

2001

Full Issue, Number 12, Summer 2001

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

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

Augustana Digital Commons Citation

The Congregational and Synodical Mission Unit, The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (2001) "Full Issue, Number 12, Summer 2001," *Intersections*: Vol. 2001: No. 12, Article 1.

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/intersections/vol2001/iss12/1>

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

INTERSECTIONS

faith + life + learning

NUMBER TWELVE

SUMMER 2001



radical. adj.
From Greek,
radix. Of or
pertaining to
a root or
to roots.
A radical
inquiry, one
that digs at
the roots.

INTERSECTIONS

faith + life + learning

NUMBER 12

SUMMER 2001

Contributors

- Teaching as a Form of Servant Leadership*.....4
Leonard Schulze
- The Vocation of a Lutheran College*.....11
L. DeAne Lagerquist
- Perspectives on Institutional Service: All Hands on Deck*.....22
Ruth Henricks
- A River Runs Through It: CLU as a Church-Related University*.....21
A. Joseph Everson

INTERSECTIONS

SUMMER 2001

Published by : The Division for Higher Education & Schools
The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Published at Capital University, Columbus, Ohio USA 43209

Arne Selbyg, *Publisher*

Tom Christenson, *Editor*

Marisa Rose Cull, *Student Assistant*

Vicki Miller, *Secretary*

Editorial Board: Timothy A. Bennett, Wittenberg Univ.; Karla Bohmbach, Susquehanna Univ.; DeAne Lagerquist, St. Olaf College; Anne Pedersen, Augustana College (Sioux Falls).

Cover: Sig Rauspern, Iowa Seed Catalogs

Sponsored by the



PURPOSE STATEMENT

This publication is by and largely for the academic communities of the twenty-eight colleges and universities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. It is published by the Division for Higher Education and Schools of the ELCA. The publication presently has its home at Capital University, Columbus, Ohio which has generously offered leadership, physical and financial support as an institutional sponsor for the inauguration of the publication.

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

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

FROM THE PUBLISHER

The Vocation of a Lutheran College conferences have been possible because of generous support from Lutheran Brotherhood and the Lilly Endowment, and the Lutheran Brotherhood Foundation has also provided funding for the printing cost of *INTERSECTIONS*. When the vocation conferences had become established the ELCA Division for Higher Education and Schools began to seek funding for a more select faculty development project, "The Lutheran Academy of Scholars in Higher Education." Again the Lutheran Brotherhood Foundation and the Lilly Endowment came through. Thanks to their generosity, each year since 1999 ten to twelve scholars from Lutheran colleges and universities and Lutheran scholars from other institutions have been selected to participate in a two week seminar during the summer, and to meet for a couple of days the following winter and the following summer. During the opening seminar they spend the mornings under the leadership of an eminent scholar in conversations about topical issues where faith and learning intersect. In the afternoons and evenings they work on their own scholarly projects, and study hard for the remaining seminar sessions. During the follow up sessions they hear from each other about the progress they have made on their scholarly projects, and give each other critique, ideas and encouragement.

The first three years the opening seminars have been held at Harvard University, under the leadership of Dr. Ronald Thiemann, the John Lord O'Brian Professor of Divinity. In 1999 and 2000 the theme was "Finding Our Voice - Christian Faith and Critical Vision." This year the theme has been "The Lutheran Public Intellectual: Faith, Reason and the Arts." There is no question in my mind that it is both because of the leadership of professor Thiemann and because of the excellence of the participants that the academies have

been a success. Since I had the privilege of sitting in on the first of these two-week sessions in 1999, I can tell you that the seminars had the kind of academic intellectual exchanges that we most of the time only dream about having at our own institutions.

In 2002 the academy will move to the University of California, Berkeley, and the scholarly leadership will be provided by professor Ted Peters. The theme will deal with the intersection of faith and science, but the exact title has not yet been selected. But if you want to be part of a great academic experience, look for our announcement, or contact me now to get on our mailing list so you receive a copy of it, and then send in a well-supported application.

Arne Selbyg
Director for Colleges and Universities

FROM THE EDITOR

The first three offerings in this issue were first given as talks at the Vocation of a Lutheran College Conference held the summer of 2000 at Dana College in Blair, Nebraska. Leonard Schulze had been asked to keynote the conference before he had become the executive director of DHES. So we thought we were getting a faculty member as speaker but got our new division leader as well.

These pieces illustrate the advantage of hearing a diversity of voices. Each speaks to the call of learning and teaching in a different voice informed by personality, experience, as well as by academic discipline and work experience. We hope that they provoke our readers as much as they provoked those of us who heard them as presentations.

Speaking of provocations, let me recommend to you two books I have recently read. 1.) Peter C. Hodgson. *God's Wisdom: Toward a Theology of Education*, Westminster John Knox Press (1995). This is not a book about theological education, but a book that attempts to see the task of education (generally considered -- it's not just about faith-related education) as a movement toward God. The consequence of this vision changes both how we understand the task of education and how we understand the relation of God to the world. Irenaeus's axiom may be as adequate a summary of Hodgson's view as anything: "The glory of God is human beings made fully alive ... the aliveness of human beings is in beholding God." 2.) Douglas Sloan. *Faith and Knowledge: Mainline Protestantism and American Higher Education*, Westminster John Knox Press (1994). This book was recommended to me by Paul Dovre and I thank him for putting me in touch with it. It focuses on the relation between faith and knowledge in higher education and the historical process by which these two ideas have become pretty thoroughly dissociated from each other. This dissociation left faith-related institutions hard-pressed to explain what it meant to be a college / university related essentially to a faith tradition. Sloan reads the history of theology in the 20th century as attempts to answer that question and he believes that the attempts have, for the most part, failed. Sloan thinks that the relevance has been lost and that we need to rethink our epistemology, the way we think about knowledge, in order to recover it. This is a challenging book which invites responses from thinkers in the sciences as well as in philosophy and theology.

Tom Christenson
Capital University

TEACHING AS A FORM OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP

Leonard Schulze

Oh! Blessed rage for order, pale Ramon,
The maker's rage to order words of the sea,
Words of the fragrant portals, dimly-starred,
And of ourselves and of our origins,
In ghostlier demarcations, keener sounds.
-Wallace Stevens

PROLOGUE ON PERSPECTIVE

The reflections that follow stem from 30 years of experience as a classroom teacher in higher education. They represent neither a personal memoir nor a systematic analysis of issues surrounding the role of the teacher/professor in higher education in the year 2000. In what I take to be solidly *Lutheran* fashion, their status is more...paradoxical.

The main paradox of this essay is that it is offered to you as both parochial *and* comprehensive. It is *parochial* because in the final analysis it is an apologia for the vocation of teaching in a Lutheran college or university. It is *comprehensive* because I find that the distinctively Lutheran understandings of education, of teaching, and of learning are remarkably encompassing, empowering, and liberating. I hope to persuade you that this *parochial comprehensiveness* is a paradox to be embraced, rather than a contradiction to be avoided.

Like the Incarnate Word, the universality of our work as educators in Lutheran colleges and universities is scandalously grounded in its very particularity. It is important that we hold up these paradoxical--even scandalous--understandings of our work. These understandings can be a precious counter-cultural--even prophetic--voice in contemporary academia, where a post-Enlightenment paradigm of instrumentalist rationality is increasingly viewed as the only game in town.

The relationship of these reflections to Lutheran theology, however, indeed to theology in general, is rather more inductive than deductive. I invite you first to join me in some phenomenological reflections about the structure and intent of our work as educators. Only after we have recaptured some of these roots of our work will we attempt to link our findings to theological concepts and to Lutheran ideas about God, human beings, and the relationship between them.

The most important claims I will make are

1. that teaching is a precious and paradoxical form of servant leadership, and
2. that exercising that leadership in a Lutheran institution of higher education is a distinctive and valuable vocation.

And my ultimate purpose is to provoke you to commit yourself to ongoing discernment and nurturing of your own distinctive ways of embracing that vocation in servant leadership.

Section I explores some features of language and politics in the current state of the academy. These brief observations will conclude with a description of some of my own ways of thinking about things as a student and professor of the humanities.

Section II explores the educational process, and the role of teaching in that process, as a form of purposive leadership. This section includes brief characterizations of the leadership implicit in the pedagogy of some famous teachers, and an invitation to reflect on your own models of pedagogy.

Section III consists of a brief descriptive taxonomy of the four *kinds* of learning that we as teachers are always engaged in leading our students toward, whether we recognize it or not. I believe that this taxonomy, albeit necessarily reductive, is reasonably comprehensive, at least for the purposes of reflecting together about our vocation as teachers. This section concludes with the assertion that only the paradoxical concept of *servant leadership* adequately captures the vocation of the Lutheran teacher.

In Section IV, the final open-ended section, I offer a series of theses about education, about Lutheranism, and about their relationship. This format is intended to evoke Martin Luther's own famous use of theses as evocative invitations to discourse in community. Concluding with these theses is not mere homage to St. Martin of Wittenberg, but an affirmation of a style of inquiry and discourse that we would do well to reclaim as appropriate in the academy.

I. ACADEMIC POLITICS, LANGUAGE, AND MY METHODOLOGY

As a student and professor of the humanities, I have an

interest in how the *words* we use are shaped by such things as language structure, history, culture, and individual creativity, and in how those words in turn shape the very questions we are able to ask.

In some sense, of course, all academics are preoccupied with the power of language; we are, after all, a guild of talking heads, teaching others to talk as we do. Some of us, especially analytical philosophers, would claim that our collective task is to delimit the treacherous slippage of language as much as possible; their ideal would be to avoid language altogether if we could. Others, like poets in the vein of Sydney and Shelley and linguists in the tradition of Sapir and Whorf, delight in exploring how our languages and other symbol systems inevitably prestructure our apprehension of reality. Still others, like continental philosophers in the tradition of Nietzsche and Derrida, lead us into semiotic fun-houses where we perpetually confront the futility of our desires to grasp the fullness of Being.

In my view, most of the academic and political culture wars being waged these days can be plotted as disagreements about the meaning of the age-old insight that human beings are symbol-using animals. But I think it would be a misuse of our time to argue whether we should align ourselves with postmodernists or neoconservatives in these culture wars.

I propose to cut through the Gordian knot by simply taking a brief look at the etymology of the word "education" and of a few related words. Within limits, we can thereby gain historical and cultural *perspective* on the very concept of education, and on related *praxes* that we might otherwise take for granted in the usage of our own time and place.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* tells us that the word "education" came into English from the Latin *educare*, which originally meant "to rear, to bring up, as one does children or young animals." In the idiom of contemporary American English, we might say that the historically foundational sense of "to educate" is therefore "to raise," and that to be "well-educated" is to be "raised well." I find it interesting and instructive that originally this notion of *educare* included not only the notion of teaching and training, but also that of nourishing--of ensuring that *all* the requirements for growth and development of a youth were being met.

The *OED* also tells us that the Late Latin word *educare* was in turn derived from a compound of two other Latin words, *e* and *ducere*. Now the root sense of *e-ducere* is "to

lead forth," or "to pull out." This sense of "leading or pulling" at the heart of the word "education" may be found in other common English words that share their origin in the Latin verb *ducere*. "Productive" (pulling forward), "reductive" (pulling back), "inductive" (leading in), "deductive" (leading down or away) "ductile" (pullable), and "duke" (leader) are a few that come to mind.

These root meanings of the word "education," if we take them seriously, enable a radically renewed awareness of the rich connections between "education" and other qualities and concepts that we don't normally associate with it nowadays. For me, the concept of *leadership* jumps out of this etymological nexus.

The connotations and connections between education and leadership function not only in the more commonly known Latinate component of the heritage of English. There are uncannily analogous roots at work in the German expressions for education. Take *Erziehung*, for example. *Ziehen* is the everyday German word for "to pull," so *Erziehung* is, quite literally, "pulling forth." *Ziehen* is also the verbal form of the noun *Zug*, which means "train," "draft," or "characteristic." This noun has found its way into English, as in *tug-of-war* and *tugboat*. This Germanic strand of the story suggests that the activity of "train-ing," of pulling into shape, of tugging is inherent to the meaning of the world "education."

Of course, the more elevated expression "Bildung" is also used in German, usually to connote the acquisition of putatively higher-level cultural skills and awareness. Here, too, however, the implied role of the teacher as "shaper" and "former" of the student is clear, as it is in the case of the analogous French expression, "formation."

The etymological evidence would suggest, then, that "education" has historically been viewed quite literally as a form of leadership. Our forebears apparently took it for granted that this form of leadership involved at least the following:

- 1) nurturing the student
- 2) training or "pulling forth" the student, an active and purposive leading from one place, condition, or shape to another.

Underlying the ideas of nurture, training, and leading is a clear sense that education is never a *thing* or a *state*, but always a *process* that involves a nurturer, a trainer, a leader--that is, a *teacher*. As the primary *agent* of the

educational process, the teacher/leader always brings certain assumptions--conscious or unconscious--to his or her leadership. The most significant of these is the assumption of a relationship to the student, to the trainee. As we proceed, I invite you to reflect about your own assumptions regarding this relationship. Is this a relationship of control? Of Pygmalion-like ego-investment? Of condescending good will? Of...love?

