Phipps, Kim S. "Epilogue: Campus Climate and Christian Scholarship." *Scholarship and Christian Faith*, Oxford University Press, edited by Douglas Jacobsen and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen, 2004, pp. 171-183.

Epilogue: Campus Climate and Christian Scholarship

Kim S. Phipps

This book's use of the term "conversation" is, for the most part, metaphorical. Conversation is used as a symbol for the broad discussion of Christian scholarship we would like to encourage within the academy as a whole. This epilogue seeks to move from that relatively abstract use of the term toward a focus on the real conversations—face-to-face dialogues and institutional conversations—that actually take place on college and university campuses. The goal is to explore how to promote open dialogue and "enlarge the conversation" in our own academic communities.

Virtually every college and university with which I am familiar refers to itself from time to time as a community—a community of scholars, a community of learners, a community of people living and working together. Community is, however, a notoriously fuzzy term. What does it mean? What is its importance for the scholarly quest? How does it relate to "conversation"?

At its core, community is the acknowledgment of our unavoidable interrelatedness; it is the admission that we are dependent on each other. Philip Slater has bluntly said that "the notion that people begin as separate individuals, who then march out and connect themselves with others, is one of the most dazzling bits of self-mystification in the history of the species."[1] Perhaps the most famous expression of this sentiment comes from the seventeenth-century English poet John Donne, who wrote in his *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions:*

> No man is an *Iland*, intire of it selfe; every man is a peece of the *Continent*, a part of the *maine;* if a *Clod* bee washed

> away by the *Sea, Europe* is the lesse, as well as if a *Promontorie* were, as well as if a *Mannor* of thy *friends* or of *thine owne* were; any mans *death* diminishes *me,* because I an involved in *Mankinde;* And therefore never send to know for whom the *bell* tolls; It tolls for *thee.*[2]

Ernest Boyer, the educator to whom this book is dedicated, often noted that "we are all inextricably connected" to each other.[3] These three commentators on the human condition agree that individualism is a dangerous myth—a myth in the popular sense of the term, meaning something that is simply not true—but they also acknowledge that it is an amazingly powerful myth and one to which the academic world is not immune.[4]

The work of scholarship is, however, not an enterprise that can subsist on individualism. Scholarship is rooted in connectedness—in mutual assistance, conversation, encouragement, support, and evaluation. Scholarship proceeds by building on what others have done, and it makes sense only in the context of what others are doing. Scholarship is inherently and unavoidably communal. As the literary critic Wayne Booth explains: "We depend upon appraising the testimony and authority and general ethos of other people as they appraise the testimony and authority of still others, who in turn depend on others . . . and no one can say where these circles of mutual trust [within the academy] end."[5] This structure of mutual trust is evident within the individual disciplines where specialists share their insights with others and hold each other accountable. Booth argues that a similar structure of trust, assistance, and evaluation can and should operate across the disciplines, and he suggests that in healthy colleges and universities this kind of crosscampus dialogue will be an important aspect of the overall culture.

This campus-wide conversation will sometimes be formally interdisciplinary in nature—that is, the multidisciplinary exploration of some academic topic—but more often it will focus on concerns that transcend the standard academic divisions of knowledge and on issues that have become matters of special attention and importance for a particular college or university. The common threads that emerge and repeat themselves within this kind of campus-wide conversation tend, over time, to become the living identity of the institution. As communities of learning, we are the content of what we communicate. But colleges and universities are also deeply shaped by *how* we talk to each other, and here the ideals of community become even more important. Well-functioning communities nurture people through the conversations they maintain. Well-functioning communities give people the personal and emotional resources they need to flourish both as individuals *and* as persons who can help other members of the community flourish. And well-functioning educational communities produce scholarship because their members are in the business of supporting and encouraging each other in their scholarly work.

