, and Abraham Kuyper. What holds these essays together, however, is Wolterstorff's insistence that a vision of Christian learning should not simply be distinctive for distinctiveness's sake; neither should it blindly integrate faith and reason in such a way that faith follows reason or vice versa. Rather, a Christian view of higher education should be *faithful* both to the central concepts of the Christian faith and to the practice of bringing social justice and human flourishing—*shalom*—to a broken world. In making the claim that Christian learning or research is marked by faithfulness rather than distinctiveness, and that teaching be aimed at social practice rather than solely at developing a Christian worldview, Wolterstorff offers a compelling suggestion to how Christian scholars can integrate research and teaching by seeing themselves and their students as people who practice faithful learning directed at bringing *shalom* to the world.

Before exploring how Wolterstorff applies his notion of faithfulness and *shalom* to teaching, let us consider how Wolterstorff thinks about faithfulness regarding Christian scholars in their roles as researchers and administrators of Christian schools—in short, how they should see themselves as Christian learners.

Wolterstorff asserts, again, that Christian scholarship should be *faithful*, not merely distinctive or undifferentiated from secular scholarship. To unpack why he stresses faithfulness, we need to see that, over time, Wolterstorff has developed a *via media* between other approaches to Christian scholarship: strategies stemming from integrationism and those stemming from perspectivalism.

First, Wolterstorff rejects attempts to connect faith and learning through integrationist strategies of harmonization or compatibilism. By harmonization, Wolterstorff means strategies in which faith acquiesces to reason or science. In making the claim that Christian learning or research is marked by faithfulness rather than distinctiveness, and that teaching be aimed at social practice rather than solely at developing a Christian worldview, Wolterstorff offers a compelling suggestion to how Christian scholars can integrate research and teaching by seeing themselves and their students as people who practice faithful learning directed at bringing *shalom* to the world.

In rejecting compatibilism and harmonization, and, given Wolterstorff's Reformed theological leanings, we might...
expect him to accept the Christian perspectivalism of Abraham Kuyper, the Dutch theologian many Reformed folk consider a forerunner to postmodern thinkers like Thomas Kuhn. Kuyper and his followers, going back to Augustine, argue that only the redeemed can apprehend reality; hence, Christian scholarship will by necessity be different from scholarship based in a secular perspective. The aim of education from this Kuyperian vantage point is to produce a uniquely Christian worldview that expresses a distinctive understanding of physical and metaphysical reality.

Wolterstorff indeed finds much to like about Kuyper's critique of foundationalism, but he worries that this approach stresses the distinctiveness or difference of the Christian perspective merely for the sake of being distinctive or at the expense of dialogue. In other words, like the integrationist strategies, perspectivalism seems to settle for carving out a niche within the academy—protecting one's own beliefs or stressing one's distinctiveness—without creatively engaging academic culture or society at large. For Wolterstorff, both of these strategies separate Christians from the world or stultify engagement with other scholars. If Christian scholars are called to bring shalom to the world, such a call requires engagement.

Wolterstorff's via media is to stress scholarship and scholars that are faithful to thoughts and activities of Christianity. By being faithful in thought, Wolterstorff argues that Christian scholars should be guided in their learning by certain "control beliefs" that invigorate a Christian hermeneutic or understanding of culture and society. By taking a hermeneutical approach, Wolterstorff attempts to modify Kuyperian perspectivalism by arguing that, while conversion certainly opens a new way of reading, comprehending, and understanding reality, we are nevertheless seeing and understanding the same physical and ontological reality secularists see. Moreover, in stressing that humans are fallen rather than maintaining Kuyper's stress on human sinfulness, Wolterstorff insists that all human pursuit of truth is part of the created order—that humans long to understand the realities a Christian hermeneutic illuminates. In stressing this hermeneutical approach and humans as fallen parts of God's created order, then, Wolterstorff aims at dialogue rather than distinctiveness, keeping open lines of understanding between Christian scholars, secular scholars, and students.

Moreover, this stress on dialogue opens the way for Christian scholarship that is creatively engaging other scholars and human society more broadly. For example, Wolterstorff argues that while an integrationist might accept Skinnerian behaviorism uncritically and a perspectivalist might reject Skinner as un-Christian, being faithful would mean, based on certain controlling beliefs, that one reject Skinner's psychological determinism but also that one, in seeking a common understanding of human behavior, might examine the same material to articulate a Christian understanding of the phenomena Skinner is trying to comprehend. In addition, and in response to Kuyper, Wolterstorff notes that certain examinations might even push us to change some of our faith claims.

