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Editor’s Introduction

One hundred fifty-nine years of rigorous pursuit of Truth, Beauty, and Goodness provides a rich soil in which today’s scholarly activities at Carson-Newman College continue to flourish. A sample of that flowering graces the following pages.

2009 was a key year for Carson-Newman. Dr. J. Randall O’Brien was inaugurated as C-N’s 22nd president in October and we are pleased to offer his written adaptation of the remarks he delivered during the inauguration ceremony. The reader will find in his remarks a strong call for the integration of faith and learning and an insistence on excellence for both vectors of that institutional calling. Also on the theme of faith and learning, particularly the nature of Christian Liberal Arts education, we are pleased to publish a passionate and profound chapel address adaptation by Dr. James Barnette, of Samford University. And Dr. Bill Shiell, Pastor of First Baptist Church of Knoxville, TN, deepens our understanding of the “faithful servant” in his penetrating analysis of that role in the ancient world.

C-N’s faculty was busy as always this year in the search for wisdom and its application toward improving the lives of others. Dr. Stephen Karr, 2009 Distinguished Faculty Member, probes the science of global warming, with the ultimate end of preventing the suffering that it can cause. Nursing professor Sue McBee points out the deep connections between the healing professions and the Christian call to service. Dr. Wayne Ballard’s article also makes connections between academics and faith by exploring available means of assessing levels of spirituality in college and university leaders.

Legendary history professor Dr. James Baumgardner has written a provocative and incisive analysis of the 2008 elections in Tennessee that will cause many readers to look at those events in a new light. Dr. Jason Caudill and Mr. Bob Terrell, of C-N’s School of Business, provide a timely caution for professors and students as we all adapt to the ever-changing requirements for online security. And Dr. Jennifer Hall, of the English Department, offers a creative reading of John Donne’s life as a way to connect to today’s young people.

The range of disciplines represented in the following pages, the passion and expertise of the contributing authors, and their commitment to faithful service, combine to form a true testimony to what has made Carson-Newman College such a rewarding and valuable community for these many years.

– Brian Austin, Editor
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The Theory of Anthropogenic Climate Change

[Distinguished Faculty Award Address, 2009]

Stephen Karr

I want to begin by thanking you all for your many suggestions I received over the summer on what to talk about during this presentation. I also greatly appreciate that I didn’t receive any suggestions on what not to talk about. In answer to the question that I’ve been asked many times lately, no, I’m not going to discuss evolution. As tempting as that would be given that 2009 is the 200th anniversary of Darwin’s birth and also the 150th anniversary of the publication of his book *The Origin of Species*, I’ve decided instead to discuss a topic that hopefully will result in positive changes in our curriculum and in our lifestyles.

Part of my reason for choosing this topic comes from a conversation I had with a student this past summer. After we had covered global warming, the student, a graduating senior and a good student, remarked “this stuff is important; why haven’t we been taught this?” For that student and all the ones that follow I’ve decided to discuss anthropogenic climate change—global warming due to human activities. Though my focus here will be on greenhouse gases, other human activities such as deforestation, urban sprawl, and agricultural practices also contribute to this problem of global warming.

My use of the term “theory” in the title is deliberate and of course refers to the scientific usage of the term, not merely a guess or hypothesis. The source for much of what I’m presenting today is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 4th report.

The IPCC was founded in 1989 by the United Nations and the World Meteorological Association. This international organization assesses the state of climate change science and, every few years, provides reports on climate change. They have issued 4 such reports: 1990, 1995, 2001, and the most recent report in 2007. IPCC reports are considered to be a consensus of the scientific community, and given that the over 1000 scientists involved must agree with their statements, their reports tend to be on the conservative side, not the worst case scenario. In 2007 they released their 4th report (available at [http://www.ipcc.ch/](http://www.ipcc.ch/)) which contained 3 parts, including “Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis” which covers the science behind our understanding of climate change. IPCC reports have the endorsement of numerous societies and academies of science, including
the National Academies of Science of all the major industrialized countries.

In their 4th report, the IPCC concludes: “...warming is unequivocal and very likely due to anthropogenic greenhouse gases—with the “very likely” referring to a >90% chance that this is the correct conclusion.”

Please keep in mind that in science there are no absolutes, but rather a sliding scale of certainty ranging from the unknown to “pretty darn sure.” The IPCC statement is at the “pretty darn sure” end of scientific certainty.

It is important to recognize that what we’re considering is climate change. Weather is the “day to day” conditions in a given area and variability is expected. Climate is more about long term trends, averages, and the likelihood of extreme events. We, and all life, are adapted to the current climatic conditions which have been relatively stable for the last 10,000 or so years. This is important because most organisms show a narrow range of tolerance to conditions and even a slight change in conditions can make a huge difference, especially if the extremes become more frequent and more intense.

Part of the problem in studying climate and climate change is that climate science is very complex because a number of factors affect climate. These are referred to as climate drivers or forcers. Initially we learn about each of these drivers by studying them in isolation, but the ultimate goal is to integrate them into climate models that can accurately depict where we’ve been and predict where we are going. Greenhouse gases have emerged as one of the most significant drivers, and, unfortunately, greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide are easy to study. Not only can we accurately measure carbon dioxide levels in air and water, we can also determine its source (fossil fuels versus natural sources). In order to understand the possible sources of carbon dioxide we need to look at the carbon cycle.

In the carbon cycle, during the process of photosynthesis, carbon dioxide from the air is used to make organic carbon compounds like sugars. These sugars are actually the energy source for the plant. Sugars are broken down via a process called cellular respiration to release energy needed by the plant. You do the same thing when you burn sugars for energy; you are using cellular respiration. You can’t perform photosynthesis like the plant does to make the sugars you need so you eat the plant or you eat the animal that ate the plant. No matter who is doing the cellular respiration to burn the sugars, the carbon dioxide that once was captured via photosynthesis is now released again into the atmosphere. This same thing happens during decomposition.
Normally, photosynthesis and cellular respiration are balanced cycles. The CO₂ being removed from the atmosphere roughly equals that released by cellular respiration. Unfortunately, we are knocking this cycle out of balance in two ways:

- by deforestation—removing the organisms that perform photosynthesis
- by burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil, natural gas) which contain ancient carbon trapped millions of years ago; this carbon is released when we burn the fossil fuels

This is leading to increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide levels which, according to climate models, leads to global warming.

But there are skeptics. A summary of the usual claims by skeptics (as specified by Henson, 2008) is:

- The atmosphere isn’t warming;
- and if it is, then it’s due to natural variation;
- and even if it’s not due to natural variation, then the warming is insignificant;
- and if it becomes significant, then the benefits will outweigh the problems; and even if they don’t, technology will come to the rescue;
- and even if it doesn’t, we shouldn’t wreck the economy to fix the problem when many parts of the science are uncertain.

Please note that this is a summary of the usual claims; there is probably no one person that holds all these viewpoints. Even though all these claims have been refuted by climate scientists, skepticism still remains. With topics such as climate change, there will always be skeptics, regardless of the scientific evidence presented.

Let’s consider the key issues regarding global warming by addressing these questions:

- Is global warming occurring?
- What’s causing it?
- What problems will result from it?

Is global warming occurring?

Thermometers, in some form or fashion, have been around for hundreds of years, allowing people to directly measure temperature.
Since about the 1850’s there were enough global stations to begin following global temperature change. Analysis of global surface temperature trends reveals that average global temperatures have increased by about 1.4°F in last 100 years (0.8°C). Also, the temperature increases seen are not uniform; some places have warmed more than others. More warming has occurred in higher latitudes; the Arctic temperature has increased by about 7°F. (Brohan et al, 2006)

Based on temperature data we can conclude temperatures are increasing. This sounds like pretty good evidence for global warming . . . but is there other evidence and is there any indication that an increase in average temperature of 1 or 2°C makes any difference?

The answer to both these questions is “Yes.”

Let’s think about it. If you wanted to look for evidence of global warming, where would be a good place to look? Certainly, if warming is occurring, you would expect to see more significant ice melts—so let’s examine that by looking at glaciers and the major ice sheets of the Arctic, Antarctic, and Greenland.

Glaciers are melting at record rates worldwide. Not only are they melting, but they are also moving faster to the ocean (probably due to the lubrication effect of water between the ice and bedrock). Notable examples of glacier ice melt include the Upsala glacier in Argentina, Glacier National Park in Montana (where it has lost 80% of its glaciers), and the Chacaltaya glacier in Bolivia. It’s true that not all glaciers have been disappearing at the same rate; in fact, some glaciers in Norway actually increased in size from the 1970’s to the late 1990’s due to increased snow fall, but even these glaciers are in decline now.

The trend we see with mountain glaciers is also occurring in the high latitude areas such as ice sheets of the Arctic and the glaciers of Greenland since temperature is increasing more rapidly in the northern latitudes. If you examine photos comparing summer Arctic ice in 1979 and 2003, you see significantly less ice in the 2003 photo. The summer ice continued to decline, reaching a new low in 2007. We are now seeing ice free channels during the summer months, and by 2030 the summer Arctic ice could be gone. Greenland shows similar melting. We also see comparable effects in the Antarctic and, though some interior regions are gaining ice due to increased snow fall, overall there is a net loss of Antarctic ice. Additionally, the Antarctic has also experienced ice shelf collapse. In 2002, the Larson B ice shelf, an area over 3000 square kilometers collapsed in a 35 day period. More recently we witnessed a similar rapid disintegration of the Wilkins ice shelf in 2008. Besides representing evidence for global warming, three concerns associated with snow/ice loss include:

- rise in sea levels
• loss of fresh water for areas dependent on ice melt
• positive feedback leading to more warming (due to decreased reflectivity or albedo as ice melts and exposes darker land or water surfaces which absorb more heat from the sun)

With the melting of land ice such as that found in Greenland, the Antarctic, and glaciers, we see an increase in sea levels; sea levels have risen 4-8 inches since 1960. About half of this increase is due to thermal expansion (like others things, water expands as it is warmed) and about half due to ice melting. The 2007 IPCC report predicts another 7-23 inch rise in sea levels by the year 2100—a huge problem for the millions of people living in coastal areas.

So the idea of global warming is supported by examination of the planet’s ice. Let’s now turn to some biological evidence. Examination of biological phenomenon, such as flowering time, insect emergence, and species’ habitat range all indicate the global warming is occurring and is affecting organisms. As an example, let’s consider a case in which warming has caused a “disconnect” between bird migration and caterpillar emergence as studied by Both and Visser, 2001.

In 1980, the migration of the pied flycatcher and subsequent egg laying and hatching was such that hatching coincided with peak caterpillar emergence in its summer breeding grounds in the Netherlands. So there was lots of food for the young hatchlings and caterpillar populations were controlled. Jump ahead 20 years; in the year 2000, the caterpillar peak emergence occurred before the peak bird hatching, a problem for both the birds and the vegetation destroyed by the caterpillars. This “disconnect” occurred because the bird migration is cued by day length, whereas caterpillar emergence is triggered by temperature and with warmer temperatures the caterpillars are emerging sooner.

Studies on numerous other organisms also show evidence of global warming with some like the caterpillars being winners, some like the birds being losers. In a study of some 1600 organisms, biologists found that over half had shifted habitat range, either further north, or further up the mountain side. However, not everything can respond to global warming by merely shifting ranges (Antarctic penguins can’t move further south and polar bears can’t move further north). Also, in some cases, human development may prevent successful shifts. (I don’t think the snail is going to make it across Interstate 40).
What is causing global warming?

So, based on the evidence, global warming is occurring and even a slight increase in average temperatures does affect our planet. The next question we need to address is the “why?” Why is global warming happening?

As previously mentioned there are a number of climate drivers or forcers that affect climate. Some of these are:

- solar variability
- cosmic rays
- cycles in atmospheric circulation
- ocean circulation patterns
- presence/absence of chemicals or particulates in the atmosphere
- variations in Earth’s orbit

For instance, the Earth shows variation in its orbital path around the sun, in its tilt, and in its wobble, all of which can affect climate. But none of these natural variables can account for today’s warming. When climate scientists analyze all the potential climate drivers, most of the warming we see today can only be attributed to what we’re putting in the atmosphere, specifically greenhouse gases. Of course, what is happening here is that the greenhouse gases act like a blanket, allowing solar energy to penetrate the atmosphere, warming the Earth, but blocking the escape of heat to space. The major greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, methane, ozone, and chlorofluorocarbons. (Water vapor is also a “greenhouse gas.”) The most significant (in terms of warming the planet) of the anthropogenic greenhouse gases is carbon dioxide.

Atmospheric carbon dioxide levels have been measured since the late 1950’s. Most of us are familiar with the Keeling curve, named after Charles Keeling, showing atmospheric carbon dioxide levels measured from Mauna Loa, Hawaii. In the time since these measurements began, carbon dioxide levels have risen from about 315 ppm (parts per million) to about 380 ppm. Although these measurements are for a mountain top in Hawaii, since carbon dioxide mixes and distributes fairly evenly in the atmosphere this data represents global carbon dioxide levels (not just those over Hawaii). Examination of Greenland and Antarctic ice core data reveals that preindustrial atmospheric carbon dioxide levels remained fairly level at about 280 ppm prior the large scale use of fossil fuels. How high the levels will rise depends on what we do to curb emissions. Besides carbon dioxide, other greenhouse gases like methane and nitrous oxide
show similar increases. Again, according to climatologists, the only climate driver that fits the observed warming is the increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gases.

**What problems will result from global warming?**

So let’s pause and take stock of where we are:
- Global warming is occurring.
- Based on the evidence, the warming is due to anthropogenic greenhouse gases.

But will a slight increase in average temperatures really make that much of a difference? Will it cause problems? Though we have already touched on the idea that a slight increase in temperature does affect the planet, let’s look at some of the problems of global warming in more detail. We’ll begin by looking at effects on other organisms and then we’ll look at effects on humans. We’ve already discussed the disconnect between bird migration and caterpillar emergence. And some problems, such as the effect on polar bears, are obvious. Examples of other problems include:

- The Adelie penguins in the Antarctic. In 1990 the colony had 320 breeding pairs. This number dropped to 54 in 2004—due to warming and loss of sea ice.
- The killing of pine trees by the pine bark beetle. The beetles are cold sensitive and therefore pine trees at higher elevations and northern latitudes were protected— not so with global warming. Tens of thousands of acres of pine trees have been lost.
- Coral reef destruction. Ecologically, coral reefs are very important to ocean ecosystems, representing the “tropical rain forest” equivalent in the ocean in that reefs are home to lots of different organisms, an ecosystem with a great deal of biodiversity. Although other factors can contribute to the demise of coral reefs, global warming and increased carbon dioxide are especially problematic. Coral represents a symbiotic relationship between an animal-like polyp and photosynthetic algae. The polyp secretes a hard calcium carbonate shell which provides protection and support; the algae provide food and energy via photosynthesis. What’s happening today is negatively affecting the coral in two ways. First, with increased carbon dioxide, more carbon dioxide
is absorbed into the ocean which lowers the pH of the ocean. With the lower pH or more acidic environment, the coral is less able to produce the calcium carbonate shell (like osteoporosis of the reef). Second, the coral is very temperature sensitive and easily stressed, which causes the polyp to expel the algae, which in turn leads to loss of color (or “bleaching”), ultimately killing the coral. If present trends continue, coral reefs could disappear from most areas by the year 2100. The Great Barrier Reef of Australia could be dead in 30 years.

These are just a few examples of organisms at risk due to global warming. A study by Thomas, et al, published in the journal *Nature* in 2004, indicates that climate change may lead to as much as 37% species extinction by 2050—a loss of about 1/3 of organisms in the next 40 years!

But again, with any environmental changes there will be “winners” and “losers.” The pine bark beetles are “winners” (provided they still have pine trees); other “winners” include poison ivy and ragweed, both of which are thriving. With increased carbon dioxide, not only does poison ivy grow faster, its toxin is more toxic. Ragweed responds to higher carbon dioxide by producing more pollen, a leading allergen in the late summer and fall.

So we see numerous effects of global warming on other organisms; but what about humans? Does global warming impact us?

Let’s revisit the issue of ice and glaciers melting. Such melts are having two major effects on humans: sea level rise leading to more problems with coastal erosion and flooding and loss of fresh water. Keep in mind that about 50% of the world’s population lives in coastal areas. A one meter rise in sea level, which we may see by the year 2100, will flood many coastal areas. One casualty of warming and sea level rise is the village of Shishmaref, Alaska. With rising sea levels and diminished ocean ice in the fall (which provided protection from the severe fall storms) erosion became such a problem that the village is being relocated inland.

Another problem for humans concerning glaciers melting is that in many areas of the world, people are dependent on glacier melt runoff for water. In Lima, Peru for instance (home to about 8 million people), the city’s fresh water comes largely from glacier ice melt. What happens when the glacier is gone?

An additional problematic “melting” concerns the permafrost, the permanently frozen regions of the extreme north, which are only
permanently frozen if it’s cold enough. Unfortunately, it hasn’t been cold enough. With the permafrost melting we see damage to roads, buildings, and even forests, producing what are referred to as “drunken forests.” This is concern enough, but the melting of the permafrost could have far reaching effects. Frozen in the permafrost are billions of tons of organic carbon and methane hydrates (methane frozen in ice). With the thawing of the permafrost, decomposers will degrade the organic carbon, releasing carbon dioxide or methane (depending on conditions) into the atmosphere, leading to elevations of both these greenhouse gases, which leads to more warming, which leads to more thawing, etc.

So ice and permafrost melting are significant problems for us. Another big area of concern for humans involves storms and weather extremes. Who can forget the 2005 hurricane season, the year in which we saw four category 5 hurricanes form in the Atlantic, including Wilma, Rita, and Katrina? Predicting hurricane frequency and intensity tends to be a little more dicey. For instance, during El Nino years, like now, Atlantic hurricanes are less likely to form. But think about what is necessary for hurricanes to form and what powers them: warmer surface waters.

In the last 30 years we have seen:
- increases seen in duration and wind speeds of tropical cyclones
- increases in the percentage of hurricanes classified as Category 4 or 5

IPCC climate models predict more storms of higher intensity. And it’s not just hurricanes we need to be concerned about. Their models also predict more weather extremes and changes in rainfall patterns so more floods, droughts, and heat waves are expected. In the summer of 2003, an intense heat wave settled over Europe killing more than 40,000 people. We are already seeing “hundred year” and even “thousand year” floods occurring more frequently than expected.

Infectious disease is another problem area related to the effects of global warming on humans. We have seen and we will continue to see increased spreading of diseases like malaria, dengue fever, and West Nile virus, in part due to spread of the disease vectors—mosquitoes. But it’s not just vector borne diseases. Other diseases such as cholera are also increasing with global warming.

How much global warming occurs and how serious all these problems become depends on our response, how much we do to curtail greenhouse gas emissions! IPCC has projections based on 6 scenarios—again based on what we do when. In their projections
carbon dioxide increase will be between 540 and 970 ppm with additional warming ranging from 2-12.5°F. Keep in mind, the increase in average temperature over the last century was 1.4 °F, and that change has caused problems for us.

So what do we need to do? How do we respond to this? Since this is a global problem we need global solutions. Data regarding global carbon dioxide emissions through 2002 show us that the US has long been the global leader. However, China has now surpassed us. In 2006, China put out an estimated 6,200 million metric tons of carbon dioxide; we could only manage 5,800 million metric tons (but keep in mind, China has 4 times the population we do, so per capita we’re still number one).

One way we have attempted to address the problem of global warming is through international agreements such as the Kyoto Protocol, a program aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions. By 2005, all the major countries of the world had ratified to Kyoto Protocol except for the US and Australia. Since 2005, Australia has ratified, leaving only the U.S.

In December, 2009, world leaders will meet in Copenhagen to draft the successor to the Kyoto Protocol. We can only hope that the U.S. will be accountable for what it does.

In terms of what needs to be done, our response strategies require both mitigation and adaptation: reducing the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere (mitigation), and improving our ability to cope (adaptation). Locally, we can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions by opting for Appalachian Electric’s “Green Power Switch.” The Green Power Switch program represents a mitigation strategy where households and business can purchase blocks of “green” power. That is power associated with renewable forms of energy. Additionally, Appalachian Electric has in place a program where “members” who actually generate electricity by means of renewable resources can sell their power back to TVA.

For Jefferson City, as of July 28, 2009, 12 households had purchased a total of 24 blocks of renewable power, with one household accounting for 8 or 1/3rd of the 24 blocks.

What can you do to reduce carbon dioxide emissions? Some things you can do include:

- drive a fuel efficient car, walk, or bike
- install energy efficient windows
- install insulation
- use compact fluorescent light bulbs
- insulate your water heater
set thermostats lower in the winter, higher in the summer
use less hot water
support “green” companies and purchase blocks of green power

But even if you’re still not convinced of the problems of greenhouse gas emissions and global warming, there are many other reasons we need to do everything we can to reduce burning of fossil fuels. Our fossil fuel use (extraction, processing, distribution, and use) contributes to many environmental problems (land destruction, water and air pollution, species endangerment and extinction) and health problems. Just as an example, consider the fly ash spill of December 2008, in Kingston, TN.

(Post script: Since the original presentation of this article we’ve also suffered the loss of miners in the coal mine accident in West Virginia and the massive oil leak in the gulf. Hopefully by the time you are reading this article, the oil leak will have been controlled, but the damage it caused will be felt for some time.)

Another very important reason to do everything we can to conserve fossil fuels concerns money. Thanks to the efforts of the IT folks and others, we can now shut down our computers at night and over weekends. This will save us at least $25,000 per year in energy costs, but only if we all participate. I would argue that the reduction in C-N’s carbon footprint is even more important than the money savings. This simple change has the potential to prevent the release of over a million tons of carbon into the skies above East Tennessee.