While this should be true of all colleges and universities, it is particularly important for Christian and church-related institutions of higher learning. To define community in terms of mutual care and flourishing is after all a distinctively Christian, if not necessarily uniquely Christian, way of understanding the nature of community. In fact, the theologian Rowan Williams has argued that this is the point of the church as an institution: to provide evidence that mutually self-giving human community is possible.[6] Applying that ideal of Christian community to higher education, Monika Hellwig has argued that Catholic colleges and universities (and by implication all other Christian institutions of higher learning) ought to be defined by their

> concern for the whole person of the student and all who are involved in the institution. Genuine human bonds of friendship and mutual respect and support are envisaged as the core of the educational enterprise, because not only book learning but human formation for leadership and responsibility in all walks of life are sought through the community experience of higher education.[7]

My approach will accordingly be to focus on the world of Christian higher education as that realm where Christian scholarship rooted in Christian community ought to be visible in an exemplary way. In doing this, I will concentrate on three specific areas of campus life: the climate of the campus as a place of intellectual hospitality; the practices of the campus as they encourage inclusive conversation; and the role of administrative leadership in nurturing campus cultures that embrace scholarship rooted in community.

An Ethos of Intellectual Hospitality

Hospitality can only be learned by experiencing its wonderful gifts. Hospitality is the gracious welcoming of the other into one's domain—into one's home or office or community, and into one's heart and soul. The term *hospitality* connotes genuine respect and concern both for an individual's needs and for her perspectives. Hospitality is a welcoming of the person in all of his or her uniqueness and fullness as a human being.

My husband and I experienced true hospitality early in our married life when we were interviewed for a staff position at a Midwestern church. A member of the congregation named Numa welcomed us into her home and into her heart during that stressful candidacy weekend. The food she prepared was delicious and the conversation was characterized by laughter and goodwill, but the most important aspect of Numa's hospitality was the way she carefully listened to two naive twenty-two-year-olds who had much to learn and experience (but didn't know it). We received the invitation to serve that congregation, and throughout the ensuing years, Numa repeatedly invited us for dinner,

provided us with many tangible gifts, and even included us in family holiday celebrations. But her hospitality was most clearly communicated by her consistent, nonjudgmental, empathetic listening. Although she could have "set us straight" on numerous occasions, she chose instead to carefully listen, gently suggest, and enthusiastically support our initiatives and our dreams. She communicated love and respect to us in every conversation and action. Whenever I encounter the word *hospitality* I am immediately reminded of Numa and the gift of her presence in our lives.

Intellectual hospitality is, of course, not exactly the same as ordinary (which is actually not so ordinary) hospitality, but many traits are shared. Intellectual hospitality involves care and concern for the person, and it also necessitates inviting others into conversation, listening without prejudging, and affirming the value of others and their perspectives even when legitimate disagreement exists. Most important, intellectual hospitality involves the virtue of epistemological humility, which roots our openness to the views of others in the recognition that our own mental powers are limited and that the cognitive, experiential, and affective insights of others, especially when they are different from our own, can truly deepen and extend our understanding of others and the world that surrounds us. Intellectual hospitality is not just a matter of being civil to other people in an academic setting; it is a methodology of inquiry that humbly assumes that we can learn as much (or more) from those with whom we disagree as we can from our like-minded colleagues.

In addition to this academic rationale, there are a host of other reasons for Christian scholars to be intellectually hospitable. The first reason is rooted in the *imago dei*, which implies the infinite worth and value of all human beings because they are uniquely created in God's image. A second reason for Christians to be intellectually hospitable is that it is a concrete manifestation of being obedient to the New Testament commandment to love one's neighbor. Third, Christians are called to be intellectually hospitable because it is reflective of the kind, gentle, and compassionate ways of the Holy Spirit. The ideal of hospitality can undoubtedly be amply supported from scripture and Christian tradition. It is perhaps less clear how to apply intellectual hospitality to Christian scholars' roles as faculty in the classroom, colleagues in academic societies, and administrators at church-related colleges and universities.

Somewhat counterintuitively, applying hospitality to the scholarly realm requires an acknowledgment of legitimate conflict. In his article "The Academic Life as Christian Vocation," Charles J. Matthewes argues that Christian scholars *should* and *could* model for the academy the value of ideational conflict as a context for learning. He argues that "acknowledging conflict is a critical element in the Christian vision of the world."[8] The goal, of course, is not to stop with conflict but ultimately to move toward reconciliation. Without the recognition of conflict, reconciliation is impossible. Matthewes suggests that the work of reconciliation in the realm of intellectual inquiry and dispute

should go beyond mere discussion and be expressed in reconciled relationships. That is appropriate Christian advice, for the essence of the gospel is reconciliation with both God and others. It is also appropriate scholarly counsel: when we are estranged from someone we invariably discount their ideas, and when that happens in the realm of scholarship, we may unthinkingly close ourselves off to any insights the other person might offer, which in turn limits our own reflective analysis of the world.