There are of course, many possible ways to conceive of the teacher-learner relationship. It might be worthwhile to take a brief look at a few representative models, and see whether we recognize ourselves in any of the mirrors they provide. Consider, for example, the Allegory of the Cave in the *Republic*, where Plato argues that only the enlightened philosopher-king could properly serve as a teacher, because only the philosopher-king has been freed from the shackles of illusion that constrain all the other denizens of the cave. On this account, the teacher makes a kind of noble sacrifice. Having attained enlightenment, the teacher voluntarily subjects himself again to darkness, and to the cries of pain from his students when he forces their shadow-conditioned eyes to turn to the light. He is the archetypal sage on the stage. He would, however, like Marlene Dietrich, rather be alone. It is a noble sacrifice, though, worthy in the eyes of the republic, whose well-being depends on it. Do you see yourself or any of your colleagues in this picture?

Or do you see yourself or your colleagues in some of Plato's other well-known analogies of the process of education and the role of the teacher? In the *Theatetus*, the teacher is presented not as a condescending philosopher-king, but as a midwife. In the *Meno*, a patient and attentive teacher helps to bring into the consciousness of the slave boy something that was always already there. It just needed to be "unforgotten" (*anamnesia*). The truth (*aletheia*) just needed to be roused from its lethargy. Maybe these models make us think more of our role as a guide on the side. Is this a feminine model of the role of the teacher, as opposed to the masculine model of the *Republic*?

Or perhaps we should revisit that archetypal critical thinker, the Socrates of the *Apology*. You will remember that Socrates claims that it is impossible for him to be guilty of *teaching* Athenian youth about false gods, because he doesn't actually teach or profess *anything*. All he does is ask a few simple questions about such important things as virtue and justice, in an honest search to find a truly wise man who knows what he's talking about. It

turns out nobody does, especially nobody in any position of authority and responsibility in the *polis*. Reluctantly--so he says--Socrates must conclude that he is, after all, pretty wise. At least he *knows* that he doesn't know anything--unlike all those pompous senators, deans, presidents, preachers, bishops, and board members. Anything familiar here?

One final example: Maybe your theory and praxis as a teacher resonates with Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. You may seek a truly dialectical relationship with others, so that *both* you and your interlocutors may be liberated from the limited imperialistic conceptions of the world that come with your respective ideologies. From this interaction and bonafide dialogue, there should emerge a "true word" that will transform the world for all involved. In this relationship of parity, the implied hierarchical relationship between teacher and student is suspended. In fact, nobody can accurately be called a teacher, yet everybody should view everybody else as a teacher. How often have you said, or heard one of your colleagues say: "I learn so much from my students?"

We could extend these examples more or less at will, and I invite you to continue this reflective game on your own. The point I want to make is that all of us are probably more familiar than we realize with a wide variety of *models* of teaching. But these models come to us attached to a series of ethical, epistemological, and even metaphysical assumptions about education and about human nature.

We need to reflect about these assumptions. We should regard no model as the "standard" or "default" model. There are *choices* to be made. And my suggestion is very simple: One of the best ways to discern the appropriate role and function of the teacher is to approach every teaching/learning situation with the question of *leadership* in mind:

Who is leading whom? The identity, character, authority, and credibility of the leader are important questions. And at least one fascinating mystery about human learning is that to some degree we seem capable of *self-guided* learning, of auto-didactic efficacy. What kind of teaching appropriately respects such power and freedom?

From where to where? To what ends? In anticipation of the claims made upon us as Lutheran teachers, one might ponder: How did/does God approach the challenge of leading/teaching people? What does the incarnational theology of the cross have to do with being a good teacher?

Of course, getting *accurate* answers to these questions may not be so simple, and they may vary from case to case. Sometimes it's hard to tell the leader from the led, the puller from the pullee. As the father of six-year-old and a twelve-year-old, I can attest to that. I of course do my best to "educate" my kids, that is, to nurture them into full selfhood and to raise them up in proper decorum, skills, and behavior.

But I know very well that it is often I who am nurtured and who learn from them--things that I have never known or have long since forgotten. My son's art work, for example, teaches me to see everyday objects in new and striking ways, and my daughter's spontaneous dancing reveals to me new and wondrous synergies between sound and motion. I am usually glad these role reversals happen, but they can make you humble about your role as parent/educator. And they can prove to you that it's not always easy to answer the question: "Who's leading/pulling whom?"

Sometimes it's just not possible to identify the starting place or the ending place of the teaching/learning process until *after* you find yourself at the new place. Most of us involved as professionals in higher education believe that the places we are moving toward, and leading our students toward, are somehow *better* than where we, and our students, were before. Education, we believe, involves an *increase* in something. When we teachers are asked to be more specific about the nature of this increase, we generally respond a little impatiently, because it should be obvious that we're talking about increases in awareness, understanding, appreciation, or skill.

But these sorts of questions about education are legitimate, and the answers to them can only be fully appreciated if we keep before us the question of the *purposiveness* of our *leadership*: "From where to where?"

III. A TAXONOMY OF LEARNING: WHERE TEACHERS LEAD THEIR STUDENTS

I offer you this taxonomy not as an end in itself, but rather as a heuristic device to help us think as clearly as we can about the purposiveness of the leadership inherent in our activity as teachers--in any setting, but particularly in the setting of a Lutheran college or university. I suggest to you that all learning can be seen as an instance of one or more of the following, and that each kind of learning may require its own form of leadership:

- A. Learning "About" (Information)
- B. Learning "Why" (Analysis/Critical Thinking)
- C. Learning "How" (Praxis/Work)
- D. Learning "For" (Teleology)

My descriptions of these four kinds of learning represent distillations of my own experiences, study, and reflection over approximately 35 years as a student and as a professor in higher education. Let me briefly explain what I mean by each one.

Learning "about" things is a pretty universal human enterprise. When you learn "about" things, you learn *that* something is the case. You learn that leaves are (generally) green, that things fall when you drop them (at least under certain conditions), that it gets hot in Texas in August, that Tokyo is a city in Japan, that in English grammar the object of a preposition takes the objective case. On the simplest level, this sort of knowledge may be thought of as "information."

To the degree that such information accords with how things are in the world, or at least with how things are generally thought to be in the world, we refer to such information as "facts." Much of our learning happens in this category; it consists in absorbing and retaining information.

Learning information is unquestionably important. *All* education is dependent upon our becoming *aware of*, or *familiar with*, facts. No matter how sophisticated, theoretically astute, or creative a person is or becomes, broad familiarity with facts of all sorts is going to be expected of an educated person. We are always learning them, whether they are of any immediate use to us or not. We absorb them through television, newspapers, lectures, conversations, and games. Such ongoing learning *about* things is part of what we mean when we say that an educated person has a responsibility to have an *objective* relationship with reality. With regard to this kind of learning, the leadership responsibility of teachers looks something like this:

As purposive teachers, we have the responsibility for helping to provide access to accurate and reliable information, and to ensure that our students achieve appropriate familiarity with that information. We are called to lead our students from ignorance to awareness.

But of course being familiar with information alone, no matter how extensive, does not qualify anyone as an

educated person. Human beings, because of apparently inherent curiosity, are not content to know *that* things are the case. We seem compelled, at least collectively, to some understanding of *why* things are the way they are. We seek to understand cause, history, development, becoming. As we move from mere awareness *that* something is the case to being able to give an account of *why* it is the case, we say we are engaging in "critical thinking," which involves not merely perception, but judgment, logic, and reflection. Because we now have *interpretations* of facts, we are able to *understand* and *explain* them, at least within some contexts.

These two kinds of learning--learning "about" and learning "why"--may be pretty reliably found in any community of higher learning worth its salt. And you'll certainly find them in abundance at Lutheran colleges and universities. These kinds of learning are almost universally associated, at least within the world of modern Western higher education, with *homo sapiens*--with humans as beings who claim to *know*. In some ways the almost unquestioned respect for these two kinds of knowing has set aside modern universities from almost every other kind of institution in our culture.

I say "almost" unquestioned, because the analytical and experimental aspects of critical awareness have in fact come under fire from some quarters as inherently invasive and destructive. Yet the *freedom* to learn *about* things, and, within certain ethical limits, *why* things are the way they are, has in fact become a widely known and appreciated feature of the purposive environment of higher education. This is good, and it is important. Without this basic respect for learning about the way things are, and learning why they are that way, universities would probably simply replicate or reinforce the prejudices and fantasies of those who have not bothered to discipline themselves to such learning. Therefore the following kind of leadership of the teacher is essential:

As purposive teachers, we have the responsibility for the ethical preservation of an environment in which information, both familiar and unfamiliar, is subjected to the free scrutiny of understanding. We should not take such an environment for granted, because it is not clear that any other institutions in our culture have an equal stake in nurturing and preserving it. We are called to lead our students from passive reception of information to active and critical interpretation of information.

But of course human beings are not merely disembodied

minds or talking heads. *Homo sapiens* though we may be, we are also *homo faber*. We *make* things, both of ourselves and in the world. We are not merely bystanders who perceive and cogitators who understand, but agents who act in the world. In so doing, we *apply* our awareness and our critical understanding of the world and of one another. For such application to be effective, we must also learn *how* to perform effectively. We must acquire and practice certain skills, which require discipline and habit.

A singer learns *about* certain sounds and *understands how* they are produced, but does not stop there. She learns these things not just for their own sake, but so that she can learn *how* to sing beautifully. A writer learns *about* grammar, spelling and diction, and understands *why* certain organizational structures will work with a given readership, not just for their own sake, but so that he can learn *how* to write effectively.

In *using* our factual and critical learning, we take it back *out* of the realm of pure "freedom" and harness it to some performance or production. In an important way, we see our humanness *realized* in such performance or production. Such learning is part of the heritage and purpose of ELCA institutions. In short, while sheer learning and curiosity are encouraged, *so too* is the sort of learning that will enable our students to make themselves *useful*.

As purposive teachers, we should help our students relate their knowledge of information and their theoretical understanding to relevant praxis and meaningful work. In this context, the prevalent dichotomies between "liberal learning" and "applied learning," and between theory and practice, should be viewed as largely false problems. We are called to lead our students from awareness and understanding to a skillful and disciplined use of that knowledge and understanding.

But useful *for what*? Without effective engagement with both short-term and ultimate *purposes* for which we pursue all this learning, it remains unfocused and ungrounded. It is in linking our awareness, our critical understanding, and our action in the world to *purposiveness* that all these kinds of learning have meaning. By definition, such purposiveness is larger than the individual self. The Greeks, particularly Aristotle, had a profound understanding of the role of such purposiveness in creating the conditions for a meaningful life. Aristotle called it "teleology," after the Greek word for purpose, *telos*.

There is no question, at least to my mind, that this last kind

of learning is the kind that has caused human beings the most difficulty. After all, our apprehension of our ultimate purposes is cloudy, isn't it? Especially in modern times, we have learned to be actively suspicious of people, nations, and religions who put too much emphasis on this sort of thing. All too often, the invocation of purpose has stifled the development of the *other* kinds of learning we have been discussing. When we are confronted with people who tell us we should subscribe to "the" absolute, we rightly question "whose absolute?"

In fact, when we are confronted with the claim that a teacher should be a leader, part of us is conditioned to resist this claim. because it smacks of authority, hierarchy, and loss of the student's autonomy.

On the other hand, we know in our hearts that it is all too convenient to misuse such appropriate skepticism as a reason for *permanently* pulling back from investing ourselves in larger purposes. All too convenient, and all too tragic. For fear of being duped, many people refuse to invest their lives in anything larger than themselves. Yet such cynicism is the surest way to stop the educational process short of its full flowering.

Moreover, it is the surest way to live an ultimately meaningless life mired in anomy, in apathy, or even in despair. All our skills and all our awareness and all the sharpness of our critical thinking will careen around aimlessly. Goethe knew this modern malady well, and portrayed it vividly in his play *Faust*. Along the way to re-engaging with meaningful purpose in his life, Goethe's hero did make some bad choices, but he was eventually redeemed because he kept caring about something larger than himself.

As purposive teachers, it is our responsibility to actively nurture an environment in which the alphas and omegas of our existence, the big questions of faith and commitment, may be safely pursued in conjunction with the more truncated, but vital learning of information, critical awareness, and skills.

As far as I can tell, every ELCA college or university seeks to engage its students in *all four* of these kinds of learning. Moreover, most of them do it in such a way as to make it difficult for students to cordon off these four kinds of learning into separate areas. It's usually not going to be the case that a student will learn *information* only in, say, a first-year course in physics, that a student's *critical thinking* will be engaged only in a logic course in

philosophy, that a student's *performance skills* will be developed only in theatre courses, or that a student's *faith and values* will be engaged only in theology courses. At least, that is, if we teachers are doing our jobs right. If we are, then our students will experience *each* of these kinds of learning in *all* of the forty-plus courses they will take on the way to their degrees.

Being a student in this kind of learning environment should be an exhilarating, marvelous, and life-changing experience. If we teachers do our jobs right, our students will master wondrous information they had never dreamed of. They will be invited to develop new and critical understandings of everything from the New Testament to capitalism. They will further develop skills they already had and discover talents they didn't know they had. They will wrestle with devils--and with angels, and find themselves discerning their vocations in life. The good news is that we get to be part of it all, and see them grow. And if we approach our teaching in this comprehensive way, then we, too, can continue to have marvelous, life-changing, and exhilarating experiences.