But let’s do more. Given the enormity of the potential problems we are facing with fossil fuel use and climate change due to anthropogenic greenhouse gases, we must do anything and everything we can to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. If we merely continue with a “business as usual approach,” the consequences will be dire. I challenge us to become leaders and models for environmental stewardship. And as educators, it is our responsibility to educate others about these problems. Let’s make environmental stewardship a component of our general education core curriculum. Let’s strive to have every graduate from Carson-Newman well educated and versed in the problems of climate change and what can be done about it. We owe it to our children, to our grandchildren, and ourselves as stewards of God’s creation.
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The Future of the Past: Celebrating our Heritage and Hope

[Presidential Inaugural Address, October 30, 2009]

J. Randall O'Brien

Distinguished platform guests, esteemed Board of Trustees, illustrious presidents and notable colleagues from sister institutions, treasured faculty, staff, students, and alumni, and beloved Family and Friends: the Psalmist says it so well, “This is the day the LORD has made; let us rejoice and be glad in it!” (Ps. 118:24)

May I thank each of you for being here today? How absolutely gracious of you! I would love to call each of you by name, but that would take all of my allotted hour and forty-five minutes. However, I simply must thank the Presidential Search Committee and the Board of Trustees for extending the call to us to serve this incredible Carson-Newman family. To Search Committee Chair Ogle I would like to say a special thanks for your leadership and friendship in the process, and my dear friend, for your exceedingly gracious introduction today.

The Inauguration Committee, co-chaired by Deans Clark Measels and Kitty Coffey, worked long, hard, sacrificially, and well to make these days a success. I am grateful to each of you.

Kay and I have been so warmly welcomed to East Tennessee. The faculty, staff, students, alumni, community, convention, pastors, and churches have all made us feel right at home. And we are!

Senator Alexander, your untiring public service as President of the University of Tennessee, as Governor, as U.S. Department of Education Secretary, and now as our Senator has provided us a model of visionary leadership. You traveled a long way to deliver your inspiring words to us today, but your words will travel farther. You have spoken prophetically in the national conversation regarding higher education and we have listened. Moreover, we will act. Beginning in January we will offer 10 or more programs of study wherein students may receive a baccalaureate degree in 3 years. We have entered a new era in higher education.

Obsolescence is not limited to manual typewriters, 8-track tape cartridges, party-line telephones, and Edsel automobiles. Senescence is not limited to America’s roads, bridges, and downtowns. Everything ages, including higher education; much becomes obsolete, including academic programs, information delivery systems, and approaches to education.

“The Golden Age of American Colleges is past; the Age of Survival is upon us.” So say some of the experts in our field. If, in fact,
this claim is true, institutions who fail to comprehend current dangers and adapt will not survive.

Accessibility and affordability are major issues, along with years of study required to complete a degree. There are others. Distinguishing between price and cost is critical. For it’s hard to control the price of a college education when the costs continue to soar, which include energy, insurance, maintenance of aging buildings, construction costs of new facilities, health care, technology, salary needs and other operational costs. Changes must come in innovative pricing, degree reform, green initiatives, budget decentralization and accountability, organizational and structural reform, alternative scheduling, distance learning, graduation rates, continuing education, and in globalization of higher education.

Senator Alexander, we appreciate your seasoned service and wisdom, your watchful eye, prophetic voice, and authoritative leadership in higher education. Thank you for your important words today.

My remarks which follow will move along a different track, one no less critical, no less urgent. We are in a crisis. But before we address the present crisis, much less the future, we must take note of the past.

The Future of the Past

Oh, what a glorious past we share, Carson-Newman College and our sister American colleges and universities! First, Carson-Newman. When the Baptist Education Society of East Tennessee called a meeting at the Dandridge Baptist Church in 1849 to consider founding “an institution of learning,” twenty-one Trustees were elected to raise money and secure a charter. One of the leaders was James Carson, for whom the School would eventually be named. The host pastor was William Rogers, who would become the first President of the School.

Around that time in nearby Mossy Creek (later, in 1901, to become known as Jefferson City) five gentlemen known today as “The Oak Tree Five” met under an old oak tree after a hard day’s work in the fields and determined to create a place of education for their sons (and later their daughters, as well). These five men—the Reverend William Bowen, Professor Robert Reedy Bryan, and three farmer-builders named Newman: I.M., Samuel, and William—along with the aforementioned Trustees, secured two acres of land on the banks of Mossy Creek just below our current baseball field, raised $2,386.50 to
start the School, named Mossy Creek Missionary Baptist Seminary, and began holding classes in the Mossy Creek Baptist Church.

Soon (in 1855) Mossy Creek Missionary Baptist Seminary changed its name to Mossy Creek Baptist College. The first graduate was a doctor, the second a lawyer, and the third a minister.

The 1876-77 mission statement of Mossy Creek Baptist College noted, “This institution looks to the highest possible grade of intellectual and Christian culture of all its pupils.”

In 1880 the Trustees changed the name of our School to Carson College, in honor of James Carson, a founder and 30-year Trustee.

Five years later (in 1885) The Mossy Creek Female Academy was chartered and soon became known as Newman Female Seminary, then Newman College, in honor of the Newman family of founders.

The two colleges—Carson and Newman—became one, Carson-Newman College, in 1889.

The 1919-20 mission statement of Carson-Newman College emphasized, “It has always been the purpose of the College to offer its students instruction in the light of the teachings of Jesus Christ. . . . The College owes its allegiance to Christ and considers itself an agency for the spread of His righteousness among men.”

The 1993-94 mission statement proclaimed, “We purpose to: . . . develop graduates who understand that the lordship of Christ touches all vocations and professions and involves the graduates in becoming leaders in church and state.”

What a glorious past!

Conceived in a church, with echoes of Eden’s Tree and the Tree planted by streams of water in Psalm 1 reverberating numinously around the Oak Tree Five, with classes born in the church, this sacred academy, indeed, stands as a testament to Providence and prayer.

Yet, we are but a star within a breathtaking galaxy. Nearly all colleges in America before 1865 were born of church organizations or devout Christians with intentional Christian ends in mind.

- Harvard (1636) was established by Congregationalists.
- William & Mary (1693) was established by Anglicans.
- Yale (1701) was founded by Congregationalists.
- Princeton (1747) was founded by Presbyterians.
- Brown (1765) and the University of Chicago (1890) were founded by Baptists.
- Other church colleges of distinction include Columbia (1754), Penn (1755), and Dartmouth (1769).
Harvard’s motto in 1650 proclaimed *Christi Glorium* (Glory to Christ). Her motto in 1692 became *Christo et Ecclesiae* (Christ and Church). Harvard’s earliest set of “Rules and Precepts” decreed that each student was “to be plainly instructed, and earnestly pressed to consider well, the main end of his life and studies is, 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.”

Yale’s stated purpose from the beginning was “to teach and engage the children to know God in Jesus Christ and to love and serve him in all sobriety, godliness, and righteousness of life. . . .”

The first public announcement regarding the University of Chicago read, “The new University is to be a Christian institution. It is to be forever under the auspices of the Baptist denomination.” Her first president announced that the “President and two thirds of its Trustees will be Baptists. . . . In all and above all and under all, the University of Chicago, whatever else it may be, by the grace of God shall be Christian in tone, in influence, and in work. The provisions of this charter . . . are pledges to you that this shall always remain true.”

Dartmouth President Asa Smith charged in his inaugural address of 1863 that, “The College . . . should be distinctly and eminently Christian. . . . Let the studies which we call moral, have a Christian baptism. . . . Let Ethical Science . . . be bathed in the light of Calvary.” President’s Smith charge of 1863 came as late as 100 years after Dartmouth’s founding.

By the early 1900s, however, the secularization of higher education had displaced the dominant Christian intellectual position in state universities and major private universities, and by the 1960s, in most other church colleges, as well.

Aware of the dangers of the secular way, Yale President Charles Seymour, in his inaugural address in 1937, called for a return to our Christian heritage and hope, declaring,

Yale was dedicated to the upraising of spiritual leaders. We betray our trust if we fail to explore the various ways in which the youth who come to us may learn to appreciate spiritual values. . . . The simple and direct way is through the maintenance and upbuilding of the Christian religion as a vital part of university life. I call on all members of the faculty, as members of a thinking body, freely to recognize the tremendous validity and power of the teachings of Christ in our life-and-death struggle against the forces of selfish materialism. If we lose that struggle . . . scholarship as well as religion will disappear.
Oh, what an uproar William F. Buckley, Jr. created in 1951 with the publication of his book, *God & Man at Yale!* In critiquing his alma mater, Buckley alleged that Yale had lost its way, that she had become incoherent, suffering a loss of mission, that she had drifted so far from her founding ideals in failing to Christianize Yale that the average student attending Yale graduated with a shattered respect for Christianity.

Professor McGeorge Bundy, who would later serve the Kennedy and Johnson administrations as National Security Advisor, published in the *Atlantic Monthly* a scathing response to Buckley, essentially presenting the University’s official statement of denial of Buckley’s allegations. The battle was joined.

So, where are we today? At a critical crossroads. It is difficult to imagine any of our nation’s major private universities, or state universities, being anything but bored with the conversation regarding Christianity’s mission on campus. Christianity, along with Elvis, has left the building.

Will Christian faith forever be vanquished from higher education? Or will it be allowed to return from exile? What does Athens have to do with Jerusalem? Tertullian asked. “Much,” Duns replied! “Much,” sings a chorus of contemporary voices across America! “Everything,” say hundreds of history’s brightest lights, as well as today’s leading intellectuals! Paul, Clement, Anselm, Augustine, Aquinas, Erasmus, Calvin, Luther, Orr, Kuyper, Newman, Trueblood, Holmes, Marsden, Noll, Burtchaell, Dockery, Ringenberg, Lewis, Schwehn, Neuhaus, Jacobsen, Beaty, Benne, Plantinga, Wolterstorff, McGrath, Hughes, Evans, and countless other luminaries testify of the inseparable nature of truth and theology. Anselm and Augustine wrote passionately of “faith seeking understanding.”

On the contrary, Richard Dawkins, a leading spokesman for atheism today, claims, “Faith is the great cop-out, the great excuse to evade the need to think and evaluate evidence.”

Hear what John Polkinghorne, past Chairman of the Nuclear Physics Board of the Science Research Council in Great Britain, has to say of the matter:

... we live in a cosmos, not a chaos, so that the world makes total sense. In other words, there is indeed a Theory of Everything... the name of that Theory is Theology... the world makes total sense because it is a creation, the unified expression of the Mind and Will of its Creator.
Polkinghorne, now fellow of Queen’s College, Cambridge, continues: “I believe that theology is of continuing significance in a scientific age and that its pursuit is an indispensable part of the activity of a complete university.”

Francis Collins, one of the world’s leading geneticists and the longtime head of the Human Genome Project, the decade-long work to decode the DNA of our species, writes: “...the principles of faith are, in fact, complementary with the principles of science... In my view, there is no conflict in being a rigorous scientist and a person who believes in a God who takes a personal interest in each one of us.”

All of this is well and good, but is there anyone here who believes that Ivy League U., or State U., will rush to become citadels for the integration of faith and learning? Do we really believe our public and major private universities may choose to become bastions of Christian orthodoxy? What then is the future of the past? Where then might academies of science, humanities, fine arts, education, professional schools, and faith be found? I’m glad you asked.

Comes the prophet!

In 1975 Arthur Holmes, influenced heavily by Abraham Kuyper, John Henry Newman, and Elton Trueblood, published The Idea of a Christian College. Holmes argued that only an active integration of faith and learning truly distinguishes the secular and Christian university. Floodgates opened, and out poured volumes of sympathetic works from the ranks of the intelligentsia. The leitmotif of each of their works calls for Christian colleges and universities to reverse their retreat, reclaim their heritage, and to do so by marching boldly into the Promised Land of Christian higher education holding high the banner, “All Truth is God’s Truth.”

Comes the surprise!

“Distant cousins” are “preaching” a “not-so-distant” message from the halls of secular universities. As William Ringenberg notes,

At least since the appearance of Allan Bloom’s The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Soul of Today’s Students (1987) and Paige Smith’s Killing the Spirit: Higher Education in America (1990) ... the general modern critique of secular higher education has bemoaned the tendency to replace the character and values education dimension of learning with an intellectualist conformity and anti-religion bias.

Ringenberg continues,
Even the traditionally elite institutions themselves are becoming aware of their growing barrenness as noted by Columbia University professor Andrew Delbanco: “There is a nervousness that may account for the use of compensatory institutions within the institution such as the Center for Human Values at Princeton . . . or the Institute for Ethics at Duke. But what can it mean that thinking about ethics has become mostly an extracurricular activity?”

Add to this critique the work of Harry Lewis, former Dean of Harvard College, entitled *Excellence Without a Soul: How a Great University Forgot Education*, in which he acknowledges that “moral education has withered” in our universities and the testimony of crisis mounts.

All of this is nice, but we in Christian colleges and universities are not simply talking about values and ethics. It is certainly true that we, among others, concur with the need for a renewed focus upon morals. But the cry is for more than that.

If America’s colleges displaced historic orthodox Christianity with generic religion and social good, or at best confined Christianity to the office of the campus minister, or a chapel service, or a specially created department of religion, leaving no place for Christian faith in the nerve center of the university, the curriculum; if science became the new orthodoxy in the halls of academe; if our campuses severed the rose from its roots by finding a place for morals in the fields of study but none for Christianity; if our colleges came in time to find morals passé, while manners, whatever that means, became the mark of an educated person, are we really surprised to discover that we are living in communities stuffed with information but starved for values? And if we have fallen over the precipice, is the appropriate corrective step to climb part of the way up the slippery cliff during the cultural monsoon and hope we won’t be washed away again? Or should we consider ascending to the top of the rock and rest on the solid footing of historic orthodox Christianity? Why then the call for a focus on morals? Without an authoritative foundation do not morals erode? Isn’t that precisely why we have arrived at our point of need?

Perhaps in our secular age secular colleges and universities will not desire to integrate faith and learning, choosing to go their own way instead. But I would like to join the caravan of sages through the ages, including the company of evangelical confessing scholars today, who hold to the unity of truth, and to the belief that faith and learning, not faith or learning, is the best way to attain true erudition.
In our search for knowledge, our quest for truth, why should our learning communities and faith communities remain separate? Let us embrace an open search for truth wherein freedom to think includes permission to ask any question and to analyze every perspective. Open intellectual inquiry may not, by self-definition, exclude thinking Christianly across the curriculum. Any search for truth which excludes, \textit{a priori}, consideration of evidence or particular views is, at best, misguided elitism, mishandled epistemology, or mistaken scientific method. At worst it is missionary secularism intent upon installing the new atheism as the fundamentalist religion of college campuses. Enough of this idolatrous sacrifice of our children!

Let us no longer accept the patronizing heresy of compartmentalizing our Christian faith into non-threatening conclaves safely away from the classroom. Rather let us champion both free academic inquiry and committed theological loyalty. We in the academy make much of academic freedom. Then let us in our Christian colleges dare to let truth and error compete for residence in our minds. Let us read widely, listen deeply, reflect critically, observe studiously, present effectively, debate delightfully, write masterfully, analyze keenly, question honestly, dissent respectfully, think Christianly, and live gratefully in the presence of our Creator-Redeemer-Sustainer God.

The universe is our campus; the cosmos is our campus. All truth is God’s truth. “\textit{Vocatus atque non-vocatus Deus aderit},” the eminent psychologist Carl Jung had carved above the door of his home: “Bidden, or not bidden, God is present.”

So, what is the future of the past?

In a story titled “Christian Colleges are Booming,” \textit{Time} magazine reported a U.S. Department of Education survey which revealed an enrollment increase of 67.3\% for the decade of 1992-2002 for schools listed in the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities. The increase for all other colleges and universities during the same 10-year period was 2.1\%, a 65\% differential!

Apparently the longing is for a place where the life of the mind and the shepherding of the spirit might find a welcome home. If so, Carson-Newman’s ethos of open intellectual inquiry and a deeper spiritual life—a beautiful tapestry of faith, learning, and caring community—positions us providentially to meet the deepest needs of our neighbors and to realize the highest dreams we dare to dream.

I dream of a college where our graduates have learned how to think; they have learned what the best and brightest minds throughout
the ages have thought and are currently thinking; but they have also learned to think for themselves, and to think Christianly, at that.

The college of my dreams features the Christian intellectual tradition as a centerpiece, the integration of faith and learning as the cornerstone, and classroom excellence, cutting-edge scholarship, love of students, all within a caring community, as its ethos.

The college of my dreams stands firmly under the lordship of Jesus Christ where we faithfully accept our Lord’s invitation “to love Him with all of our hearts, with all of our souls, and with all of our minds.”

As Victor Hugo shared, “There is nothing like a dream to shape the future.”

Thank you.
A Search for Viable Assessment Instruments of Spirituality and Values in American Higher Education Leadership: A Review of Literature

H. Wayne Ballard

In the world of leadership studies, new paradigms for evaluating and prescribing what makes good leadership are being created by a new generation of scholars who are beginning to think beyond the boundaries of previously entrenched thoughts and ideas. One such scholar, Gilbert Fairholm states the problem quite well,

The problem is that theorists and practitioners have developed a mind-set that defines one kind of “leadership truth” and excludes any other alternatives. Any ideas about leadership that differ from this mind-set are generally rejected out of hand. Indeed, we do not easily move out of one reality into another (Fairholm, 2000, p. ix).

A new discipline that has emerged in leadership studies seeks to understand and to describe the values adhered to by a leader, an institution, or the collective members of any given organization (Rokeach, 1973). Fairholm asserts that leaders set and enforce the values of their institution. He also adds that “values leadership moves beyond science to philosophy (Fairholm, 2000, p. xxi).”

In concert with the study of values is the burgeoning field of the study of spirituality as a means for understanding leaders (Moxley, 2000). Fairholm says of this new field, “Leaders or members who have a clear sense of their own spirituality and that of their coworkers can have a greater transformational effect on the organization, its forms, and processes than a formal reorganization plan (Fairholm, 2000, p. xxiii).”

The study of spirituality is emerging in many fields of research such as Healthcare, Counseling, and the Psychology of Religion (Miller, 2003). The search for a proper definition of spirituality is a complex matter (Brown D. J., 2007). Not everyone has embraced this new academic exercise whole-heartedly. Bryan Speck states that “proponents of spirituality as a legitimate academic subject are asking too much of colleagues who are not warm to such a proposal if they cannot at least provide a coherent definition of spirituality grounded in an explicit, cogent worldview as a focal point of an academic dialogue (Speck, 2005, p. 12).”
Traditionally, spirituality and religion have been terms that have been used interchangeably (Hill P. &., 1999, p. 359). Kenneth Pargament argues that spirituality and religion should stand on their own merits as related but separate areas of study (Pargament K., 1999). Pargament asks whether the field described as the Psychology of Religion should be renamed the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality (Pargament K., 1999). He further argues against those who simply bifurcate religion and spirituality into terms of bad and good, old establishment and newness of identity. Pargament offers his own definitions of religion and spirituality. Religion is defined as “a search for significance in ways related to the sacred (Pargament K., 1999, p. 11).” Thus, functionally, religion is viewed as a search for significance. Spirituality is defined as “a search for the sacred (Pargament K., 1999, p. 12).” Pargament uses a Hebraic definition of the sacred as the concept of “otherness” or being “set apart.” He then puts the two definitions into a close relationship with each other by saying, “spirituality is the heart and soul of religion (Pargament K., 1999, p. 13).”

Brown, Johnson, and Parrish define spirituality and religion in more traditional terms. Spirituality is considered a “metaphysical/transcendental experience or any experience that brings one meaning, purpose, or into a relationship with a higher being or higher power (Brown D. J., 2007, p. 3).” Religion is defined as “a social assembly where like-minded individuals congregate to form an organization where spirituality is experienced through structured beliefs (Brown D. J., 2007, p. 3).” Miller and Thoresen speak of spirituality and religiousness as “latent constructs – conceptual underlying entities that are not observed directly but can be inferred from observations of some of their component dimensions (Miller, 2003, p. 7).” They continue by adding that latent constructs are “multidimensional, with no single measure or dimension being likely to capture their essential meaning (Miller, 2003, p. 7).” Miller and Thoresen give a further example by describing health as a latent construct. Health is said to be more than attaining desirable blood pressure, or normal body temperature. Spirituality then is more than just a single observation transpiring in a single point in time. It is a complex and comprehensive term (Miller, 2003). Due to the necessity of brevity in this paper, Pargament’s definition of spirituality will serve as a workable model: “spirituality is the search for the sacred (Pargament K., 1999).”

The focus of this paper is the search for a viable assessment instruments of spirituality and values in American higher education leadership. I urge the reader or listener of this paper to suspend elements of their disbelief long enough to allow your own sense of
imagination to have the opportunity to engage. Imagination may be the “missing link” in finding new vistas for appreciating the contributions that many are making in the fields of values and spirituality today. Edwin H. Friedman describes the need for imagination in not confining ourselves by the “maps” of our time. In his work, A Failure of Nerve: Leadership in the Age of the Quick Fix, Friedman outlines the imagination needed by the discoverers of the New World in the 1400’s C.E. and how their re-drawing of the existing maps of the world led to other dramatic breakthroughs such as the Protestant Reformation (Friedman, 2007).

Background of study

In the fall of 2004, a crazy idea came into my head. Why not look into doing another degree outside the field of Religious Studies at the University of Tennessee? So in the next few months I learned about a cohort Ph.D. program at the University of Tennessee under the direction of Dr. Grady Bogue, a former university president and chancellor in the Louisiana State University system. After meeting in a personal interview with Dr. Bogue and completing my entrance requirements I was accepted and began working toward a Ph.D. in Education with a concentration in Higher Education Administration in the Summer of 2005.