Intellectual hospitality also requires avoiding the cavalier or judgmental labeling of new or different points of view. Labeling is a necessary function of academic life. We all employ labels to help reduce the complexity of the world to manageable proportions. Intellectual life is rife with metaphors, taxonomies, typologies, and a host of other interpretive frameworks that sort people and ideas into helpful categories. But labels can also be used negatively, as rhetorical devices that deter the development of an intellectually hospitable climate by preventing individuals from perceiving people, ideas, and events as they truly exist. Terms such as "secular," "conservative," "liberal," "feminist," and "fundamentalist" often obfuscate more than they elucidate. This is true even when we are using these terms solely as mental categories that are never verbally expressed. If we allow ourselves to think in terms of glib or biased categories, those thoughts will affect the social worlds in which we live even if they are never given voice. Intellectual hospitality requires us to use labels sparingly and generously rather than critically and suspiciously.

When scholars fulfill their roles as teachers, intellectual hospitality takes on even greater significance. Diana Chapman Walsh, president of Wellesley College, has argued that taking learning seriously necessitates the creation of campus cultures that engender honest, spirited dialogue about significant issues. An open, affirming classroom climate is essential for students to feel empowered to pursue "coherence, connection, meaning, purpose, hope, [and] love" in their lives and thinking. She adds that "these qualities of mind and spirit . . . are the very stuff of what faculty, when they are at their best, are inculcating in their students and passing on to future generations."[9] Christian scholars should possess a particular affinity for these spiritual elements of the educational process and for the ways intellectual hospitality can contribute to a meaningful learning experience.

There is, however, a caveat to this discussion of intellectual hospitality as it relates to church-related institutions of higher education. These institutions sometimes face challenges of intellectual hospitality that other colleges and universities do not encounter. Often the challenge emanates not from the campus itself but from its external constituency. Friends and supporters of the college sometimes ask how much diversity can be allowed before the core identity and mission of the college will be harmed. How embracing can and should a church-related college be? Isn't there a place in American higher education for schools that provide a respite from the unchecked pluralism of

the culture as a whole? Those are valid questions, especially when Christian colleges and universities are committed to the nurturing of Christian values in students as well as to the exploration of intellectual issues. But the critical factor is not one of limiting what issues can be discussed or who can be welcomed to the campus; rather this issue is more a matter of learning how to think and live as Christians in the midst of a very complex world. Leaders of church-related colleges need to communicate to their constituents that the particular missions and identities of their institutions can be cultivated even as intellectual hospitality is practiced.

The Practice of Inclusive Conversation

In the quest to create an intellectually hospitable campus climate that supports and encourages quality Christian scholarship, no practice is more important than inclusive conversation. The goal of inclusive conversation is civil dialogue rather than political posturing or the supercilious placating of others. It is the cultivation of true dialogue, rather than dueling monologues. Reuel Howe's little book *The Miracle of Dialogue* (1963) still says it well. He writes:

> At some moment, in the monologue, one participant may give up his pretenses and lay aside the masks by which he seeks the approval and good will of the other, dare to be what he is in relation to the other, invite the other to be a partner in dialogue and be fully present to him as he really is. At that moment each of the participants must accept the resulting address and response as the discipline and task of communication. Any relationship less than this would not be dialogue and, therefore, not communication.[10]

Creating a space for dialogue, for true conversation, is a core defining characteristic of educational institutions. In fact, John Bennett has suggested that conversation can serve as a metaphor for the entire educational process:

> Conversation points toward the cultural importance of individual participation in engagement with the voices that constitute our human inheritance; it highlights the importance of the active engagement of those participating—faculty and students alike—as well as the significance of elements of self-involvement and reflexivity. It also reminds us of the need for hospitable openness to the other, be the other multicultural, global, near or far. And it illustrates the importance of observing a covenant with the other in mutual learning, not simply a contract of mutual convenience.[11]

College or university campuses are places where individuals learn how to hear the voices of others and to enter into scholarly conversations about ideas, im-

ages, issues, and ideologies. The campus as a whole, not just the classroom, is a place where students and faculty not only *learn indirectly about* what others think but also a place where we *learn directly from* each other about what each of us thinks.