One last perspective on this four-fold process of education before I conclude with my ten theses. It is a nearly universal cliché that education involves liberation. Many universities--including public ones--have adopted a version of the Biblical promise as a virtual mission statement: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

We may now be in a better position to give this common platitude more meaningful content, provided we think of freedom not merely as freedom *from* some kind of constraint or other. Unfortunately, such a negative concept of freedom is widespread in our culture. The problem is that once we've achieved liberation from constraints, we don't necessarily have anything *positive*.

There is a flip-side to freedom *from*, however, and that is freedom *to*. Freedom *to* is inherent in the purposive definition of teaching as leadership that I have been attempting to outline. *Both* freedom "from" and freedom "to" come into sharper focus when we as teachers conceive of our role as leaders to help our students achieve the four kinds of learning we have been discussing.

This role *can* of course degenerate into tyranny. But let us be bold and clear on this point. We usually recognize the difference between a true leader and a tyrant. So too can we be confident that we can recognize a true teacher

motivated by a positive and enabling sense of leadership. The answer lies in the paradox of the *servant* leader--one who leads not to achieve his or her greater glory, but to enable the student to discern his or her God-given vocation, and to equip him or her to live it fully. In this *imitatio Christi*, the teacher's own true vocation is achieved.

IV. TEN THESES FOR DISCUSSION AMONG THOSE WHO TEACH IN A LUTHERAN COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY

I conclude with an invitation, indeed an exhortation, for you to explore the following theses about your work as a teacher in a Lutheran college or university. Ideally, such exploration will happen in discussion or even disputation with your colleagues in community. It is, after all, in community that such words are fleshed out.

1. If one is not clear what one is aiming at, anything one hits can be described as a bullseye. Such a *laissez-faire* approach to the teaching function should not be defended under the contemporary rubric of academic freedom.
2. Teaching is a purposive activity. Its purposiveness involves nurture, as well as clarity about the kinds of learning involved.
3. All who profess to teach should be engaged in the definition and defense of their understanding of its purposiveness.
4. Every definition of purpose involves political and ethical choices. The "default" settings in contemporary secular higher education, or in other institutions of our culture, should not necessarily be our guide.
5. The disciplinary methodologies and practices of

graduate training and of much academic life, in themselves, provide inadequate models for effective, purposive teaching in institutions of higher education related to the ELCA.

6. Lutheran theology and the tradition of Lutheran Christianity provide a number of concepts, intellectual habits, and behaviors that can help us become better teachers. Among the most important of these are:

-The Gospel liberates us from the need to use knowledge as power.

-We are called to love our neighbors, including our students.

-A Christian is free from all masters, but is called to be the perfect servant of all.

-All truth is God's truth, and the free use of reason is one of God's gifts to us.

- "Disputatio" is an appropriate expression of faith, not a sign of its absence.

-All people have vocations; these vocations are discerned in community.

-All things human, including the university *and* the church, are "semper reformanda."

7. We can and should lead our students from the tyranny of ignorance to the freedom of awareness.

8. We can and should lead our students from the tyranny of rote knowledge to the freedom of critical understanding.

9. We can and should lead our students from the tyranny of incompetence to the freedom of skillful action.

10. We can and should lead our students from the tyranny of anomy and isolation to the freedom of purposive lives in community.

Leonard Schulze is the executive director of the Division for Higher Education and Schools of the ELCA.

THE VOCATION OF A LUTHERAN COLLEGE

in the midst of American Higher Education

L. DeAne Lagerquist

My task is to examine the vocation of Lutheran colleges in the midst of American higher education, to consider both the work to which these schools are called and the manner in which that work is carried out in a way that suggests how the schools compare to other American schools and to one another. Behind this descriptive task there lurks, unarticulated, a dual demand for justification. First, show that the designation Lutheran is significant now, not only in the past; and second, show that it matters in ways that make the schools worth maintaining and attending in the future.

Colleges and universities are communities united in their commitment to the life of the mind and to the centrality of ideas within that life; often they are communities characterized also by internal disputes about how best to cultivate that life and about its connection with other aspects of human endeavor. Issues such as the value of experiential learning, the significance of personal identity to scholarship, and the proper role of religious conviction in academic life have focused the discussions in the last decades of the 20th century, but the underlying concerns are perennial.

Here I explore the commitments and practices of Lutheran schools. First I do this by placing them in the context of American higher education. This chronological account suggests both that the 28 colleges and universities now associated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America have much in common with other schools and that there are significant variations within the Lutheran set. I then turn to consider the basis upon which these schools might be regarded as Lutheran, in contrast to secular schools or other sorts of religious ones and in view of their differences from one another. Leaving behind nominal, historical, and institutional matters I examine the tradition embodied in characteristic practices that engender specific virtues suggesting that explicitly Lutheran reasons can be given for these.¹

FOUNDINGS AND FOUNDATIONS

Although I was an undergraduate history major and earned two graduate degrees in historical fields, I began my teaching career knowing woefully little about the history of

higher education. Unfortunately few faculty members come out of graduate school informed about these topics.

Our ignorance prevents a clear view either of the whole of the enterprise or of the place our schools occupy in it. My plot is not the decline of authentic religious life on campuses under the rubric of either secularization or disengagement nor is it a rebuttal of such a thesis.² Rather I intend to provide a brief chronological account that draws attention to commonality and difference among Lutheran colleges and between them and other American colleges. I do this because I'm convinced that knowing how our schools and their work fit into this larger scheme will allow us to understand more about our work and to do it better.

The founding of American institutions of higher education is generally told in three phases. The first began, of course, in 1636 with the establishment of Harvard College, a small, religiously affiliated, school on the model of English colleges, a school whose "vocation", if you will, included that "Every one shall consider the main end of his life and studies to know God and Jesus Christ, which is eternal life . . . and therefore to lay Christ in the bottom as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning."³ Stated more generally, the purpose of producing "both a learned clergy and an educated gentry"⁴ was characteristic of all nine colleges founded prior to the American Revolution and of the scores established in the following decades. This remained the primary goal and usual model for American higher education until the mid-19th century. Following the Civil War another model appeared, the model of the modern research university devoted to the production of knowledge and specialized education of advanced students. The third phase, beginning in the 1940s, is characterized by rapid expansion: more students, bigger schools, new schools including many with two-year, non-residential programs. It may be that we are now well into a fourth phase in which the idea that learning occurs in the company of other students and teachers who share a specific place and time is under extreme challenge. Certainly at schools such as these associated with the ELCA we are no longer in a growth mode as is attested by frequent use of phrases such as "belt-tightening", "down-sizing", "out-sourcing", "strategic planning," "assessment," and "the culture of evidence."

THE OLD TIME COLLEGE

The aims and programs of the nine colonial colleges had much in common with one another and with the English tradition of the liberal arts which, historian Christopher Lucas suggests, included a “combination of literary training, religious piety, and courtly etiquette” that produced “an archetypal conception of the ideally-educated person as a ‘Christian gentleman.’”⁵ The colleges’ programs consisted almost entirely of rhetoric, grammar, and theology taught by Christian gentlemen whose pedagogical method, most often lectures, was designed to transfer a defined body of knowledge to their students. Students were not taught how to learn, they were given what was then judged to be the treasures of Classical and Christian culture as the foundation for development of Christian character and responsible participation in civic life, often as clergymen. Close supervision of students’ life outside the classroom, or at least efforts to do so, was also intended to prepare students for civic life. The number of students was small; in a peak year (1770) the total number enrolled at Yale was 413.⁶

While these schools shared goals and methods and were alike in placing Christianity at the center of both, the particular sort of Christianity varied. At the outset Harvard’s supporters were Congregationalists, but by the early 18th century conservatives, suspicious that the school’s orthodoxy had been undermined, established The Collegiate School in Connecticut. (The school was renamed Yale in recognition of a major gift in kind from Elihu Yale.) Similarly, Yale’s second, less enthusiastic thoughts about the Great Awakening contributed to the founding of Princeton by “New Side” (pro-revivalist) Presbyterians. The “sectarian” importance of establishing a college was related to the college’s task in preparing clerical leadership for the sponsoring party. Using the language of a Harvard brochure published in 1643, one may point to the sponsors’ dread “to leave an illiterate Ministry to Churches.”⁷ Although there were Lutherans in the colonies from the 1620s, and although Henry M. Muhlenberg, the patriarch of American Lutheranism who arrived in the 1740s, was concerned about the education of potential clergy, Lutherans did not found or sponsor a college in this period.

Having pointed to the identification of these schools with particular religious parties, I hasten to offer three cautions. First, I have used the word parties rather than denominations quite deliberately because in this time period nothing so organized or formal as a denomination

existed. Second, at this stage identification with a religious party did not render a college ineligible for public financial support. William and Mary’s receipt of duties paid on skins and furs and income generated by a tobacco tax provides a vivid example of the typical blurring of public/private status. This blurring continued even after 1819 when a U.S. Supreme Court decision regarding Dartmouth College began to clarify matters. Third, despite distinctions between the religious character of the colleges—Brown was Baptist, William & Mary was Anglican, Columbia was Dutch Reformed—the student body was sure to be more heterogeneous. There were no official standards of belief for enrollment.

Following the Revolution what we now call the “old time college” model remained the ideal with many—individuals, groups of church folks or official religious groups, and municipal boosters—rushing to found schools as the population expanded in numbers and across the continent. In the two decades between 1782 and 1802 nineteen colleges were founded; by the outbreak of the Civil War the total number reached 250 including Indiana College in Bloomington, Emory in Georgia, Roman Catholic Notre Dame, and several Lutheran colleges.⁸ The stated purposes of these schools were consistent with earlier concerns. A board member at the College of California put it this way: “to make men more manly, and humanity more humane; to augment the discourse of reason, intelligence and faith, and to kindle the beacon fires of truth on all the summits of existence.”⁹ Other leaders were more explicitly Christian in their aims, particularly those persons deeply affected by the Second Great Awakening, those concerned to evangelize on the western frontier, or those Protestants who feared Roman Catholic expansion. Churches with a strong tradition of an educated clergy, such as Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Lutherans, were eager founders of new institutions; Antebellum Presbyterians had 49 colleges.¹⁰ Tory Female Seminary (1821) and Mount Holyoke Seminary (1837) lead the way in providing educational opportunities for young women. Oberlin College, profoundly influenced by revivalism and committed to social reform agendas, begin to admit women and people of color. By the 1850s a small handful of colleges for blacks were in operation.¹¹

Regardless of who founded these schools or who staffed them, they were alike in their programs and in their small size.¹² If a calculated average enrollment was about 250, the actual enrollment at many schools was far less.¹³ Even at the so-called state schools Protestant culture and influence pervaded leadership and community life. There,

as at schools which claimed religious identity, the president often was a clergyman and usually he was personally responsible for college governance. In the late 1820s the Yale Report asserted the foundational purposes of collegiate education: "The two great points to be gained in intellectual culture, are the *discipline* and the *furniture* of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge."¹⁴ However, this assertion, perhaps better RE-assertion, was not universally supported. Indeed debates about educational objectives and specific curricular reforms preceded the Yale Report. The standard classical course was being supplemented by literary and scientific tracks that took account of appeals for more practical learning and responded to the expectation that education had an economic benefit for the student as well as a civic one for the nation. By the late 19th century students at schools that adopted an elective system were able to select specific classes rather than committing to a prescribed series of courses.

LUTHERAN COLLEGES

More than half of the 28 colleges and universities affiliated with the ELCA were founded between 1832 and 1870. Others that no longer exist, either due to merger or to closure, were also begun. All except California Lutheran were established in some form prior to 1900. Here we can not look carefully at each school as Richard Solberg does in his useful volume, *Lutheran Higher Education in North America*¹⁵, or as is done in histories of individual schools. I commend those to you, but here use broader strokes to convey some patterns—ways that these schools were like or unlike other "old time colleges," like each other, and distinct from each other. The simple assertion that every Lutheran synod founded its own college is not entirely wrong and helpfully points out that the colleges thus established were distinguished by their sponsorship, by the structure of the sponsorship, and by the sorts of religious, ethnic, and geographical factors that bound the sponsoring group together. This observation is not helpful to the degree that it obscures the key role of the colleges in linking together those many 19th and early 20th century church bodies. The graduates of one became faculty members at another; a faculty member from a third became the president of a fourth. The Association of Lutheran College Faculty was one of the first pan-Lutheran organizations.

That said, this seems the time to turn to Philip Schaff, a 19th century church historian, for his categorization of Lutherans in his time.¹⁶ Although congregations were

linked to one another in dozens of synods, Schaff divided them into three types based upon degree of Americanization and sort of commitment to confessional specificity: the Neo-Lutherans, the moderates, and the Old Lutherans. Neo-Lutherans were those whose longer residence in the United States (some came from pre-Revolutionary families) had yielded sympathy with the generalized Protestantism then called evangelical and manifested in cooperative societies such as the American Bible Society. Within Lutheran circles these people were also known as Americanists or Platformists in reference to the Definite Synodical Platform which offered an "American" revision of that central Lutheran document, the Augsburg Confession. The moderates were a more complex group which included both persons from these same families, quite literally, and more recently arrived immigrants. They too adapted themselves and their churches to the American setting, but were significantly more resistant to ecumenical cooperation and more devoted to confessional adherence. The Old Lutherans, notably but not only, the Saxons who founded the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod were the most sectarian in their corporate life, were committed to preservation of doctrinal purity, and required agreement with the largest number of confessional documents. These three types of Lutherans corresponded roughly with the General Synod, the General Council, and the Synodical Conference though bodies such as the Joint Synod of Ohio and the Augustana Synod and individual members sometimes straddled the boundaries. When these groups, or their members, founded, supported and ran colleges they were alike in having a religious purpose, but the particular nuances of the Lutheran version of Christianity they espoused differed as did their expectation that the college would promote ethnic identity.