One of my first seminars was with Dr. Bill Judge who now serves as the E.V. Williams Chair of Strategic Leadership & Professor of Strategic Management at Old Dominion University. It was in his seminar that the idea was first planted for my current plan of study. I am attempting to build a values and spirituality profile of current presidents of institutions of higher education at three distinct levels of Carnegie classification and then use the results of these profiles to determine if there are statistical differences between the values and spirituality of these presidents at these differing levels of placement. The three levels will include a fair sample of presidents of two-year community colleges, four-year liberal arts colleges, and tier one research universities.

In The Leaders Shadow: Exploring and Developing Executive Character, Judge describes executive leaders in terms of personality and values (Judge, 1999). Central to Judge’s work is his development of a personality, values, and spirituality profile of executive leaders that can be used for the purposes of comparison and assessment. These profiles are the product of a battery of personality, values, and spirituality assessment instruments that are given to the executives,
scored, and then used to develop the finished product which becomes the personality, values, and spirituality profile (Judge, 1999).

The assessment instrument used by Judge in determining the personality profile of the executive is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, 1993). This assessment is currently administered to over three million Americans every year and it has been translated into at least twelve different languages (Judge, 1999). Judge uses the Rokeach Value Survey as his instrument for obtaining the executive’s sense of values. The Rokeach Value Survey has been used extensively in determining a host of value related variables such as employee motivation (Brown M., 1976), ethical choices (McCabe, 1991), and cross-cultural differences (Kamakura, 1991). For the final area of Judge’s profile, the executive’s spirituality, he uses the Religious Orientation Scale by Allport and Ross (Allport, 1967) and the Index of Core Spiritual Experiences developed by Kass, Friedman, Leserman, Zuttermeister, and Benson (Kass, 1991). Collectively, these instruments are used by Judge to create a personality, values, and spirituality profile that can be collated and used for comparison purposes. Closely following Judge’s work, the purpose of this study is to create a profile of spirituality and values of college and university presidents by using targeted assessment instruments that focus on these qualities.

Complicating Factors in Measuring Values and Spirituality

Recent studies have illustrated the problems that arise when attempting to measure values and spirituality (Hill P., 2000), (Pargament K., 1999), (Kirkpatrick, 1990). Slater, Hall and Edwards outline five issues that arise when attempting to measure religion and spirituality (Slater, 2001). This representative list includes the lack of precision in definitions of various constructs, the issue of illusory spiritual health, ceiling effects, social desirability, and bias (Slater, 2001, p. 5). The lack of precision in definitions of various constructs is discussed in detail in the work of Peter Hill and Ralph Hood, Measures of Religiosity (Hill P. &., 1999). One example of lack of precision in definitions involves the overlapping of meanings of the terms “measures of religion” and “measures of spirituality.” Hill and Hood describe how the term “spirituality” can be subsumed under the term “religion” and thus affected by the current scrutiny this term is receiving (Hill P. &., 1999, p. 5).

The second issue suggested by Slater, Hall and Edwards is the issue of illusory spiritual health. This term is borrowed from the work of Shedler, Mayman, and Manis (Shedler, 1993) who coined the term the “illusion of mental health.” Shedler, Mayman and Manis describe
individuals who maintain the “illusion of mental health” as those who look outwardly healthy on the self-reporting scales yet are deemed as distressed by a licensed clinician (Shedler, 1993, p. 6). Slater, Hall and Edwards apply the principle of the “illusion of mental health” to those participating in spiritual health assessment instruments. They suggest that though someone may look spiritually healthy on a given instrument, in reality they may actually be unhealthy spiritually, or spiritually immature (Slater, 2001, p. 6).

A third complicating factor that may arise when evaluating spirituality and values is the ceiling effect (Slater, 2001). A ceiling effect is “when there is considerable negative skew and/or the majority of individuals score within one or two standard deviations of the maximum score (Bufford, 1991).” The ceiling effect has been demonstrated to occur frequently when applying a spirituality instrument for a population heavily concentrated with those identifying themselves as evangelicals (Bufford, 1991). The ceiling effect is reminiscent of the famous quote by Garrison Keillor, “Welcome to Lake Wobegon, where all the women are strong, all the men are good-looking, and all the children are above average (Keillor, 2010).”

Social desirability is the fourth issue that may arise when attempting to measure spirituality and religion (Slater, 2001). Social desirability happens when individuals deny socially undesirable traits and claim socially desirable ones thus placing the survey participant in a better light than may actually be the case (Nederhof, 1985). Social desirability results from two primary factors: self-deception and other deception (Nederhof, 1985, p. 264).

One more problem that may arise is the problem of possible bias (Slater, 2001). Slater, Hall, and Edwards state that many of the spirituality instruments used today have developed within a given religious denomination or particular theological orientation and may reflect bias towards other denominations or groups with a differing theological orientation (Slater, 2001, p. 8). With these potential problems serving as a warning beacon let us now consider some of the various assessment instruments used in evaluating spirituality and values today.

Available Instruments for Consideration

There are a number of instruments used in the assessment of religion, spirituality, and values. In *The Measures of Religiosity*, editors Peter Hill and Ralph Hood list 126 different assessments that are in use today (Hill P. &., 1999). In a later unpublished manuscript, Hill also evaluated 25 of the most promising measures of religion and
spirituality quantifying these with what Hill describes as a level of evidence approach (Hill P., 2000).

The 126 religion and spirituality assessments outlined by Hill and Wood are arranged according to seventeen categories of assessment. These include the following (Hill P. &., 1999):

1. Scales of Religious Beliefs and Practices
2. Scales of Religious Attitudes
3. Scales of Religious Orientation
4. Scales of Religious Development
5. Scales of Religious Commitment and Involvement
6. Scales of Religious Experience
7. Scales of Religious/Moral Values or Personal Characteristics
8. Multidimensional Scales of Religiousness
9. Scales of Religious Coping and Problem-Solving
10. Scales of Spirituality and Mysticism
11. God Concept Scales
12. Scales of Religious Fundamentalism
13. Scales of Death/Afterlife, Views of
15. Scales of Forgiveness
16. Scales of Institutional Religion
17. Scales of Related Constructs

The assessment instruments selected by Judge can now be helpful in creating a much shorter list from which to choose those categories of instruments most relevant to the current study (Judge, 1999). Since the current study is not concerned with issues of personality, the Myers/Briggs analysis will not be considered.

Religiosity Assessment Instruments

The primary scale of religion used by Judge is the Religious Orientation Survey developed by Allport and Ross (Allport, 1967). This assessment instrument has been the dominant instrument used in the field of Psychology of Religion for the past forty years (Slater, 2001). The major emphasis of the Allport and Ross survey is the juxtaposition of intrinsic versus extrinsic religious orientation (Hill P. &., 1999, pp. 144-153). In plain terms, persons scoring high on extrinsic religious orientation generally are seen as those who use religion for their own utilitarian purposes. Persons scoring high on the intrinsic religious orientation are those who use religion for their own private commitment or sense of personal practice or faith (Slater, 2001).
Another popular instrument in this category which has been widely used is the Quest Scale developed by Batson and Ventis in 1982 (Batson C. &., 1982) (Batson C. &., Measuring religion as quest: 1. Validity Concerns, 1991) (Batson C. &., Measuring religion as quest: 2. Reliability concerns, 1991). In response to the Religious Orientation Scale (Allport, 1967), Batson and Ventis desired to move beyond the issues of intrinsic versus extrinsic religious orientation (Slater, 2001, p. 9). Batson and Schoenrade write the Quest Scale involves “openly facing complex, existential questions (questions of life’s meaning, of death, and of relations with others) and resisting clear-cut, pat answers (Batson C. &., Measuring religion as quest: 2. Reliability concerns, 1991, p. 430). Hood and Morris criticize the Quest Scale based upon its inherent critique of those with strong faith commitments. Speaking of the Quest model Hood and Morris write, “true religious faith becomes an eternal quest, unresting and ever seeking (Hood R. &., 1985, p. 595).”

In addition to the Religious Orientation Survey (Allport, 1967) and the Quest Scale (Batson C. &., 1982) there are nine additional instruments identified as scales of religious orientation. These include: Age Universal Religious Orientation Scale (Gorsuch R. &., 1983), Christian Religious Internalization Scale (Ryan, 1993), Committed-Consensual Measures (Allen R. &., 1967), Duke Religion Index (Koenig H. P., 1997), Indiscriminate Proreligiousness Scale (Pargament K. B., 1987), Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale (Hoge, 1972), Religious Maturity Scale (Dudley, 1990), Religious Orientation Scale-Revised (Gorsuch R. &., 1989), and the Religious Position Scale (King, 1975).

Of these numerous scales representing the scales of religious orientation, the Duke Religion Index may have the most promise for incorporation as a useful tool for building a spirituality and values profile of college and university presidents. Koenig, Parkerson, and Meador intended from the beginning for this instrument to be used to “measure religiosity in a comprehensive, yet brief and non-offensive manner” (Koenig H. P., 1997, p. 885). In regard to practical considerations this tool is a brief scale and can be taken in a very short period of time (Hill P. &., 1999, p. 131). It also addresses in generic terms issues of religion, spirituality, and personal faith. Christian, Muslim, Buddhist, Jewish, New Age spiritualist, or atheist should all be able to use the survey without feeling offended by the types of questions asked.
1. How often do you attend church or other religious meetings?
   1. More than once a week
   2. Once a week
   3. A few times a month
   4. A few times a year
   5. Once a year or less
   6. Never

2. How often do you spend time in private religious activities, such as prayer, meditation, or Bible study?
   1. More than once a day
   2. Daily
   3. Two or more times/week
   4. Once a week
   5. A few times a month
   6. Rarely or never

The following section contains 3 statements about religious beliefs or experience. Please mark the extent to which each statement is true or not true for you.

3. In my life, I experience the presence of the Divine (i.e., God).
   1. Definitely true of me
   2. Tends to be true
   3. Unsure
   4. Tends not to be true
   5. Definitely not true

4. My religious beliefs are what really lies behind my whole approach to life.
   1. Definitely true of me
   2. Tends to be true
   3. Unsure
   4. Tends not to be true
   5. Definitely not true

5. I try hard to carry my religion over into all other dealings in life.
1. Definitely true of me
2. Tends to be true
3. Unsure
4. Tends not to be true
5. Definitely not true

In two separate studies, Koenig, one of the co-authors of the Duke Religious Index, offers some research analysis of the effectiveness of this scale (Koenig H., 1997) (Koenig H. H., 1997). Koenig, Patterson, and Meador claim that this scale successfully measures three major dimensions of religiousness: organizational religiosity, non-organizational religiosity, and intrinsic religiosity (Koenig H. P., 1997). Organizational religiosity is determined by the frequency one attends religious services of some type. Non-organizational religiosity is expressed by the amount of time one spends in personal or private religious activities. Intrinsic religiosity speaks to the way in which one incorporates aspects of religion into their personal life. Two recent articles support Koenig’s claim. In 2002, Storch and others successfully used the Duke Religion Index in evaluating religiosity and depression in intercollegiate athletes (Storch E. S., 2002). The sample used in this study was 105 athletes at a public university in the Southeast. The Duke Religion Index was used in combination with the Personality Assessment Inventory (Morey, 1991). The following year, Storch and others used the Duke Religion Index once again in comparing religiosity and substance abuse in intercollegiate athletes (Storch E. S., 2003).

Thus, in lieu of the Religious Orientation Scale used by Judge and many others over the years, the Duke Religion Index should provide an effective and brief introductory assessment in building a spirituality and values profile of American college and university presidents.

Values Assessment Instruments

It is clear that American culture is once again focusing on the importance of values and ethics in our institutions. Recent scandals in the church, our universities, and the corporate sector have forced the spotlight to again be focused on the importance of high standards in the area of personal and institutional values and ethics. In a recent commercial produced and distributed by the Mendoza Business School of the University of Notre Dame, school leaders pronounce their willingness to fight for the principle of values and ethics by unveiling the Executive Integral Leadership Program as key part of their Masters
of Business Administration degree (See the video at: http://video.nd.edu/226-fighting-for-ethical-leadership).

The Rokeach Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973) is another instrument used by Bill Judge in his work The Leader’s Shadow: Exploring and Developing Executive Character (Judge, 1999) while building a character profile for executives. This instrument attempts to uncover the religious and non-religious human values of a leader (Hill P. &., 1999, p. 252). The Rokeach Value Survey is also included among the 126 measures of religiosity outlined in the Measures of Religion by Hill and Hood (Hill P. &., 1999). Rokeach’s survey is included along with five others in a chapter titled, “Scales of Religious/Moral Values or Personal Characteristics” (Hill P. &., 1999, pp. 229-268).

The Character Assessment Scale developed by Schmidt uses a 225 item scale based on selected criteria from biblical writers of the New Testament (Schmidt, 1987). Reviewer Michael Boivin writes, “The Character Assessment Scale assesses personal character traits within the framework of an evangelical Christian commitment (Hill P. &., 1999, p. 230).” Likewise, Wichern’s Spiritual Leadership Qualities Inventory is based on two New Testament passages attributed to Paul, 1 Timothy 3:1-7 and Titus 1:5-9 (Wichern, 1980). Wichern’s inventory lists 222 statements and asks the reader to mark either true or false for each statement. The participant is also asked to give their opinion on each item on the space between the statements (Hill P. &., 1999, pp. 257-265). In addition to these two surveys that are based on biblical teaching, two of the remaining four surveys evaluate the way Judeo-Christian values are supported. The Christian Moral Values Scale operates with a ten item scale dealing with values that are not embraced by the traditional Judeo-Christian community or that are often debated (Francis, 1990). The Missionary Kids’ Value Scales by Sharp identifies 18 measures dealing with issues such as religiosity, awareness of the world, commitment to justice, and cross-cultural issues for children who have grown up abroad (Sharp, 1990).

The final two values surveys described in the work of Hill and Hood are the Rokeach Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973) and the Value Profile (Bales, 1969). The Value Profile rates values in four areas: acceptance of authority, need-determined expression versus value-determined restraint, equalitarianism, and individualism (Hill P. &., 1999, p. 229). In each of the four areas ten statements are given for the participant to record responses on a scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree (Hill P. &., 1999).

Far and away, the leading values scale for the past forty years has been the Rokeach Value Survey (Hill P. &., 1999, pp. 252-254).
The Rokeach Values Survey has been used in many previous studies investigating differing aspects such as employees’ motivation (Brown M., 1976), ethical choices (McCabe, 1991), and cross-cultural differences (Kamakura, 1991). Rokeach defines a value as a prescriptive or proscriptive belief that a specific mode of behavior or end-state of existence is preferred to an opposite mode of behavior or end-state (Rokeach, 1973, p. 5). Rokeach argues for the existence of two principle categories of values: terminal values and instrumental values (Rokeach, 1973). Terminal values describe our preferred mode of behavior while instrumental values describe the end states that we seek in life (Judge, 1999, p. 65). The Rokeach Values Survey lists 18 terminal and instrumental values and then asks participants to prioritize their top five values on each scale based on their own perspective of values.

Rokeach Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973)

Below is a list of 18 terminal values. Study the list carefully and select your five most important values. Then place a “1” next to the value which is most important to you, a “2” next the value which is the second most important, and so on until you have ranked your top five.

__ A comfortable life (a prosperous life)
__ An exciting life (a stimulating, active life)
__ A sense of accomplishment (lasting contribution)
__ A world of peace (free of war and conflict)
__ Equality (brotherhood/sisterhood, equal opportunity)
__ Family security (taking care of loved ones)
__ Freedom (independence, free choice)
__ Happiness (contentedness)
__ A world of beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)
__ Inner harmony (freedom from inner conflict)
__ Mature love (sexual and spiritual intimacy)
__ National security (protection from attack)
__ Pleasure (an enjoyable, leisurely life)
__ Salvation (saved eternal life)
__ Self-respect (self-esteem)
__ Social recognition (respect, admiration)
__ True friendship (close companionship)
__ Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)

Below is a list of 18 instrumental values. Study the list carefully and select your five most important values. Then place a “1” next to the value which is most important to you, a “2” next the value which is the second most important, and so on until you have ranked your top five.
__Ambitious (hardworking, aspiring)
__Broadminded (open-minded)
__Capable (competent, effective)
__Cheerful (lighthearted, joyful)
__Clean (neat, tidy)
__Courageous (standing up for your beliefs)
__Forgiving (willing to pardon others)
__Helpful (working for the welfare of others)
__Honest (sincere, truthful)
__Imaginative (daring, creative)
__Independent (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
__Intellectual (intelligent, reflective)
__Logical (consistent, rational)
__Loving (compassionate, affectionate, tender)
__Obedient (dutiful, respectful)
__Polite (courteous, well-mannered)
__Responsible (dependable)
__Self-controlled (restrained, self-disciplined)

There have been several reviews of the Rokeach Value Survey over the past forty years (Allen M., 1994), (Feather, 1988), (Thompson, 1982), (Gibbons, 1993). The durability and longevity of this survey speaks to its reliability and validity (Hill P. &., 1999, pp. 252-253). Having withstood the challenges of time and testing, the Rokeach Value Survey used by Judge in building his character profile of leaders, will be used as a second instrument in this study to evaluate the values, both terminal and instrumental, of selected college and university presidents. The final piece missing in the replication of Judge’s initial work is a viable instrument used to measure the spirituality of the study subjects.

Spirituality Assessment Instruments

Hood and Hill describe the huge interest of spirituality in the late 1980’s into the 1990’s as an explosion of research (Hill P. &., 1999). Along with this explosion came the development of several new measures for assessing spirituality (Brown D. J., 2007). In the midst of their cataloguing of the measures of religiosity, Hood and Hill include a chapter dedicated to the more popular measures related to spirituality (Hill P. &., 1999, pp. 359-385). There are six measures listed by Hood and Hill: Index of Core Spiritual Experiences (Kass, 1991), The Mysticism Scale: Research Form D (Hood R., 1975), Spiritual Assessment Inventory (Hall, 1996), Spiritual Themes and Religious Responses Test (Saur, 1993), Spiritual Well-Being Questionnaire
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(Moberg, 1984), and the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Ellison, 1983) (Paloutzian, 1991).

The Saur and Saur Spiritual Themes and Religious Responses Test along with Hood’s Mysticism Scale avoid using the word God in their assessment (Hill P., 2000). The Index of Core Spiritual Experiences uses the word God, but allows the respondent to define God in their own terms. It states, “people have many different definitions of the “Higher Power” that we often call ‘God.’” Hill and Hood call these three the least culturally bound due to their avoidance of direct appeal to a Judeo-Christian God (Hill P. &., 1999, p. 359). Moberg’s Spiritual Well-Being Questionnaire is limited for use within a Christian setting. Hill and Hood describe the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Ellison, 1983) as one of the most popular measures of religion or spirituality among all 126 listed in their volume (Hill P. &., 1999, p. 359).

The Spiritual Well-Being Scale was initially published to measure quality of life and spiritual well-being (Brown D. J., 2007), (Ellison, 1983). Two subscales are used within the instrument: religious well-being and existential well-being (Hill P. &., 1999). Hall and Edwards describe these two subscales as relating the horizontal and vertical dimensions of spiritual well-being (Hall, 1996). Religious well-being centers on the well being of spiritual life centered in an understanding of a higher being (Brown D. J., 2007). Existential well-being centers upon how well adjusted a person is to life and community (Brown D. J., 2007). Brown, Johnson, and Parrish report over 300 studies have been produced using the Spiritual Well-Being Scale in spite of its susceptibility to reporting a “ceiling effect (Brown D. J., 2007, p. 5).”

Judge avoids using the more popular assessment, the Spiritual Well-Being Scale in favor of a more recent assessment, the Index of Core Spiritual Experiences. Judge also modifies the original Index of Core Spiritual Experiences that originally included seven basic areas into six basic questions: How religious/spiritual are you? How often do you practice your spirituality? Have you experienced a spiritual force? How close are you to God? Was there a singular experience that proved to you that God exists? How comfortable are you with the statement, ‘God dwells within you?’ (Judge, 1999, pp. 190-191). The Index of Core Spiritual Experiences was initially developed with two objectives. The first objective is to identify core spiritual experiences and the second objective is to investigate the relationships between this scale and health benefits (Hill P. &., 1999). Though heavily weighted in favor of a Judeo-Christian setting, the Index of Core Spiritual
Experiences has been demonstrated to have high reliability and validity (Judge, 1999) (Hill P. &., 1999).

Index of Core Spiritual Experiences (Kass, 1991)
Instructions: The following questions concern your spiritual or religious beliefs and experiences. There are no right or wrong answers. For each question, circle the number of the answer that is most true to you.

1. How strongly religious (or spiritually oriented) do you consider yourself to be? (strong; somewhat strong; not very strong; not at all; can’t answer)

2. About how often do you spend time on religious or spiritual practices? (several times per day-several times per week; once per week-several times per month; once per month-several times a year; once a year or less)

3. How often have you felt as though you were very close to a powerful spiritual force that seemed to lift you outside yourself? (never; once or twice; several times; often; can’t answer)

People have different definitions of the “Higher Power” that we often call “God.” Please use your definition of God when answering the following questions:

4. How close do you feel to God? (extremely close; somewhat close; not very close; I don’t believe in God; can’t answer)

5. Have you ever had an experience that has convinced you that God exists (yes; no; can’t answer)

6. Indicate whether you agree or disagree with this statement: “God dwells within you.” (definitely disagree; tend to disagree; tend to agree; definitely agree)

7. The following list describes spiritual experiences that some people have had. Please indicate if you have had any of these experiences and the extent to which each of them has affected your belief in God.