In a healthy conversation, participants listen in order to deepen their understanding of a subject and to better appreciate one another. The importance of the conversation metaphor for scholarship in general and for Christian scholarship in particular is that it acknowledges the fact that our views on various topics are often derived from our own autobiographies as much as they result from logical reflection. Although reason and logic are central to understanding faith and scholarship, narrative also fulfills an important role. Martha Nussbaum has articulated the way personal narratives positively influence academic conversations in contrast to logic. She argues that narratives—personal and interpersonal stories—inspire creative wonderment and foster a sense of awe about humanity.[12] Narratives elicit empathy and camaraderie. Narratives require listeners to open their hearts and minds to the ideas, struggles, and experiences of others. Narratives often serve to create shared meaning and promote community. Scholarship that precludes consideration of the autobiographical perspectives of individual scholars will be severely limited, lacking creative imagination and insights into human nature.

The conversations we need to facilitate on our campuses regarding the nature and character of Christian scholarship must embrace both personal narrative and rational argument. The academy is slowly coming to understand the value of personal narratives as they relate to critical reflection and analysis, but many discussions surrounding Christian scholarship focus solely on logic and reason. This response may well be a reaction against the past when some Christian scholars used the language of testimony as a means of avoiding serious engagement with intellectual issues. While recognizing that potential danger, contemporary Christian scholarship needs to include both personal narrative and dispassionate reflection on faith, life, and the academic disciplines.

It is not sufficient to only improve our conversational skills; we also need to enlarge the subject of the conversation itself. As has already been suggested in this book, one way to expand Christian scholarship is to include perspectives from a variety of Christian traditions. Every tradition has strengths and weaknesses to bring to the conversation, and all traditions will be enriched by the mutual affirmation and critique of dialogue. This book engages in some criticism of the Reformed integration model of Christian scholarship because, as the current dominant model, it has sometimes tended to squeeze out other voices. Critique of the integration model opens space for other perspectives to be heard and valued. (Similar critical analyses could and should be brought to bear on all the other traditions of Christian scholarship.) The dynamic of conversation at different church-related colleges and universities will be distinctive

since each institution ought rightly to give special attention and nurture to the specific tradition(s) that have informed the historic mission and identity of that school. At the same time, we all recognize that individual Christian traditions exist within a much larger matrix of Christian diversity, and we need to be very careful not to assume that our form of faith represents the best or the most authentic expression of Christianity.

Enlarging our campus conversations also means expanding the conversation socially to include voices that have been previously absent or marginalized. There is much to be gained from including the voices of both women and men and those of persons from other cultures, ethnic and racial groups, and religious traditions. The inclusion of these voices will offer new insights into the theoretical and practical assumptions that are foundational to discussions of both academic and faith issues. Of course, this view of inclusivity is now commonly articulated in official institutional rhetoric. Who would disagree? But the sad truth is that most of the participants in the discussions of Christian scholarship on college and university campuses across the nation are white males. We need to devise new ways of framing questions and structuring conversations so others will be attracted to and affirmed for participation in the discussion. Constructive practices that result in inclusive conversation do not happen without intention, commitment, planning, and foresight.

Finally, enlarging our campus conversations about Christian scholarship will require us to understand and value different forms of scholarship. As suggested earlier in this book, Ernest Boyer's categorization of scholarship as discovery, integration, application, and teaching might assist this understanding, and so might Gardner's idea of multiple intelligences. This book distinguishes among analytic, strategic, and empathic scholarship, while recognizing that most scholarship incorporates all three styles to some degree. What happens on many of our campuses is that conversation breaks down along the lines of the more applied versus the more theoretical disciplines (often taking the specific form of the traditional liberal arts juxtaposed against more career-oriented departments like business, engineering, education, and nursing), with the artists located on the periphery.