Sydney E. Ahlstrom, a 20th century church historian who was himself Lutheran, offered another categorization of Lutherans specifically in reference to higher education.¹⁷ He identified three currents of Lutheranism: the scholastic, the pietistic, and the critical. Each current emerged from a particular historical setting, yet all three claim affinities with Luther's thought and endure beyond that original setting. In the early 17th century the scholastic impulse toward definition and systematization was strong. The pietistic emphasis upon inner spiritual life and participation in evangelism, acts of mercy, and the moral life followed in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. Then in the later 18th and much of the 19th century came the investigative spirit of the critical stream. Ahlstrom observed that all of these currents can flow together within one stream: a church body, an institution, or an individual person.

Certainly the three have marked American Lutheranism both by their presence and by their interactions. Among American Lutherans during the colonial era the pietistic emphasis was strongest with leadership from key figures including Muhlenberg. Pietism was also deeply influential for many of the 19th century immigrants. The notable exception was those who formed the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod; they were more sympathetic to scholastic concerns. The relative force of these three impulses among the founders and subsequent leaders of colleges contributed to the particular nuances of Lutheranism found on Lutheran campuses and thus account in part for the differences between the schools as well as for their similarities.

Samuel S. Schmucker was both the first Lutheran clergyman to be formally trained in the United States, at Princeton, and, in 1832, the founder of the first Lutheran college in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. In keeping with the Lutheran commitment to an educated pastorate, Schmucker first established a seminary. Finding its students frequently ill-prepared to take up theological studies, he opened the college as a remedy. Schmucker was arguably the most influential and well-known Neo-Lutheran, inside Lutheranism and out. Thus it is only to be expected that Gettysburg College, like so many other small schools founded by Protestants in these decades, depended heavily on financial backing from local, non-Lutheran supporters and included non-Lutherans on its board and in its student body. In contrast the faculty members were usually Lutheran clergymen some of whom also taught at the nearby seminary. From the outset Gettysburg was an American college without strong ties to either an ethnic or an immigrant community. Although the Lutherans could trace their origins to Germany, they were not immigrants or the children of immigrants and tended to regard themselves primarily as Americans. Young men enrolled at Gettysburg received an education quite like what they might have gotten at any of the host of similar colleges. Indeed the primary factor that separated Gettysburg from its peers was its association with Lutherans.

For a decade Gettysburg was the single Lutheran college. Then, in the 1840s and 1850s a half dozen additional schools more-or-less replicated its model and its association with the Neo-Lutheran branches of Lutheranism. Wittenberg, in Springfield, Ohio, and Newberry in South Carolina were each located near a seminary with the intention of preparing its future students. From the outset Newberry was more closely affiliated with the South Carolina Synod than Gettysburg had been with the General Synod. As was common, these Lutheran

colleges did not restrict their enrollment to those called to the Lutheran pastorate. However, all founded in these decades restricted their enrollment to male students. Young women were offered educational opportunities which I will discuss later.

With the founding of Capital University (1850) in Columbus, Ohio the variety within the set of Lutheran associated colleges increased theologically, ethnically, and programmatically. In comparison to Wittenberg only 50 miles away, the founders of Capital were theological moderates. This confessional position allowed some of the recent German immigrants to lend their support to Capital. Thus the school was also distinguished by its ethnic identification. Rather than the American college, the model for this school was an old style European university with faculties in arts, medicine, law, and theology. Of the projected professional programs only the seminary and law schools became operative. No other 19th century Lutheran school shared this aspiration. Like Capital several were associated with groups defined by moderate or orthodox theology, more-or-less pietist inclinations, and national origins. Muhlenberg College (1867) was founded in direct response to Gettysburg's more minimalist confessional position and lack of attention to things German.

Other Germans and Scandinavians arriving in the mid-19th century soon followed the lead of their co-religionists in setting up both seminaries and colleges. The combination of theological specificity, style of piety, and ethnic identification contributed to closer ties—whether formal, informal, or symbolic—between these schools and their church bodies than was the case for the Neo-Lutheran schools.¹⁸ Augustana College (1860) in Rock Island, Illinois, for example, was founded by direct action of the newly organized Augustana Synod and 49 congregations. However, since the Synod provided no direct financial support the founding was a sort of unfunded mandate.¹⁹ Dana and Grand View were both founded by Danish Lutherans distinguished by the first group's "holy" pietism and the second's "happy" Grundtvigianism. Insofar as these colleges served as—indeed were founded precisely to—supply the seminaries with students and thus the church with pastors, the colleges enrolled only male students. This was the case at Wartburg (1852), Augustana, Luther (1861), and Augsburg (1869). This purpose was consistent with the long standing Lutheran conviction that education is a necessary qualification for the office of public ministry. A personally apprehended call from God is not enough, as it sometimes was among more revivalist influenced Protestants. While lay

Lutherans were capable of leading themselves in worship, and did, because a pastor was required to administer the sacraments the need for qualified candidates was urgent. Among these schools Augsburg was remarkable for its fierce defense of a gymnasium-like program which combined college and seminary training in a nine year sequence quite unlike the usual pattern of a four-year college course followed by a clearly articulated seminary course.²⁰

Beyond their theological and ethnic identifications, Lutheran schools in the late 19th century also differed from one another in ways that mirrored the variety of non-Lutheran schools in the era. There were distinctions based in the audience and in the program determined by school's stated purpose. Some institutions admitted women, either along with men as at Thiel and St. Olaf or only women as at Elizabeth and Marion Colleges in the south and the Lutheran Ladies' Seminary in Red Wing, Minnesota.²¹ By the mid-1960s the last of the Lutheran women's colleges closed so we tend to forget that there ever were any when in fact there were close to three dozen, many of them established by private initiative.²² Most of these schools were located in the east and the south. Their programs ranged from something resembling a high school to a more rigorous curriculum which offered students a classical course as well as alternatives, for example a practical business course. The co-educational model that is now regarded as the norm, was introduced among Lutherans at Thiel College (1866), founded with leadership from William A. Passavant. Seven years later Susquehanna Female Seminary merged with the Missionary Institute forming the basis of Susquehanna University. St. Olaf and Gustavus Adolphus, founded by Norwegians in 1874 and Swedes in 1876, were co-educational from the outset.

Although some male students at these schools may have been headed for the pastorate, their curricula were not primarily pre-seminary programs. Even more than at the men's schools, there were always a certain number of students whose contributions to the world would be as teachers, business people, and medical professionals, as well as through their membership in communities, congregations, and families. The founders of co-educational colleges (or academies) recognized what might now be called the need for an informed citizenry. That view is consistent with Martin Luther's argument urging the German nobility to support schools. There Luther set out three purposes for education: first, it supported faith by enabling the believer to understand the gospel as well as to experience it; second, education prepared the students to

employ their talents in service to their neighbors; and third, pastors required sound learning to faithfully fulfill the special responsibilities of their office.²³ This view of education reflects Luther's insistence that God's grace precedes human action; it is a gift. As in the gift economies considered by Lewis Hyde, this gift evokes a grateful response that transforms and transfers the gift to a third party.²⁴ Here the second act of giving is the believer's vocation to serve the neighbor. Because such service requires adequate preparation, education should be provided. Because that education undergirds faithful response to the believer's vocation, it might be termed "vocational education" but in the robust theological sense of the word and not in its narrowly technical meaning.²⁵

Given this understanding of education and vocation, it is not surprising that some Lutheran schools offered occupational training for "jobs" other than that of the pastor. While nursing schools attached to deaconess hospitals might fit this category, the principle example is normal schools, such as those operated by the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod or the Lutheran Normal School in Madison, Minnesota. The purpose of these schools was to train teachers for parochial and public teaching. The close connection between parochial schools and the interests of the sponsoring churches may account for the official and close relationship between the Lutheran Normal School and the United Church which founded it following synodical action. This is in contrast to the looser connection of overlapping "membership" between the Lutheran Ladies' Seminary and the Norwegian Synod and to the label "College of the Church" (here the United Church) for which Augsburg and St. Olaf were in competition. Even at the colleges the number of occupational offerings during this period would likely surprise us. Of course there were lots of other normal schools, both private and public, in these years and many colleges offered a range of practical courses. Debates about such programs included assertions of educational principles as well as appeals to economic realities. It is impossible to determine merely from lists of courses whether Lutheran involvement was a response to economic pressures, an educational principle, or a manifestation of a Lutheran commitment to the centrality of service to the neighbor.

CHANGING CONTEXTS

In the decades after the Civil War and into the 20th century the model of the old time college was replaced by that of the modern university that crossed the Atlantic with

influential scholars trained in Germany.²⁶ It informed establishment of new private institutions with Johns Hopkins University (1876) as the earliest; development of public institutions such as the University of Wisconsin, many of them supported by the Morrill Acts (1862 & 1890); and the transformation of some old style colleges, Harvard among them. The modern university differed from the old time college on several counts all rooted in its particular purpose. Rather than transmitting a fixed body of knowledge to undergraduates and enabling them to be good citizens, the university was to discover new information and in the case of the "land grant" universities facilitate its application. Some universities that grew from colleges had once been connected to a religious party, but by the late 19th century that connection was usually diluted or gone. Most universities were not associated with religious groups though there are notable exceptions, particularly among the Roman Catholics and Methodists.²⁷

No Lutheran college made the transition nor did Lutherans found a modern university. Nonetheless, like other colleges Lutheran colleges are affected by this powerful ideal and tend to evaluate our programs by its standards even as we assert our differences: we are devoted to the liberal arts, in some form, they are specialized; we are focused on teaching, they are focused on research; they are huge, we are small; we attend the student's whole person, often in a residential program, they only care about the mind. Of course, these comparisons are overdrawn, on both sides, and yet they suggest the way in which the university has become the standard by which even the most prestigious colleges describe themselves and against which they justify their continuation.²⁸

The challenge was put bluntly over a century ago by a Columbia University professor who declared, "I confess that I am unable to divine what is to be ultimately the position of Colleges which cannot become Universities and will not be Gymnasias. I cannot see what reason they will have to exist. It will be largely a waste of capital to maintain them, and largely a waste of time to attend them."²⁹

Beginning after World War II and into recent decades American higher education was in an expansionist mode that peaked about the time that those who are now mid-career were in college. The GI Bill provided hosts of veterans with the financial resources to attend college and initiated a series of infusions of government money into higher education. Some of that money supported growth in existing institutions; some of it was used to open new

schools including hundreds of non-residential, community colleges with two-year programs; some of it continues to be used to provide members of specific groups with access to college. Here are the staggering numbers. In 1947 there were 2.3 million students enrolled at 1,800 schools; in 1986, 12.3 million students were enrolled in 3,200 schools (about a third of them had 2-year programs).³⁰ That is 10 million more students in almost twice as many schools, not quite forty years later. At the same time the sorts of programs offered also expanded, both to include the occupational tracks at community colleges and in response to innovations in scholarship such as women's studies and ethnic studies.

ELCA colleges benefited from these changes. Many renovated their facilities or constructed new buildings in mid-century using federal funds. A large percentage of students now have federal or state money in their financial aid packages. Many current faculty began their teaching careers with federally insured loans to pay off. In the 1960s and 70s schools increased enrollment, perhaps by 100%, and added classes, majors, and programs to serve those students. Lutherans even took courage to open two new colleges: the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America cooperated at California Lutheran (1959) and the LCMS founded Christ College—Irvine, now part of the Concordia University system. (During the same years, some schools were "lost" by merger or closing.)

Certainly these schools are different today than they were when the class of 1950 was in attendance. Here are some of the ways. The faculty members are less likely to come from the college's "conventional constituency," that is to say they may not be Lutherans and they probably aren't members of the ethnic group that founded the college, if one did. Similarly they are less likely to be alumni or graduates of any liberal arts college. But, they are likely to have better academic credentials. Some took the job hoping it would be the first step in an upward career path and discovered that they liked the place and have stayed on happily; others, however, committed to significant aspects of the school's mission or continue to be dissatisfied with their academic fate. The composition of the student body has also changed. There is a smaller proportion of Lutherans. Even as colleges are trying desperately to recruit a more diverse group with regard to race and ethnicity they long for higher board scores. As tuition and fees go up there are still efforts to provide access to students who are without the funds to pay the current price. Mission statements suggest these changes by their use of a

common vocabulary.³¹ Whole person, diversity, community, liberal arts, service: these are the words that appear again and again. The statements vary more in the way they signal Lutheran connections. Some state a current formal affiliation with the ELCA or to its regional synods; others point more vaguely to Lutheran heritage or tradition. In the midst of such comparisons to the past, it is salutary to acknowledge that the past was not the same everywhere. From the start the older colleges founded by native-born, more assimilated, Neo-Lutherans have been less distinctly Lutheran than those founded by recent immigrants who were more devoted to the Confessions or more intensely pietistic.