The response choices are:

I had this experience and it:

4) Convinced me of God’s existence
3) Strengthened belief in God; or
2) Did not strengthen belief in God.
1) I have never had this experience.
A. An experience of God’s energy or presence
B. An experience of a great spiritual figure (e.g., Jesus, Mary, Elijah, Buddha)
C. An experience of angels or guiding spirits
D. An experience of communication with someone who has died
E. Meeting or listening to a spiritual leader or master
F. An overwhelming experience of love
G. An experience of profound inner peace
H. An experience of complete joy and ecstasy
I. A miraculous (or not normally occurring) event
J. A healing of your body or mind (or witnessed such a healing)
K. A feeling of unity with the earth and all living beings
L. An experience with near death or life after death
M. Other

Following the road already travelled by William Judge, it is sorely tempting to simply use the Index of Core Spiritual Experiences as the final component in building a profile of spirituality and values of selected college and university presidents. As described by Hill and Hood, this instrument is sensitive to a variety of spiritual backgrounds and journeys represented by the various survey participants (Hill, P. &., 1999). Though its effectiveness beyond the cultural walls of Western culture has not been demonstrated, it at least offers a level of sensitivity toward what many consider a deeply personal matter – one’s own sense of spirituality.

In the vein of offering something new and creative I will tweak Judge’s approach just a bit here and use Paloutzian and Ellison’s Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982) in place of the Index of Core Spiritual Experiences (Kass, 1991).

Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Ellison, 1983)
For each of the following statements, circle the choice that best indicates the extent of your agreement or disagreement as it describes your personal experience.

SA = Strongly Agree   D =Disagree
MA= Moderately Agree  MD= Moderately Disagree
A= Agree               SD= Strongly Disagree

1. I don’t find much satisfaction in private prayer with God.
   SA MA A D MD SD
2. I don’t know who I am, where I came from, or where I am going.
   SA MA A D MD SD
3. I believe that God loves me and cares about me.
   SA MA A D MD SD
4. I feel that life is a positive experience
   SA MA A D MD SD
5. I believe that God is impersonal and not interested in my daily situations.
   SA MA A D MD SD
6. I feel unsettled about my future.
   SA MA A D MD SD
7. I have a personally meaningful relationship with God.
   SA MA A D MD SD
8. I feel very fulfilled and satisfied with life.
   SA MA A D MD SD
9. I don’t get much personal strength and support from my god.
   SA MA A D MD SD
10. I feel a sense of well-being about the direction my life is headed in.
    SA MA A D MD SD
11. I believe that God is concerned about my problems.
    SA MA A D MD SD
12. I don’t enjoy much about life.
    SA MA A D MD SD
13. I don’t have a personally satisfying relationship with God.
    SA MA A D MD SD
    SA MA A D MD SD
15. My relationship with God helps me not to feel lonely.
    SA MA A D MD SD
16. I feel that life is full of conflict and unhappiness.
    SA MA A D MD SD
17. I feel most fulfilled when I’m in close communion with God.
    SA MA A D MD SD
18. Life doesn’t have much meaning.
    SA MA A D MD SD
19. My relation with God contributes to my sense of well-being.
    SA MA A D MD SD
20. I believe there is some real purpose for my life.
    SA MA A D MD SD
The Spiritual Well-Being Scale was developed as a “general measure of the quality of life (Hill, P. &., 1999, p. 382).” Its popularity, evidenced by the large number of studies who have chosen this instrument, has validated its high internal consistency and reliability (Hill, P. &., 1999). Hall and Edwards highlight a few of the concerns that have emerged concerning the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Hall, 1996). One concern regards the use of the two-factor solution of the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Hall, 1996, p. 345). There are two major reasons I have selected the Spiritual Well-Being Scale over Judge’s selection, the Index of Core Spiritual Experiences. First, this instrument has been used over 300 times successfully in previous studies (Brown D. J., 2007, p. 5). It has adequately proved itself in a “levels of evidence” (Miller, 2003) approach as valid. Over seventy studies have identified a possible “ceiling effect” as its major shortcoming (Slater, 2001, p. 11), but it is especially sensitive to the lower end of a spirituality scale, particularly illuminating spiritual distress or lack of well-being (Hill P. &., 1999, p. 383). A second reason is one of pure pragmatism. The simple Likert scale (Likert, 1932) of six varying degrees for each statement will lend itself to less complicated and more reliable statistical analysis especially as compared to the variation of questions found in the Index of Core Spiritual Experiences.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there are a large number of assessment instruments available to the creative researcher interested in studying values and spirituality among various populations today. Gorsuch warned future researchers in the 1990’s to be careful in trying to recreate the wheel in regards to making new assessment instruments (Gorsuch R. &., 1989) (Hall, 1996). Current scholarship has not exhausted the usefulness of the existing assessments in regard to the study of values and spirituality. Indeed new instruments may be needed with certain studies on selected populations, but researchers must demonstrate a valid need before adding to the existing pile of assessment instruments (Gorsuch R. &., 1989). In my on-going research I will hasten to the advice given by Gorsuch.

Speck does well to caution the researcher of values and spirituality to remember that unless a working definition can be mutually agreed upon by the members of the profession, many, if not most, will remain skeptical of the contributions made in this area (Speck, 2005). The working definition articulated in this paper, “spirituality is the search for the sacred” (Pargament K. , 1999), is not wholly sufficient. By using the Duke University Religion Index (Koenig H. , 1997), the Rokeach Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973), and
the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Ellison, 1983), we discover an operational definition of spirituality that affirms the suggestion of Miller and Thoresen, and will view spirituality as a latent construct rather than a singularly identifiable term (Miller, 2003). Thus, spirituality is defined operationally as the outcomes of the values and spirituality profile built in the process of this study.

It is my intention to continue to follow the path pioneered by Bill Judge (Judge, 1999) and add to this body of work by expanding his work with corporate executives to the field of executive leadership in higher education. In my study, I will utilize the Duke University Religion Index (Koenig H. P., 1997), the Rokeach Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973), and the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Ellison, 1983) in building a profile of values and spirituality. These profiles can then be used to determine if there are any differences between the profiles of values and spirituality among presidents of colleges and universities of different types: two year community colleges, four year liberal arts colleges, and tier one research universities.
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A Deeper Shade of Red: Tennessee and the 2008 Elections

James L. Baumgardner

In contrast to a pattern that had developed in the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections that featured an electoral map taking on an increasingly red hue, 2008 witnessed certain red states donning a shade of purple as they moved at least temporarily into the ranks of the blue states. Bucking this trend, however, were two states that went a deeper shade of red on the presidential level. Then, there was Tennessee and its distinctive deeper shade of red.

Initially riding a wave of discontent with the Bush Administration over its handling of the war in Iraq but eventually coming to center upon its seemingly inept bungling of an economy growing increasingly sour, the Democrats scored a major victory in the 2008 elections, ultimately gaining a solid control of both houses of Congress and a secure grasp on the White House. Most dramatically, the man sent to that ironically named center of executive power was the first African-American president, much to the delight of many people around the world and to the obvious satisfaction of the nation's mainstream media.

Barack Obama's victory was achieved in a rather spectacular fashion. In contrast to the preceding two presidential elections, no new states slipped into the Republican camp, while nine states moved from the red to the blue side of electoral politics (Pomper 2005, 43ff; Abramson 2010, 61ff). Included were the two states (New Mexico and Iowa) that the Republicans in 2004 had taken from the 2000 Democratic electoral list, two rock-ribbed GOP states (Indiana and Nevada), and three southern states (Virginia, North Carolina, and Florida). Also falling to Obama was Ohio, which served to reinforce the old political axiom that no Republican candidate has won the presidency without carrying that state.

Amid this tide of blue, two states (Arkansas and Louisiana), for whatever reason(s), moved in the opposite direction, giving John McCain a greater percentage of the popular vote than had been received by George W. Bush in 2004 (Pomper 2010, 50-51). In a quite different fashion, Tennessee joined that very small list of states that adorned themselves in redder garb than had been worn four years earlier.

If an examination is confined to presidential voting in 2008 as compared to 2004, the outcome of the two-party vote in Tennessee in 2004 (57.2%–42.8%) and 2008 (57.6%–42.4%) showed only a .4% variation in favor of McCain (R) in 2008 and Kerry (D) in 2004. On the congressional level, the party balance was the same as it previously had been, five Democrats and four Republicans. It was on the state level, however, that Tennessee in 2008 went a deeper shade of red by
giving Republicans control of both houses of the Assembly for the first time since Reconstruction days.

To what should such a historical turn of events be attributed? Almost unanimously, leaders of both parties in the state declared that it had been caused by McCain's popularity with Tennessee voters, cemented by an election eve visit to the northeastern part of the state. By comparison, with the exception of his presence at the third and final presidential debate held at Belmont University in Nashville, Obama basically ignored the state in his campaigning. Democratic Governor Phil Bredesen, who engaged in an unsuccessful effort to aid candidacies of some Democratic state legislative hopefuls noted that, especially in East Tennessee, McCain's appeal allowed him to win as much as 73% of the popular vote in certain areas. He ruefully noted that such a result was not "a head wind" but rather "a howling gale blowing in your face" (Humphrey, "Races may", B8).

Is the suggestion in effect that Tennessee Republicans rode a presidential contender's coattails to victory in key state legislative elections an adequate explanation for the historic turn of events that caused the state in 2008 to assume a deeper shade of red? Are there other possible factors worthy of consideration? Race? Ideology? Moral Values? Realignment?

Race

While issues of race are far from unknown in other sections of the country, questions of race and racism are especially sensitive topics to white southerners. Indeed, the great majority generally are unwilling to acknowledge their existence, much less to discuss the matter. Such reticence, however, should not be allowed to disguise the fact that current southern voting patterns are rooted in the soil of the civil rights movement of the 1960s, the role the two major parties played with regard to it, and the reaction of southern voters, white and black. Regardless of the reasons southern voters might give for casting their ballots in the way they have from the 1970s onward, to deny their 1960s origins is at best disingenuous and at worst either dishonest or based on willful ignorance.

From the Reconstruction era to the 1960s, it generally was true that to be white and southern meant that one voted Democratic, while to be black and southern often meant that one was not given the opportunity to vote in large parts of the South. Such was the case because the southern wing of the Democratic Party served as the vehicle of white supremacy and thus supported white efforts to reduce blacks to second-class citizenship. That situation began to change dramatically in
the 1960s with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Whatever the other effects of the measures on the South, they radically transformed the southern political landscape.

These laws were pushed through Congress by liberal northern Democrats who were being encouraged in their efforts by a renegade president with southern roots, Lyndon B. Johnson. Although moderate Republicans in Congress aided particularly in the passage of the 1964 measure, conservatives seized control of the party that year and nominated for president a then ultra-conservative senator from Arizona, Barry M. Goldwater, who was an opponent of federal involvement in civil rights and who had voted against the recently passed civil rights legislation.

Clearly grasping the implicit message conservative Republicans were sending to them, white southerners on the presidential level began an exodus from Democratic ranks that turned into a swelling tide in 1968 and went to flood stage in 1972. Since that time, these voters (at least most of them) have been willing to pause only long enough to consider two Democratic presidential candidates, both of whom were southern but neither one of whom could have carried the southern states they won without black voter support. Meanwhile, as old-time southern Democratic incumbents gradually left congressional offices either through retirement, or death, or decisions not to seek reelection, they most often were replaced by conservative Republican candidates, a trend that began to trickle down to the state level by the late 1980s and early 1990s.

The upshot of these developments was that, while white southerners began flocking to the Republican Party, southern blacks were gaining a political clout that they had not known or possessed since the glory days of Reconstruction. Aware that their growing influence in southern politics had come courtesy of the Democratic national leadership, these newly enfranchised voters rapidly became the bastion of Democratic strength in the post-1960s South. Thereby, regardless of the racial situation in the South on levels other than political, southern politics assumed an air of segregation, with 90+% of blacks supporting the Democratic Party and a growing percentage of whites giving their allegiance to the Republican Party.

Given this situation and the absence of solid evidence among whites regarding the bases of their growing support of the Republican Party, one can only speculate about the role race might play during any election season, but particularly in the years in which there are national elections, especially ones involving the presidency. Little wonder that supporters of an African-American for that office experienced considerable anxiety about the role that race might play. Hence, at least
some Democrats were ready to respond quickly to any perceived Republican charges that smacked of playing the race card (Abramson, 2010, 43-44). Indeed, Obama himself, in an effort to head off any such tactic, at a rally in Missouri warned that the Republicans were “going to make you scared of me... You know, he doesn’t look like all those other Presidents on those dollar bills, you know. He’s risky.” The McCain campaign quickly struck back by charging that it was Obama who “had played the race card, and he played it from the bottom of the deck” (Ibid., 44).

If Obama’s Democratic supporters had in mind concrete reasons for their concern, they needed look no further than the 2006 Senate race in Tennessee. To oppose wealthy Chattanooga businessman Bob Corker, Democrats set forth Harold Ford, Jr., scion of a highly influential black Memphis family political dynasty. In a number of ways, Ford resembled Obama. Of approximately the same physical build, they both had received educations at elite schools and were very articulate and compelling speakers. Differences included Ford possessing the political experience (ten years in Congress) that Obama largely lacked, while Obama had an attractive family (preventing any attack that might imply that he lacked a sense of “family values”), as opposed to Ford’s vulnerable-to-attack bachelor status.

While the mainstream media in Tennessee (print and television) generally went to great lengths to avoid introducing the element of race into the 2006 contest, Republican organizations on both the state and national levels felt no such restraints but at the same time rejected charges that their efforts were grounded in racism. Among the Republican state organization’s offerings was a fund-raising appeal sent out in late September which included a picture of Ford that exaggerated his skin color by converting a color photograph of him to black-and-white. When a Democratic leader labeled it an attempt to appeal “to the basest instincts among their [Republican] constituencies,” the Republican state party executive described it as simply a cost-saving measure in that color photos are more expensive to reproduce than are black-and-white ones and denounced Democratic charges as “irresponsible, baseless and reckless” (Humphrey, “Ethicist,” B7).

Late in the campaign, the Republican National Committee decided to play hard ball by releasing a television spot that built upon the bachelor Ford’s admission that he had attended a 2005 Playboy-sponsored Super Bowl party by bringing on camera a blonde, white “wanna-be” actress to say that she had met Ford at that party. With closed hand and finger held to resemble a telephone, she then appealed, “Harold, call me.” A student of political ads, a Vanderbilt political science professor declared the implied interracial sex overtone to be
"unbelievable" and stated that the entire spot (which also included an attempt to tie Ford to the porn industry) made "Willie Horton [the infamous 1988 spot that the George H.W. Bush campaign had run against Michael Dukakis] look like child's play." Apparently with a straight face, an RNC spokesman pointed to Ford's admission that he had been at the party and solemnly proclaimed that the ad "raises valid points and has no racial overtones" (Humprey, "RNC defends", A6).

Perhaps much to the surprise of Tennessee's Obama supporters, the RNC was much more restrained in the 2008 campaign. It carefully avoided political spots with implicit racial messages, and it went so far as to slap down early in the contest an intemperate attempt by the party's state committee to emphasize in a spot Obama's middle name of Hussein.

After the campaign, however, black Democrat Nathan Vaughn blamed the defeat of his bid for re-election to a state House seat from a largely white district in part on a mailer that had been distributed by the Republican state organization. Labeling Vaughn as "part of the liberal, big government flock," it pictured three blackbirds with the heads of Vaughn, Obama, and Nancy Pelosi, the last-named being added, Vaughn claimed, to provide "cover." The response of the state Republican chairperson was to argue that, while she did not know who had designed or authorized the release of the mailer, Vaughn's complaint was "tiring" and proceeded to add, "What we're seeing is, if someone chooses to vote for a white person, this is what you have to deal with: 'You're a racist'" (Humphrey, "Dem denounces," A4-5).

Whatever the degree of racism injected into the 2008 campaign, it seems clear that, in southern presidential voting, race very much was involved. With the exceptions of Arkansas and Louisiana, the Republican percentage of the popular vote in the former states of the Confederacy (plus Kentucky and Oklahoma, which states many political analysts now are including in their observations concerning southern voting behavior) remained at or below the 2004 levels, with the most startling reversals occurring in Virginia, North Carolina, and Florida, states Bush carried in 2004 but which fell to Obama.

If race were important to southern whites, how did the levels of Republican support remain approximately the same or decline? What caused the reversals in Virginia, North Carolina, and Florida? The answer in large measure in most cases was race, i.e., black voters turning out in huge numbers throughout the region. (In Alabama, for example, black participation in counties in which blacks are in a majority jumped 15%.) (NY Times, P1). In Virginia and North Carolina, Obama did not carry white voters but the margins of loss were less than in 2004 (Ibid, P8). In the face of this reality, heavy black turnouts in
those two states likely helped carry the day for Obama. While Florida offers a more complex problem of analysis due to its population diversity, the black role certainly was at least one factor in the Democratic victory there.

In the national balloting, the struggle for the white vote (which constituted about 75% of the total) took a distinctly sectional overtone, with the national vote about even, but with the southern white voters giving about two-thirds of their ballots to McCain (“What mattered” 2008, A17). Overall, Obama lost this vote by twelve percentage points, which was about the same margin of loss Al Gore experienced in 2000 and an improvement over John Kerry's 17% loss in 2004. Among white males, Obama's margin of loss was 16%, but this result was an improvement over John Kerry's 25% in 2004 (NY Times, P8). An offsetting factor was that nationwide the black vote represented about 25% of Obama's total vote, a record never before achieved by any Democratic presidential nominee (Abramson 2010, 127).

In the South, the heavy black turnout may have served to help mask any racial overtones in white voting. Rural white-dominated counties generally voted heavily for McCain, but it is not clear as to whether this phenomenon was accompanied by a heavier white turnout than in 2004 (NY Times, P1).

In Tennessee (as was true also for Arkansas), those counties with a 90% white population witnessed little change in turnout over 2004 levels (Ibid.). Overall in the state, the white vote represented 84% of the total and split 34% for Obama and 63% for McCain. (Among white men, the division was 31%-64%.) By contrast, the black vote, constituting 12% of the total, went 94% Obama (CNN.com).

These figures and comparisons would seem to indicate that the fact that McCain's 57% of the overall vote in Tennessee simply matched rather than exceeded Bush's 2004 percentage was a product of a heavy black vote, particularly in Shelby County (home of Memphis) with its large African-American population. Throughout the state, Obama carried a total of only five of the state's ninety-five counties, as compared to the thirty-two captured by Ford in the 2006 Senate race. Found also in Ford's 2006 total, the five Obama counties included Shelby, Davidson (home of Nashville, the state's largest city), and three rural, traditionally Democratic counties, Jackson (north-middle Tennessee) and West Tennessee's Hardeman and Houston counties. Knox and Hamilton counties in East Tennessee, home of the state's third (Knoxville) and fourth (Chattanooga) largest cities, both went heavily for McCain. Obama's victory in Davidson County, which basically is Nashville, came as no surprise since the city has a cosmopolitan environment, including a number of progressive whites and a diversity
As was true for white southerners in general, the relative performances of McCain and Obama in Tennessee tended to be attributed to ideology, with not a single hint of race being involved. A stellar example of this tendency was the Knoxville News Sentinel's reporting of the presidential results in Knox County, under the headline "Ideological gap wide." Correctly noting that the Knox County vote "followed the typical voting pattern seen in the rest of the Southeast," the story was accompanied by a map of voting by precinct quite similar to the one that was presented in the aftermath of the 2006 Senate race. What was shown could be recognized easily by students of southern voting behavior, i.e., an inner city heavily populated by blacks voting Democratic, while suburban and rural areas, overwhelmingly the domains of whites, voted Republican (Stambaugh, Al). Yet, this aspect was totally ignored in favor of an ideological slant.

The newspaper's verdict was endorsed by local supporters of both parties. A Republican city councilman who had led the McCain campaign effort in the county declared it to be "just the way it seems to fall in every election," in that "the city's just a little bit more liberal than the county." An Obama volunteer worker attributed the outcome to "a lot of younger-minded people in the city" who "live downtown and tend to be a little more liberal and free-thinking" (Ibid., A1,11).

A typical white southern response to charges of racism motivating white voters is to treat the notion with derision while pointing to ideological differences. A good example of this tactic was an angry letter to the editor of the Knoxville News Sentinel denouncing Obama's "socialist policies" while mocking those who would greet opposition to policies such as "using the tax code to redistribute wealth" and appointing to the federal judiciary "liberal, activist judges who legislate from the bench" with charges of "must be a racist." The writer stated his conclusion, "The race card is being played, but not by anyone but Obama and his supporters" (Viles, B4).

The disorderly, chaotic 1960s (civil rights and antiwar demonstrations, student radicals, "hippies," black militancy, the rise of the feminist and gay liberation movements) gave rise to a so-called "white backlash" that was exploited in 1968 by George Wallace and Richard Nixon and that represented the beginning of a return to the political, economic, religious, social, and cultural conservatism that has characterized the great portion of American history. The recapture of the Republican Party by conservatives in the mid-1960s left that party...
perfectly positioned to take advantage of this reaction and to exploit the so-called "culture war" that arose in the 1970s and 1980s.

By contrast, while the Republican Party slowly but steadily moved to purge at least its national ranks of all but conservatives (a process now virtually complete), the Democratic Party's non-southern, liberal leaders continued to be plagued by so-called moderates (referred to in the 1980s as "boll weevils" and currently as "blue dogs") who in reality are social and cultural conservatives who cripple efforts to present a truly liberal alternative to the Republican Party's conservatism. Hence, the party often has been rendered largely ineffective while still being branded as "liberal" in the minds of many voters.