If we can help faculty members communicate in ways that acknowledge the practical side of the liberal arts and the empathic side of the professional disciplines and the strategic side of art, theater, and music (along with all the other possible existing combinations), we might be able to begin to undermine the ostracizing language of "us versus them" that now comes so readily to faculty conversations. Current discussions of Christian scholarship tend to follow patterns that are most amenable to those in the traditional liberal arts, especially the humanities. While sound historical and practical reasons for this tendency exist, and while the concerns of the liberal arts most emphatically do enrich conversations dealing with more applied fields of study, we cannot be content to leave the discussion in its current state. New models of Christian

scholarship must respect all of the academic disciplines and must encourage all scholars to reflect on faith and learning in ways that fit naturally with their specific areas of expertise. Campus conversations that nurture and promote broader, stronger, and more direct connections between scholarship and faith will benefit both students and faculty.

Administrative Leadership

While many aspects of campus culture are shaped by the faculty as they seek to realize the identity and mission of the college, administrative leadership fulfills a critical role in creating a healthy climate of learning and scholarship at any college or university. Christian colleges and universities accordingly have much to learn from the national discussion that has focused attention on the emerging need for college and university administrators (in addition to being simple managers of the institution) to perceive themselves as leaders of a learning community. In fact, this is their first and most important task. Administrators ought to see themselves—and faculty and students ought to perceive them—as scholars with a unique role within the community, a role that often defines the nature of the institution.

The rhetoric that administrators choose to describe their schools, faculty, and students is fundamental. Perhaps the worst mistake an administrator can make is to speak of the college or university as simply a business, where student-consumers purchase various educational services from the institution and where faculty are seen as more or less replaceable assembly-line workers in a knowledge factory. This type of rhetoric demeans the meaning and purpose of education. But it is not just avoiding bad rhetoric that is required; administrators need to provide the campus community with language that inspires faculty and students alike to the highest levels of scholarly aspiration. Church-related colleges may have something special to model in this regard. At a recent gathering at a major research university, the highest purpose for education articulated by the leaders was "to help keep America strong and ahead of the rest of the world." While that may be a worthy goal (even if it is more than a bit ethnocentric), it does not compare to the Christian ideal of education as a means of knowing, loving, and serving God, our neighbors (meaning humanity as a whole), and all of creation.

Beyond language usage, however, administrators have a responsibility to establish and maintain policies that will aid and encourage—rather than undermine and discourage—the nurturing of scholarship and community on campus. Administrators need to work with faculty colleagues to create reward systems, including policies regarding promotion, tenure, and internal grants, that recognize excellence and elicit the best scholarship from many faculty members and departments within their institutions. One means of accom-

plishing this goal is to negotiate individual professional growth contracts with faculty members that encourage them to explore their unique interests, passions, gifts, and abilities. These contracts could be structured so that the particular stage of a faculty member's career (early, midterm, and late) might be considered a variable in the contract. Growth contracts are not the only way to motivate faculty members to scholarly excellence, but they represent one example of creative options that need to be considered.

Currently, however, institutional policies and practices frequently reflect very wooden, rigid definitions of scholarship. Most campuses have promotion and tenure processes based on the tripartite system of teaching, scholarship, and service; the reality is that scholarly productivity is the essential component at many institutions. Furthermore, there is often an informal caste system that assigns differential worth to different kinds of scholarly activity. At some schools, traditional "discovery" research (to use Boyer's terminology) rules the roost, and alternate forms of scholarship are viewed as deficient or unimportant. At other schools, especially those that pride themselves on being "teaching institutions," discovery research is demeaned as something pursued only by self-aggrandizing and uncollegial faculty. We need to develop policies and processes that recognize all of the various forms of scholarship.

Administrators also need to create mechanisms that demonstrate flexibility and fairness in our approach to faculty evaluation. The notion of flexibility does not imply a lessening of standards but the broadening of categories to include various forms and styles of teaching, scholarship, and service. It also means allowing faculty members to participate in determining how they will divide up their limited time and energy. Promotion and tenure policies that consider faculty interests and strengths in this way affirm the scholar in his or her calling and will undoubtedly result in greater self-understanding, higher levels of intrinsic motivation, and increased levels of performance. Honoring of individual differences among faculty members coupled with the equal valuing of all the scholarly domains, including humanities, arts, social sciences, natural sciences, and the professions will result in a transformed campus climate. No one in the campus conversation should ever be regarded as a second-class academic citizen.