In the meantime the churches to which the colleges are connected have also been changing. In the 1960s and again in 1988 mergers reduced their number and diluted the relationship between the members of a smaller church and “their”—“our”—college. Locally, church-wide, and internationally Lutherans have become more actively ecumenical. While it has never been the case that all Lutherans have gone to Lutheran schools, as potential students from Lutheran congregations have been given more options and expanded their horizons fewer have automatically selected Lutheran schools. There are lots of reasons for that. The much discussed decline in denominational loyalty is certainly one important factor. Being Lutheran in name isn’t enough, especially if the word Lutheran isn’t in the college’s name and when many prospective students, and their parents, and their pastors don’t even know which schools are Lutheran.³²

WHO ARE THESE SCHOOLS NOW?

In view of the facts that the name Lutheran seems to matter less to some folks than it once did and to matter not at all to others, including most everyone who is not Lutheran and that the amount of financial support that comes directly from the ELCA church-wide office or from its synods is minimal, for the moment let us leave aside the formal relationship with the ELCA. What characteristics do these 28 schools have in common today? They are small, or small-ish; they are residential, more-or-less; they offer a liberal arts program, for the most part. These characteristics place these schools with others that continue the traditions established by the old time colleges, and mostly in Carnegie categories: BA I or II or Comprehensive University I. An honest appraisal also notes that within this larger pool, Lutheran colleges as a group are less expensive, have fewer financial resources,

and are less selective. Based on the credentials of our faculty and the attention we give to our students’ “whole lives” we stand by the quality of our programs. Indeed some of our schools are “best buys.”

Now I’m a person from a family that loves to get a good deal, but I’ve also learned that it is not a good deal to buy something I don’t need or won’t use no matter how low the price. I think that the case that these colleges are worth continuing to operate and worth attending must be made on some basis other than their comparatively low price. Moreover I’m convinced that we have something to offer that derives, not from the search for a marginal differentiation in the market but from the Lutheran tradition; here I intend by Lutheran tradition the theological “argument” that has been socially embodied and historically extended in, though not limited to, Lutheran churches.³³

This final section points to five practices that are common on Lutheran campuses and for which explicitly Lutheran reasons can be given.³⁴ Before specifying the aims of Lutheran higher education, listing common practices, suggesting how the practices might be grounded in Lutheran teaching, and proposing virtues that they might engender, I make these caveats. My discussion will be suggestive rather than a complete development of my own views and certainly will not include careful engagement with the others who are involved in this conversation. The intention is that readers will test these ideas against the situation at their own schools. I do not make the strong claim that these practices are uniquely Lutheran or even the softer claim that they are distinctly Lutheran. Other schools also engage in these practices, though as part of different narratives. Indeed, it is likely that on our campuses, even among the readers of this essay, there are persons who participate in these practices or affirm them, but whose commitment does not grow out of the Lutheran tradition. Further, I know that the practices have local variations that reflect both past history and present circumstances. Nonetheless, taken together these practices contribute to a recognizable Lutheran identity for institutions and it may be that if none of them are practiced and no explicitly Lutheran reasons can be marshaled to defend their absence, then the time has come to admit that the institutional ties to the ELCA are meaningless even if the school continues to be well worth attending.

What are the aims of Lutheran higher education? What good ends is it meant to accomplish? I follow Luther’s argument to the German princes but I reorder the three

“goods” that he offers. Further I distinguish between the overlapping goods for the larger society, for the church, and for students, both those who are Christians and those who are not. Because the Lutheran tradition here intersects and runs together with the tradition of American higher education and because here we are concerned with institutions that are schools I want first to specify the good offered to students regardless of their beliefs. They are equipped to use their gifts—talents, training, opportunities for example—in ways that benefit their communities (defined variously) including their role as members of families, as citizens, and as workers. This is also a good the schools offer to society. Second for students who are believers—I might say who know that God’s gift of grace has made them righteous—we also aim to enhance their righteous living. Third, for the churches, certainly the ELCA, its congregations, and its ministries but also others, we aim to cultivate in their members the skills and virtues that are necessary for faithful participation in congregational life and to provide lay and clerical leadership.

How do we accomplish these good ends for students, society and the churches? I offer a short list of five practices largely directed toward students that can be carried out in various ways as appropriate to local history and current situation:

The school really is a college. The faculty and students along with other staff are drawn into a community by their shared commitment to and engagement in learning. The faculty provides students with an academically solid curriculum that neither excludes a topic or discipline for fear that it might destroy faith nor over-estimates the possibility that human knowledge will ever know all that is God. Thus scientific disciplines and attention to physical well-being, study of many cultures, languages, and religions, and cultivation of critical capacities are all possible though the particular program mix is determined locally. This is education that is both evocative and provocative. By evocative I intend that it draws out the best from students and from our human heritage. This assumes that there is sweet water in these wells to be drawn out, gifts to be received and passed on. By provocative I intend that this education engages and stimulates action. Its reception of gifts from ancestors or contemporaries is not romantic or uncritical. Rather it is a realistic engagement with self and society (and with the natural world) and an engagement that can not remain passive, but must respond. Among the available areas of study, three are given particular importance.

Students study--perhaps are required to study--the Bible and the Christian tradition. This is a cognitive goal, not a covert effort to convert students who are not Lutheran to Lutheranism or who are not Christian to Christianity. This does not, however, exclude the possibility that God will work such a change in any of the multiple arenas of college life. The religion department may have particular responsibility for required courses, but careful, informed consideration of Christianity and its implications for life—intellectual and otherwise—is not limited to courses offered by that department.

Students participate in the arts both as makers of art and as an appreciative audience. This reflects the conviction that God is present in and revealed by finite things such as lines of poetry, oil paint, dance steps or frames of film in a manner not entirely unlike God’s presence in the water, wine and bread of the sacraments. The arts can provide a glimpse of God and they afford us the means to express what is “too deep for words.” Likely music is given a prominent place. Perhaps this is only an accident of history or a continuation of Martin Luther’s high regard for music. I am not a musician, so please don’t disregard this as self-interest or as some St. Olaf College party line. I suspect that music, especially participatory (rather than performed) choral music is prominent also because it brings the intellect and the body into partnership even as it brings the individual into the group.

Students are encouraged to apply what they learn, both in their own lives and in service to others. This takes place in the classroom and outside of it. By encouraging students to apply what they learn in their own lives we demonstrate that learning is not merely a matter of objective acquisition of information; that it includes a subjective element as well. However this subjective application is not merely concerned with the immediate, personal relevance of learning. Application is also an act of service, a sort of action that is provoked by attention to vocation. The gift of learning calls forth from the student (and the teacher) responsible use of this gift for the good of one’s neighbors in this time, in the current or future now.

Christian worship is conducted on campus regularly and frequently. Here individuals are convoked or called into community; here the community invokes God. The ways that we order our time, that most finite and yet most equally distributed resource, is a sign of how we are oriented in the world. To set aside time for worship is an affirmation of the centrality of God’s grace in the midst of

ordinary things, and within the finitude of time and space. Such an orientation, toward "true north" if you will, equips us to carry out our work responsibly and faithfully. Also: worship, not the classroom, is the appropriate location for the proclamation of the gospel that allows us to recognize God elsewhere, e.g. in the arts, in our neighbors, or in nature. When we do encounter God in these places or receive divine grace in the minuteness or magnificence of nature, in the beauty of human artifacts, in the depth of social relationships, worship is where we join in expressions of gratitude. So too, when God seems only hidden, nature only dangerous, relationships only broken, or human invention only damaging, this is where we join the psalmist in cries of anger and lament. In the midst of an American society, characterized by Steven Carter as a "culture of disbelief," this use of time, space, and other resources may seem quite odd. Many Americans regard religion as personal rather than corporate, as private rather than public. That Lutheran colleges do set aside this time and support this activity with institutional resources, but do not require participation, is partially explained by the centrality of Word and sacrament to our understanding of the church. Indeed, explicitly Lutheran arguments can be marshaled for all five of these practices.

What is the explicit Lutheran grounding of these practices? They are informed by specific teachings central to the Lutheran tradition of Christianity. Important among those teachings are:

- The ultimate nature of divine grace which renders all else penultimate;*
- An understanding of human beings as made in God's image, yet fallen; bound in sin, yet freed by God's grace;*
- The expectation that gratitude for God's gracious gift of justification will issue both in returning thanks to God in worship and in using one's talents and temporal gifts in service to the neighbor; and*
- Recognition that God's self-revelation comes most reliably in the person of Jesus the Christ, in the scriptures, and in the sacraments but also through other "masks" which include human reason, social relationships, and nature.*

Just how these teachings and others support the practices

I've listed is beyond this essay, though significant and subject to debate.³⁵

What virtues do these practices engender? Gratitude, wisdom, boldness and humility. Because I have used these terms idiosyncratically I must provide some small elaboration. Recalling their variety as individuals and assuming their excellence in their particular work, when I meet graduates of our schools I would like to recognize them by these virtues.³⁶

- By their loving gratitude, that is by their disposition to recognize that all that they are and have is a gift and by their disposition to respond with thankfulness to the divine giver and with generosity and hospitality toward others;
- By their faithful wisdom, that is by their ability to think about matters of faith with rigor and knowledge without excluding the sensual, the natural, and social; and by their ability to think and act faithfully in other arenas of life;
- By their bold freedom, that is by their willingness to speak the truth and act with mercy and justice without undue concern about the effect upon their penultimate situation; and
- By their hopeful humility, that is by their capacity to respond to limitation and failure with good grace knowing that all temporal things are penultimate and that God's re-creative power is at work both now and in eternity.

I long for our life together to be characterized more by mutual consolation than by recrimination; more by anticipation than by disappointment; more by hope than by discouragement.

If the colleges and universities affiliated with the ELCA are able, by these practices, to engender these virtues in their students (as well as in their staff and faculty) and to accomplish these aims for students, for society, and for the churches then they are faithful to the Lutheran tradition as well as worth being maintained by the ELCA and attended by its members and by other students. If they are able to do these things, then they may also offer an alternative to consumerist views of education, something that is much needed today.

L. DeAne Lagerquist is a professor of religion at St. Olaf College.

¹ This essay was first written for oral presentation at the sixth Vocation of a Lutheran College conference, August 2000. My thinking about these matters has been profoundly stimulated and informed by the conversation at those meetings and in their planning; by participation in the Lutheran Academy of Scholars; and by my colleagues and students at St. Olaf College including those involved in drafting the so called "We(e) Document."

² The "secularization thesis" has been put forth by George M. Marsden and James T. Burtchaell among others. In *The Dying of the Light: The Disengagement of Colleges and Universities from Their Christian Churches* (Eerdmans, 1998) Burtchaell includes three Lutheran schools: Gettysburg, St. Olaf, and Concordia, River Forest. Other readings of St. Olaf's history and current situation are offered by Mark Granquist, in Richard T. Hughes and William B. Adrian, eds., *Christian Models of Higher Education: Strategies for Success in the Twenty-first Century* (Eerdmans, 1997) and Robert Benne, *Quality with Soul: Thriving Ventures in Christian Higher Education* (Eerdmans, forthcoming).

³ Quoted by Christopher J. Lucas, *American Higher Education: A History* (St. Martin's Griffin, 1994), p. 105, n. 5.

⁴ F. Michael Perko, "Religion and Collegiate Education," *Encyclopedia of American Religious Experience*, 1611.

⁵ Lucas, p. 313.

⁶ Lucas, p. 109.

⁷ "The Harvard Guide," www.news.harvard.edu/guide

⁸ Lucas, p. 117.

⁹ Quoted by Lucas, p. 119, n. 81. The College of California was founded in 1855 by Congregationalists but became the secular University of California in 1868. Perko, p. 1614.

¹⁰ Perko, p. 1613.

¹¹ 1849 Avery College; 1851 Miner Academy; 1856 Wilberforce and others, Lucas, p. 122.

¹² Here I may seem to suggest that the purposes and program of schools for women or for blacks was no different than at schools for men. That is not the case. Intense debates were carried on about precisely that point. For example, those who asserted that if women were to be allowed advanced education then the education should be of a different sort than the sort offered to men tended to reject co-education.

O. M. Norlie, a graduate of co-educational St. Olaf, took this position in the early 20th century as part of his support of the Lutheran Ladies' Seminary. See L. DeAne Lagerquist, "'As Sister, Wife, and Mother': Education for Young Norwegian-American Lutheran Women," *Norwegian-American Studies* Vol. 33 (1992): 130-1.

¹³ Lucas, p. 140, gives an estimate of 62,000 in 1870. If the number of schools held constant at 250, a statistical average would have been 248; however, some schools had less than 100.

¹⁴ Quoted by Lucas, p. 133, p. 135.

¹⁵ (Augsburg, 1985).

¹⁶ Schaff's 1854 remarks to an audience in Germany are quoted in E. Clifford Nelson, ed., *Lutherans in North America* (Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 211-13. Burtchaell uses a similar three part division in his treatment of Lutherans. I find his characterizations distorting. This is especially so for the "moderate" group. His term for it—confessing—does not give adequate attention to the role of Lutheran Pietism (in contrast to the evangelical pietism of revivalism) among some of the moderate groups or nor does it acknowledge the on-going role of the Confessions even among the Neo-Lutherans who revised the Augsburg Confession rather than rejecting it out of hand. For further treatment of American Lutheranism see L. DeAne Lagerquist, *The Lutherans* (Greenwood, 1999).

¹⁷ "What's Lutheran About Higher Education? – A Critique," *Papers and Proceedings of the 60th Annual Convention* (Washington, D.C.: Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, 1974), pp. 8-16.

¹⁸ Legal ownership, significant financial support, and structures of governance are examples of formal ties; overlapping membership and social interactions are examples of informal ties which contribute to a school's symbolic role as source of group pride and visibility.

¹⁹ Solberg, p. 184.

²⁰ The curricular difference was a component in the two schools' competition to be designated the official college of the United Church, formed in 1890 by the merger of the three moderate Norwegian-American churches. A brief discussion of the controversy see Solberg, pp.231-3 or Michael B. Aune, "'Both Sides of the Hyphen'? The Churchly and Ethnic Heritage of St. Olaf College," in Pamela Schwandt, ed. *Called to Serve: St. Olaf and the Vocation of a Church College* (St. Olaf College, 1999), pp. 42-44.

²¹ See L. DeAne Lagerquist, "As Sister, Wife, and Mother," pp. 111-18 and "Utile Dulci, The Useful and the Sweet: Women and Lutheran Higher Education," Shiler Lecture, Luther College, March 1998.

²² Solberg, p. 275. Fourteen were founded prior to 1860; another 20 after. Early in the twentieth century the United Lutheran Church in America Board of Education made plans to found a women's college with Mary Markely as the president. Funds were raised and property purchased, but in 1934 the project was abandoned and the moneys designated for scholarship aid for female students. p. 299 and Lagerquist, "Utile Dulci".

²³ Martin Luther, "To the Councilmen of all Cities in Germany that they Establish and Maintain Christian Schools," in Timothy Lull, ed., *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings* (Fortress Press, 1989), pp. 704-35.

²⁴ Lewis Hyde, *The Gift: Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property* (Vintage Books, 1983). See in particular "The Circle," pp. 11-24 and chapter 3, "The Labor of Gratitude," pp. 40-55.

²⁵ Mark U. Edwards, Jr. has often employed this usage during his tenure as president of St. Olaf College.

²⁶ See Julie A. Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and Marginalization of Morality* (University of Chicago Press, 1996) for a helpful account that considers the consequences for curriculum and student services.

²⁷ The degree to which these schools now retain a vital relationship to their religious bodies is a point of discussion. See George M. Marsden's *The Soul of the American University* (Oxford University Press, 1994) for an detailed account which argues the secularization thesis. My point is only that not all such institutions have always been secular.

²⁸ A recent issue of *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* Winter 1999) was titled "Distinctly American: The Residential Liberal Arts Colleges. In the Preface Stephen R. Graubard discussed the reasons to devote an issue to this topic and observes "[M]uch that is distinctive to higher education in the United States, those attributes that make the American system very significantly different from any other, are generally lost sight of. The residential liberal arts college of the country, while scarcely invisible, do not today figure in the public prints or in the television commentary as the country's major private and public research universities do." vi

²⁹ Lucas, p. 143

³⁰ Lucas, pp. 228-9.

³¹ Based on ten of the 28 read for the Lutheran Academy of Scholars, 2000.

³² LECNA data

³³ *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (University of Notre Dame Press, second edition, 1984). I am grateful to Donald Reed and Ronald Thiemann for their generous tutoring as I have begun to understand MacIntyre's proposal and to explore how it might illuminate our work in Lutheran higher education. MacIntyre's influential work has informed reconsideration of denominations that attends to matters beyond their institutional forms. This shift is important for efforts to understand colleges' relationships to those denominations in view of diminished financial support, weakened church participation in governance, and reduced numbers of church members among colleges' faculty and staff. See Robert Bruce Mullins and Russell E. Richey, eds. *Reimagining Denominationalism: Interpretive Essays* (Oxford University Press, 1994). Of particular interest for this essay is Christa R. Klein, "Denominational History as Public History: The Lutheran Case," pp. 307-17. Mark R. Schwehn's discussion of academic virtues does not rely upon MacIntyre but is consistent with MacIntyre's proposal. *Exiles from Eden: Religion and the Academic Vocation in America* (Oxford University Press, 1993), "Spirited Inquiry," pp. 44-65.

³⁴ An earlier consideration of these matters appears in "What Does It Mean? Lutheran Higher Education," *Lutheran Higher Education*, Vol. 135, no. 4 (March/April 2000), pp. 184-198. This article was first presented to faculty at Concordia University, River Forest. I explored these issues in "Incarnating a Tradition: Personal and Institutional Reflections" at Gustavus Adolphus College, September 1998, and in "A Mission of Calling" at Newberry College, February 2000. Those who are familiar with this on-going discussion will note the affinity between the spirit, if not the details, of my proposal and Tom Christenson "Learning and Teaching as an Exercise in Christian Freedom," *Intersections: Faith + Life + Learning* No. 6 (Winter 1999): pp. 3-11; Darrell Jodock, "The Lutheran Tradition and the Liberal Arts College: How are They Related," in Schwandt, pp. 13-36; and Schwehn, *Exiles from Eden*. I have not addressed here questions about faculty profile or governance, matters Schwehn terms "constitutional requirements" in "The Idea of a Christian University," in Paul J. Contino and David Morgan, eds. *The Lutheran Reader* (Valparaiso, 1999), pp. 64-65. His proposals suggest the key issues that need to be resolved on each campus. I am also informed by the work of Ernest Simmons, *Lutheran Higher Education: An Introduction* (Augsburg, 1998) and Bob Benne. Although we arrived at them independently Marcia Bunge's list in "Introduction to Valparaiso in the Context of Lutheran Higher Education, in *The Lutheran Reader* , pp. 1-9 and my list of practices are quite similar.

³⁵For an more extended discussion see Lagerquist, "What Does This Mean?"

³⁶I have not developed the specifically intellectual significance of these virtues but have pointed only toward their more general and moral import. In *Exiles from Eden* Schwehn suggests that humility, faith, self-denial, and charity each have cognitive importance with potential to shape the academic enterprise. I am in sympathy with his general assertion and find much overlap between the content of the virtues he names and those I list here.

PERSPECTIVES ON INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE: ALL HANDS ON DECK

Ruth Henricks

"Go in peace. Serve the Lord." At the end of each worship service, these words challenge us to live the liturgy in all we do. The dismissal of the people of God to "Go in peace" and "Serve the Lord" is the transition from the liturgy of the Word and Sacrament to the liturgy of ministry in the world. For the baptized children of God the liturgy never ceases!

Foster McCurley, in his soon to be published book, *Go in Peace; Serve the Lord: The Social Ministry of the Church*, states that "as proclaimer and as sign, the church participates in the world, both by what it says and what it does." Recognizing that *all* humanity is crated in the image of God and that it is for *all* humanity that Christ died, *all* people and all the needs of people belong to the ministry of the church.

He goes on to say that "the purpose of the church's social ministry is to serve God's humanity, to minister to the needs of the most vulnerable, and to indicate by service its commitment to the integrity of every human being. No matter what the faith of the needy person, even if no faith at all, that person possesses a God-given dignity that no one can deny or diminish. The person to be served is not an object of the church's efforts to increase its membership but a subject with all the dignity that people made in the image God conveys."

Whether expressions of the church find the motive for social ministry in identification with the vulnerable of the land, in the identification of Jesus Christ with the poor, in the response of the people of God to God's saving action, in the command to love God by the loving neighbor, or in the continuation of Jesus' own ministry, the message is clear: the people of God live not for themselves but for others. In such sacrificial love God is glorified and the Lord is served.

In *Teaching a Stone to Talk*, Annie Dillard said that Christians often treat their faith life and worship as if they are tourists "having coffee and donuts on Deck C. Presumably someone is minding the ship, correcting the course, avoiding icebergs, watching the radar screen..." She asserted that the wind is picking up and we are not sufficiently aware of the conditions. The image of passengers on Deck C having coffee and donuts also fits for some social ministry organizations, and, I would

suspect, colleges, and maybe even some church body leaders in places like Chicago and St. Louis. It is urgent that we have "all hands on deck" in the church--Now!

The winds on deck are absolutely changing! Leaders of social ministry organizations are faced with a variety of dilemmas in regard to the decisions we must make to be both effective and faithful.

The gap between the rich and the poor is growing at an astronomical rate during *the* most significant time of prosperity in the history of this nation and the world. The Caucasian majority will become the Caucasian minority in the U.S. by 2050, with Hispanics and Latinos reaching over fifty percent of the U.S. population.

Both of the factors--the rich getting richer while the poor are getting poorer and the predicted Hispanic majority--are occurring at a time when we baby boomers are aging and a larger portion of the U.S. population is moving to over the age of 65. The face of our country is changing!

And to challenge our future in Social Ministry organizations even more, capitalism and the search for new profit fields have led the for-profit sector into the arena of human services. Today you find Lockheed Martin and technology companies responding competitively to RFP's social welfare programs! The face of who is delivering human care is changing!

Dual career families are approaching seventy-five percent of the population. Over fifty percent of the workforce are women and sixty percent of the new entrants into the workforce are women. Nearly thirty-three percent of American workers--34 million people, are now contingency workers, including temps, part-timers, consultants, freelancers, and self-employed workers. Almost nine percent of the adult working population--close to 10 million Americans--are now in the process of starting their own companies.

What do these statistics and numbers mean to agencies and institutions of the church? How can we use them to lead the church we so dearly love into the next century? I believe we need to read this environment carefully. Andrew Grove, chairman of Intel Corporation and author of the best-selling book, *Only the Paranoid Survive*,

suggests we answer three simple questions:

Has the organization that you most worry about or compete with shifted? Grove suggests that you try the "silver bullet" test. If you had one bullet, what would you shoot with it? If you change the director of the gun, that is one of the signals that you may be dealing with something more than an ordinary shift in the competitive landscape (family service to for-profits).

Is your key complements--an organization whose work you rely on to make your services more available--changing? A shift in direction by a partner or market ally can be as decisive as a move by a competitor.

Do the people you have worked with for 20 years seem to be talking gibberish? Are they suddenly talking about people, services, or organizations that no one had heard of a year ago? If so, it's time to pay attention to what's going on.

The power of our church today comes through the many acts of mercy, hospitality, service, and education that we offer. To serve and to thrive...most of our colleges and SMOs are pretty good on the "serve" part; we meet people's needs day in and day out. Even if needs or resources change, we usually meet, and sometimes even exceed, expectations.

When it comes to thriving, however, it is a different story. How many of us can say our organizations really thrive? Most folks I know in SMOs feel that every day is a battle. It feels like our nose is barely above water, and that the sea is not calm. For many not-for-profit SMOs, survival, rather than thriving, is our major accomplishment.

And the challenges seems to be growing: more competition for gifts, less willingness to pay for overhead, and pressure to do "more for less." We are challenged to "make the waters safe for travel."

Through all this, we must remember that God's power is in the acts of mercy that we perform each day. God is found in the ordinary--earthen pots and clay vessels. We are ordinary people doing extraordinary acts in an extraordinary time in history! David Tiede, president of Luther Seminary, asked at a Connecting Institutions Conference in St. Paul, Minnesota earlier this year, "How will your earthen vessel bear the treasures entrusted to us on our watch?" Who will we employ to be on watch? Many serious decisions and a great deal of time for

planning and training of leadership is necessary if social ministry is to be effective, high quality, and sustainable.

Throughout the history of the Lutheran church, social ministry organizations have acted out our understanding of the Gospel through social service programs, often speaking for the voiceless and the disenfranchised. Social ministry organizations and institutions of higher learning are the embodiment of the church in the nation and the world. We are "where rubber hits the road." The art or dance or jazz (whatever you want to call it) of our leading agencies and institutions of higher education is complex--culturally, economically, and theologically. In the Rogers and Hammerstein musical, "The King and I", the song asks, "Shall we dance?" But I believe the question is more rightly for us--"Will we dance?"

I do not believe that it is any longer correct or astute to continue asking, "What can or will the church, or the Synod, or the congregation, do for us?" I believe that the question now is more one of, "What will we do for the church? What is our calling as Social Ministry Organizations and colleges in the church?" What role will we step to the dance floor and perform? Will we lead or will we follow? Can we find a way to follow and be faithful to our Lutheran tradition and theology and lead to the newness of the 21st century creation and situation?

My god friend's father, Dr. Arthur Becker, said a long time ago, "The church's responsibility is to assure people that God has not abandoned them...that the promise of God's grace in Christ is still in place. If the Word and the Sacrament ministry of congregations is the 'mouth' of the body of Christ, ten Social Ministry Organizations (and I would add colleges) are the 'hands' of the body of Christ. The work of agencies and institutions of the church must always be measured to the extent to which people are assured that they will not be abandoned." We are not, in Social Ministry Organizations and colleges, an add-on, an appendage to, or a nice little extra. We *are* the church in the world.

I agree with Bob Bacher, executive for Administration in the Office of the Bishop of the ELCA, who say that "we should never speak of the church and its institutions. These very words imply a conceptual and operational separation of the two and control of one by the other." I maintain, as do many others, that if Lutheran SMO's and colleges did not exist, we would have to invent them to *be* church and *do* mission.