Whether it be race, economics, culture, religion, or society, white southerners always have tended to be conservative. Hence, from the 1960s onward, they tended to find the Republican Party's increasingly conservative stances not only upon economics but also upon social and cultural issues quite attractive and responded by flocking into the party's ranks. In turn, their growing influence in the party became reflected by southerners assuming congressional leadership positions with the Republican return to control of Congress in 1994 (Flanigan and Zingale 2010, 82-83). (Tennessee has begun to break into this act on the basis of the performance of its two Republican senators, first-termer Bob Corker and 2008 re-elected Lamar Alexander.) Also indicative of southern clout is the importance of the region's white voters to Republican presidential success, a fact that first became evident in 1968 and 1972 and has been manifested repeatedly since that time.

Rather ironically, it was Jesse Helms, primarily remembered by his many detractors (all of whom he considered despicable liberals, if not communists) as the race-baiting senator from North Carolina, who took the lead in the 1950s and 1960s in helping reshape the Republican Party into a conservative force that could provide white southerners with a reassuring political home built upon more than a racist foundation. To do so, he used what critics came to call "pious incitement" which (among a number of other things) "not only excited a racist conservative constituency but also led people of moderate views to question liberal institutions" (Thrift 2008, 910). Helms subsequently "honed pious incitement into a powerful tool for tapping into [television] viewers' anger and frustration over the civil rights movement, taxes, Supreme Court rulings, mainstream media, and liberal elites everywhere" (Ibid.). He wanted to reconfigure the Republican Party into "a party so conservative that it could" make criticism of the private sector unacceptable, command obedience to authority, and undermine spending on the public sector" (Ibid., 925).

The end result was that Helms helped bring into being the
conservative Republican Party of today which has as its most dependable supporters white southerners. In the process, "pious incitement became a national strategy. White racial fears and moral outrage have been central to Republican strategy since the nation's shift to a conservative consensus" (Ibid. 926). White southerners had found a reassuring conservative ideology upon which to base their voting preferences.

Within this context, one thing certainly should be clear. To assume, as did a Wall Street Journal political pundit in the immediate aftermath of the 2008 elections, that Virginia and North Carolina falling into the Democratic presidential column "means the Republican hold on the South is cracking" (Seib, A9) is both premature and a great underestimation of the loyalty many white southerners have to their peculiar brand of conservatism and thus to the Republican Party. (Ironically, in the same article, the author admitted that Obama's victory "was more personal than ideological.")

Moral Values

If a conservative ideology provided white southerners with reassurance, related moral values issues made them quite comfortable with their voting preferences. Based upon a conservative ideology, voting for moral values made it entirely unnecessary to reference any other reason for the manner in which they chose to cast their ballots.

The emergence of the feminist and gay rights movements in the late 1960s and early 1970s placed the Democratic Party at a definite disadvantage in an increasingly conservative political environment. Dedicated from its origins in the 1790s as the Democratic Republican (or simply Republican) Party to principles of equality and individual rights, the national party could hardly afford to take stances opposing abortion and demands for equal treatment of gays. In sharp contrast, the Republican Party, which always had been inclined to allow use of the government to help those pious individuals who seek to push their narrow views of morality in order to create their version of a truly Christian nation, only stood to benefit by taking pro-life and anti-gay stances, particularly after the appearance of the Christian (or Religious) Right (now often called the New Evangelicals) in the 1970s.

Convinced the country was on the wrong religious and moral track, members of the Christian Right opposed such things as pornography, the disintegration of the family, and the teaching of "secular humanism" (centered upon evolution and sex education) in the public schools, while favoring the restoration of organized prayer in those same schools. Above all, as the country moved through the 20th
century and into the 21st, they became known for their determined opposition to abortion and gay marriage.

Originally called “family values,” moral values became increasingly embraced by a greater diversity of Americans who expanded the meaning of the phrase. In the post-election survey of voters in 2004, the things that were cited as areas of concern went far beyond abortion (viewed only by one in six as the key moral issue) and gay marriage (viewed as the number one problem only by one in eight). “Greed and materialism” were seen by one-third as a major moral problem, while another third pointed to “poverty and economic justice.” On election day, 42% of those casting ballots listed the war in Iraq as a vexing “moral issue” (Pomper 2005, 59).

As likely would be true for white southerners in general, the great majority of Tennesseans would not have dreamed of defining moral values that broadly in either 2004 or 2008. For one thing, Tennesseans generally never have seen a war that the United States has fought (with the possible exception of the Civil War) that they did not like and support. (After all, there is a reason Tennessee is known as “the Volunteer State”!) Such things as opposition to “greed and materialism” and “poverty and economic justice” could be lumped together under the broad rubric of “social justice.” Tennesseans, however, generally favor “justice” only if it is not qualified by the word “social.” In the view of many of them, calls for “social justice” are designed to benefit only the “undeserving” members of society, those too lazy to work to support themselves and their families and instead look to the government to meet their needs.

Consequently, the bulk of Tennessee’s moral values voters view abortion and gay marriage (oddly combined with opposition to gun control) as the issues of greatest concern, and they used them to oppose Al Gore (a native son) in 2000, John Kerry in 2004, and Obama in 2008. (Who can forget the stampede among panic-stricken whites throughout the nation to buy guns and ammunition in advance of Obama’s election in the fear that, after he became president, he would find a way to institute strict gun control laws?) On the basis of 2008 election exit polls, 52% of Tennessee’s white voters listed themselves as evangelicals (i.e., born-again Christians), a figure that tied the state with Oklahoma and which was eclipsed only by Arkansas’ 55%. (A possible explanation for why that state was one of only two in the nation in which McCain outperformed Bush’s 2004 vote percentage?) These Volunteer State white evangelical voters overwhelmingly cast their ballots for McCain and likely were the source of the Republican capture of both houses of the Assembly for the first time since Reconstruction. (Nationwide, evangelical whites cast 26% of the ballots in this election, and they voted 3-1 in favor of McCain both throughout the country and in Tennessee.) (Mansfield, A1, 10). According to this scenario, then, it was moral values voting that led
Tennessee in 2008 to turn a deeper shade of red.

Realignment

Was race or ideology or moral values, separately or collectively, the reason(s) for Tennessee’s 2008 change of hue, or were they simply contributing factors to the more basic cause of realignment? In the final analysis, perhaps what happened in the state in 2008 simply was another step in alignment with the Republican Party that a number of other former Confederate states already had undergone.

Even as white southerners in other states were moving in the later 1960s, the 1970s, and the 1980s from the Democratic to the Republican ranks, Tennessee still was being viewed as a moderate state in which either Republicans or Democrats could prevail in any given election, depending upon the parties respective candidates and/or the issues of most importance to its voters.

As late as 2006, a year in which the Democratic candidate for the U.S. Senate was beaten by his Republican opponent while the Democratic governor seeking reelection prevailed in all the state's ninety-five counties, leaders in both parties were hailing the independence of the state's voters and solemnly declaring the state still to be a two-party entity (Humphrey, "Tennessee voters", A1, 10).

Yet, was Governor Phil Bredesen’s overwhelming re-election a sign that Tennessee still was a two-party state? Bredesen is a wily politician who has the rare gift of getting things done by proposing solutions to the state's problems in such a way as to draw both parties into the fray and ultimately to agree on the approach to be taken. At the same time, he is so low-key that he tends to fly below the political radar in such a manner that no one can get a definite fix on his position on many key issues. Although a Democrat, few (if any) know his stances on key social and cultural issues such as abortion, gay rights, and gun control, all “killer” subjects which Republicans in conservative states use to their political advantage.

Meanwhile, why would Tennessee’s voters decide in 2008 to turn control of the Assembly to the state's Republicans, who during the 2009 legislative session spent an inordinate amount of time and energy trying to determine all the places (including bars) where Tennesseans with gun carry permits could take their weapons? The reality is that, where volatile cultural issues are at stake, there is virtually no way to distinguish most of the state’s Democratic politicians from their Republican counterparts. Thus, unless the 2008 elections indeed were a part of a realignment process in which conservative Tennessee voters felt assured that votes on aspects of these controversial issues were
more likely to be brought to the floors of both houses of the Assembly by a Republican leadership for up-or-down votes, why shift total control of both houses from one group of politicians to another in a situation in which their positions are virtually identical?

Conclusion

In a year in which the Democrats managed to turn several states from red to purple, the lead story in the Knoxville News Sentinel two days after the November elections virtually boasted that "in Tennessee, the political palette just changed to a deeper shade of red" (Collins, A1). Why? Was it due merely to McCain's appeal to the state's voters, as leaders in both parties claimed in the election's aftermath? Could the real reason have been race or ideology, and is there any way (thanks largely to Jesse Helms) to separate one from the other? Was it the result of moral values voting? Or was the deeper cause realignment?

There is no presidential election in 2010 to blur the political picture, but there is a gubernatorial contest in Tennessee, as well as elections for members of the Assembly. To make matters more interesting, two long-time Democratic members of the state's congressional delegation have called it quits, while at least one other Democratic-held seat possibly may be in play. Hence, there is much blood in the political waters for Republican sharks to smell.

If the Republicans win the governor's seat, increase their numbers in the Assembly, and convert the state's congressional delegation from a Democratic to a Republican majority of perhaps as great as six-three or even seven-two, the state will have progressed from "a deeper shade of red" to "dead red." Although the "why" for such an outcome still might not be totally clear, the generally expressed voter reason likely will be a view of moral values representing an evangelicalism that firmly believes that Jesus' teachings translate politically into Republican conservatism, something of which Jesse Helms had no doubt as early as the 1950s.
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Integrating Online Security into the Undergraduate Curriculum

Jason G. Caudill
Robert Terrell

Introduction

Advances in technology have undeniably changed higher education. Some changes are clear to see inside the classroom: digital projectors and PowerPoint presentations, the use of an LMS for document and information distribution, online discussion forums that carry into the classroom. Other changes are not so visible, but still very real: online sourcing for student research, study group meetings organized via Facebook, and instead of working on the crossword in the campus paper students divert themselves in class by texting with their cell phones. These changes, and others, have changed faculty practices and student expectations.

Such changes, however, may have impacts that reach far beyond the classroom. The rise of ubiquitous computing and social networking has placed unprepared undergraduate students in serious jeopardy. Identity theft is rampant, employers are making hiring, promotion, and termination decisions based on online content, and at the most basic level simple embarrassment can result from unwise social networking. Institutions of higher education have long considered it their responsibility to prepare students to graduate as logical, thinking, contributing members of society, whatever their chosen field of study. In today’s environment, that burden has been expanded to include preparing students to live and work safely in an electronic environment.

The Importance of Online Security

Social networking brings many benefits to students and others, and it has even found a place in the eLearning environment with Facebook and other applications being successfully integrated into the electronic classroom. These benefits, however, can be quickly eclipsed by the dangers waiting for users’ foolish mistakes. Recent history provides many telling examples of just what can go wrong with such technology.

The same week that this paper was being written a Canadian woman suffering from depression was overtaken by legal problems because of Facebook. The woman was on paid disability leave from
work because of her depression. On orders from her physician she was making an effort to have fun by going out with friends and taking a vacation to a beach resort. She posted pictures of these activities to Facebook to share with friends. On seeing the pictures her employer declared that she was not actually depressed because she was out having fun and terminated her disability benefits (Beretsy, 2009). At the time of this writing the court battles are just beginning to ensue, but the smoking gun for the company’s allegations is a Facebook profile.

In 2008 two staffers from Barack Obama’s presidential campaign made national news for a picture on one of their Facebook profiles of the two of them feeding a beer to and fondling a life-size cardboard cutout of primary opponent Hilary Clinton (Kamen, 2008). In 2009 the head of Great Britain’s spy agency, MI6, had pictures, his home address, and other security-threatening items exposed to the world on Facebook through his wife’s account (Hemming, 2009). A quick search on Youtube of the authors’ own institution quickly reveals videos of students vandalizing their dormitory and playing guitar naked in the middle of the hallway, one video with 907 views and the other with 610. The star of one video was one author’s former advisee.

More seriously, malicious attacks through social networking software are entirely possible. Researchers have investigated and published how relatively simple it is to use automated identity theft attacks against such networks (Bilge, Strufe, Balzarotti, & Kirda, 2009) and ways in which data can be extracted from social networks to compromise user privacy (Bonneau, Anderson, & Danezis, 2009). Thus, the potential impact of unsecure social networking practices go far beyond embarrassment or career damage and can reach as far as credit damage and total financial ruin.

This evidence, some of which is amusing and some of which is simply disturbing, is presented with a purpose; people everywhere are putting inappropriate things online and people everywhere are suffering for such mistakes. Granted, not everyone who makes an ill-advised post to Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, or MySpace suffers the consequences; many do not, but the consequences that are experienced are real and can be quite serious. Content that students post online during college could haunt them in later life as they pursue professional positions or even political office (Govani & Pashley, 2005).

Today’s college-aged students, mostly members of what is commonly called Generation Y, are distinctly different from the Generation X and Baby Boom generations who are currently managers in the corporate world and faculty members in colleges (Gurchiek, 2009). Unfortunately, studies show that even when students are concerned about their information privacy on sites like Facebook that
Concern does not influence their behavior (Fogel & Nehmad, 2009). As teachers, faculty members have an obligation to give such students information about where the threats are and how to protect themselves.

Changes for Teachers and Teaching

The social network openness of Gen Y students is the catalyst for changes not only in the teaching environment but also for teachers themselves. Students’ comfort with networking, with the online exchange of information, and with their feelings about appropriate attire and topics of conversation are all impacting how education works. To maintain the educational environment individual instructors and institutions as a whole have to address such issues.

In any class, in any subject, and in any major a teacher must provide students with the foundational knowledge from which to function. Increasingly, this is true for social issues as well as professional ones, although the lines between the two are becoming increasingly blurry. Social networking activity by students can impact their professional lives, and, conversely, their professional lives can drive their choices in social networking.

Students today are comfortable with, and increasingly expect, much more contact and familiarity with their professors than past generations. In one study two-thirds of students who were surveyed said that it was acceptable for faculty to be on Facebook (Fogel & Nehmad, 2009). This can be a great benefit to the educational environment, but it can also create difficult issues. Should professors friend their students on Facebook? If professors are on Facebook should they act on information they discover via a friended student’s Facebook status or profile? What should a professor do when a particularly comfortable student submits an assignment that includes pictures of the student in revealing swimwear?

All of these are questions that confront today’s higher education faculty. The challenge to and responsibility of faculty are clear; they must conduct themselves appropriately and also properly educate their students. This education does not have to be limited to college computer labs or courses centered on technology. Online security can be integrated across the curriculum.

Integrating Online Security

Higher education has seen and continues to see success with initiatives that integrate course content across the curriculum. Writing across the curriculum is one common application (Todd & Hudson, 2008). In
order to capitalize on the same tactic faculty members should identify opportunities in different disciplines to present online security issues.

Many institutions start new students out with an introductory course intended to teach freshmen how to succeed in college. Study habits, budgeting, and personal security with regard to substance use and relationships are all common topics in such courses. These classes would also be an excellent opportunity to introduce students to information security topics.

Information systems and technology courses within various academic departments also present the opportunity to infuse social networking security and risks into a curriculum. Doing this, even as a part of information technology classes dedicated to teaching security, will drive a level of professionalism and responsibility within the profession that is often tasked with organizational security planning and training for online issues and applications. It will support social network awareness in the future information technology professionals being trained in such programs.

Beyond introductory and computer-centric college classes there are opportunities across multiple disciplines to discuss the importance of information security. Political science courses could illustrate the importance of security by highlighting damaging events that occurred to politicians. Art classes could take the opportunity to discuss proper use and dissemination of media. Literature classes could address issues of free speech contrasted with responsibility and accountability and relate the lesson to individual online activities. Each discipline would be different, but almost every discipline could find an appropriate time to add such content.

Working across the curriculum will expose students to multiple perspectives of the very important issue of online security and will also provide them with reminders by presenting the topic in different semesters. This will also help to ensure that students of all disciplines, not just those specializing in technology-centric subjects, will have the benefit of training.

Conclusion

The long-term impacts of students’ online activities are yet to be seen; the technology has not existed for long enough to provide longitudinal data on what happens to students ten and fifteen years past graduation. Evidence is mounting, however, that employers and others are using this technology as a tool to monitor and evaluate employees and job candidates. As with all new knowledge, one of the key factors in helping students succeed will be to expose them to the knowledge.
Integrating online security across the curriculum can be a key component of such an effort.
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Exhuming Early Donne at Carson-Newman College

Jennifer W. Hall

One of the many blessings of teaching at Carson-Newman is the fact that professors are encouraged to discuss spiritual issues and questions that truly matter. This encouragement is given not only by our fine colleagues, administrators, trustees, and alumni, but more importantly, by the students themselves who openly explore questions regarding God, Jesus Christ, free will, providence, life, afterlife, and death, among others. Case in point: my students often revel in the late writings of John Donne, the esteemed Dean of St. Paul’s Cathedral. Who is not convicted by his cry, “Oh, my black soul! . . . / Thou art like a pilgrim, which abroad hath done / Treason, and durst not turn to whence he is fled” (Holy Sonnets 2. 1-3)? Who cannot relate to the reminder that “No man is an Island, entire of it selfe” (Meditation 17)? Who is not moved by the liberating claim, “Death be not proud, though some have called thee / Mighty and dreadfull, for, thou art not soe” (Holy Sonnets 6. 1-2). Yet before encountering John Donne the devout Christian and his soaring explorations of God’s grace, mercy, and love, students first must approach the poetry of early Donne, a young man who has turned away from religion and seeks to control his own mortality and immortality. He is more of a challenge. Or is he? The following discussion offers some thoughts gleaned from research and from dialogue with Carson-Newman students regarding Donne’s persona in his earliest poetry. This John Donne is far removed from the austere, devout pastor of the later works, but he is not removed from the quest for humble faith, mercy, and grace that most humans undertake on their path toward God and Jesus Christ.

Libertine dandy, licentious lover, witty courtier, experimental poet, religious mystic, and spiritual great, John Donne has been nothing over the centuries if not a paradox. In The Progress of the Soul: The Interior Career of John Donne, Richard E. Hughes explores the development of Donne’s mind and the personal challenges that define him. Born in 1572 into a distinguished, Catholic family deemed “renegade” by the Protestant establishment, Donne faced personal, educational, and ecclesiastical obstacles early in life (Hughes 13). Donne’s father died when Donne was barely four years old, a loss that greatly affected the young boy. A descendent of the martyr Thomas More, Donne was also well aware of his Jesuit uncle’s execution in the name of the so-called “true” church (130). Even more disturbing, Donne’s younger brother Henry died from a fever contracted in prison, having been arrested for giving sanctuary to a Catholic priest (15).
Such early encounters with death and with the hateful tensions between Catholics and Protestants had immeasurable impact on Donne’s writing as well as on his psychology and evolving theology.

Faced with such early experiences of death and violence, Donne developed an almost obsessive quest to comprehend death that has long been noted by critics as integral to understanding his poetic personae. In fact, Donald Ramsay Roberts declared in 1947 that “a wish for death was a permanent and constant element in [Donne’s] psychic life” (970) and that “the death wish may well be the clue to what has often been regarded as the enigma of Donne’s personality” (975). Other critics like John Carey argue that Donne’s obsession with death cannot be dismissed as an archetypal “death wish” but rather should be viewed as a haunting fear of death or, more heroically, as an attempt to find death “challenging” and in such a role minimize or “negate its deathliness” (198-201). Whatever the interpretation, most critics agree that the death quest is one of, if not the most, revealing (and paradoxically concealing) elements in Donne’s writing. Such a consensus is not surprising, for most readers recognize upon even the most leisurely of readings that death manifests itself in the Donnean canon often—too often for many twenty-first century sensibilities. What is surprising, however, is that most critics explore death only in the later poetry, in Holy Sonnets and Meditations, and in the sermons. Given Donne’s very early exposure to the reality of death, I contend and most students agree that to comprehend Donne’s death quest fully one must begin with his earliest volume, Songs and Sonnets. Such a logical beginning, for as Carey has noted, of the fifty-four poems in the volume, thirty-two address death in some form (201).

In order to “exhume” the purpose of Donne’s death quest and its imagery in Songs and Sonnets, students must first ask themselves many questions. What are the characteristics of the Donne persona who composes these lyrics? Is he Donne the rake? the brash rebel? the astute politician? At what point in Donne’s life journey do we find him between the years 1590 and 1611, when the poems are believed to have been composed? Hughes notes that a crucial tenet in Donnean study is that his “mind . . . slowly reveals itself through its art,” for “what we witness in the whole of Donne’s art is a mind discovering itself” (8-9). What fragment of Donne’s developing mind emerges in Songs and Sonnets? How does this voice address, use, and face death and faith?

We have already recalled Donne’s early exposure to death and the ostracism he faced as a young Catholic in late 16th-century England. Yet before his marriage in 1601 to Ann Egerton, Donne seems to face such adversities with the bravado of a robust rebel, subtly defying the society that attempts to repress him. One of the boldest images of his
Youthful bravado can be seen in his earliest known portrait, commissioned in or around 1591 when Donne was just eighteen years old. Louis L. Martz reveals that the portrait was created shortly after Donne accompanied Spanish forces at the siege of Antwerp in 1585 and thus “his sword and costume imply a military stance” (8). Such militaristic bravura was not uncommon and does not really suggest the defiant rebel that Donne embodies at this time. What does embody Donne’s defiance is his brashly advertised Catholic affiliation “indicated by an earring in the form of the [Catholic] cross” (Martz 8). Even more revealing than the iconoclastic image is the Spanish motto proudly furled above the portrait: “Antes Muerto que Mudado” (“Rather dead than changed”) (8). Clearly, young Donne, who was soon to enter legal studies at Thavies Inn and later volunteer for the Earl of Essex on a “privateering” raid to Cadiz (Hughes 14-5), can be viewed as a young, rebellious, and seemingly confident individual, actively striving to overcome societal and ecclesiastical restrictions and boundaries. This is the attitude of bravado and defiance that imbues the persona of Songs and Sonnets.