I recently spoke to a national gathering of chief academic officers about the idea of educational community. In the discussion that followed, it became apparent that the term "community" was met with a significant amount of cynicism. Perhaps skepticism about community results from the hyperspecialization in the academy that has led to a divisive process of labeling and organizing according to disciplines, subdisciplines, methodologies, and institutional types. Campus cultures have often been shaped according to those divisions, and it will require courageous and creative commitment to challenge the seemingly impenetrable nature of those labels and boundaries.

But despite those problems, the ideal of community remains foundational

to the academic life. The root of the word "community"—to communicate or to make common—is at the core of the academy's sharing of knowledge, wisdom, and understanding. Church-related colleges and universities and Christian scholars on other collegiate campuses have an opportunity to model what it means to fully participate in a community of learning. David Morgan of Valparaiso University suggests that building a Christian community of learning depends on much more than the rhetoric of official published statements, noting that "we must not restrict ourselves to creedal documents and mission statements, but focus with great interest on the things we do, the stories we tell, the rites we preserve, the memories of play, the music we perform, the buildings we build and those we raze."[13] The challenge for the administrator is to sponsor opportunities that enable faculty to tell stories (even their own), to create spaces for the kind of authentic conversation that includes honest questioning about faith, religion, and the academy, and to develop campus rituals and celebrations that focus on what human beings hold in common rather than what divides them. When community is actively preserved and nurtured on a campus, scholars will be empowered to share their questions along with their conclusions. Community makes it possible for colleagues and students to experience the joy of articulating the best of thinking, feeling, and practice.

The benefits of this kind of learning community extend to students and also to the larger contemporary society. As noted by Diana Chapman Walsh,

> inspired faculty—faculty who are not dispirited and whose morale is high—are indispensable in meaning making. They can build the relationships, forge the connections, bind together the pluralistic global learning communities that will provide undergraduates with models to carry throughout their lives, models that inspire lives of purpose and commitment to causes larger than themselves.[14]

Faculty will become inspired when campus structures and policies are designed to nurture rather than obstruct the development of their own interests and vocational calling.

Early in Gail Godwin's novel *Evensong*, the main character, Margaret, writes an angry letter to her friend (and future husband) Adrian Bonner. As a young seminarian Margaret has just experienced an emotionally exhausting, faith-challenging week working in an urban hospital ward. She wonders if ministry is truly her vocational calling. Adrian responds with these words of conjecture: "Something's your vocation if it keeps making more of you."[15] The vocation of the Christian scholar is to remain faithful while pursuing questions, reconsidering paradigms, proposing solutions, and creating artistic works. Christian scholars pursue scholarship because they are called to do so and because their scholarly pursuits make more of them as human beings—more of them intellectually, artistically, professionally, personally, and spiritually. In-

deed, scholarship adds depth and breadth not only to the scholar's life and to the educational community in which he or she lives and works but also to the academy, the church, and society. Quality scholarship overflows: it produces passion, curiosity, synergy, and community that cannot be fenced in by the boundaries of any particular institution or organization.

The challenge for administrative leaders at church-related colleges and universities is to nurture and maintain campus cultures that acknowledge, affirm, and celebrate the many varieties of Christian scholarly vocation. Administrators must possess the courage and vision to create campuses that are characterized by "*inhabitable* truth . . . humble confidence . . . [and] relational trust" where students, administrators, and faculty alike can join together in a process of "communal knowing and being known."[16] And that, after all, is what the grand conversation of scholarship and Christian faith is all about: not simply knowing things but also being known. Not claiming the truth as if we owned it but living in truth and toward truth as a style of life. Not holding on to our current views as if they defined knowledge for all time but sharing our ideas and ideals with others in the confidence that they will come back to us in improved form. It is precisely that spirit of hope and trust that both undergirds us and beckons us forward in the ongoing conversation of Christian scholarship.