Again, the aim of Christian scholarship must be to learn and thereby understand the great traditions of art and literature that reflect this human quest for understanding, to understand the call of justice in society, and rightly to apprehend the social and cultural structures that constitute fallen human society. Importantly, Wolterstorff believes that such scholarship reveals a broken world—disenchanted, ravaged by competitive capitalism, and torn by competing logics. Because this world, which includes college students, is so broken, the call of the gospel demands that faithful assessment of society not be the end of scholarship; the aim is, rather, Christian praxis, or, to use Alasdair MacIntyre's word—social practice. And for scholars, the most immediate point of social contact is the student, which brings us to Wolterstorff's reflections on teaching.

As with scholarship, Wolterstorff examines the competing models of Christian teaching that have marked Christian higher education. Wolterstorff argues that all of these approaches depend on
strategies similar to those that he explores in thinking about scholarship—integration of faith and learning on the one hand or Christian distinctiveness on the other. In either case, these models lack the vision to equip and energize students to practice faithful Christianity in the world. Wolterstorff especially stresses the limits in seeing the integration of faith and learning as the aim of Christian education, arguing that such integration is only the means, not the goal, of faithful teaching; the goal should be to lead students to social practice—to educate students to bring *shalom* to the world.

Part of educating for *shalom* will involve students developing a Christian hermeneutic—acquiring the necessary control beliefs and thereby rightly understanding society. On this point too Wolterstorff gets quite precise, arguing that students should be well-versed in older hermeneutics (Christian or not), the arts and culture (without these we could not flourish—experience *shalom*), and the means for understanding social relations—especially that they see the problems inherent in capitalism and that they utilize a “world systems” (Immanuel Wallerstein) approach to geopolitical and economic relationships. But even with a Christian hermeneutic in place, students must again be inspired towards the social practice of bringing *shalom* to a broken humanity. In places Wolterstorff also calls such education “teaching for justice,” as justice, along with general human flourishing, is what being in a place of *shalom* means.

In the end, Wolterstorff offers a vision of Christian higher education that is both faithful to Christian thought and radical in its social vision. One can imagine that Wolterstorff’s bold and often precise claims might lose some of his readers. His critiques of capitalism and nationalism in particular will be hard for some to swallow. Moreover, one can see the architecture of the Reformed theological tradition throughout the essay. But the beauty here in Wolterstorff’s work is his commitment to a unique Christian perspective as well as open engagement with the world both within and outside the boundaries of the academy—engagement as scholars and engagement by proxy through students.

Joe Creech
Valparaiso University


In 2001 Robert Benne published *Quality with Soul: How Six Premier Colleges and Universities Keep Faith with Their Religious Traditions*. Beyond the details concerning the six institutions, Benne’s work provides scholars interested in religious colleges and universities a typology by which to identify the religious nature of such institutions. The four types include what he calls the orthodox, the critical mass, the intentionally pluralistic, and the accidentally pluralistic. While such a typology proves helpful, scholars such as James C. Kennedy and Caroline J. Simon contend that none of these categories adequately describe the religious nature of their own institution, Hope College. In particular, they argue in *Can Hope Endure? A Historical Case Study in Christian Higher Education* that “Hope College is difficult to categorize, even in a more complicated and refined revision of Benne’s taxonomy” (18). The bulk of their text offers an exploration of the religious nature of Hope College. However, the real significance of Kennedy and Simon’s work is that it challenges individuals interested in religious higher education to look beyond such categories in an effort to pursue a deeper understanding of the narrative fabric of particular institutions.

The distinctive dimension present in the narrative fabric of Hope College is its continued commitment to charting what the authors identify as a middle path. Such a path is the result of generations of Hope community members who believed “Sectarian rigidity leads to a kind of living death by ossification for an academic institution, while unexamined accommodation... leads to death by a thousand equivocations and compromises” (17). Forces within the Hope community may prefer one or the other of these two extremes. However,
Kennedy and Simon offer that neither side has proven able to define the religious nature of the institution. Combined with forces residing between these two extremes, a “tensile strength” came to be identified as a defining quality of Hope’s middle way (25). An ebb and flow has existed over the course of Hope’s history, and the middle way continues to prove to be definitive of Hope’s religious nature even if the future generation is left with as many questions to answer as the generations which came before it.

In order to offer a sufficient understanding of the development of Hope’s middle way, Kennedy and Simon offer what may be described best as an intellectual history of Hope that focuses on questions of the institution’s religious nature. Readers looking for a detailed history of Hope will prove to be disappointed as will readers looking for a more thematic or conceptual overview of the fabric of the Hope community. Kennedy and Simon spend the majority of their time moving back and forth between explorations of faculty hiring and the moral community into which Hope invites students. However, their book follows a historical trajectory reaching back to the conditions that brought about the establishment of the college and comes all the way forward to the selection of its current president, James E. Bultman.

Beyond the broader strokes painted in chapters one and eight, chapters two through seven each explore in chronological order important epochs of Hope’s history. For example Chapter 2 covers the years 1866–1945 and explores the roots of Hope’s middle way. Chapter 5 covers the years 1963–1972 and explores deep challenges posed to Hope’s middle way as posed by influential forces favoring greater accommodations.

Perhaps the most interesting narrative Kennedy and Simon include in their work concerns the controversial leadership Ben Patterson offered to Hope when he served as the community’s Dean of the Chapel during the 1990s. As a test to the tensile strength of Hope’s middle way, Kennedy and Simon offer that “Hope’s new chaplain could not, and would not, compromise with people or programs that he believed were at odds with Christian essentials” (188). Although Patterson’s programs proved to be quite popular with a number of students and some faculty and staff members, he also accumulated a host of ardent critics. Perhaps Patterson more than anyone else pushed Hope to consider whether Hope could sustain its “middle way” or instead must choose either a denominational or ecumenical or evangelical direction” (204). In 2000 Patterson claimed his work at Hope had come to an end and left for Westmont College—an institution that had chosen to take the evangelical direction.

Despite Kennedy and Simon’s plea for readers to understand how narratives involving figures such as Ben Patterson shape the religious identity of particular institutions, they appear to fall prey to depending needlessly upon such typologies when referencing another Reformed college in western Michigan, Calvin College. After referring to Calvin’s founding denomination, the Christian Reformed Church (CRC), as secessionist, Kennedy and Simon go on to offer that although Hope’s founding denomination, the Reformed Church in America, “did occasionally intervene directly in the life of Hope College, these incursions were less frequent than CRC interventions at Calvin College” (57). Toward the end of their book, Kennedy and Simon offer that an appreciation for the middle way means that Hope viewed itself as “being not-Oberlin-not-Calvin,’ and most recently, being vibrantly Christian without being prescriptive or parochial” (220). Brief references scattered in various places in this book paint Calvin College and the CRC as sectarian. The primary point at this juncture is not to offer an apologetic on behalf of Calvin and the CRC. By contrast, the primary point is that such passing references are devoid of the larger narrative fabric that defines an institution such as Calvin. If Hope defies being placed within one of Benne’s categories, Calvin also deserves more than such scant and reductive remarks.

Despite such a weakness, James C. Kennedy and Caroline J. Simon’s Can Hope Endure? challenges individuals to go beyond convenient forms of exploration and to learn to appreciate the narrative fabric
that defines the religious identity of colleges and universities. Colleges and universities prove to be extremely complex communities. Explorations of the religious identity of such institutions only add to the complexity. When one takes the time to read through the details Kennedy and Simon have offered in relation to Hope College, one learns of a community that has committed itself in varying forms to the tensile strength of the middle way. By its nature, such strength comes when people care enough to engage in conflict and seek to reconcile their differences. Such an engagement is evidence of the concern that the members of the Hope College community have for their community. In the end, may all colleges and universities calling themselves religious be comprised of people willing to engage in such forms of dialogue even if for a season such dialogue is fraught with conflict.

Todd C. Ream
Indiana Wesleyan University


I TAKE IT AS A SIGN OF MATURITY that Christian higher education recently has generated not just a slew of taxonomies and histories but also manifestos, jeremiads, and calls for reform. Conflicting Allegiances belongs in the latter camp, a particularly apt metaphor since Michael Budde and John Wright hope to march religious colleges back to boot camp and reshape their flabby flanks. The goal of these essays is not just to “imagine some of the particulars of a new sort of Christian institution of higher learning” but also to jettison the “names, the books, the arguments that have made “Christianity and higher education’ a cottage industry of conferences, workshops, foundation grants, and consultancies over the past few decades” (8). The irony of announcing a coup funded by the very cottage industry the preface decrees appears to be lost on the editors (granting agencies include the Rhodes Foundation, Baylor University, and Point Loma Nazarene University itself) and signals a myopia reflected in many of the essays, but it is this very brashness that recommends the collection. By imagining the contours of institutions that do not exist, these essays provoke those of us who work at real-life colleges and universities to think more critically and perhaps expansively about our own schools.

The “new sort of Christian institution” this book imagines is a university that is truly church based (“ecclesiually based” is the preferred term), that takes as its foundation and touchstone the church as “a distinctive people called into being by the Holy Spirit to continue the priorities and practices of Jesus Christ in the world” (8). The goal of such a university is to form Christian disciples rather than produce citizens for a liberal democratic society. The essays, which cover topics as diverse as Great Books programs, the sciences, professional schools, Women’s Studies, and student life, vary widely in thoughtfulness and quality, but all raise serious questions about the very structure of Christian higher education.

What, for instance, are the consequences of using traditional metaphors of war, such as “the fight against disease” or the genetic “code,” in the life sciences? What would a cruciform narrative of the sciences look like? In what ways can Christian institutions of higher education resist the privatization of religion in decisions about curriculum, pedagogy, fundraising, and the like? How can Christian colleges and universities wrest the teaching of Scripture away from the professional guilds so that students learn to read the Bible theologically “as shaping and being shaped by the church’s ongoing struggle to live and worship faithfully before the Triune God” (172). Some of the most radical proposals, such as disbanding professional schools in order to escape the crushing demands of accreditation and careerism, dare to speak aloud what is merely muttered in many schools, but raise perplexing questions about the ethics of abandoning students and selected academic fields as well as the potential re-inscription of the secular/sacred divide.

The absent but presiding presence in this volume is Radical Orthodoxy as outlined
by John Milbank, whose essay forms the penultimate chapter. Radical Orthodoxy’s insistence on the primacy of Christ and the priority of the church, as well as its British-inflected outside view of North American institutions, provides a welcome and challenging voice in the field of higher education. But the volume slides around this central question: if Christian discipleship is the telos of the ecclesiologically based university, what strictures must be placed upon the hiring of faculty and the selection of students? How does the vision of a pluralist university shared by most of the authors accord with this goal? In fact, the tone of many essays as well as some of the specific proposals (such as dismantling professional schools) sound uncannily like the mission statements of bible colleges and conservative universities the authors either dismiss or despise. Only Wes Avrarn, in his trenchant critique of the chaplaincy, dares to suggest that “there may be things an ideal ecclesiologically based institution may yet learn from places like Grove City College or even from universities like Oral Roberts or Bob Jones,” although he hastens to add, “but I would not advocate their model” (228). Nor is it entirely clear how the goal of creating “educational and formative processes oriented toward discipleship and the church” (227) is substantially different from the Reformed understanding that there is no square inch of which God does not say, “This is mine,” or the Lutheran insistence on the suffering Christ in the world, or the evangelical call “For Christ and his kingdom”—all presumably “customary, but inadequate, ways of thinking” about Christian higher education (9). Similarly, many of the “new” ideas articulated in this volume are far from novel. William Cavanaugh’s argument that the university itself, rather than individual professors, should be the subject of academic freedom in order to maintain a proper diversity of institutions of higher education has been a staple of Christian college rhetoric for a number of years.

Furthermore, Radical Orthodoxy’s sacramental blinders occasionally cause serious misreadings of other Christian traditions, as when Barry Harvey attributes the moral strength of the French people in the village of Le Chambon, who harbored many Jews during World War II despite persecution and political pressure, to their rootedness in the “material sinews... of baptism and Eucharist” (65). Now as a Calvinist, I am thoroughly committed to the material reality and significance of the sacraments, but Harvey fails to credit the tradition of preaching in the Huguenot churches that formed and transformed the consciences of ordinary people. There were many Christians in France who participated in the “material sinews” of baptism and communion but who did not form communities to rescue Jews, presumably in part because they lacked the theological imagination that might have enabled them to see themselves in continuity with the Old Testament cities of refuge and the Old Testament people of God, a theological imagination inculcated in the villagers of Le Chambon through years of listening to sermons.

Throughout the volume, it is often difficult to see what connection the ecclesia, imagined by Milbank as “the taking up and intermingling of many human traditions” and therefore analogous to the “plural space of the academy” (246), has to actual, local, practicing bodies of believers. The sense of ecclesia as an abstraction may be due in part to the fact that all the essayists, with one exception, are theologians or philosophers, many of whom teach in seminars or other graduate schools rather than in undergraduate programs. The book as a whole would have benefited from dialogue between these thinkers and practicing scholars from the disciplines they critique. It is no accident that one of the best essays is by Wes Avrarn on the chaplaincy, a difficult vocation that he practiced with skill and not a few scars at Bates before he joined the faculty at Yale Divinity School.

Despite these quibbles, Conflicting Allegiances is well worth reading. It may not convince you to establish an ecclesiologically based university, but it will challenge you to rethink your own assumptions about and commitment to Christian higher education.
If a group of thoughtful people in the modern world were asked the question: What is the greatest tragedy and most continuing sorrow in life? there would at first be many different answers. Some would point to the fear of death both for themselves and for those whom they love. Others would be quite sure that the steady, relentless weight of financial worry is more tragic for the human spirit than any other single thing. And still others would point to the loss of friends who were on the way with us for a little while and then went away again. Perhaps many, under the storm and stress of modern life, would mention the secret fears of humanity, the inward hidden hurt, the tears and anxieties which men and women try to hide from themselves and from one another.

As the discussion proceeded, however, it is entirely possible that the group would agree that the most tragic thing in the modern world is its sense of incompleteness, of unfinished tasks, of things that men would like to do and cannot do. This is, of course, a characteristic of human life throughout the ages. There is always a profound sense of loose ends and frayed edges in all men and women who are aware of the undertones of life and living.

In all the long story of man’s life on earth there is only one exception to this general rule. Once, and only once, in the long story of human completeness was there one task that was done—completely, finally, absolutely—by every standard of measurement human or divine. The work of our Lord from the first cry in the manger to the last cry on the Cross was a divine symphony coming to its final and inevitable end. In a single stroke His cry, “It is Finished,” transformed our human sense of incompleteness, our unfinished lives, our loose ends and frayed edges, into something new, holy, complete, and eternal.

In order to understand that, one must look at Good Friday more closely. It was three o’clock in the afternoon. The hour of the end. The crowd had become more quiet. It was awed into silence by the strange noonday darkness and by the words of the Man on the Cross in the center. Men always grow still when they are face to face with death. Suddenly, into the mid-afternoon stillness, came the cry, “It is Finished.” This was the cry of a Worker whose work is done, of a Soldier whose victory is won, of a Savior whose purposes had been accomplished. The Son of Mary was going home leaving no chips in His shop, and the Son of God was returning to glory leaving no souls unredeemed. Here on Good Friday we have the cry of finished redemption, of accomplished atonement. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself! To many in the modern world—both within the Church and beyond its borders—all this does not mean very much. It has been worn by much use. Its meaning has been darkened by centuries of unbelief and mockery. It is time for us to see as the world balances on the edge of darkness that this is the greatest truth in all history. In one moment it restores the ancient, divine, and eternal balance between justice and mercy. Let modern man never forget that the justice of God demands punishment for sin. There is no way of getting around that. The figure of divine justice is not blindfolded. It sees sin in all its horror and blackness. There is no evasion of it. There is no getting away from it under the sobbing sky.

The Cross, however, also tells us something else. God does not only see sin, but He
also sees the sinner. He sees him only in mercy. Since the cry of our Lord, “It is Finished,” there is now a perfect balance between justice and mercy. Everything is tied together. There are no frayed edges and loose ends. Everything is done. Justice and mercy have met. This is final.

Our Lord has in His grip also these days, and these years, and what we have done to one another and to Him. His is the power of a finished task and a completed redemption. Let the modern world see that power and that mercy, and we shall have one more chance from the hand of God to find our way out of the noise and confusion of our anxious years.

ROOTEDNESS

Some of us are rocket
some are rock —
so how is stone decided?
by heat
by pressure
dissolution
change

How then re-assembled? ignited? launched?
By direction/determination? or what?
Some of us are burden, some are bird:
who imposes liberty?
Need we clothe our us in armor?
“ “ “ “ in chains?
or disinvest safety altogether?

Do we judge duty by utility? weight?
How divide pacifists
from their fists?

Some would suggest a scalpel...

— Our natures won't alter even with chainsaw.

But when clenched missiles powder the earth
and massy skies bring eagles down,
I see us:
spots in the carnage:
O carnations.

Duane Vorhees
The Lilly Fellows Program in Humanities and the Arts
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Topping’s landscape offers a view of beautiful blue sky, encouraging viewers to gaze heavenward during Easter season to welcome the light and color of spring, and to reflect on the beauty and meaning of the Easter holiday.
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