Such a view of Donne as a self-preserving, brash youth is consistent with other readings of Donne’s character during the 1590s. Graham Parry notes that much of Donne’s early poetry is blatant “self-advertisement” (42). In order to gain patronage and advancement, the young Donne used his poetry to “parade his wit,” “to entertain and astonish friends,” and “to [signal] his presence” (Parry 42). Indeed, Donne is that man-about-town whom Sir Richard Baker retrospectively described inChronicles of the Kings of England (1641) in this manner: “And here I desire the Readers leave to rememb... Mr. John Donne, who leaving Oxford, lived at the Innes of Court, not dissolute, but very neat; a great Visiter of Ladies, a great frequenter of playes, a great Writer of conceited Verses” (qtd. in Hughes 7). Donne’s contemporaries, current critics, and students realize that the Donne composing Songs and Sonnets is not the religious aesthete or devout pastor of later years. Instead, Donne is a young man, enjoying life and rebelling against constraints and boundaries, and yet also a Donne eager for advancement and acceptance within society. Donne uses this same bravado to address the ultimate constrainer: death.

If students reach this view of Donne’s early persona, they must then ask themselves, “Is this view consistent with the traditional interpretations of Donne’s persona and attitude toward death in Songs and Sonnets?” Quite frankly, for the most part it is not. While not denying death’s presence in the poems, many critics have dismissed Donne’s views of death as fairly insignificant. For instance, Donald Guss suggests that Donne’s use of death is merely an elaborate
extension of Petrarchan convention (17-8). Parry admits death’s “proximity” to love in *Songs* but suggests that while it “may be a strategy for intensifying relationships” it probably more simply reflects the realities of low life expectancy in the age (56). Similarly, Bettie Anne Doebler contends that the death imagery so shocking to modern readers would have been far less shocking, disturbing, or even noticeable in a society where . . . the crowded city population was much more familiar than we are with the physical aspects of death. The people knew such horrors of plague. . . . And on another level of experience, they delighted in the barbarity of public executions. In view of this close contact with death, their language describing it is apt to be harsh to our ears. In other words, it is possible that Donne, in using language which seems morbid to us, is following the conventions of his time. (3)

But death is much more than just a poetic convention, intensifier of relationships, or acceptable inevitability in *Songs and Sonnets*. Donne does not merely intensify his love affairs by recognizing they will end in death. Nor does he simply pay slight homage to death’s inevitability. Instead, he consistently pictures himself as a dead man, not impotent or static, but actively involved in the lives of those still on earth. Such simple explanations regarding mortality rates are not really satisfying. The puzzle still seems to be missing several pieces.

More helpful to students are those interpretations that take into account Donne’s ever-present relationship with death. In her investigation of “Protestant Poetics,” Barbara Lewalski asserts that the central characteristics of such poetics are a distinct focus of “meditation on personal experience” (11) and a “painstaking analysis of the personal religious life” (13). For Lewalski, the meditative introspection in Donne’s poetry indicates his “keen psychological awareness” (20) and his “pervasive self-dramatization” (254). Mary Ann Radzinowicz believes that the speaker adopts the *anima mea* found in the biblical psalms—the personal lament expressed through dialogue between a man and his soul (40-1). Given Donne’s personal struggles regarding faith, Protestantism and Catholicism, martyrdom and death, such interpretations bring us nearer to completing the puzzle of young Donne. Still, the puzzle remains incomplete: both interpretations address *Holy Sonnets*, poems composed by a Donne persona spiritually evolved well beyond that of the earlier poems. The simple fact is that during composition of *Songs*, Donne had not resolved his own religious conflict by embracing Protestant Anglicanism. In “The Will,” Donne informs the reader, “My faith I give to Roman Catholics; / [but] all my good works unto the Schismatics / of Amsterdam. . . .” i.e. extreme
Still, considering the early poems as the site of introspection, self-dramatization, and personal exploration seems highly promising.

Beyond the rather psychoanalytic possibilities discussed thus far remains the possibility, as my students often remind me, that Donne, the brash and experimental youth, may have simply delighted in the macabre spectacle of death—a 16th century equivalent to a postmodern Goth or *Twilight* fan. “Maybe, Dr. Hall, his ‘quest’ is not for spiritual understanding or self-aggrandizing but rather for grotesque and momentary thrill-seeking.” Perhaps, and studies certainly support the idea. Anthony Low suggests that Donne may have been familiar with advances in the medical profession regarding dissection and anatomy and may have approached the mysteries of life by studying “not [the] living but [the] dead” (8). Either to study the “New Science” or simply to thrill at its somewhat gruesome laboratory necessities, Donne became a “science-lover” (14), reveling in the “scientific puzzle” of exhumations, dissections, and autopsies (6). His world, his relationships, his psychology, his religion are all corpses needing meticulous and laborious examination.

Whether a scientific thrill-seeker or a spiritual explorer, what we encounter in *Songs and Sonnets* is John Donne openly, brashly determining to beat Death at his game. With the braggadocio of the rebel of Cadiz, Donne openly defies death’s authority over him and denies his need for faith to negate a fear of death. If powerless to do so in reality, in poetry Donne will make himself a corpse with active powers; he will haunt his lovers and friends; he will harness and control death and thus remain “alive.” If he must face death, he will face it on his terms. In a letter dated September 1608 (near the end of this early period of poetry) and addressed to Sir Henry Goodyer, Donne proclaims:

> I would not that death should take me asleep. I would not have him merely seise me, and onely declare me to be dead, but win me, and overcome me. When I must shipwrack, I would do it in a Sea, where mine impotencie might have some excuse; not in a sullen weedy lake, where I could not have so much as exercise for my swimming. Therefore I would fain do something. . . . (*Selected Prose* 388)

That “something” is to “seise,” fight, overcome Death poetically and metaphorically.

Now students can view a poem like “The Apparition” not solely as anti-Petrarchan or as a portrait of a vengeful, rejected lover, but rather as a manifestation of the rebellious, young Donne who harnesses death and, as a dead man, becomes not powerless but more powerful against those remaining on earth. The speaker assures his old
mistress, the “murd’ress” (1), that “I am dead” (1). However, the speaker defies death’s power to deem him powerless, and therefore the mistress cannot “thinkst thee free / From all solicitation of me” (2-3). The speaker claims so much power over the death-state that he declares he can single-handedly cause the “poor aspen wench” to become psychologically tormented and “Bath’d in a cold quicksilver sweat” (11-2). The rebel Donne images himself in utter control of death and of his deathly ability to haunt the living. Portraying himself more powerful dead than alive, the speaker claims victory over death and infidelity.

Yet another example of Donne overcoming and manipulating death is found in “The Dampe.” Donne opens with a disturbing image of his own autopsy in which the picture of his beloved is found in his heart:

When I am dead, and doctors know not why,
And my friends’ curiosity
Will have me cut up to survey each part,
When they shall find your picture in my heart,
You think a sudden dampe of love
Will through all their sense move,
And work on them as me, and so prefer
Your murder, to the name of massacre. (1-8)

In this vignette, the speaker does indeed admit that his death is somehow caused by the loss of love; however, what is again noticeable is Donne’s engendering the speaker with powers that control, destroy, and quite literally kill those remaining on earth. Though his cruel mistress may have rejected him and may believe that his friends will be affected by the “dampe of [her] love” (5), he will minimize her own casualty, her one “murder” (8), by causing a “massacre” of his own (8). Her rejection, her “dampe,” may have destroyed him, but he will now claim its power. The macabre picture portrayed is that through his own decomposing, damp contagion, he will now poison all around him: his lover, his curious friends, the meticulous doctors. As a dead man, Donne possesses more power than when alive and thus once again beats death at his game. He is not victim of death, but rather an agent, a determiner of death in others.

Consistently throughout the fifty-four poems of the volume, readers discover this defiant Donne in a battle with death. At times death is even reduced to a simple event that occurs too often to merit specific notice. For example, with nonchalant affectation, Donne contends in “The Legacie” that death is a rather mundane occurrence:
“When dyed last, and dear, I dye / As often as from thee I goe, / Though it be an hour ago” (1-3). Of course there exist the infamous innuendos to sexual climax in the verb “to die,” but moreover we once again see Donne consciously attempting to defeat death with the same defiance of his military portrait. Still “better dead than changed,” Donne insists, “Though I be dead . . . I should be / Mine own executor and legacy” (6-7). Confidently autonomous, we see Donne not only as a powerful dead man, but as a dead man performing his own autopsy: “When I had ripp’d me, and search’d where hearts should lie” (14). Again he may have to die physically, but even in death, Donne will be the one in control and the one who determines his actions, his purpose, and his legacy.

Further into the volume, we find Donne still adamantly insisting that death will not victimize him in any way. In fact, in “The Funerall,” after describing his own “enshrouding,” Donne goes on to insist that his buriers “not harm / Nor question much / That subtle wreath of hair, which crowns my arm” (1-3). The wreath, a token of his lover, becomes not a symbol of his death or loss but of his ability as a dead man to accomplish “some [act of ] bravery” (23); therefore, “since [his lover] would save none of [him], [He will] bury some or [her]” (24). No cuckold to women or to death, Donne the corpse declares the final victory by entombing a portion of this woman which neither she nor death can control.

This type of symbolic and material overcoming of death is further evidenced in “The Relic.” Yet another vignette is presented in which Donne’s corpse is exhumed: “When my grave is broke up again / Some second guest to entertain” (1-2). Again the witnesses find a decayed body bedecked with “A bracelet of bright hair about the bone” (6). In this scene, Donne again becomes the center of earthly attention yet in a much more spiritual manner. His corpse and his mistress’s “relic” become iconographic, religious relics kissed and adored by many and to which miracles are attributed:

All women shall adore us, and some men; 
And, since at times miracles are sought, 
I would have that age by this paper taught 
What miracles we harmless lovers wrought. (19-22)

Once again, though dead, Donne rebelliously maintains and creates an active identity, engendering his self, his memory, and his corpse with more powers than ever associated with the living. Donne controls a portion of the world even when dead and will, as he insists in “The Will,” “undo / The world by dying . . .” (46-7).
Many literary critics adamantly deny that the identity or spiritual quests of the actual poet matter when approaching a poem. With Donne, this view limits the power of his canon. To appreciate fully the later Donne who professes the Savior’s gifts of mercy, grace, forgiveness, love, and eternal life, students need to sense the seemingly confident, but somewhat lost young man of the Songs. Beneath his bravado remain the uncertainty and pain of a very real human being, seeking a very real relationship with a very real Savior. The young man who once taunted “but think that I / Am, by being dead, immortal; can ghosts die?” (“The Computation” 9-10) eventually finds humble faith in a Savior who actually does conquer Death. Ultimately, Donne claims a Savior whose death and resurrection free him to declare, “On short sleep past [death], we wake eternally, / And death shall be no more; death, thou shalt die” (Holy Sonnets 6. 13-4). Donne finds peace and acknowledges that he does not control death, but that his God certainly does. Thus, in the later works, John Donne ecstatically celebrates the Life Everlasting given to God’s children who seek Him—his children like John Donne, Jennifer Hall, and Carson-Newman’s fine young scholars. What a blessing to be able to explore such a quest and message in the sacred space of a Carson-Newman classroom.
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Good evening. I am very excited to be here to celebrate and pay tribute to you who are being recognized for Professional Nursing Clinical Excellence.

As you have probably noticed, the program theme tonight is *Nursing Knows No Boundaries*. I appreciate the opportunity to share for a few minutes my passion for nursing care that moves beyond the preconceived notions that limit our practice to local nursing agencies such as hospitals, clinics, or other health care agencies. I ask you tonight to consider for a moment that nursing practice may indeed begin and be centered in these local agencies in the areas in which we live, but is certainly not limited to these agencies. There is a big, big world out there and in that world are many suffering people in need of the holistic “bipsychosocialspiritual” care we are able to provide.

Some of you no doubt felt a calling to nursing. Others, for a variety of reasons, have chosen nursing as a career path. Either way, what we have been charged with and educated to do is promote the health of individuals, families and communities, but I doubt if there was ever a stipulation on where they would be found or limitations on where our practice could take us beyond “the job.”

Some might think tonight as you have viewed the slides of multiple medical mission experiences that we are simply taking a few minutes to acknowledge nurses in global missions. Please understand, that is not my reason for being here. What I believe about nursing lies in this theme: *Nursing Knows No Boundaries*. It is a great challenge for us all. It is time we rethink who we are in this profession we call nursing and who we could and should be. I would like to pause here and note a couple of things that must be addressed that hopefully will bring more clarity to this idea that *Nursing Knows No Boundaries*.

What I want to note relates to this term “profession” we use so loosely in nursing. Yes, we indeed call ourselves professionals and say that nursing is a profession. But, does our practice truly resemble professional practice? Let me remind you of a couple of attributes that historically are required as criteria of a profession. Abraham Flexner, an educator who studied characteristics of a profession in the early 1900’s, noted that to be a professional one must exhibit the professional
culture 24 hours a day 7 days a week. This criterion continues to hold true today. So nursing should be a major part of our identity. Kozer and Erb (who are nurses by the way) write in their book on professional characteristics that for the professional there is no distinction between professional role and life. So, as we look at ourselves and our peers in nursing, do we see this reflection of a caring health professional in which there is no distinction between our professional role and life, and do we possess that 24/7 mentality?

Or, sadly, do we aspire to that “clock in - clock out” mentality: “this is only my job, it begins when I get to work and ends when I leave.” That “clock in - clock out” mentality is deemed a characteristic of the occupational, non-professional role. Who are you nurses out there? Who am I?

Another criterion that is noted in the literature on professionalism suggests that a professional person is one who gives back to the community. For nurses this may happen through serving on health committees, possibly raising financial support for a health related program, or just plain volunteerism at a free clinic, food pantry, soup kitchen, disaster relief with Red Cross, or even going on medical missions to third world countries.

Do we embrace this ideology of moving beyond that “clock in—clock out” mentality to one that recognizes a much larger world, a world that desperately needs us to do what we do best—provide nursing care that promotes health and values people as people? Do we make time in our busy schedules to step out of the day to day routine into a world in need that lies beyond the work place?

No, I am not simply talking about nurses in missions moving beyond the expected boundaries of practice, but rather the mission of nurses to move beyond the preconceived boundaries of practice.

If the mission of nurses is to acknowledge and practice in a world where there are no boundaries, then we had better take a close look at just what “mission” means. Webster notes about five different definitions but the one that best exemplifies what traditionally has been related to nursing is: “The special task for which a person is apparently destined for life, a calling.” Our mission is our destiny; it is why we are here; it is who we are; it is what we do.

Greg Anderson, in his book Living Life on Purpose, provides a formula for mission. The formula begins with vision: capturing a sense of what might be. To that vision add service: giving of one’s self to others, serving others, caring for others. Add to vision and service passion: loving who you are and what you do, your passion drives you. Sound like nursing so far?
Put those three together—vision, service, and passion—and that equals mission, which Anderson describes as: “Living out the reason you were put on earth at this moment in history.” Would you agree that Anderson’s formula nicely fits our mission?

As nurses, don’t we have a vision—seeing what might be and becoming those servants who give of ourselves to serve and care for our patients? And don’t we have a passion that drives us to accomplish this mission, living out who we are as we render care to the people around us?

When we reflect on our profession and take a look at some of those nurses who came before us, we catch a glimpse of this mission of nurses to move beyond the preconceived boundaries of practice. They practiced nursing without boundaries.

**Florence Nightingale**

You knew I would have to start with Flo. No, she wasn’t confined by the position she had in the hospital in England; she saw the need during the Crimean War to go to Scutari and reform the army’s pitiful excuse for a makeshift hospital, and thereby reduced the death rate from around 50% to 2%. Can you imagine how many young men were thankful that she was living out her mission of nursing and she knew no boundaries?

**Dorothea Dix**

During a time when those who were mentally ill were removed from society and chained naked in stalls and cages, she lobbied Congress for funding and began the first generation of mental asylums in America. I dare say a lot of people before and since are grateful that Dorothea lived her mission in nursing, knowing no boundaries.

**Lillian Wald**

She went beyond the traditional health care of her time and started a visiting nurse service, later described as “public health nursing,” to the indigent immigrants in New York’s Lower East Side. Because Lillian Wald knew no boundaries, many an outbreak of disease was stifled and the lives of men, women, and children were spared.

**Clara Barton**

This founder of the American Red Cross began a relief effort to care for others that continues today. I am sure the people in Nashville who are being helped by the Red Cross right now, and countless others throughout the USA and the world who have suffered from previous disasters are glad Clara knew no boundaries.
Mary Breckinridge

In the early 1920’s Mary Breckinridge began Frontier Nursing Service (FNS). She posted clinics and built a hospital in isolated mountains in Eastern Kentucky where there was essentially no health care available. FNS have delivered over 20,000 babies and treated countless numbers in outlying clinics since then. I guess the people in Eastern Kentucky are thankful Mary Breckinridge knew no boundaries.

These are but a few of our historical nursing figures who personified that mission of nursing, that 24/7 mentality, that giving back to society, to go beyond the preconceived boundaries of nursing practice in areas of need.

At Carson-Newman one of my clinical assignments is working with senior nursing majors in a community setting. In that setting we work with white, black, Hispanic, the homeless persons. We work with many who speak limited (if any) English: people from Romania, Ukraine, Russia, Moldova, etc. It is a very multicultural environment, and most are from another sub-culture as well, the culture of poverty. We do a lot of health assessment and health education, and we give them food and clothing.

During the orientation of this clinical experience the students are given a couple of challenges. One relates to becoming a professional nurse. Each student is challenged to consider that her/his identity is that of a nurse, so that after graduation and after becoming established in a practice, each should give back to the greater community—maybe in an area that resembles the clinical experience. As a nurse you should make a difference, go beyond the expected, and know no boundaries to your care.

The second challenge comes from not only the professional aspect of nursing but also from the mission we have at Carson-Newman as a Christian institution. Many of the clients who come to this clinical site are struggling with very complicated life situations. They are stigmatized by society as low-status and non-valued. They have limited health care because they have no money and no insurance. They many times feel hopeless, helpless, and lonely. They are just surviving day by day. Some are in abusive situations, and many hear very few words of kindness or concern. I charge my students to realize that on this day, for the limited time you have with these people, you can, by your care, show them they are valued and worthy of respect.

You can demonstrate a kindness and concern that they rarely see in the world in which they live. You can make a difference. You can touch the very spirit of a person with a smile, a kind word, and a caring touch.
I tell the students that if we embrace the mission Christ set before us, as well as the mission of nursing, we will treat those we serve as we indeed would want to be treated. As we all know, that is a longing we all have—to feel valued and cared for as human beings.

You don’t have to be a Florence Nightingale or Mary Breckinridge. It may not be your mission in nursing to go to war or build a hospital. It may not be your mission to go to third world countries and provide health care.

But never doubt that there is a mission, a destiny, for each of us. And that is to provide care for people wherever they may be, helping them along life’s way, making the world a better place because we are here, at this time in history, to accomplish our purpose, our mission. *Nursing Knows No Boundaries.*

No doubt for many in this room I am preaching to the choir. You already know no boundaries to your mission in nursing. You have embraced the characteristics of a profession and live out the “it’s not all about me” ethic, asking instead “how can I, with my knowledge and skills, have a positive impact on a world in need?” For others, it is time to embrace fully your mission of professional nursing.

I would like to conclude with a fable on nursing’s origins, in Biblical style, by Margretta Styles.

*In the beginning, God created nursing.*

*He said, I will take a solid, simple, significant system of education,*

*And an adequate applicable base of clinical research,*

*And on these rocks, will I build one of my greatest gifts to mankind: Nursing Practice.*

*On the seventh day, He . . . threw up His hands . . . and has left it up to us.*

I am deeply honored to stand before you tonight. I am very proud of your accomplishments at present and know there are more to come.

My prayer is that God will richly bless you as you continue your journey ahead in your mission of nursing and move beyond any boundary you find in your way as you reach out to those in need.
Yes, But…Yes!
Letting Liberal Arts Preach

[Adapted from 2010 Liberal Arts Emphasis Week Address]

James Barnette

For many years every Christmas Eve, the Barnette clan observed a time-honored tradition. Just before sitting down for the big dinner, we would cram in the living room to hear the Christmas narrative from the second chapter of Luke. My father, a seminary professor, would read from the Gospel in his wonderfully melodious, ministerial voice. Immediately after the reading, he would announce, “Let us pray,” whereupon he would pray in the same melodious ministerial tone. This tradition took a turn in 1983. After reading the Lucan account, closing the Bible, and heralding, “Let us pray,” my father was interrupted by his then-five-year-old grandson. Shooting his hand into the air, Drew declared, “Granddaddy, I would like to do the prayer!” My father, welcoming the torch-passing, replied, “OK, Drew, you do the prayer.” With all the authority that a five year-old could muster, Drew announced, “Let us pray.” And he began very well, reciting the first stanza of the one prayer that he had learned at church:

*God is great.*
*God is good.*
*Let us thank Him for our food.*

Unfortunately for Drew, he was determined to continue with the closing stanza:

*By His hands,*
*We are fed.*
*Give us, Lord, our daily bread.*
*Amen.*

Drew recited the first stanza flawlessly. But then he went blank—no second stanza. A most awkward silence ensued, with the rest of us peeking around the room, not knowing how to help him. But suddenly, Drew handled the recovery himself by blurt ing out:

“And if at first you don’t succeed,
As his biased uncle, I must say that I was proud of his creative improvisation! A harsher critic might surmise that Drew’s faith and Drew’s reasoning were not operating together in full sync at that particular moment. But as we all know, it is a daily challenge for our faith and our reason to operate together as they should. Nowhere does this challenge play itself out more vitally than in the context of a university committed to a Christian mission. In this context, liberal arts and the life of faith must remain in vigorous conversation with one another. So I offer you my own fodder for further conversation, coming at this subject as one who has a foot planted firmly both in the church and in the academy.

**Preacher and Professor**

There are some who see liberal arts and the life of faith as being at odds with each other, even threatening to each other. In particular, some see liberal arts education as a threatening enterprise bent on undermining the basic confessions of Christian faith. On the contrary, liberal arts education is a grace of God that enhances the life of faith. The problem is that sometimes we fail to let liberal arts fulfill its calling. Its calling is to engage the life of the mind with all of what life teaches that might take us to deeper understanding of and reverence for life. But too often we prevent liberal arts from doing what it is called to do. Instead of feeling threatened by this calling, we must set our prejudice aside and let liberal arts do its thing. In other words, we must let liberal arts preach.

I fulfill my life’s calling in two ways, as a preacher and as a professor. Some people perceive these two roles as completely separate vocations. My experience tells me otherwise. In fact, I see the roles working together, each enriching the other. Thomas Aquinas contended that Faith and Reason are complementary ways of knowing. It follows that faith and liberal arts are complementary, each vital to the other. How, then, do faith and liberal arts enhance each other? The way that I have experienced this mutual enhancement could be summed up in the following statement: “Yes, but...yes!”

**“Yes”**

I love Sundays. On Sunday I affirm publicly the News that answers the plight of human brokenness. On Sunday I speak of the
One Who is the definitive self-disclosure of God in the world. I proclaim that by His death we all can find life. I confirm that He is the way to life everlasting. I resolve that He is indeed the way and the truth and the life. In other words, Sunday is my chance to say “Yes”: yes to faith in Christ; yes to His saving power that rescues us from darkness; yes to His Lordship over all creation. And it is my job on Sunday to convince anyone who can hear me of the “Yes”—that Christ is Whom He says He is, that He is alive today, and that He will rescue to eternal life anyone who would put his or her trust in Him. I love Sundays.

“Yes, But ...”

But then Monday comes, and I step from sanctuary to classroom, from pulpit to lectern, from plain proclamation to liberal arts education. Suddenly, yesterday’s simple message of faith bumps headfirst into the complexities of this world as we know it. And so we must explore these complexities. Fortunately, these complexities have been structured into helpful fields like history, biology, psychology, theater, chemistry, communication, art, mathematics, and literature. When matched with these disciplines, faith no longer seems simple. And it is not. Stepping from sanctuary to classroom moves us from Sunday’s “Yes” to Monday’s “Yes, but...” We experience this clash in every academic discipline we study. Even religion classes at a faith-based university like this one are not immune to complexities with which we wrestle: “Yes, Jesus is the Truth, but sometimes His teachings are difficult to understand.” “Yes, God is sovereign, but why does there have to be this much injustice in the world?” “Yes, the Bible is God’s word, but it is also a human book in some way, is it not?” “Yes, the church is Christ’s bride, but she is certainly a corrupted institution.”

These and other issues move us from Sunday’s “yes” to Monday’s “Yes, but...” And we realize that this faith in Christ and His word is not so simple. Now for some, this is a daunting realization; it can be threatening to some, disillusioning to others. For some of us it feels like our faith for which we have so much love and passion is being put on trial.

So as a student, what do you do with this? First of all, the worst thing you can do is retreat. Some do this by wearing blinders and simply avoid the questions; others respond like a cornered animal, bracing to strike out at any concept that threatens their fixed belief-system; still others throw up their hands in surrender, assuming wrongly that what they grew up hearing about in church is all a sham.
Instead, what you must do is engage openly and honestly with these various disciplines. Why? Because not to do so is to choose the way of dishonest denial and, in a word, fear. What is more, not to engage in liberal arts is to dishonor God. Do you hear that? Not to engage your faith with the academic disciplines—however “secular” they might seem to be at times—is to dishonor God. Indeed, it is insulting to God when you fail to do so. John Calvin, one of the staunchest and most doctrinaire theologians in the church’s history, makes this very plain. Note this passage from his Institutes of the Christian Religion:

“Whenever...we meet with heathen writers, let us learn from that light of truth which is admirably displayed in their works, that the human mind, fallen as it is, and corrupted from its integrity, is yet invested and adorned by God with excellent talents. If we believe that the Spirit of God is the only fountain of truth, we shall neither reject nor despise the truth itself, wherever it shall appear, unless we wish to insult the Spirit of God.” (Institutes, Book II, Chapter II, Section XV.)

Listen to Calvin: You insult God when you fail to engage these disciplines, whether or not they are overtly “Christian.” Failing to do so forthrightly and fully is to suggest that God is not big enough to stand against them. Worse, you are failing to be a good steward of these disciplines that God commands you to learn. And why not engage them? Here you are at college—the best time of life to engage these disciplines. Not to be illuminated by them is like going to a five-star restaurant for a nine-course meal. One by one they bring you each of the nine courses—tantalizing hors d’oeuvres, succulent salads, mouth-watering entrees, decadent desserts—and all you do is look at each dish, never tasting any of them. And then you pay the expensive bill and go home, never having sampled any of the meal, let alone consumed any of it.

You have an incredible gift here—to learn from the vastness of life as we know it, as we understand it. And what is more, engaging with liberal arts enhances the life of faith. When you let it preach, it transforms and renews your mind. In fact, when you let liberal arts do its thing, it does not take away your faith’s passion but rather it widens it, deepens it, helps complete it.

Well, let’s just say we buy into this idea. How, then, do we let liberal arts preach? With the chapel-time that we have, and as a preacher-professor, let me offer one strategy: Look to Jesus.

More than any other title, Jesus was referred to as “Rabbi,” which means “Teacher.” Now in Jesus’ day, “liberal arts” was neither a term nor a concept. However, it is clear that Jesus was all about liberal arts. Jesus was a liberal arts rabbi. He drew from other disciplines—from science to philosophy, from psychology to
aesthetics. Not only was Jesus all about liberal arts, but He was also all about letting liberal arts preach. Put another way, Jesus was all about moving from “Yes” to “Yes, but”: “You have heard it said ‘You shall not murder.’ Yes, but...I say to you that whoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment...You have heard it said ‘you shall not commit adultery.’ Yes, but...I say to you that anyone who looks at a woman with lust has committed adultery in his heart.” Here we see that as a practitioner of liberal arts Jesus drew richly from psychology. He was keenly aware of human behavior—of our mixed motives, of our inevitable hypocrisies, of our shadow sides. In other words, Jesus knew that following Him as a disciple is not that simple, that it is, in fact, quite complex. And as the Creator of all things, no doubt Jesus was aware of those disciplines that offer honest depiction and appraisal of matters good and evil, light and dark, our virtuous side and our darker side. Jesus designed those disciplines that help tell it like it is: art, music, history, theology, sociology, and definitely political science. He created these disciplines which serve us by exposing truths—the virtuous one and the dark ones—as well as how to function effectively amid these truths. Jesus offers these liberal arts to us for the sake of honest engagement with the world as it is—the good and the bad, the ugly and the beautiful, the pure and the depraved.

Yes, Jesus was a liberal arts rabbi who was all about “Yes, but...” Through His teaching He let liberal arts preach. Which leads us to an important reminder: What was His primary method of teaching? How did He teach in a way that His words would preach? In a word, story. Jesus taught by telling stories. Now does the fact that He taught by spinning narratives tell us something about how we should approach liberal arts?

When used effectively, story draws us into that marvelous dynamic that poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge dubbed “the willing suspension of disbelief.” The “suspension” is what happens when you are reading a great novel that pulls you into the narrative. You meet characters and form relationships with them; you travel with them through each chapter; you experience emotions along the way as plots turn and characters interact. Now you are not really in the world that the novel is creating in your mind; you do not actually believe that you are in this other world that the book is painting. But you have chosen to suspend your disbelief and enter into the story, to become a part of it. You do the same thing as you watch Avatar in 3D. You are sitting in a theater, and you know that light is traveling through celluloid and flashing images onto a screen, depicting a world that you know is not real. Nevertheless, at some point—either consciously or subconsciously—you decide to suspend your disbelief in that world,
and suddenly you are living among the Navi on the planet Pandora. You experience this willing suspension as you play a video game or watch a stage performance. You do not believe in the reality of what you are witnessing, but you allow yourself to be pulled in—often cannot help but be pulled in. You suspend your disbelief in this new reality, and you enter into it, participate in it. And as you enter into this new reality, often you find yourself experiencing some truth in a new way, from a fresh angle. And then when you reenter this world, that fresh experience with truth teaches you, informs your life. Put in the words of your theme this week, it enhances your “adventure of the mind.”

Jesus knew this participatory power of stories—how they draw us in and teach us new truths. That is why he taught in parable. Matthew 13:34 tells us that “Jesus spoke all these things to the crowd in parables; he did not say anything to them without using a parable.” Jesus knew their power. He knew that by telling them he could pull his listeners into the story, make them participate in it, and in the long run find themselves in it. This is why John Claypool called parables “windows that become mirrors.”

Now what does this have to do with you, your faith, and your experience with liberal arts? Sometimes you come upon an issue in one of your classes that seems to challenge something you believe, perhaps appears even to threaten what you believe. When that happens, see it not as an issue to disregard but as a story in which to enter. Suspend your disbelief in that issue (or in that professor!). Let yourself be pulled into it. See where it takes you. See what it can teach you. I am not saying believe it—I am saying suspend your disbelief in it. Make it a parable that just might teach you something new, just might shed light on what you believe, or perhaps even change what you believe. You can apply this exercise even in classes that do not seem so “storified”—yes, even in the sciences. Nobel Prize winner and renowned zoologist Sir Peter Medawar said that even scientists go about their work “telling stories which are scrupulously tested to see if they are stories about real life” (The Art of the Soluble, Penguin Books, 1969, p. 170).

Again, you don’t have to agree with whatever “liberal arts” is throwing at you. You don’t have to believe it. But let liberal arts preach by suspending your disbelief so that you can enter the story and see what it might teach you, see how it might stretch you, see how it might help complete you. The important thing is that you are deepening your experience with life, with great thoughts, with the world and, especially, with faith. Even more importantly, you are glorifying God by doing this, not insulting Him as Calvin warned.
“Yes, But … yes!”

When we let liberal arts preach, we can move from the “Yes” of faith through the “Yes, but…” of academic inquiry. And when we let our faith and our inquiry work together, we can arrive at that amazing point of synthesis, where the joy of faith and the mystery of inquiry lead us to that place of deepened relationship with God and His world. John Calvin describes this point of contact between faith and knowledge as “piety… that union of reverence and love to God which the knowledge of his benefits inspires” (Institutes, Book I, Chapter II, Section I). This experience of genuine piety inspires us to carry out our “chief end” as declared by the Westminster Confession: “to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever.”

(By the way, I am not a Calvinist, nor do I agree with all articles of the Westminster Confession, particularly those that espouse the most debated aspects of Calvinist theology. However, I have deep appreciation and respect both for Calvin and Westminster, and both have enriched my faith tremendously. Hopefully this is an example of my suspending disbelief in a particular theological approach and learning to appreciate this “discipline” without agreeing with it!)

I am very drawn to Westminster’s term, “glorify,” as it does encapsulate our primary purpose. The word is derived from the Greek doxa, meaning “glory.” From this term we received that wonderful word, “doxology.” We associate this term with worship, particularly as we praise God from Whom all blessing flow. The literal meaning of doxa is “weight.” Perhaps that is a good description of where we arrive at the end of this dance between faith and liberal arts—when we get to that place of “Yes, but…yes!” I remember when I first came to Christ, and things were light and joyful and breezy. Then my faith bumped up against this world and it got a little heavier. Then I went to seminary and I wrestled with different theological viewpoints, and my faith got even heavier. Then I became a minister in a church with loving but broken people like me, and it got even heavier. But mind you—it was not at all just “bad-heavy”; it was heaviness encompassing all of life and faith: the good, the bad, the ugly, the beautiful, the unjust and the just, the depraved and the heavenly. In other words, at its best, it was and is glorious. It is feeling the weight of this life of faith in all of its fullness, all of its mystery, all of its delight. Yes—all of its glory. When you let your faith preach and let your liberal arts preach, you will experience the doxology of life as God offers it to you.

That is where liberal art helps get you—from the “Yes” of experiencing the Gospel to the “Yes, but...” of exploring its depth and mystery to the “Yes, but…yes” of realizing the fullness of its glory.
And here you are at this college where the glorious weight of life invites you to engage, perhaps more than any other time in your life. This is the time when liberal arts can train up your mind in a way that keeps the fire of faith burning high and deep in your soul.

So let liberal arts preach! Let it stretch you, confound you, enlighten you, bless you. Let liberal arts fulfill its calling—even as your mind and your faith are most tested, even as the questions weigh heaviest on you. You might not realize the fullness of its value when you feel the present weight; but as you suspend your disbelief and process through the story, truth will prevail and glory will be revealed. Let liberal arts do its thing in all areas of your life. Let it engage you wherever you might find yourself: at school, at home, at church, in the workplace and, perhaps, in the delivery room...

It was two days ago plus eighteen years. I was watching Good Morning America in a waiting room. I was wearing surgical garb, some of which I would find out later was on backwards. I was a Ph.D. candidate, though at that moment I felt pretty dumb and was afraid I was going to feel even dumber. Suddenly a nurse burst through the doors. “It’s time for the C-section Mr. Barnette!” I was whisked across the hall and into a very cold room inhabited by other surgically adorned people. On a table in the middle of the room lay my wife sporting a happy, drug-induced smile. The anesthesiologist, a former high school football coach (no kidding), positioned me at the end of the table just behind my wife’s blissful face.

I do not remember all that happened in the seven minutes that followed, as I found myself in a haze of uncertainty and uselessness. What I do remember is Coach Anesthesiologist elbowing me at certain points, barking questions at me, and my brilliant replies:

“What’s the matter, don’t you know how kids are born?!”
“Yeah, but …”
“You know how a C-section goes, right?!”
“Yeah, but …”
“What’s the matter, never heard a baby cry before?!”
“Yeah, but …”
“Hey, would you like to cut the cord?”
“Yeah, but—NO!” (That was the one question I was able to answer clearly.)

I remember the little one’s piercing cry, and I remember her eyes and fists clenched so tightly. And remembered her mouth opened so widely. “Let’s take her to the weighing table,” I heard a nurse say. Someone put their hands on my shoulders and guided me over to the weighing table, and before they placed her on it, I touched the table
with my fingertips. It was ice cold. I knew what was about to happen...

The decibel level tripled. And there I stood, staring uselessly at this enraged creature. Was she being weighed, or was I? I had never felt more weighed down.

“You’re a father!” a nurse chimed.

“Yeah, but…”

The nurse looked at me as if I was the lowest form of life. Then, after a most awkward of moments, the nurse raised her voice so I could barely hear her above the crying: “Well, Dad, do something!” At that moment, the only thing I could think to do was to bend down and whisper to this wailing newborn the same words I had spoken to her every night as she slumbered in her mother’s womb:

“Hannah Joy, Daddy loves you.”

Suddenly—a stir, then quiet, a deep breath, shoulders relax.

Another deep breath, clenched fists loosen; fingers begin drumming the air.

And then … eyes bat open for the first time. She marks me with her gaze.

Yes!
Share in the Joy: Faithful Household Servants
in Matthew 25:14-30
[Russell Bradley Jones Lecture]

William D. Shiell

The parable of the talents occurs near the end of Jesus' eschatological discourse in Matthew 25:14-30 and is famous for the commendation delivered at many funerals: “Well done, good and faithful servant.”¹ A cursory reading of the parable, however, indicates that the themes allude to a hierarchy of master and servant. The servants are not rewarded with an eternal dwelling, but they are given the opportunity to have a larger responsibility and increase their share of the master’s estate. As a reward, the master tells them to “Share in the joy of the master.”

Most commentators view this phrase as an invitation to a banquet² or a characteristic of God’s future eternal kingdom.³ First-

¹ A version of this lecture will appear as a chapter in the forthcoming festschrift Thriving in Babylon: Essays in Memory of A. J. Conyers (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2010). This lecture is dedicated in memory of Dr. Conyers and honors Russell Bradley Jones, both of whom were eschatological scholars. See Dr. Jones’s book, What, Where, and When is the Millenium? (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1975).
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Jeremias has controlled the discipline on this word with his “Aramaism.” In the received tradition of interpretations, most of the arguments about “share in the joy” stem from the questions raised by Jeremias: “Was this phrase (and others) the ipssima vox of Jesus?” The logic then follows that (1) The early church hoped for an eternity in heaven. (2) This phrase was not something Jesus said because the phrase was not part of the original form of the parable. (3) This had to be an addition by the writer or the early church. (4) This addition must then refer to the messianic banquet or wedding feast because this was one of the common hopes of the early church. For example, see Joel R. Wohlgemut citing Jeremias and Scott on p. 108. Wohlgemut, however, arrives at different conclusions. I am raising a different question. I am asking how the first century audience understood the phrase in light of their culture as it was performed as a part of the Gospel of Matthew in its final form. The only notable exceptions to this interpretation are David E. Garland, Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel (ed. Charles H. Talbert; 1; Reading the New Testament Series; New York: Crossroad, 1995), 464 and Stanley Hauerwas, Matthew (ed. R. R. Reno; BTCB; Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2006), 210.

E. Carson Brisson, “Matthew 25:14-30,” Int 56 (2002): 308. Bruce J. Ackerson et al., The Storyteller’s Companion to the Bible (ed. Dennis E. Smith; vol. 11 of The Parables of Jesus; ed. Dennis E. Smith and Michael E. Williams; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006), 93. Arland J. Hultgren, The Parables of Jesus: a Commentary (The Bible in its World; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 278; Donald A. Hagner, Matthew 14-28 (ed. Ralph P. Martin; WBC 33b; Dallas: Word Books, 1995), 736. Hagner states, “The invitation may refer to the happiness of a like prosperity. For Christian readers (both in the first century and in the present), however, the language cannot fail to connote the joy of eschatological blessing, just as the judgment of the wicked servant points to eschatological judgment.” This might be true, but the parable indicates that the faithful servants received the wicked servant’s talent. Apparently, there were still things that could be accomplished with that talent in the present.
century listeners, however, likely understood the phrase “share in the joy of the master” in light of the faithful household servant tradition in the Mediterranean world. Households used servants to manage finances, oversee farms, supervise people, and educate their children. Long before they were manumitted, or even if slaves were never freed, masters offered incentives that benefited the slave and brought rewards and pleasure to the master. By the first century, this long-standing tradition had become a part of the culture of master-slave relationships in such a way that the average person recognized the relationship in the parable. The “joy of the master” was not an invitation to an event at the end of time but a mutually beneficial command to be experienced as part of the household.

The Faithful Household Servant in Antiquity

In order to understand how an audience understood a turn of phrase such as the one found in Matthew, we will set the phrase in the context of three ancient literary traditions in the culture through the early second century C. E. These Greco-Roman, early Jewish, and early Christian texts offer a sense of the audience’s expectation as they heard the parable in the first century.

---

5 For the purposes of this essay, I have avoided later rabbinic and Greco-Roman texts that indicate how later audiences might have viewed this work. For a helpful list of rabbinic texts related to this parable that fall outside this period, see Klyne Snodgrass, Stories with Intent, 522.
6 This is just one view of the ancient audience. For instance, Richard Rohrbaugh focuses on the matter of the third servant in the parable. He discusses the parable through a social-scientific lens from the perspective of a peasant in a “limited good” agrarian society. He suggests that peasants would have taken the side of the third servant and have been offended by the rewards of the first two. I am suggesting here that peasants were not the only ones in the audience and proposing that some slave peasants would have responded positively to this parable in light of this household servant tradition. Peasants’ views would have been just as varied as those of others in the first century.
Faithful household servants can be found in each tradition. Many of these slaves were eventually freed. Some faithful servants, however, remained in the house and were rewarded by masters. In the ancient world, masters of households can treat slaves with a variety of punishments and rewards. They used fear and punishment as frequent motivators. In some cases, however, they commend these faithful servants and slaves for carrying out their duties or increasing the master’s wealth. They give the slaves greater responsibility and the privilege of bearing children. When the master commends the slaves, they share in the joy of the master’s satisfaction, happiness, and pleasure.

**Greco-Roman examples.** The Greek household codes of Xenophon and Pseudo-Aristotle provide a model for rewarding faithful servitude, and Xenophon’s influence extended into the first century C.E. In both cases the slaves carry out the work of the household as well as the unseemly work of sexual favors for the master. Xenophon uses a dialogue to teach conduct in a household. In this case, Socrates and Isocrates discuss the expectations and rewards of a housekeeper. Socrates states:

> Now, when we appointed our housekeeper, we looked for the one who seemed to have the greatest degree of self-control in eating, drinking wine, sleeping, and intercourse with me, and who, furthermore, seemed to have memory and the foresight both to avoid being punished by us for negligence and to

---

Palestine. For a critique of these views see Joel R. Wohlegmuth, “Entrusted Money (Matt. 25:14-28),” in *Jesus and His Parables: Interpreting the Parables of Jesus Today* (ed. V. George Shillington; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997), 119.

7 K. R. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: a Study in Social Control* (Collection Latomus 185; Bruxelles: Latomus, 1984), 40.


consider how, by pleasing us in any way, she might be rewarded by us in return. We taught her to be loyal to us by giving her a share of our joy when we were happy, and if we had any trouble, we called on her to share it too. We trained her to be eager to improve the estate by taking her into our confidence and by giving her a share in our success. We instilled a sense of justice in her by giving more honour to the just than to the unjust, and showing her that the just live lives that are richer and better suited to a free citizen than the unjust. And so we appointed her to this post. (Xenophon *Economicus* 9.11-13 [Pomeroy])

A writer using the pseudonym of Aristotle shared similar views:

Every slave should have before his eyes a definite goal or term of his labour. To set the prize of freedom before him is both just and expedient since having a prize to work for, and a time defined for its attainment, he will put his heart into his labours. . . . We should also keep festivals and give treats, more on the slaves’ account than on that of the freemen; since the free have a fuller share in those enjoyments for the sake of which these institutions exist.” (Aristotle *Economicus* 1.5.6 [Armstrong, LCL])

In Xenophon, the slave shares in the pleasure and satisfaction of the master as well as the trouble. They received a share of the profits and the pleasure of the master. In Aristotle, the “festivals and treats” are the means by which the master gives joy even though the prize of freedom is the ultimate goal.

Roman writers described household slaves who demonstrated fidelity above and beyond the call of duty. In some cases they gave their lives for their masters. In a working relationship, however,


11 Valerius Maximus discussed several examples “Of the Fidelity of Slaves” in his book of sayings (6.8.1-7). Six are examples of slaves who gave their lives for their masters. One master, C. Plotius Plancus, offered his life in exchange for his slaves when they were trying to protect him (6.8.5). Antius Restio experienced fidelity and infidelity. His slaves looted his house when trying to escape. A slave
where the slave is neither freed nor facing impending death, masters rewarded slaves similarly to their Greek predecessors in a household. In the Roman period, however, masters went further, following Stoic advice that mutually benefited master and servant and rewarding servants with holidays.

Varro’s and Columella’s household codes discuss how slaves in the Roman period share in their master’s joy. Varro, from the first century B.C.E., discusses the role the foremen:

The foremen are to be made more zealous by rewards, and care must be taken that they have a bit of property of their own, and mates from among their fellow-slaves to bear them children; for by this means they are made more steady and more attached to the place. . . . The good will of the foremen should be won by treating them with some degree of consideration; and those of the hands who excel the others should also be consulted as to the work to be done. When this is done they are less inclined to think they are looked down upon, and rather think that they are held in some esteem by the master. (Varro De re rustica 1.17.5-7)

In his household manual for operating a farm, Columella offers advice on rewarding female slaves for good work and behavior. Helping slaves was good for business.

I now and then avenge those who have just cause for grievance, as well as punish those who incite the slaves to revolt, or who slander their taskmasters; and on the other hand, I reward those who conduct themselves with energy and diligence. To women, too, who are unusually prolific, and who ought to be rewarded for the bearing of a certain number of offspring, I have granted exemption from work and sometimes even freedom after they had reared many children. For to a mother of three sons exemption from work was granted; to a mother of more her freedom as well. Such justice and consideration on the part of the master contributes greatly to whom he had bound in chains allowed Antius to escape with some crafty ingenuity and gave his life for him (6.8.7). Seneca mentions an incident between Caesar Augustus, a Senator named Rufus, and his slave (De Beneficiis 3.27).

K. R. Bradley, Slaves and Masters, 40. Bradley indicates that the rewards served as a means of “social control.”
the increase of his estate. . . If he has made it a practice to do all this for many years, he will maintain a well-ordered discipline when old age comes; and whatever his age, he will never be so wasted with years as to be despised by his slaves. (Rust. 1.8.18-20 [Forster and Heffner, LCL])

The Stoic philosopher Seneca carries this theme further. The rewards for slaves extended beyond incentives for good work or the chance to bear children. In some cases, masters bestowed gifts to slaves, and the slaves reciprocated. Seneca discusses the joy that comes to a grateful giver and recipient of a gift. The giver and recipient share mutually in joy:

But he who is happy in having received a benefit tastes a constant and unfailing pleasure, and rejoices in viewing, not the gift, but the intention of him from whom he received it. The grateful man delights in a benefit over and over, the ungrateful man but once. But is it possible to compare the lives of these two? For the one, as a disclaimer of debts and a cheat are apt to be, is downcast and worried, he denies to his parents, to his protector, to his teachers, the consideration that is their due, while the other is joyous, cheerful, and, watching for an opportunity to repay his gratitude, derives great joy from this very sentiment, and seeks, not how he may default in his obligations, but how he may make very full and rich return, not only to his parents and friends, but also to persons of lower station. For, even if he has received a benefit from his slave, he considers, not from whom it came, but what he received. (Seneca De benefecis 3.17.4 [Basore, LCL])

Consider, rather, whether in the case of slaves, a manifestation of virtue is not the more praiseworthy the rarer it is, and too, whether it is not all the more gratifying that, despite their general aversion to domination and the irksomeness of constraint, some slave by his affection for his master has overcome the common hatred of being a slave. So therefore, a benefit does not cease to be a benefit because it proceeded from a slave, but is all the greater on that account because he could not be deterred from it even by being a slave. (Seneca Ben. 3.19.4 [Basore, LCL]).

Seneca describes that these benefits mutually benefit the household when the slave “supplies more than he contracted to do”:
When he exceeds the bounds of his station and goodwill toward his master, and surpasses the expectation of his master by daring some lofty deed that would be an honour even to those more happily born, a benefit is found to exist inside the household. (Seneca *Ben. 3.22.2* [Basore, LCL])

This kind of joy applies to slaves who bestow gifts on their masters. His work on the estate is viewed as a benefit.

Masters used holidays to reward some slaves and abuse others. Dionysius of Halicarnassus mentions how the Roman holidays of Saturnalia and Compilatia made the slaves “more agreeable to their masters and be less sensible of the severity of their condition.” (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Antiquitates romanes* 4.14.4 [Cary, LCL]). For five days during Saturnalia, some slaves appeared to have the same freedom as their masters. Many of Martials epigrams were written about these holidays. During Saturnalia, Martial writes, “Play, frisky slaves, do nought by play. These [whips] I shall keep under seal for five days” (Martial, *Epigrams* 14.79 [Bailey, LCL]). A slave like Flaccus, however, was sexually abused during the festivals (*Epig. 11.98* [Bailey, LCL]).

**Jewish tradition.** Jewish literature records a faithful servant tradition, most notably in the events surrounding Joseph, Potiphar, and

---

13 Bradley cites a number of potential holidays depending on the master’s relationship with the slave including Matonialia in March, Fors Fortuna on June 24, Saturnalia Dec. 17-23 and Compatilia January 3-5. August 13 was a holiday for slaves alone. K. R. Bradley, p. 40. *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control 1984. Vol. 185, collection latomus.* Also see art from this period as examples.

14 Victoria Rimell, *Martial’s Rome: Empire and the Ideology of Epigram* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 141 and 175. Ironically, Martial describes banquets and festivals full of hedonistic pleasures that some slaves would have wanted to take refuge from.

15 Daniel in the house of Nebuchadnezzar also seems to fit this tradition. He rewards his servant Daniel with gifts and authority in Babylon (Daniel 2:46-49). Jewish tradition was very familiar with slavery but rarely followed, if at all, the instructions regarding Jubilee. Other than the Exodus events, the only two instances of manumission recorded in the Hebrew Bible are Jeremiah 34:8-11 and Nehemiah
The stories contain similar characteristics as those from the Greco-Roman traditions. Joseph serves as a household servant. His masters praise him, rejoice in his presence, promote him within the household, and reward him with greater responsibility.

The tradition begins in the Hebrew Bible with Genesis and is echoed later in the Psalms. Joseph serves in the house of Potiphar and eventually Pharaoh and is promoted from interpreter of dreams to a household servant supervisor (Genesis 39:4-8; 41:39-43). The tradition is echoed in Psalm 105:21.

Josephus varies the tradition a bit. He notes how Joseph enjoyed the rewards and happiness that the Pharaoh bestowed on him (A.J. 5.7, 6.1).

Philo combines the thread of the faithful servant from ancient Judaism with the pleasure of the master in the present life (De Abrahamo 22.108). Household servants can be trusted not only to do their jobs but also to fight in battle and receive the rewards and spoils of the battle. They rejoice in the presence of their master (Abr. 40.235). In his case, those who are slaves to God are already free even if they are enslaved to an earthly master. For example, Joseph is a model of the faithful servant in a household (De Iosepho 8.37-40), and Philo notes that Joseph received the praise and acclaim of the Pharaoh and his advisers in addition to his promotion (Ios. 21.1-4). At one point, the Pharaoh has such a relationship with Joseph that he considers himself to be a father figure (Ios. 242).\(^7\) Joseph, however, fits Philo’s broader argument in Every Good Person is Free that those who are slaves to

---


Hellenistic Jewish literature contains other references to the Joseph story in Jub. 34.10-11; 34.18-19; 39.5-8; 40.6-9; L.A.B. 8.9-10; 43.5; T. Jos. in the Testament of the 12 Patriarchs Wis 10.13-14; 4 Macc. 2.1-6; and 1 Macc 2.53. The texts mentioned here feature the themes of the faithful household servant similar to other Greco-Roman and early Christian literature. For a helpful survey of the Hellenistic images of Joseph, see Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: the Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 30; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 73-109.

\(^7\) Compare his comment to Jub. 43.19 that also refers to Joseph as a father to Pharaoh. This picture of Joseph is not consistent in Philo’s writings. Compare the contrasting retelling of the story in De Somniis where Joseph appears to be pursuing personal glory. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 89. His promotion, however, in Potiphar’s and Pharaoh’s households are consistent in these writings.
God have already been freed. One of the characteristics of that freedom is happiness while they are working (Prob. 18.121).¹⁸

The Hellenistic Jewish novel Joseph and Aseneth employs this theme in the marriage of Joseph to Pentephres the priest’s daughter Aseneth. The story is set during the seven years of plenty when Joseph served in Pharaoh’s household. Aseneth is the ultimate reward for this faithful servant because she would have been pledged to one of Pharaoh’s sons. Instead Joseph insists that Pharaoh should preside over the wedding. Pharaoh blesses the union publicly (a commendation), throws a feast, rejoices in the presence of the bride and groom, and rewards both with crowns on their heads (Jos. As. 21.1-7). The mutually beneficial relationship is reiterated at the conclusion of the story. After one of Pharaoh’s jealous sons fails in an attempt to take Aseneth, the writer refers to Joseph as one “like a father” to Pharaoh’s younger son (Jos. As. 29.9).¹⁹


Four parables fit the picture of a master who commends and rewards faithful service with greater responsibility without granting manumission: Matthew 24:45-51; 25:14-30; Luke 12:42-46; and 19:11-27. In Matthew 25:14-30, the master not only rewards the servants with more responsibility but also invites them to “enter into the joy of the master.”

The Shepherd of Hermas echoes this tradition in a parable reminiscent of Joseph and Aseneth. In this case, the son approves of the master’s joy. In the parable, a faithful servant oversees a vineyard. While the master is away, he generously helps the servants he oversees. The servant first turns a vineyard full of weeds into a flourishing crop. With his son’s approval, the master rewards the servant by making him a joint heir with the master’s son “because, when he had a good thought he did not put it on one side, but carried it out.” (Herm. Sim. 5.2.7 [Lake, LCL]). During the celebration feast, the servant shared the food the master gave him and gave the food to his fellow servants. According to the parable, “His master heard all these events, and again

¹⁹ Gruen, Heritage and Hellenism, 99.
rejoiced greatly at his conduct. The master again assembled his friends and his son and reported to them what he had done with the food which he had received, and they were still more pleased that the servant should be made joint heir with his son.” (Herm. Sim. 5.2.10-11 Lake, LCL) In this context the servant, master, son, and fellow servants rejoice together that the servant is a joint heir.

Philippians employs the rhetoric of a joyful servant. Paul refers to himself as a servant (1:1) who prays with joy (1:4) and whose joy grows (1:18). He urges the audience to grow in their joy (1:26) and to identify with Christ by imitating his humble service (2:6).  

**Summary.** Greco-Roman, early Jewish, and early Christian works reflect a common tradition in the ancient world. Masters rewarded household servants or slaves for faithful service even if they were not in the process of manumission. The beneficent masters gave servants not only tangible gifts and greater responsibility but also the pleasure, joy, and commendation of the master. This joy could be characterized by a variety of behaviors: words of commendation, a holiday, a promotion with greater responsibility, or a share of the inheritance. The examples from the ancient world indicate that the servant received the benefit associated with joy immediately. He did not wait, delay gratification, or hope for a reward in the afterlife. The servant experienced the joy as part of his occupation.

In some cases, the master receives a mutually beneficial joy that comes with the faithful servant. Not only does the master profit from the servant’s work, but in each tradition the master is pleased because the servant does so well. The master is happy because the servant is happy, and vice-versa.

The Faithful Servants in the Parable of the Talents

The Matthean parable of the talents fits the faithful household servant theme from antiquity. The faithful servants receive tangible benefits of greater responsibility and the intangibles of commendation and joy. The master mutually benefits from the servants’ faithfulness.

The context of the parable in Matthew. This parable is the fourth parable featuring a managerial slave in Matthew (18:23-35; 20...
The parable is the third of four eschatological parables that conclude this section of the Gospel (24:45-25:46). These four are interwoven conceptually and lexically. They emphasize preparation, obedience, and faithful living in light of the end. Each describes how faithfulness is demonstrated differently. The wise servant is faithful because he works when the master comes. The bridesmaids prepare wisely and rest. The faithful servants invest the master’s resources. The sheep care for the less fortunate.


Each parable emphasizes preparation, obedience, and faithful living in light of the end. All of them share varying degrees of judgment or punishment for the unprepared or unfaithful. The rewards, however, alternate between a present reality and eternal benefits.

The parables of the bridesmaids and sheep and goats invite the prepared characters into a banquet and eternal life, respectively. The parable of the bridesmaids calls for attention and preparation by those who await the returning groom. When the groom returns, they are invited to a wedding feast. In the sheep and the goats, the king commends people for acts of service to the prisoners, naked, and poor.

The other two parables share similar themes. Both have lexical links to Greek household codes: “household” (οἶκοις 24:14); “master” (κύριος 24:45; 25:20) and “servant” (δοῦλος 24:14; 25:14). The parable of the “wise and foolish servants” opens the section

---

21 Glancy notes that Matthew has a certain interest in managerial slaves compared to the other Gospels. Glancy, Slavery in Early Christianity, 113.
22 Snodgrass, Stories with Intent, 494.
23 Hultgren notes that the first two focus on the responsibilities of all. The parable of the talents discusses the responsibilities of those given gifts. Hultgren, The Parables of Jesus, 274.
24 Snodgrass, Stories with Intent, 494.
25 Most commentators link the parable of the bridesmaids with the parable of the talents because of the wedding banquet or feast.
(24:45-50). This parable places faithful service in the context of a surprise visit from a master. The audience hears that faithful work is part of the responsibility while a person awaits the return. A faithful servant is rewarded with more work to do.\(^{26}\)

The master gives greater responsibility to the faithful servants in the parable. The issue, however, is how the “joy of the master” functions in this context.

**The master’s rewards.** The master entrusts talents to three servants while he is away on a journey. Two of them are found faithful, and one is not and is thrown into the outer darkness. His talent is taken from him and given to the others to invest. Like the wise servants in Matthew 24, these servants are responsible for the master’s possessions. In this case, a talent represents a share of the master’s money. The faithful servants respond to what their master has entrusted them to do.\(^{27}\) These servants do not have the prospect of liberation in their immediate future, much like other household servants in the ancient world. They do, however, have responsibility for a portion of the master’s estate much like the stewards in the manuals of Xenophon (*Oeconomicus* 9.11-13) and Varro (*Rust.* 1.17.5-7). In the parable, two servants invest the master’s talents. When the master returns, he offers three benefits. (1) A commendation: “Well done, good and faithful servant.” (2) A promotion: “You have been faithful in a few things; I will put you in charge of many things.” (3) A command: “Share in the joy of your master.”

The first two echo similar benefits in other parables of rewarded household servants (Matthew 24:45-51; Luke 12:42-46; 19:11-27). These fit the listener’s expectations. The commendation and promotion resemble similar treatment for Greco-Roman servants in the household codes (Xenophon, Varro, and Columella 1.8.18-20) and Joseph as a servant in Pharaoh’s house (Philo (*De Josepho* 21.1-4)). The third benefit combines elements of the other two. This reward benefits servant and master.

**The mutual benefits.** Unlike the other parables that feature the rewarded household servant (Matthew 24:45-51; Luke 12:42-46; 19:11-27), the master commands an additional benefit not found in the other parables: “enter into the joy of the master.” This command combines the servant’s promotion, greater responsibility, delight in his

\(^{26}\) Such parables of surprise are part of the theme of Matthew in this section of the Gospel.

\(^{27}\) Witherington, *Matthew*, 464.
achievement, the master’s delight in greater earnings, and his pleasure toward his servant.

From the context of Mediterranean culture, the five function together as mutually beneficial rewards for master and servant. Based on the literary evidence, the first century listener was familiar with the joy that a servant shares because of good work. Seneca indicates how these benefits brought joy to the recipient (Ben. 3.17). Masters rewarded slaves with holidays for times of celebration (Dionysius of Halicarnassus Ant. rom. 4.14.4). Jewish tradition indicates rewards for slaves’ good work (Philo De Abr. 40.235). Josephus attests to Joseph’s happiness and joy because of Pharaoh’s pleasure (A.J. 5.7, 6.1).

Masters experienced joy because of the profits they shared and the pleasure they found in their servants. Seneca indicates that servants could bestow gifts on their masters, overcoming the “hatred” for being a slave. (Ben. 3.19.4). A master rewards a servant because of the pleasure of increased profits (Columella Rust. 1.8.18-20) in the first century C.E. A master’s pride grows because the servant surpasses expectations, and the master enjoys extending the benefits (Ben. 3.22.2).

The function of the benefits. We can imagine how this was understood by the auditors of Matthew. The audience identified with the faithful household servants who experienced the benefits of the kingdom of heaven before they reached the end.28 As servants, they received their responsibilities as trustees of the kingdom.29 Much like the wise servants and the bridesmaids, they are given more time than they expected; now they must choose how to respond.30 Knowing the greater responsibility of the task ahead as disciples on the journey, the community heard the parable as commendations to them. They could view the responsibilities, issues, and concerns of the community as

---

28 Glancy, Slaves in Early Christianity, 129. Ackerson suggests that this is the third in a series of parables “that the help the church know how to prepare for Jesus’ return,” Bruce J. Ackerson, The Parables of Jesus, 93. Also “The parable urges the Christian community to respond to God’s rule in the pattern of the first two servants. God wants the church to increase the radius of the shining of its light of good works and testimony,” 110.

29 Wohlegmuth, “Entrusted Money,” in Shillington, Jesus and His Parables, 119. He argues against the traditional allegorical rendering and views this as a call to “take steps which would lead them to share in the kingdom’s wealth.”

signs of greater trust by the master and opportunity for them to extend the mission in the world. They could experience the joy of the master by taking the words of commendation to heart, accepting the responsibility of their service and resources, and sharing in the pleasurable joy of the master.

The joy of the master is the work, responsibility, and resources that Jesus (as master) continues to bestow on the community of faithful disciples. In earlier sections of the Gospel, the audience has heard instructions about “entering” (ἐισέρχομαι) the kingdom of heaven (5:20; 7:13, 23, 19:23). The parable shows that the listeners participate in the kingdom of heaven in this life through faithful service. They do not wait until after death for a delayed reward. Joy is experienced by master and servants mutually now. They share the benefits of faithful service: words of commendation, greater responsibility, and the joy that is the master’s to give.

A person feeling insignificant in the community with very few responsibilities realizes that the number or size of responsibilities matter little. The master gives the same commendation to both servants even though the amount of their talents differs. They are not only honored to be asked but take great joy in the opportunity to please the

---

31 Garland, Matthew, 242. Witherington, Matthew, 464. For the traditional allegorical reading of the parable where the faithful servants=faithful listeners, wicked servant=unfaithful people, master=God, see Craig L. Blomberg, Interpreting the Parables (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1990), 216. Hultgren extends the allegory. Talents=Gifts entrusted to disciples, including money. Hultgren, Parables, 278. Hultgren links the parable to the spiritual gifts mentioned in Romans 12:6 and 1 Cor 12:4.

32 Garland, Matthew, 242. “In the situation of the Christian community, the resources that have been given it apply to its task of mission in the world (10:1; 24:14; 28:19).”

33 Hauerwas, Matthew, 210. This joy comes as the community receives these gifts “without regret.” Hauerwas says that the responsibilities are learning to tell the truth and love our enemies. I think the parable suggests that the audience would have seen any resource God has given as something worth doing. Also Snodgrass, Stories with Intent, 535.


35 Snodgrass, Stories with Intent, 542.
master. The master is mutually pleased and shares the joy of the servant because the servant has been faithful.

The faithful servants manage the talents well because they are motivated by the master’s joy rather than fear of the master’s punishments. They recognize that with responsibility comes accountability. The difference between fidelity and indolence is the servant’s view of the master. In some communities fear of punishment became a motivator for service. The third servant assumes that the master is harsh, acts out of fear, and buries the talent. Matthew’s parable highlights how accountability in the kingdom of heaven does not require fear as a motivator. In this community, the mutual joy shared by master and slave drives obedience.

The community faithfully uses the resources and experiences the joy of service because Jesus continues to enjoy seeing his servants do well, grow, and benefit. He is joyful because the servants do well. He benefits from the risky investment. His joy grows and offers something to share because material and emotional benefits extend faithful stewardship.

Share in the Joy

Contrary to popular sentiment, “Well done thou good and faithful servant,” is not a conclusion to life’s journey. Even though the received history of interpretation has suggested that the phrase functions as an invitation to a banquet or a feast, the evidence from the ancient world suggests otherwise.

We have seen that this commendation is one part of the experience of the joy of faithful service. Those who serve the master are not rewarded with an ending festival banquet but even greater responsibility. They share joy with their master, and the servants return to work.

---

36 In this way, the theme of joy subverts a cultural fear of servants to masters as well as the misunderstanding of the statement of the third servant: “I knew you were a hard man...so I was afraid.”
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