In its "Statement of the Purpose," The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America offers the ways in which the ELCA will participate in "God's mission." Among the statements used on how the ELCA will respond to "participate in God's mission" are the words (and I quote from the ELCA constitution), "To fulfill these purposes, this church shall: a) Receive, establish, and support those congregations, ministries, organizations, insitutions, and agencies necessary to carry on God's mission through this church" (ELCA Constitution, Chapter 4.02).

"Can it be stated any more clearly than that?" asks Ken Senft, director of The Mission Institute. "The ELCA is saying that important and included 'to participate in God's mission' are the organizations, institutions, and agencies necessary to carry on God's mission through this church. The ELCA is claiming a relationship with organizations, institutions, and agencies for mission--as it participates in God's mission to the world. This claim means that in our understanding of this church, all the parts of this church are included in order for each part to receive from and for each part to give to the whole of this church. All parts of this church contribute to the strength of the whole church. All Parts of this church receive strength from the whole church. All parts of the church, those centered in Word and Sacrament in the gathered congregation, and those parts of the church scattered in the world through institutions (SMOs, colleges and universities, seminaries) are all together in God's mission in the world."

Social ministry organizations are also affiliated with the ELCA and/or recognized by the LCMS. The first principle in these recognition/affiliation documents pledges social ministry organizations to adopt "a mission statement which declares the organization's purpose, directs its ministry of responding to human needs as an expression of the Gospel, and affirms the integral nature of its mission with the whole mission of the church."

The connection between church and institution requires a will on the part of the church to see the opportunities for mission through institutions--institutions over which they do not have significant, if any, governance control and institutions over which they do not have significant financial dependence upon for church budget support.

The connection between institution and church requires a will on the part of the institution to have a substantive relationship with the church in which shared vision, community, and participation in mission are the anticipated results from shared roots.

I think being a leader in SMOs and colleges today requires courage, commitment, and strong will. It requires "all hands being on deck." It requires us to be vigilant and ready to act. Our church needs leadership from the front. I believe it was Timothy Lull or David Tiede that said not long ago, "Be real and Be ready!" Our church was not planted in this land only for the comfort of the faithful. Is it then, or could it be, that our calling as agencies and institutions of the church, is to put a burr under the saddle, to lead from the front, and to act with courage and boldness in a time when people are searching for strong leadership and direct statements that address their time, their place, their situation?

In the 1970's I am told at least two college presidents, and I know a number of Lutheran SMO presidents declared that their institutions really no longer needed the church. Several SMOs wanted to remove Lutheran from their name because they saw it as a hindrance to raising money and attracting clients. They were looking to the business community for their support and their referrals, not the church. Interesting to me is my belief that it is, in fact, our very connection and rootedness in the church that makes us interesting and desirable by business. We have values that attract these businesses. We have something that those not affiliated with a church body do not have.

Because we are not in social ministry and education to make profit, we are able to speak more boldly. Because we have stakeholders, not stockholders, we can advocate for justice without fear of investor mutiny. Oh, there are ramifications. Stakeholders can leave too, but for most of them, they want a church-affiliated voice saying what they fear to speak. I frequently tell donors, "LFS is not in a popularity contest. In fact, we frequently serve those least popular in society, It is a lesson from Christ--He served the least loved--the leper, the prostitute, the Pharisee. And he did it without an intake interview to see if they were Lutheran or had enough income to enter the synagogue!"

Bob Bacher says we are standing at a threshold in agencies and institutions of the church. "A threshold," he says, "calls attention to an interruption, a meeting of old and new. The advantage of seeing our time now as a threshold is twofold. First, it makes it harder to assume that business as usual will do and avoids the neglect of the past in some headlong plunge into an imagined 'brave new world.' In counseling programs at Lutheran Family Services we will tell clients not to 'get stuck in their past. A road sign in Canada says, 'Be careful which rut you fall into. You may be driving it for the next 25 miles.' W

must heed the signs.”

Mission is both here and there. Given the nature of modern society, the mission frontier is right here at the door of our congregations, colleges, or SMOs, but it is also far away, given that the whole world is the subject of God’s love. I frequently tell congregations in Nebraska that sometimes we in the church do mission work halfway around the world, and sometimes we do it in our own backyards. I can walk outside my office door in downtown Omaha and find a homeless man on a cold winter night sleeping in the alley behind a dumpster or I can look out my office window on a sunny summer noon hour and see prostitutes work the business crowd.

Do we as leaders in colleges and SMOs have the courage to really lead? To hold on to rooted theology and yet be pulled by the situation that the church finds itself in society? For example, do we really have the courage to lead this church from inclusiveness “numbers counting” into real cultural pluralism and diversity? Do we have the courage to admit that eight students from Africa do not make a multiculturally diverse student body or a social service agency staff?

Do we have the courage to study the demographic trends and change our college curriculum to make Spanish a requirement for *all* students, whether they are majoring in accounting or sociology or journalism? Is Intro to Art or Physical Therapy or Logic any more important in the year 2000 than Conversational Spanish? Do we have the courage to teach the church that starting a mission congregation in a Hispanic section of town using all the Caucasian, Northern European liturgy and cultural norms in worship may not be effective, genuine outreach or care of neighbor?

Do we have the courage in social ministry to enter the world of counseling over the internet wires? Do we have the courage in our colleges and seminaries to stop preparing students for church and a world that doesn’t exist as some of professors and counselors once knew it? Do we have the courage in our social ministry organizations to cut back our services to Caucasian clients in order to increase our services to Hispanic, Sudanese, and African American clients? Do we really believe we are a church in a mission field or is that just something Loren Mead writes about?

Listen to Justo Gonzales, a pastor and scholar. In his book, *Santa Biblia: The Bible through Hispanic Eyes*, Gonzales comments on Paul’s use of manna in the wilderness story

in which Paul appeals to the Corinthian congregation to share and send money for the poor in Jerusalem. “Perhaps,” Gonzalez writes, “one of the reasons we tend to remember the miracle of production, and not the miracle of distribution, is that as individuals or as a society, we can boast of imitating God being productive, but we cannot boast about the manner in which our resources are distributed.” In other words, we can produce, but we do not share (or distribute) our resources so easily.

Are we in agencies and colleges really courageous enough to invite church leaders to tell us what they really need from us? Are we really courageous enough to tell church leaders what the new mission field is really like? We need people in our SMOs that are trained to work in a mission field where skin is not all white and all language is not English, where most people, including our staff, are not Lutheran, and where more words are spoken over the internet than over the telephone. Technology is bringing the outside world into our social ministry organizations.

Let’s say you are going to a party, so you pull out a couple of dollars and buy a little greeting card that plays “Happy Birthday” when it is opened. After the party, someone casually tosses the card into the trash, throwing away more computer power than existed in the entire world before 1950! We cannot any longer settle in!

Our partnerships are changing. How we do our work is changing. At LFS of Nebraska we are partnering with the Methodists in the North Omaha community. We are beginning to partner with Church World Service in Refugee Resettlement. Twenty years ago we did refugee resettlement alone. Today we are doing it ecumenically. We are working with the Catholics, Baptists, and Congregationalists in neighborhood development. When most of the people in the world were Caucasian, and when the mainline churches had growing memberships, we lay leaders and clergy alike, settled into our padded pews and sermon files. The more things changed, the more they stayed the same.

Some of my colleagues in social ministry believe that social ministry organizations are in a growing position of weakness in the church because we are losing funding from the church at all levels. You, in colleges, know that all too well. Maybe, just maybe, in our weakness is our strength for this next century! Maybe out of our lesser dependence on financial support from the church, we will be free and courageous enough to assume leadership from the front in our church.

I heard the story once of a refugee, now a pastor in Wisconsin, who said, "How can my people engage successfully in society but remain true to cherished traditions?" For us here today, her question could be paraphrased to this, "How can we in institutions work successfully in society and remain faithful to our calling?"

Maybe what the church needs from us in colleges and social ministry organizations is a brave new voice, not fearful of reelection or declining membership numbers. What is our calling in the church in the 21st century? Maybe, just maybe, we are the bearers of hope! In our agencies and institutions we may have enough distance from the bureaucracy of the church to step boldly into action. Do we have the courage?

It was the very proclamation of "feed the hungry, clothe the naked, care for the children" that led our church--Danes, Norwegians, Swedes, and Germans--into social ministry and higher education, into caring for our neighbor. I do not question why we do it. Our Gospel call to care for our neighbor remains the same. In 2000 I question the how, the where, and the to whom we deliver the education and the social services. To stay viable and competitive, I suggest a broadening of the focus of neighbor from the primarily white orphan or white college student to a more intentionally inclusive, culturally diverse group.

In the 1980's social ministry organizations were encouraged to diversify our programs and funding bases so that we were not so dependent on one funding source. Today, we are talking about focusing on what we do best and dropping the rest. Can we act on mission fields that exist in our own backyards? Could colleges and SMOs pool our resources and provide scholarships to children in foster care--children on the edge, not benefitting from the millions made in the market this year? Could we provide social service and education scholarships in large numbers to the Sudanese refugees in our backyards? Could we look at more two-year degrees? Could we develop youth and family ministry programs that educate lay persons to minister in our congregations and communities? Could we develop more dual-degree training between ordained ministry, religion, and social work? Could we, together, step to the plate, admit the problems of alcohol on our campuses, and address the problem?

Since knowledge doubles in our world every two years, can we step boldly into education and change what is required to be learned in four years? Can we prepare our students and social workers for a world where English *is* the second language? Could we spend more of our resources to speak about "vocation and calling" to high school students?

Could colleges and social ministry organizations work more together in speaking about vocation in the church? Social ministry organizations need accountants, public relations directors, human resource managers, foster care workers, and administrative assistants, counselors, and network administrators. Together, could we help students see that for Christians, occupation is seen through the eyes of God-given vocation, that work is not the venue for personal aggrandizement, but for witness to Christ in the service of neighbor? This understanding gives all who work in social ministry organizations a sense of purpose beyond the paycheck. Could we not help our students understand that calling and vocation extend beyond the call to ordained ministry? Social ministry organizations need your brightest and best students, who have a sense of vocation and calling, to use their occupational skills and their faith-based understanding of care for neighbor, in order to keep the church in society, caring for the voiceless and abused, the abandoned and forgotten.

In Nebraska this past legislative session, twelve of the largest not for profit private providers banded together, mobilized our boards and staff, and almost single-handedly moved the legislature to raise reimbursement rates for providers. We had not had rate increases in six years. Let me be clear. I do not mean that we care more about Nebraska's children and families than employees of the state. However, we were not "chained by their bureaucracy" and we could be a powerful voice of advocacy and justice for both our agencies and for clients. Can we not do the same in church? Can we not, in this mission field time in the church, when mainline denominations are "struggling to maintain" their church headquarters and staff, be the voice of the church, crying out in the wilderness, calling all hands on deck, to "Go in Peace; Serve the Lord."

Ruth Henricks is the President and CEO of Lutheran Family Services of Nebraska.

A RIVER RUNS THROUGH IT: CALIFORNIA LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY AS A CHURCH RELATED UNIVERSITY

A. Joseph Everson

A university has many faces. At CLU, we recognize that the 850 undergraduates who live on our campus have a rather different experience than do the 450 students who commute. The 500 students enrolled in ADEP (our adult education program) are all at least 25 years of age and hold associate degrees from another school; they typically come to our campus only one or two evenings a week. They have an experience of university life that is quite different from that of undergraduate students. In addition, we have almost 1,000 graduate students, who also attend evening classes and work toward advanced degrees in business, education, public policy and psychology.

While our students may experience CLU in different ways, we believe that there is a rather distinctive ethos on this campus, an ethos shaped by our religious heritage and expressed through the commitment and contributions of faculty, staff and students over the years. Three aspects of our ethos are particularly important:

1. First, we are a small university in which we strive for personal attention and excellence in instruction. We are a total community comprised of approximately 2800 students, 150 administrators and staff, 100 full time faculty and almost as many part-time faculty members. What happens in classrooms is very important for us. What happens in co-curricular activities, in our campus dorms and in other areas of student life is also important for us.

2. Secondly, we are a church-related university. We are affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. In recent years, we have devoted considerable attention to our university mission statement, which declares:

-CLU is a diverse scholarly community dedicated to excellence in the liberal arts and professional studies.

-Rooted in the Lutheran tradition of Christian faith, the University encourages critical inquiry into matters of both faith and reason.

-The mission of the University is to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and

committed to service and justice.

As I have pondered the question of the distinctive ethos of CLU, I have found myself thinking about Norman MacLean's classic work *A River Runs Through It*. In that work he describes how a mountain river defines the geography of his western Montana world. We also have a river which crosses the CLU campus. It is not a mighty river, however. Once I saw it when it flooded the entire heart of our campus. But most of the time, our creek is only a quiet stream. The banks are filled with wonderful wildflowers and for much of the year, when night falls, the world along our creek is alive with the sound of a symphony of frogs. In its own way, our small creek adds beauty and grace to the campus and brings definition particularly to Kingsman Park, which is at the heart of the CLU campus.

In a similar way, I believe that a particular stream of Christian faith and tradition also runs through this campus. This stream does not run like a mountain river but is much more like our quiet creek. It is a stream that does not overwhelm the community. Many of us believe that this is appropriate, and at the same time, believe strongly that this stream of faith is central to our ethos and adds beauty, grace and definition to all that we do here. Some people on our campus take our church-relatedness with great seriousness; others do not. But many who are not even sure how to articulate what "church-relatedness" means still express the feeling that our Lutheran identity and heritage brings something unique and special to this academic community.

3. A third aspect of our ethos is not as easy to explain and is often quite puzzling for those who are new to this place. We are a community committed to critical inquiry into matters of both faith and reason. We speak of a dialectic between the realm of faith and the realm of reason. This has been a longstanding characteristic of Lutheran higher education. To some it might appear that we see faith and reason as separate realms. But they are not really separate. Like poles of a battery, the realms of faith and reason are intimately related, and equally essential. In Lutheran tradition, many will argue that neither realm, neither faith nor reason, should be able to "trump" the other.

Sometimes faith needs to be corrected by reason just as reason needs to be tempered by faith. Like a well-charged battery, a healthy dialectic between matters of reason and faith can spark electricity and yield productive energy for a community. At times that energy results in heat; just as often we hope that the energy can also yield light or new insight.

I see the dialectic working itself out in various ways here at CLU:

In the realm of faith, we have an active "Lord of Life" student congregation on our campus. The student congregation has two pastors; other staff members and a church council oversee a broad spectrum of discussion or activity groups. The student congregation worships at a Sunday evening service each week and also sponsors a large Wednesday evening gathering known as "Common Ground." We have a full-time Assistant to the President for Church Relations who has the specific responsibility of developing good lines of communications with area clergy and congregations. As part of the governance of the university, people known as Convocators come to our campus once each year as representatives of the five western synods of the ELCA. They review the work of the college and along with other responsibilities, have the task of electing all new members of our Board of Regents.

In the academic realm, our core academic curriculum requires a minimum of two religion courses for all four-year students. Our "Introduction to Religious Studies: The Christian Tradition" course involves historical and critical study of Old and New Testament literature, and includes an introduction to selected themes in Christian history. Beyond that introductory course, the religion department offers a wide range of elective courses, three different religion minors (five courses) and a religion major (nine courses). In addition, the religion department is committed to integrated study with other academic departments through cluster programs, global studies and various seminars. Religious themes are regularly assigned in various departments across the curriculum and frequently appear within the University Artist and Speakers series.

A university chapel service is held each Wednesday morning at 10 a.m., designed as a place where matters of faith and reason may come together. The chapel service is clearly a time of worship and praise. But during a past academic year, the chapel schedule included a morning focused on welcoming international students and several

other occasions when athletic teams or other groups on campus were introduced. The campus pastors participate in the opening convocation, the Founders Day convocation and the spring honors convocation, when students who have achieved academic distinction are recognized.

Chapel attendance is voluntary. The administration asks that student and faculty committees not meet during the Wednesday chapel hour and most administrative offices close during that time. But there would be very little if any support on this campus for making chapel participation a requirement.

The dialectic between faith and reason in Lutheran tradition goes back all the way to the writings of Martin Luther. In his 1520 treatise on "The Freedom of the Christian," for example, Luther wrote:

"The Christian is free lord of all, subject to none"

And at the same time, because of the obligations of love and compassion, he declared:

"The Christian is servant to all, subject to all."

Luther contends that both propositions are true. Church historian Richard Solberg and others before him have called this dialectical characteristic of Lutheran thought a "theology of paradox" (Solberg 74). Most famous, perhaps, is Luther's statement about the nature of human beings; they are, he declared, "simul justus et peccator"—simultaneously "saints and sinners." By that, Luther meant that individual human beings are capable of bringing great good and/or great evil in the world. It is important to note that the Lutheran colleges and universities affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) have not been governed by creedal statements or specific affirmations about particular church doctrines. Consequently, ELCA Lutheran colleges and universities in north America have for the most part not experienced the bitter feuds over questions of "biblical inerrancy", "verbal inspiration" or the debates over dogmatic truths that have haunted many formerly Protestant church-related schools.

Rather, as Richard Hughes has noted: [In Lutheran tradition] "... the task of the Christian scholar ... is not to impose on the world- or on the material that he or she studies- a distinctly 'Christian worldview'. It is rather 'to study the world as it is and then to bring that world into dialogue with the Christian vision of redemption and

grace.” (Hughes 6)

What, then, is distinctive about the ethos of this Lutheran university? As an invitation to further conversation, I want briefly to introduce six virtues or commitments that I believe characterize the ethos of CLU. They are not accidental virtues. I believe that these six commitments flow directly from the stream of Christian tradition which provided the energy for those who founded this school in the era from 1959-1964 and new energy for those who have continued to nurture the ethos of this campus.

1. Commitment to Academic Freedom

This commitment is at the heart of our Lutheran heritage. We celebrate the memory that Martin Luther was a progressive academic within his medieval world. Martin Marty has said that the Lutheran tradition in higher education begins with the protest of a rebellious untenured junior faculty member! In 1517, Martin Luther was still a rather young member of the faculty at the university at Wittenberg, Germany, which had been founded only a decade or two earlier by the German Elector, Frederick the Wise.

As a devout Roman Catholic priest, Luther's passion for reformation emerged from his commitments as a scholar and as a member of that university community. He felt a very real sense of responsibility as a professor of Biblical interpretation to speak out in debate about the crass selling of indulgences. In the spirit of Luther, we treasure the words of the gospel of St. John:

"You shall know the truth and the truth will set you free!"
(John 8:32)

We welcome and embrace the academic quest for truth on this campus. We welcome new faculty who come from various backgrounds who are committed to that quest. At the same time, we see the quest also tempered by the admonition of the ancient prophet Jeremiah, who wrote:

"Seek the welfare of the human community ... for in its welfare, you will find your own!" (Jeremiah 29:7)

2. Commitment to Vocation

Luther wrote extensively about vocation. I am not always sure how well we communicate what we mean by vocation today, but I think that it involves an understanding that our human life is a gift. We did not create ourselves.

Vocation also involves a vision about the future. When students catch a hopeful vision about the future, and when they can see themselves within that vision, university education becomes rather exciting.

We are not just helping people simply to learn how to earn a living. Much more, we are helping people to learn how to live. By that, we mean, we have the opportunities to help students discover meaningful, productive and satisfying lives. Hopefully, the life they choose will bring blessings for themselves and for the larger world in which they will live.

3. Commitment to Service

In the Bible, the notion of election (the calling to be "a chosen people") is not a calling to privilege; it is rather a call to servant life. Already in the eighth century BCE, the prophet Amos complains because the people of his time misunderstood divine election to mean "privilege" (Amos 3:1-2 and 9:7-8). In a world of wealth, we contend that meaningful life is not to be discovered through privilege or through the selfish accumulation of luxuries. We consciously affirm an ethic of service on this campus—through the devoted work of faculty and staff, by the example of custodians and maintenance people, through our Habitat for Humanity chapter, through periodic Service Days and in many other service-related activities. We seek consciously to model a service ethic in the way we relate to students. I think it fair to say that we aspire to communicate an "ethic of service" that is consistent with the message of Israel's prophets and the life and teaching of Jesus.

4. Commitment to Grace – and to Graciousness

I hope it is also accurate to say that "grace" permeates the ethos of CLU. We intentionally create and maintain serious academic standards and a code of responsible conduct. Almost every semester, some students are suspended or placed on probation for violations of established rules. From time to time, a student is expelled from the university. Whenever this happens, it is a painful experience, particularly for our student affairs staff and for the faculty who have known the particular student. In these situations, I have seen our staff people struggle with the complex issues of law and grace. Faculty members struggle in similar ways with questions of law and grace when they respond to students who fail on projects large or small. We aspire to hold high standards and expectations. But "forgiveness" and a willingness to go "the second

mile" are also hallmarks of this academic community. This is not accidental. The Lutheran tradition is grounded in an understanding of a gracious God who is compassionate toward all people. And, while we do not always articulate this reality with the specific language of faith, those of us who are from the Christian tradition know very well that we are attempting to be the "body of Christ" on this campus.

At a faculty meeting this past year, I reflected on our commitment to grace by quoting the words that William Shakespeare gives to Portia, in her famous courtroom oration, as she appears disguised as a lawyer, pleading for the life of the merchant of Venice:

The quality of mercy is not strain'd;
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath. It is twice blest:
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.
'Tis mightiest in the mightiest; it becomes
The throned monarch better than his crown;
His scepter shows the force of temporal power,
The attribute to awe and majesty,
Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings;

But mercy is above this sceptred sway,
It is enthroned in the hearts of kings,
It is an attribute of God himself;
An earthly power doth then show likest God's
When mercy seasons justice.
(Shakespeare, *Merchant of Venice*, Act 4, Scene I)

We believe that the "quality of mercy" enriches and enhances the climate of a university and the lives of all who live or work there.

5. Commitment to Diversity

In our mission statement, we say that we aspire to be "a diverse scholarly community." Some might contend that we are too diverse; others will say that we are not diverse enough. Within our faculty and staff, we have a rather significant number of people of Jewish heritage. We have several Muslims, as well as faculty members who come from a variety of Asian religious traditions. Our faculty includes people from various Christian denominations and some who are agnostic. Our student body is more diverse than the faculty, in terms of race, ethnicity and religious background.

We believe that diversity within a university community is

essential and healthy. Diversity enhances our academic environment, even when it can bring certain difficult problems. Diversity raises the energy level on the campus and brings new dynamics of thought or debate within classrooms and dormitory life. In particular, a diverse population on a church-related campus must prompt those who are of Christian faith to reflect seriously on the question: "What does Christian witness look like to those who come from other religious backgrounds or from other parts of the world? Is Christian witness seen as triumphal, condescending, and judgmental or is it a witness characterized by respect and tolerance?"

6. Commitment to Reverence

For me, this is the common commitment that unites and holds together a church-related university, along with its faculty and staff. It is the common virtue that we seek to inspire in all of our students. CLU has long had a strong commitment to music, art, drama, and other fine arts. We are thrilled to have a graceful and beautiful chapel, a sacred space where we can gather as a community for worship and ritual. It is particularly interesting to be in our university chapel when the space is used for other events—for recitals, for academic lectures and for public events. Particularly in those situations, the architecture and the symbolism of the chapel invite those present to reflect on the interrelatedness of all of life, the worlds both of reason and faith.

We look forward to the day when we will have other new facilities on this campus. In the meantime, we seek to affirm a commitment that has been here since the founding of this school – a commitment of respect for the environment, for the earth which is our home, and for the sanctity of human life. In particular, as an academic community, we seek to respect the people who walk these campus pathways and occupy our classrooms. In respecting our students, we also show reverence and respect for divine mystery, the mystery of God.

The author of Proverbs, ch. 9 writes: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom!" Those of us who teach that ancient literature know that the poetic phrase "fear of the Lord" really means "reverence," "awe," or "wonder." Most of us, most of the time, are delighted to have the opportunity to work with students, both the young and the old, particularly at those moments when they catch the sense that it is very good to be alive. It is good to be with students when they discover the freedom and the courage to think for themselves. It is good to be with them when

they pose difficult questions, especially when they realize that they can do so without losing a sense of wonder about the world.

A Concluding Word about the Stream of Tradition

A river runs through it! The stream of tradition at CLU is one that advocates responsible academic freedom, concern for vocation, commitment to service, commitment to gracious and compassionate words and actions, respect for

diversity, and commitment to a sense of reverence for things large and small in this world. These commitments contribute directly to the ethos of this school. Many of us believe that this ethos that has been shaped by Christian faith. At its best, the ethos is like a stream that adds definition to the landscape, distinctive beauty and grace to the campus and meaning for the tradition in which we teach.

Joseph Everson is a professor of religion at California Lutheran University.

Bibliography

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

Lull, Timothy F. *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works*. G.B. Harrison, Editor. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1968.

Solberg, Richard W. "What Can the Lutheran Tradition Contribute to Christian Higher Education" in Hughes, Richard T. and Adrian, William B. *Models for Christian Higher Education: Strategies for Success in the Twenty-first Century*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Solberg, Richard W. *Lutheran Higher Education in North America*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985.

ELCA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES



Augsburg College
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Luther College
Decorah, Iowa

Augustana College
Rock Island, Illinois

Midland Lutheran College
Fremont, Nebraska

Augustana College
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Muhlenberg College
Allentown, Pennsylvania

Bethany College
Linsborg, Kansas

Newberry College
Newberry, South Carolina

California Lutheran University
Thousand Oaks, California

Pacific Lutheran University
Tacoma, Washington

Capital University
Columbus, Ohio

Roanoke College
Salem, Virginia

Carthage College
Kenosha, Wisconsin

St. Olaf College
Northfield, Minnesota

Concordia College
Moorhead, Minnesota

Susquehanna University
Selinsgrove, Pennsylvania

Dana College
Blair, Nebraska

Texas Lutheran University
Seguin, Texas

Finlandia University
Hancock, Michigan

Thiel College
Greenville, Pennsylvania

Gettysburg College
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Wagner College
Staten Island, New York

Grand View College
Des Moines, Iowa

Waldorf College
Forest City, Iowa

Gustavus Adolphus College
St. Peter, Minnesota

Wartburg College
Waverly, Iowa

Lenoir-Rhyne College
Hickory, North Carolina

Wittenberg University
Springfield, Ohio