NOTES

1. Quoted in Rodney Clapp, *A Peculiar People* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 91.

2. *The Complete Poetry and Selected Prose of John Donne*, edited by Charles M. Coffin (New York: Random House, 1952), 441.

3. Ernest L. Boyer, "Making Connections," in Ernest L. Boyer, *Selected Speeches 1979–1995* (Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1997), 117.

4. In *Dependent Rational Animals* (Chicago: Open Court, 1999), the philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre argues: "We human beings are vulnerable to many kinds of afflictions and most of us are at some time afflicted by serious ills. How we cope is only in small part up to us. It is most often to others that we owe our survival, let alone our flourishing" (1). Despite that bedrock fact of our existence, he says that in the long history of the West philosophers have given only glancing attention to afflictions of the human condition. For the most part, persons are discussed as if they were "continuously rational, healthy, and untroubled" (2), as if they were powerful, independent agents capable of making their way in the world without assistance from anyone. MacIntyre says it is only recently that feminist philosophers have finally begun to deconstruct the enduring myth of antiinterdependence.

5. Quoted in Dykstra, *Growing in the Life of Faith*, 136.

6. Rowan Williams, *On Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 236.

7. Monika K. Hellwig, "What Can the Roman Catholic Tradition Contribute to Christian Higher Education?" in *Models for Christian Higher Education: Strategies for*

Success in the Twenty-First Century, edited by Richard T. Hughes and William B. Adrian (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 21. Hellwig's reference is to Catholic higher education, and, while I have expanded the scope of her remarks to include all Christian college and universities, the particularity of her focus on Catholic schools may be worth noting. Several recent studies have indicated that Catholic faith, social philosophy, and educational practices do tend to nurture and embody the ideals of community better than most forms of Protestantism. See Andrew Greeley, *The Catholic Imagination* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), especially chapter 4, entitled "Community." See also John E. Tropman, *The Catholic Ethic and the Spirit of Community* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2002). An exception to this rule is found in the Anabaptist tradition which, though Protestant, places great importance on community. See, for example, Sara Wenger Shenk, *Anabaptist Ways of Knowing: A Conversation about Tradition-Based Critical Education* (Telford, Pa.: Cascadia Publishing House, 2003).

8. Charles T. Matthewes, "The Academic Life as Christian Vocation." *Journal of Religion* 79, 1 (January 1999), 110–121.

9. Diana Chapman Walsh, "Taking Learning Seriously," *Change* 22, 4 (July/August 1990), 18–23.

10. Reuel L. Howe, *The Miracle of Dialogue* (New York: Seabury Press, 1963), 37.

11. John B. Bennett, "Liberal Learning as Conversation," *Liberal Education* 87.2 (2001), 32–39.

12. Martha Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997).

13. David Morgan, "Scholarship, Teaching Practices: Reflections on Lutheran Identity," in *The Lutheran Reader,* edited by Paul Contino and David Morgan (Valparaiso, Ind.: Valparaiso University Press, 1999), 93–108.

14. Walsh, "Taking Learning Seriously," 18–23.

15. Gail Godwin, *Evensong* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2002).

16. Clapp, *A Peculiar People,* 186.

Scholarship and Christian Faith

Enlarging the Conversation

DOUGLAS JACOBSEN AND
RHONDA HUSTEDT JACOBSEN

With essays by
Rodney J. Sawatsky
Crystal L. Downing
Edward B. Davis
David L. Weaver-Zercher
Susanna Bede Caroselli
Kim S. Phipps

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2004

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford New York
Auckland Bangkok Buenos Aires Cape Town Chennai
Dar es Salaam Delhi Hong Kong Istanbul Karachi Kolkata
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Mumbai Nairobi
São Paulo Shanghai Taipei Tokyo Toronto

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.
198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

www.oup.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Scholarship and Christian faith: enlarging the conversation /
Douglas Jacobsen and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-19-517038-5
1. Church and college. 2. Learning and scholarship—Religious aspects—Christianity. 3. Education (Christian theology) I. Jacobsen, Douglas G. (Douglas Gordon), 1951– II. Jacobsen, Rhonda Hustedt.
LC383 .S33 2004
378'.071—dc21 2003008369

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper