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A Word
from the Editors

This forty-sixth issue of *Carson-Newman Studies (Faculty Studies, through 1993)* follows the familiar format of beginning with the past year’s address of the Distinguished Faculty Award recipient to the faculty and staff. This lead has been the custom since the initial issue of the publication. Following, is a series of articles by active teaching faculty. The next series consists of articles submitted by retired faculty and staff, adjunct faculty, staff members, and occasionally a student.

Each year important lectures delivered to the campus by invited guests are included. Featured are the Carlyle Marney and the T. B. Maston Lectures. Both lecturerships are sponsored by the Center for Baptist Studies to celebrate the contributions of the two named graduates of Carson-Newman College who, each in his own way, made lasting contributions to Baptist life. The last section consists of the remarks and remembrances of distinguished alumni, a faculty member honored by the Alumni Association, and the Founder’s Day chapel speaker.

This format has served *Carson-Newman Studies* well. It has set before readers the vitality and diversity of the intellectual life of the campus. The research and writing of the faculty, staff, and others has usually been of the first rank. Colleagues on campus have used this publication as a means of demonstrating the quality of their work, the extent of their research, and the incisiveness of their thinking. An article by a colleague that has been digested has often served as a springboard for discussion (sometimes heated!) and further work in one’s own discipline.

The editors would like to propose that, without losing many of the benefits of the past format with its sense of diversity within a broad community of learners, *Carson-Newman Studies* include treatments of some academic topic to which the academic community may profitably speak. One rationale for doing this is to assist the campus and its constituencies to provide an academic identity for Carson-Newman College. The changes in leadership already in place and upcoming makes this an opportune time for marking out our identity as a Baptist community of faith and learning.
We believe that this can be accomplished by directing the faculty and staff articles to a stated issue that will vary from year to year. The editors and campus leaders can maintain a short list of upcoming topics for future issues of *Carson-Newman Studies*. The topic of each year’s publication can be modified for cause and even abandoned, if required by events. The fact of a direction, however, will utilize the intellectual activities of academically gifted people in a way that the submission of random articles no matter how worthy is not presently doing.

The editors call the intellectual community to begin now—thinking, researching, exploring, and producing. Your work will be welcomed with a great deal of anticipation, as we together define who we are academically as a liberal arts college of excellence within the Baptist tradition.

The editors thank all the contributors to the present issue. These contributors and other faculty, staff, and alumni are invited to offer their intellectual efforts in future issues of *Carson-Newman Studies*.

Don H. Olive, Editor

Michael Arrington, Managing Editor
When I first joined the ranks of CPAs, the profession was highly esteemed: accounting, ministry, and medicine were three professions considered to be highly ethical. At that time, accountants had three roles. They kept the financial records of companies, prepared tax returns, and if they worked for a public accounting firm, did audits on which they provided an opinion as to the fairness of financial statements and whether or not the statements were prepared using generally accepted accounting standards. These statements were used not only by management but also by banks in assessing creditworthiness, by stockholders and potential stockholders, and by governmental agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Accountants today are much more involved in management and help make decisions within organizations. Increasingly, they are also expected to search for fraud or unethical practices when doing an audit. Courts have held them liable and they have been forced to pay out millions in lawsuits. So, whether they wanted the role or not, they became their brothers’ keepers.

How do we determine that companies have complied with generally accepted accounting principles and how do we search for fraud, especially when top management is involved. One way is by establishing more and more rules and regulations. There are now almost 200 statements of accounting standards that must be followed by companies. Many of these standards have been written after abusive practices caused society to demand more and some examples of these will be given later. The standard setting process begins with a study and is followed by a series of public hearings before the standard is adopted.

Although the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB), the standard setting body of the accounting profession, attempts to establish what we might call fair standards, other pressures sometimes thwart it. First, there are two bodies that have the power to overturn the FASB. These bodies are the Securities and Exchange Commission and Congress. Very rarely does this occur, but there are a couple of times
that it has happened. One occurred when the accounting profession tried to standardize the accounting for oil and gas exploration. Companies were using two methods, the successful efforts approach and the full cost approach. Assume that a company drilled 10 wells each costing $500,000, so the total cost is $5,000,000. Further assume that three of the holes produced oil and the other seven were dry holes. Under the full cost method, the entire $5,000,000 would be recorded as an asset and would be expensed over the years that the wells produced oil. Under the successful efforts method, the costs of drilling the seven dry holes would be expensed immediately causing net income to be reduced by $3,500,000 in the current year. Assuming the company sold five percent of the oil expected from the well for $400,000, the cost of goods under the full cost method would be one-fifth of $5,000,000 and under successful efforts, it would be one-fifth of $1,500,000 and the income statements would be as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Cost Method</th>
<th>Successful Efforts Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGS</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drilling Dry Holes</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income before Other</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$(3,175,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FASB decreed in 1977, that the companies must use the successful efforts method, but there was uproar from small companies who feared that the effect on their income would hurt their ability to borrow funds or to sell stock. The SEC overruled the FASB and came up with a new standard called Reserve Recognition Accounting that no one liked and so in 1979, all the standards were rescinded and companies went back to using the two methods they had used prior to 1977 (FASB 19).

Another problem with setting standards is that economic consequences have to be considered. In recent years the accounting profession agreed that the standard on accounting for pensions needed to be revised. One big problem was that many organizations had huge unfunded liabilities for pensions, but these liabilities were not shown on the balance sheet. This problem still exists; for example, Delta Airlines has unfunded liabilities of $5.65 billion, Ford, $11.68 billion and Northwest, $3.74 billion (http://moneycentral.msn). When it was suggested that these liabilities needed to be shown, corporations threatened
to eliminate pensions for employees. No one wanted that to happen, so a compromise was struck in which a minimum liability is shown, but it is a small percentage of the full amount (FASB 87). Decisions of this sort can certainly challenge businesses. On the one hand, they are expected to show a profit, but on the other, they are expected to follow a code of ethics and present the best information possible.

In the wake of recent scandals in many businesses, many people think there are no ethical businesses. Others may surmise that the rules put into effect both before and after the scandals, namely the Statements of Financial Accounting Standards and the Sarbanes Oxley Act simply cause businesses to look for ways around the rules. The Sarbanes Oxley Act was passed after the failure of Enron and places more responsibility on management and on accountants.

What are the types of situations that businesses must address and what is the rationale for unethical behavior? Pricing decisions, advertising, product safety, sales practices, safety practices for employees, conflicts of interest, privacy, trade secrets, discrimination, sexual harassment, drug testing, and environmental concerns are just some of the situations in which ethics may be jeopardized. Companies engage in unethical practices to beef up their financial statements, to undercut the competition, to gain an advantage in the market, and because many believe they can’t survive otherwise. Individuals in the organization are also trying to fulfill their own goals that may mean padding their own pockets.

In accounting, most unethical practices arise because businesses want to show more revenue or less expense, or because they want to show less debt on the balance sheet. Managers who are paid a bonus based on profits at the end of a year will be tempted to manipulate revenues and expenses. In the 1970s when franchisors sold franchises to others, they charged a startup fee and counted it as income immediately. In 1981, the FASB issued a standard stating that the fee should not be recognized until the services that the franchisor had promised for the fee had been provided (FASB 45). This is one example of a standard being set after abusive practices became prevalent.

Another example of this was that firms sold goods to another firm with the proviso that the firm would buy the goods back at the start of the new fiscal year. The FASB in its Statement Number 48, set criteria that must be met before revenue can be recognized when right of return exists (FASB 48).

There are also special standards covering the sale of real estate; these rules for land sales state that a certain percentage of the total sales price must have been received before any revenue can be recorded (FASB 66). Once on a trip to Rome, my husband and I were wandering
around the Coliseum when we were approached, as were all Americans who were at the site, and asked to come to a hotel to see a program on land sales in Florida. There was a hook; the sellers also promised us tea and cookies and a trip to see the catacombs. Since the catacombs were closed and we otherwise would not get to see them, we agreed to the deal. We listened to the program, ate our cookies, and turned down the land deal before leaving for the catacombs. This program may have been more far-reaching, but it was similar to many others, even some in East Tennessee. The developers might sell a piece of property for $10,000, collect a down payment of $500, and count the $10,000 as a sale. They knew that many of the buyers would forfeit the $500 after they got home and thought about the deal realistically. These companies were recording revenue that they knew they might never realize. I guess one might also ask if we were being ethical in taking advantage of this offer knowing that we had no intention of buying real estate.

As stated above, another objective of many businesses is to keep debt at a low level. This is done because lenders may require the companies to maintain a certain level of working capital, to limit dividends, to create no new debt, or to restrict drawings or benefits to shareholders. If the company wants to borrow more money, the lender may also impose a higher interest rate on new debt. Companies began to look for new ways of financing, particularly, what is known as off-balance-sheet financing. The simplest type of this to explain is leasing. In the 1960’s leases became very popular. To show the difference in the balance sheet when a company leases rather than buys, assume that a company needs a $500,000 piece of equipment. The first balance sheet shows the result of buying the equipment, spending $100,000 in cash, and acquiring debt for the other $400,000. The second balance sheet shows the results of leasing—there is no asset on the statement and no debt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Assets:</th>
<th>$ 50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Asset</td>
<td>$ 550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholders’ Equity</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total L &amp; SE</td>
<td>$ 550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Balance Sheet

Current Assets: $150,000
Total Assets $150,000

Stockholders Equity $150,000
Total L & SE $150,000

The accounting profession in 1976, issued a statement to address the fact that many of these leases were long-term and essentially purchases of equipment disguised as leases. The statement said that if the lease met any one of four criteria, it had to be recorded as if it was a purchase—i.e., the asset and the debt would be shown on the balance sheet. The four criteria are:

1. Lessee will own the asset at the end of the lease.
2. Lessee has a bargain purchase option; for example, lessee can buy the $500,000 asset at the end of the lease for 15,000.
3. Lease covers a period that is equal to or greater than 75% of asset’s useful life.
4. Present value of lease payments is equal to or greater than 90% of asset’s sale price (FASB 13)

So what do lessees do today? They lease the asset for 74% of its economic life or negotiate to get the present value of the lease payments to 89% of the current sales price. Businesses have also turned to more complex methods of achieving off-balance-sheet financing. One of the most complex areas is that of derivatives, an area that involves such schemes as interest rate swapping between firms and the more common hedging of foreign commitments. Another method, which was used extensively by Enron, is the establishment of what are called Special Purpose Entities. Normally when one business owns 51% or more of another company, the two companies have to combine their financial statements at the end of the year and show results of operations as if they had been one company for the year. Special Purpose entities, which are set up for one specific reason, did not have to follow this rule. If only outsiders owned three percent of the business, it did not have to be included in the parent company’s financial statements at the end of the year. Enron had set up over 3,000 of these entities. There are legitimate reasons to set up special entities and many businesses use them. In Enron’s case, many were not legitimate; officers of the company were sometimes the three percent outside owners.
Other companies using off-balance-sheet financing could be at risk. Walgreen’s shows no long-term debt, but has 19.3 billion of off-balance-sheet financing due in the next twenty-five years. Companies in the S & P 500 Stock Index have $482 billion of this type of debt. When US Air filed for bankruptcy, it showed 3.15 billion of debt on its balance sheet, but actually had another 7.39 billion in debt from leases (www.executivecaliber.ws)

Why are so many companies engaging in what is illegal or at least unethical in many instances? Stephen Labaton states that not only is there pressure to meet revenue and earnings projections, but there are also demographic changes that foster white-collar crime. One is the aging population; white-collar crime is more likely to involve older people. A second demographic is that the education level of the country has improved and educated people are more likely to commit white-collar crime for two reasons: it is more profitable than other crimes and there is less chance of punishment. Third, the technology explosion makes it easier for white-collar crime to be committed (New York Times, June 2, 2002). Anyone who uses the Internet has seen samples of scams or at least read about them.

As Enron fell, so did Arthur Andersen, one of the largest accounting firms in the world. This caused our profession to fall from being one of the most esteemed occupations to being perceived by the public as less ethical than used car salesmen. So where do we stand today? Our reputation has been restored but we live by rules and regulations. A banker recently stated that not only do banks have to evaluate their internal structure, policies, and employees as to possibilities for fraud, but they also have to evaluate every customer who comes into the bank.

Businesses and accountants are operating under the Sarbanes Oxley Act that is costing them millions of dollars. Those are dollars that could be used for research, salaries, product safety, or payouts to stockholders. The Tennessee State Board of Accountancy now requires all CPAs to have four hours of continuing education in ethics each year, and professionals are struggling to determine what the most effective topics are.

Are there ethical businesses and accountants? Sure there are! One example of a company that did the right thing is Johnson & Johnson when it pulled all Tylenol off the shelves as soon as a bottle that had been contaminated was discovered. If you peruse the internet, you will find such sites as Ethical Directory that says it is a directory of ethical businesses, companies, organizations, nonprofits, and websites that promote fair trade, ethics, corporate social responsibility, and the environment (www.ethicaldirectory.ca). Another site called Ethical Junction states that it is a network of screened ethical companies, organiza-
tions, products, and services (www.ethical-junction.org). Most account-
ants are hard-working individuals who are trying to do the best for 
their clients, and for shareholders. Most of those working for Arthur 
Andersen were probably ethical; it was top management that was en-
gaged in fraud.

In the future, I think we will see a softening of the Sarbanes Oxley 
Act; it is simply too onerous and too expensive. There will be more 
rules and regulations for all of industry, however. Hopefully, there will 
also be more emphasis on ethical behavior in all areas of life. One of 
the things I am most proud of is that students at Carson Newman study 
ethical behavior and employers seek them out not only because they are 
well educated, but also because they have a work ethic and a sense of 
integrity. Two of those students are here today, Kara Stooksbury who 
has degrees in Accounting and Political Science and now is teaching 
Political Science at Carson Newman, and Tim Earl, who also got a de-
gree in Accounting but then attended seminary and now serves as 
Youth Minister at First Baptist in Clinton, Tennessee.

I want to close with a poem by Pascal:

O the grandeur
And the
Littleness, the
Excellence and
The Corruption,
The Majesty and
The meanness
Of humankind.

----Pascal

I think our job is to instill in others the vision of grandeur, excel-
lence and majesty that Pascal in the Pensees believes is in mankind, not 
only because we accountants are our brothers’ keepers, but also be-
cause that responsibility has been given to all of us.
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From Techno Savvy to Information Literate: What the Millennial Students Need To Know in the Information Age

Emaly C. Conerly

The “Generation @” and the “Net Generation” are some of the current names given to the millennial students that are now on college campuses! These names allude to the fact that these students are constantly online or “connected.” They email, instant message or text message their friends, play games online, check the latest sports scores or Hollywood news on the Web, shop online, listen to their iPods, and social network with their friends online through Facebook or MySpace.

A 2004 study of 9,000 college freshmen and seniors found that 93.4 percent own a computer and use it primarily for word processing, email, and surfing the web for pleasure and class work (Windham 4). These students are techno savvy and have grown up using and living on the Web. They naturally rely on the web for doing their college research, but are they able to distinguish infomercials from facts, a news report of findings of academic research from the actual report of that research in a scholarly journal, or Wikipedia, a web encyclopedia that anyone can edit, from a reliable reference resource? The answer to this question involves not only the skill sets and abilities that students learn for finding and using information, but also the broader issues of the information explosion and the response of librarians and educators to this need of students, not just globally but at Carson-Newman College Library.

Academic librarians have observed from working with students that they use the web for research, but have very limited critical evaluation skills for finding and using the information that they find. They are not even sure what is needed or required for their research assignments, because they typically do not read thoroughly the assignment instructions. Some have never written a research paper and have never done research for any type of academic exercise. They do not question the accuracy, validity, or appropriateness of information that they find but often “cut & paste” without assimilating what they find. They do not know how to cite a source and may not know what a bibliography is,
often confusing it with “biography.” Findings from studies are similar to these observations. Educational Testing Service, ETS, did an evaluation of responses of 6300 students from sixty-three institutions across the country and issued a report that states that the majority of high school and college students lack proper critical thinking skills when it comes to researching online and using sources (Appel, para. 2-3). In a 2002 study B. J. Fogg found that people base their evaluation of the credibility of a web site by its appearance, not by the authority or sponsorship and the purpose of the web site (Nunberg, para. 6). The survey published by the Pew Project on the Internet and American Life found that 38% of those who searched the web knew that there are “unpaid and sponsored search results” but only 18% could distinguish between the two (Nunberg, para. 7). Students do need these evaluation and critical thinking skills in order to determine what is appropriate for academic research.

Another issue that these students face is the escalating amount of information available through the web and print resources. This is a radical change from the past. Students in the 1960s used the library’s card catalog to find books in the collection and abstracts and indexes to find articles in journals in the library collection. The material had gone through a filtering process of evaluation and selection by a librarian or professor. The current student generation can find the local libraries’ resources using the online library catalog, databases and indexes provided by the library or on the web, web catalogs from libraries across the world, digital libraries on the web, general web search engines, and web gateways. The resource types that are now available have grown from print or microfilm to electronic documents, images, sound and video archives, and electronic media (Rockman 2).

There has been an information explosion with the development of the web and an increasingly complex and technologically challenging information environment. In 1996, there were 10,000 scholarly databases on the market and now that number has risen to 18,000 and is still growing. The web currently has more that 100 million web pages, a phenomenal increase from 18,000 in 1995 (Foster, para. 3). The Web does not have any filtering process, as do materials selected for inclusion in library collection. Consequently, the responsibility for evaluating falls on the user. Librarians daily deal with the challenge of an ever changing and growing information environment and can understand the difficulties that students face.

So, what are librarians and educators doing to teach these “Net Generation” students how to manage this vast sea of information? Librarians increasingly view their role as preparing students to be competent in finding, evaluating, and using information effectively and ethi-
cally so that these students will be equipped to function at a high level in their future careers and be trained to make sound decisions in all aspects of their lives.

Librarians have a long-range view of their instruction to give students a desire and the abilities for lifelong learning, but they are aware that students today view the library through a different lens than students from earlier decades. Because the “Net Generation” students think that everything is available on the web, they view the library as a “museum” that belongs in the past, with little relevance to their current research needs (Barefoot, para. 5). They want their information resources “immediately available and presented in a USA Today format—short and devoid of detail” (Barefoot, para. 2) and “simple, fast, inexpensive or free, interactive, entertaining, and above all available right from the comfort of their computer workstations” (Diaz & Smith, para. 18). Librarians cannot always deliver information in the way that students would like; but, as a body of professionals, they worked on an initiative called “Information Literacy” to give these students the skills to make sense of and take some control over this explosion of information.

What is information literacy? Information literacy is a set of abilities requiring individuals to “recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information” (Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), para. 5). The information literate person is able to:

- Determine the extent of information needed
- Access the needed information effectively and efficiently
- Evaluate information and its sources critically
- Incorporate selected information into one’s knowledge base
- Use information to accomplish a specific purpose
- Understand the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information, and access and use the information ethically and legally (ACRL, para. 5).

Information literacy is an intellectual framework common to all disciplines, all learning environments, and all levels of education. It encompasses lower level skills, such as reading general information sources to learn more about a topic, to higher-level complex and abstract cognitive skills, such as evaluating and synthesizing information from various resources to solve a problem or develop a new idea.

Information literacy is not just a new fad that has been developed by librarians. The American Library Association began focusing on information literacy in 1989, with the development of a committee to
study information literacy. In 1990, a National Forum on Information Literacy was formed—a coalition of over ninety business, education, technology, media, and other organizations—to increase awareness of information literacy (Rockman 4). In 2000, the Association for College and Research Libraries approved a body of standards, the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. The American Association has also endorsed these standards for Higher Education and the Council of Independent Colleges (ACRL, para. 1). Accreditation agencies such as the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, and the New England Association of Schools and Colleges all recognize information literacy as a learning outcome (Rockman 10).

The corporate world recognizes these information literacy skills as “new economy” skills, needful in an economy that has evolved into a knowledge-based economy (9). IDC, a global provider of market intelligence, has done studies on how successful most searchers are in the workplace. The studies found that workers are successful in finding the information that they are searching for only 50% of the time or less. Because of this, “some studies suggest that 90% of the time that knowledge workers spend in creating new reports or other products is spent in recreating information that already exists” at the companies’ expense (Feldman, para. 12-13).

Education Testing Service (ETS) has developed and is promoting a standardized test for measuring information literacy competencies for high school and college students. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, the American Psychological Association’s Board of Educational Affairs, the American Chemical Society, National Council of Teachers of English, and the International Reading Association have all established information literacy standards for students in these disciplines (Rockman 11f). The First International Conference on Information Technology and Information Literacy was held in 2002.

Information literacy is a being advanced by educators in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, The United Kingdom, Europe, Scandinavia, and many other nations (Rockman 6). Information literacy is an international issue, with leadership coming from many nations and from many fields and disciplines. Because information literacy is now considered a learning outcome by higher education accreditation agencies and businesses desire information literate, college educated employees; it is an important consideration for institutions of higher education.

What is Carson-Newman College Library doing to promote information literacy? The librarians have taken a broad, holistic view of information literacy instruction. Realizing how the Net Generation students view the library, the librarians have promoted the library in such
a way as to give students a fresh and inviting perception of the library as a nice place to study and meet friends. Since 2002, the librarians have made changes to create a more comfortable and attractive study environment for students with comfortable seating and areas for group study. Having a computer lab that is open the hours of the library has been a significant attraction for students. The addition to the library of the Java City Coffee Shop, operated by Aramark, Inc., has been a big boost for the library. The library has provided a leisure reading collection, featured several art and other types of displays, hosted entertaining events such as “The Mystery in the Library,” created a Library Scavenger Hunt for Freshman Experiences classes, and used the “Library Rap,” written by Mike Forbs, in Freshman Summer Orientations and other campus events. These changes put the library on the student’s radar screen and also cast the librarians as approachable, friendly, and willing to give assistance.

In a more serious and intentional effort, the librarians have taught research instructional sessions, tailored to the specific needs of a course at the request of a professor. This has been done for at least twenty years. The English Department has graciously worked with the librarians in English 101 and 201 courses as a basis for teaching library research skills. In 2003, the Library added an Information Literacy Tutorial on WebCT which all of the students in English 101 sections completed. This tutorial focused on the competencies written by Association of Colleges and Research Libraries. Each module of the tutorial was assessed by a quiz in WebCT and an exercise handout that the librarian graded. This tutorial was revised in Fall, 2006, to make it shorter, more focused on basic skills, and more manageable for the librarian and the faculty.

The students in English 101 come to the library for two sessions for a hands-on instructional session and an entertaining assessment tool, the “Information Literacy Jeopardy Challenge.” All instructional sessions introduce students to a librarian so that they will know they can come and get individual research assistance in the library. Another research aid, developed in 2006-2007, is the mini-tutorials under the heading “How Do I?” on the library homepage. These are taken from the freshman information literacy tutorial to serve as aids to all students in doing research.

For use by faculty the library subscribes to Turnitin.com, an anti-plagiarism service for detecting plagiarized passages in students’ papers. There is a new link on the faculty services page on the Library Homepage for “Library Assignments / Research Paper Alternatives,” a list of alternatives to research papers that focus on information literacy outcomes. Librarians have given presentation to faculty in various de-
partments to update them on the growing electronic resources that the library is acquiring and acquaint them with information literacy standards and the library’s initiatives. These efforts have been successful, but more are needed.

At Carson-Newman, the library and the English Department have focused on information literacy with the primary push in the freshman year. The librarians found from information literacy quizzes given to seniors in several academic departments in 2006 and 2007, that present efforts are not enough if we want to prepare students for the current job market and for life long learning. Rockman states that “just as an athlete needs sustained conditioning and practice before the big game and a musician needs to rehearse before a major performance, a student needs multiple experiences to practice and hone information literacy skills before graduating and pursuing advanced study or entering the workplace” (16). The Wingspread Group on Higher Education has stated that although information literacy skills can be learned by students, they “must be taught and practiced, not merely absorbed as a result of unplanned academic experience” (Rockman 13).

In addition to the instruction that librarians do at the request of instructors for specific courses, the librarians are proposing a “laddered” information literacy curriculum that is embedded in the first-year Introduction to Liberal Arts course, in C-N 101, and in English 101. Information literacy is reemphasized through library instructional sessions and assignments that incorporate research and use of research resources in the introductory level of courses in all majors, in major classes with research emphasis, and in the capstone course of the majors. In these capstone courses seniors will be tested for information literacy competency.

Librarians are just one factor of the information literacy equation, however. The teaching faculty makes up the other factor. The librarians seek to collaborate with the teaching faculty to help embed information literacy in the course syllabus, learning outcomes, assignments, and assessment. To achieve maximum success, the teaching faculty must be involved in this effort. Information literacy cannot be taught in a vacuum. Students need to recognize the importance and value of information literacy, and this can only be achieved by repetition throughout the curriculum. Through assignments developed with input from librarians, faculty can make information literacy relevant. Only then will students incorporate information literacy into their knowledge base and values.

Information literacy will not go away because the information explosion is escalating and changing the way information is accessed. Its importance to individuals in their daily lives and to the market place of tomorrow will only increase. Carson-Newman has long been known for
its strong academic program. For the students educated at Carson-Newman, it is important that the college faculty embrace the cultural and societal impact that the new information age is having on every day life. Students may come to the Carson-Newman College techno savvy, but the librarians’ hope is that they graduate from this great school as information literate citizens.
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Genealogies: Footprints of God’s Grace, Judgment, and Faithfulness in the Matthean Soil

David E. Crutchley

Thursday evening May 25, 2006, I sat in the loft of the world famous Mariinsky Theater in St. Petersburg. This cultural capital of Russia that offered Dostoevsky’s *Crime and Punishment* was also home to several centuries of ballet almost as old as the city itself. I clearly remember the sense of anticipation that evening as I absorbed the ambience of the theater while waiting on the opening scene of *Don Quixote*. From the moment the curtains lifted, the exquisite colors of the décor and costumes merged with passionate music and breathtaking dance, inviting the spectator to participate in the story.

Reading the opening scenes of the four Gospels one encounters a collage of stunning diversity and persuasion. The first words of the Fourth Gospel ―in the beginning‖ echo the first words of the “book of beginnings” in the Hebrew bible—the moment when Yahweh framed the universe in time and space, brooded over the primordial deep, and threw down the bricks and mortar that shaped the cosmos. The Gospel of John, however, reaches back in the prologue beyond creation to eternity: a realm of temporality that escapes our human comprehension. There Logos and Theos co-exist in fellowship.

The Gospel of Mark differs and commences with an Elijah-like figure. John the Baptist strides through the Judean wilderness and River Jordan as a colossus preaching a message and offering a baptism of repentance that confronts the spiritual lethargy of the Jewish nation. The Gospel of Luke rolls back the curtain with the Zechariah and Elizabeth saga and in the third chapter the Evangelist introduces a record that situates his genealogy at the universal crossroads tracing Jesus’ “roots” back to Adam. On the other hand, the Gospel of Matthew offers a Jewish imprimatur as the gospel writer assembles the predicted Messiah, David, and Abraham in the opening words of a seventeen-verse genealogy.

Too often the gospel genealogies are overlooked or unfairly caricatured as collections of unpronounceable names that offer little in the
way of excitement. In fact, some contend they live up to their reputation and are as dry as dust. Michael Green makes the pertinent observation, “What an amazing way to start a Gospel—with a great long list of names!”1 Douglas Hare agrees that “it was of course appropriate to begin a biography with a statement concerning the subject’s family background, but why start with a genealogy of forty generations?”2 The clue is located in the opening verse of the gospel. Jesus is the subject of this gospel and his identity and person are inextricably linked with God, the Father, who orchestrates Israel’s history.3 Rudolf Schnackenburg reminds us that “the genealogy of Jesus Christ here, however, serves not a historical but a theological purpose.”4 Eugene Boring confirms those sentiments and claims that “the genealogy is not the result of a biographical effort to discover genealogical data, but a literary-theological construction by Matthew himself.”5 The brief of this article is to examine the serendipities in the Matthean genealogy and to demonstrate that ancestral records provide fertile soil for theological reflection.

Before venturing out on this task one needs to consider the social function and import of the genealogy in the ancient world. John Nolland explains the significance, purpose, and custom of these records: “Genealogies established individual identity; reflected, established, or legitimated social structures, status, and entitlements to office; functioned as modes of praise or delineations of character or even as [a]

---


basis of exhortation.” The rich and famous that walked the cobbled streets of Jerusalem and Rome placed great emphasis on their lineage. In Palestine, genealogies were a matter of public record and secured by the Sanhedrin. Rabbi Hillel boasted of his connection with King David, the historian Josephus flaunted his pedigree in the first pages of his autobiography, and, according to Julius Africanus, Herod the Great, embarrassed by his Idumean heritage, ordered the genealogical records in Jerusalem removed and destroyed.

The Old Testament and New Testament utilize records of ancestors. Genesis employs two extended genealogies. The first is located in chapter five and traces humankind from creation to the flood; the second in chapter ten delineates the demographic map of the world around Noah’s three sons and reflects the multiplication of nations as the fulfillment of creation. Two of the Gospels have carefully crafted genealogies.

The Matthean genealogy is artfully eloquent and follows the protocols of literary etiquette established by the Roman rhetorician Quintilian. He taught that “before the life of a man there should come his fa-

---


7 Josephus, *Vita*.1. Josephus boasts, “The family from which I am derived is not an ignoble one, but hath descended all along from the priests...Now, I am not only sprung from a sacerdotal family in general, but from the first of twenty-four courses...I am of the chief family of that first course also, nay, further, by my mother I am of royal blood” (*The Works of Josephus*, trans. William Whiston [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1987]).

8 Eusebius. *H.E*.i.7. 13 claims that “Herod, because of the family of the Israelites contributed nothing to him, and because he was goaded by his own consciousness of his base birth, burned the records of their families, thinking to appear noble if no one else was able by public documents to trace his family to the particular proselytes, or to the so-called gers of mixed descent” (*The Ecclesiastical History*, trans. Kirsopp Lake, 2 vols. [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1949]).
therland, parents, and ancestors.”9 Further editorial clues appear with the arrangement of the seventeen verses in the opening chapter into three groups of fourteen names. Alfred Plummer notes “the fondness of the Evangelist for numerical groups, and especially for triplets.”10 The precise reason for fourteen names in each set eludes resolution. Several scholars support the view that the number fourteen accords with the numerical value (gematria) of the Hebrew name for David, dwd (four and six and four). Ulrich Luz speculates that the number fourteen adopted for each period of the genealogy may mirror half the lunar month and signifies the waning and waxing of Israel’s history. Alternatively the number may reference the apocalyptic divisions of world history (1 Enoch 93:91 and 2 Baruch 53-74).11 The genealogy is also selective and structured around three “knots”—three epochs in Israel’s history: the ascent from Abraham to David, the descent from Solomon to the Exile, and the ascent from Exile to the coming of Jesus.

The intent of the genealogy is framed in Heilsgeschichte, a tapestry of salvation history. David Garland remarks that the genealogy is “far from being an archive of Jesus’ ancestors” or mere disclosure “that Jesus belongs to the legitimate line of the kings of Israel” but rather “it reveals that his roots go deep into Israel’s sacred history.”12 Similarly, Eduard Schweizer claims that the inclusio of David and Abraham (vv. 1, 17) “define the stress of the genealogy . . . and it is implied that the

9Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria III. 3. The rhetorician states that “the praise of men has more variety in it; and is first distinguished by the time that preceded their birth, the time of their life, and what happened after their death. Country, parents, ancestors preceded their birth, which may be considered two ways: if noble, they have equaled the glory of their progenitors; if otherwise, they have dignified the obscurity of their birth by the luster of their actions” (Farmington Hills, MI: Thomson Gale, 2003).


story of Jesus to be told in what follows, is not merely the genetic but the logical outcome of God’s history."

Each one of the three divisions and contours of the genealogy confront the reader with a surprise. The irregular and extraordinary feature encountered in the first series of fourteen generations is the conspicuous presence of four women—Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and Bathsheba. Women were not usually cited in Jewish genealogies. The Jewish world was ideologically androcentric, a man’s world, and the appearance of these four women seems bizarre. Living under the shadow of a husband or father, a Jewish woman could not inherit property, nor give evidence in a court of law, and her role outside the home circumscribed.

A further question that begs for resolution is, “Why these ancestral mothers and not the renowned matriarchs of Israel, namely, Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, and Leah?” The four women lodged in this record have the taint of scandal about them and hardly qualify as relatives one would advertise as belonging to the family tree. Widowed, vulnerable, and without the possibility of Levirate marriage Tamar poses as a prostitute and seduces her father-in-law Judah at the side of the road as he is on his way to a sheep convention. She conceives and bears two sons (Genesis 38). Rahab does not pose as a prostitute; she is one. At considerable risk to herself she hides the two Hebrew spies under the stalks of flax on the roof of her house (Joshua 2). Ruth, the Moabitess, journeys to Judah with her embittered mother-in-law Naomi and in the ensuing days aggressively courts Boaz “uncovering his feet at the threshing floor.” (Ruth 3:7-14) Almost blushing, the evangelist lists Bathsheba in the genealogy as the “wife of Uriah” indicating clearly that she was not the legitimate wife of King David. One can imagine the sordid and tawdry account of David’s adultery and murder of his faithful bodyguard blazoned across the Jerusalem Times. His later repentance and acknowledgement that “he is the man” when confronted by God’s mouthpiece, Nathan the prophet, does not diminish the shame of the scarlet woman, Bathsheba (2 Samuel 11-12).

Adding to the questionable moral trysts is the fact that all four women are aliens and nonJews: Tamar a Canaanite, Rahab a Jerichoite, Ruth a Moabitess, and Bathsheba a Hittite through marriage to Uriah. The skeletons are now out of the closet and one returns to the original questions. What is the Evangelist thinking when he includes four women in a Jewish genealogy and why this particular group hardly known

---

for their moral propriety? Robert Mounce remarks that “if one searched the Old Testament for a more unlikely group of candidates for a messianic lineage, it is doubtful one could come up with a more questionable group.”

Does the answer reside in the opening phrase of the Gospel of Matthew? Is Matthew perhaps suggesting in his genealogy the dawn of a new Genesis. The evocative phrase that opens the genealogy biblos geneseos (Matt. 1:1), the “book of the genesis of Jesus Christ echoes the Septuagint “the book of the genesis of heaven and earth” (Gen. 2:4) and “the book of the genesis of Adam or human beings” (Gen. 5:1). The Greek word genesis yields several meanings: the notion of a “story, account, and history” or the idea of “birth, origin, existence, and source.” Leon Morris translates the word “the book of the story of Jesus Christ,” Theodore Zahn as the “Book of the History of Jesus Christ,” and F. W. Beare as the “Story of the New Creation.” On the other hand, Ulrich Luz prefers the genealogical sense of “Register of the Origin” of Jesus Christ” and Theodore Robinson “the Birth-roll of Jesus Christ”

The Evangelist seems to suggest from the outset that God’s salvation history plan with the first Adam is fulfilled and now the Second Adam appears bringing with him a new creation and new beginning? Davies and Allison contend that the title of the first book of the Old Testament in the Septuagint had been settled as ‘Genesis’ by the time of Matthew and its readers would have read the opening phrase in the gospel thinking of the Torah’s first book and “anticipate that some sort of ‘new genesis,’ a genesis of Jesus Christ, would follow.”

---


16 Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 103 -104.


suggests that we stand at the edge of a new Genesis, a new frontier, and new covenant. Douglas Hare posits that borrowing from the language of Hollywood, “the first Gospel could be billed as ‘Genesis II, the Sequel.’”

The signature of grace is written across the scandal of the women in the Matthean genealogy. Suzanne de Dietrich cautions us that each of these women exercised faith in the covenant but “their names remind us also that the Covenant is a Covenant of grace.” The Immanuel of Matthew ushers in a Kingdom of God that prides itself on forgiveness, mercy, openness, and inclusiveness. The new Genesis provides redemptive hope and possibility of new birth. No human heart stands beyond the pale of God’s forgiveness. Martin Luther reminds us that “Christ is the kind of person who is not ashamed of sinners in fact he even puts them in his family tree.”

The grace and dignity Jesus bequeathed to women of his day is well attested, from holding a tender and riveting colloquy at the surround of Jacob’s well in the noon day heat with a Samaritan outcast to the acceptance of Mary’s provocative “burial” anointing of his feet with expensive perfume. Ivor Jones claims that “the gospel incorporates the blemishes and disasters, the righteous and the unrighteous, in the line of Jesus Christ in whom God...”

New Testament Commentaries (Penguin Books: London, 1963), 36. Davies and Allison endorse Fenton’s position that this phrase is “telescopic” and “can be extended to include ...the genealogy...the account of the birth of Jesus... ‘history,’ or ‘life-story’... and the whole new creation which begins at the conception of Jesus and will be completed at his second coming.”

19 Hare, Matthew, 7.

20 Suzanne de Dietrich, The Gospel according to Matthew, trans. Donald G. Miller. The Layman’s Bible Commentary (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1961), 16. See Luz, Matthew 1-7, 109-110. He questions this theme arguing that Jewish tradition exonerates Tamar as “more righteous” than Judah and she becomes a symbol of virtue to Philo, the prostitute Rahab models the proselyte and marries Joshua, Ruth remains unblemished, and David abuses his power and seduces Bathsheba.

began a new and surprising work” and “new beginnings are possible in the least likely of situations.”  

Jesus refused to countenance in his day the cultural walls of gender prejudice that remain in our century.

The new Genesis that recreates and restores the fallen human heart also dismantles ethnic prejudice. Salvation is for Jew and Greek and it is universal. The racial demons and reciprocal antipathy of Jew and Gentile are exorcised. Gentiles have been grafted into the Davidic line. Jesus’ lineage tracks back to Ruth the Moabitess. One who belongs to the despised race of Moab stemming out of Lot’s incest with his eldest daughter and a clan cursed for up to ten generations (Gen. 19:30-38). Paul Minear concludes that the presence of the women “provided impressive precedent for including gentiles and harlots within the church and for defending its polyglot membership as an authentic fulfillment of earlier tendencies.”  

Schweizer commends this thought and views the four “alien” women in the genealogy as prefiguring God’s activity capsulated in Jesus’ farewell mandate to the disciples on the mountain (20:19).

Krister Stendahl posits a different tack and explains this genealogical “aberration” as suggesting the mystery and enigma in God’s providence that will culminate in the “holy irregularity” of the Virgin Birth. Donald Hagner follows that approach and envisions the four women as prefiguring Mary “by calling attention to the abundant presence of both surprise and scandal in the Messiah’s lineage.”

The motif of scandal tracks through the life of Jesus. The “ambiguity” of his birth, the iconoclastic teaching by word and miracle that polarizes the

---


The second curiosity lodged in the next series of generations relates to the emendation of two names and the omission of two expected names. Hagner concedes that “omissions, variant spellings, and even variant names . . . may be expected in genealogies, with many of these alterations motivated theologically.”

It seems that Matthew changes the name of the fourth king Asa to the psalmist Asaph (1:7) and King Amon to the prophet Amos (1:10). He also omits three kings after Joram, Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah (1:8), and excludes Jehoiakim before Jehoiachin (1:11). How do we account for this editorial license and “tampering” with the well-known lists of the Judean kings? Bruner suggests that Matthew seeks to celebrate God’s mercy and grace in the first set of fourteen generations and communicates another trait of God’s character, namely, his justice, in the second set of fourteen.

Asaph is a psalmist of some renown (Psalms 50, 73-83) and Amos is the classic eighth-century social prophet. The psalmists elicited praise and doxology to God; the prophets held the nation morally and spiritually accountable to God’s plumb line. Bruner claims “Asaph and Amos spell, respectively psalmic ‘spiritual renewal’ and prophetic ‘spiritual social justice’... and together ... stand for all seers and prophets sent by God to snatch God’s people from either too much engagement with the world (then enter the spiritual psalmists) or too little engagement with the world (then enter the social prophets).”

Such license with names may concern us but Richard Gardner’s word is salutary: “Rarely, if ever, were genealogies compiled with the concern for biological precision and completeness that we look for in a

---

27Ibid., 8.


29Ibid., 12. John P. Meier prefers to read the inclusion of Asaph and Amos as representing the three parts of the Old Testament witness (*The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel* [New York: Crossroad, 1991], 53, f.n.15). On the other hand, Eduard Schweizer suggests that “Jesus fulfills the prophecies of both, the psalms and the prophets” in this literary “idiosyncrasy” (*The Good News according to Matthew*, 24).
family tree today.” Davies and Allison concur: “One should observe that the omission of names from a genealogy, for one purpose or another, including apparently, brevity, was common practice.”

Explanation of the omission of the three kings ranges from Matthean error and forgetfulness to expunging the memory of their evil deeds and violent deaths. Calvin counters quixotically: “We should pay no heed to those who say that this was done through forgetfulness, nor is the argument very probable that these were unworthy of inclusion in the genealogy of Christ. The same would apply to many others whom Matthew mixes indiscriminately with the godly and the holy. It is truer that as he wished to compile a list of fourteen kings he was not overly particular in making his selection.”

Bruner does not agree and holds to the position that the omission is deliberate and heightens the impending judgment of exile: “From the height of Israel’s political and spiritual glory under King David, Israel first gradually but then precipitously declines until she falls into the pit of exile, losing her land, temple, kings, and thus, seemingly, almost all of God’s promises.”

God is not a passive partner to covenant and will discipline his “child” (Hosea 11:1). Hosea graphically portrays the divine dilemma in the heart of God as his mercy and justice conflict over the rebellious son.

The third serendipity that occurs in the third set of generations concerns the two “fifths:” a fifth woman, Mary, mother of the Messiah, and a fifth omission – the absence of a fourteenth named father. The trajectory in this section of the genealogy moves forward and upward. The dramatic promise granted to a rugged patriarch two millennia earlier and the unconditional covenant with the second king of Israel is

---


31 Davies and Allison, Matthew 1-7,176.


33 Bruner, Matthew, 12.

34 Ibid., 7
realized in the womb of Mary. Through the chapters of Israel’s history that oscillate between prosperity under David to the travail of exile and foreign occupation, God continues to shape His story. When the house of David is buried in obscurity and the yoke of Roman political oppression heaviest, the forecasts of the prophet Isaiah materialize and “a root out of parched ground” (Isaiah 53:2) and “a shoot will spring from the stem of Jesse” (Isaiah 11:1). Yahweh has not absconded but kept faith with this renegade nation. God had promised a Messiah and he delivered. Mary stands as the adolescent peasant girl through whom the purposes of God will prevail.

Hagner submits that in the “literal translation ‘Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus,’ we encounter the biggest surprise in the genealogy” (1:16). The name Joseph signals a notable break in the genealogical pattern and a break in the course of history that suggests “God is about to do something new.” He is identified as the “husband of Mary” and not the father of Jesus and the attention shifts to his wife “from whom” (feminine relative pronoun) Jesus was born. In addition, the Greek egennethe represents syntactically a divine passive—the only passive among forty occurrences of the verb in the genealogy and suggests God’s initiative and active agency. The passive voice alerts “the reader to special activity on the part of God.” Nolland remarks that the disruption of pattern in the genealogy suggests that “Joseph seems to be being denied the normal role in procreation.” He is removed from the possibility of being the biological father of Jesus – which accords with the divine “paternity”—and instead he sits

---

35Hagner, Matthew 1-13, 12. Ivor Jones counters, however, that “the writer of the gospel is untroubled by the strange logic of this material” (The Gospel of Matthew, 3). For a discussion of the textual debate on 1:16 see Davies and Allison, Matthew 1-7, 183, f.n.71.

36Davies and Allison, Matthew 1-7, 1:184.


in the genealogy as the legal parent. Bruner attributes this “eleventh hour switch” to the fact that Jesus is a bona fide son of David by virtue of God’s giving of Jesus to Joseph as Jesus’ legal father. He continues, “If a virgin birth of a son of David is to be recorded, Jesus will have to be adopted, not generated, by a male descendant of David.” Gundry declares that “legal rights came through the father even though he was only a foster father.”

In conclusion, we have noted that the compass of the Matthean genealogy is Israel’s history and the needle is the Messiah. Floyd Filson reminds us that the “Gospel that ends with a world outlook (28: 19) … begins with a firm anchor in Israel’s national heritage and hopes, which find their fulfillment in Jesus Christ.” Hagner contends that “Matthew has in this opening pericope anticipated the fulfillment theme that is so prominent in the Gospel.” In fact, the fulfillment motif surfaces from the opening verse of the Gospel. This genealogy deviates from custom and begins with the last entry, Jesus Christ, instead of the first person to start the family. Matthew’s understanding is clear: Jesus is the denouement of God’s promises to Israel. Here is a Son of Abraham and David that eclipses all who precede him. John Meier offers the same perspective: “Tracing the genealogy of Jesus through the reigns of kings of Judah, Matthew shows the believer that, when you ‘add up’ the meaning of history, the ‘bottom line’ is Jesus Christ, the son of David.”

The genealogy underscores the breadth of God’s commitment to a people and ultimately his creation. God’s writ runs and his purposes play out in the maelstrom of history. David Hill states “the genealogy, as a whole, is an impressive witness to Matthew’s conviction that the coming of Jesus was no unpremeditated accident, but occurred in the fullness of time and in the providence of God, who overruled the gen-

40 Bruner, Matthew, 16.

41 Gundry, Matthew, 18.


43 Hagner, Matthew 1-13, 12.

44 Meier, The Vision of Matthew, 53.
erations to inaugurate in Jesus the time of fulfillment, a new beginning.\textsuperscript{45} The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; the God who anointed David and pledged an eternal kingdom; this “living God has been at work for many generations” and now “the Messiah gathers up this history of Israel with its times of greatness and of humiliation.”\textsuperscript{46}

Paul Minear captures the versatility and unpredictability of the divine enterprise in history and notes that “at every step” in the first two chapters of Matthew “there is an element of surprise, of innovation, but there is also an element of planned fulfillment.” He continues: “Expectations are in fact fulfilled, yet never in such a way as to enable participants to anticipate the place, the time, and the precise method of fulfillment.”\textsuperscript{47} Through the instrument of genealogy the Evangelist is able to demonstrate the predictable unpredictability of God in his governance of human history. Although “the message of the genealogy is plain: the whole of Israel’s history has been guided by God”\textsuperscript{48} Ernst Lohmeyer reminds us that “God’s way is often a detour through which his promise is nevertheless fulfilled.”\textsuperscript{49}

The Matthean genealogy signals that the God who drives history towards a consummation does not build roads that lead nowhere. In the opening scene of his drama Matthew surprises the reader with theological conundrums that yield rich freight and meaning. The God who walked across the Old Testament stage will in this kairos moment now spell out his purposes in Jesus Christ in a new language that Jew and Gentile may understand. But let the world be alert. For this is a God of surprise. This is a Messiah who walks on the earthly stage—”\textit{Quis et


\textsuperscript{46} Jones, \textit{The Gospel of Matthew}, 2-3.

\textsuperscript{47} Minear, \textit{Matthew}, 36.


unde”—“Who is he and where does he come from” and “Quo”—where is he going?"[^50]
Censorship and the Christian Liberal Arts College

Ernest D. Lee, Jr.

About twenty-five years ago, early in my teaching career, I included in the required readings for a world literature class the novel All Quiet on the Western Front, by Erich Maria Remarque. My students responded powerfully to the young narrator of the novel, Paul Baumer, and to Remarque's portrayal of lost innocence and the tragedy of war, as did I, but one particular passage early in the novel dramatically arrested my attention that semester. It has lived on to haunt and direct me through all my years of teaching. In the passage, Baumer, an innocent, young soldier in World War I, recalls his own teachers and realizes how terribly they had failed him and his generation: "For us lads of eighteen they ought to have been mediators and guides to the world of maturity, the world of work, of duty, of culture, of progress—to the future. We often made fun of them and played jokes on them, but in our hearts we trusted them" (12). He begins to see that his teachers were well meaning generally, but they acted "in a way that cost them nothing" (12). Now, in light of the realities he and his friends are facing, he concludes, "And that is why they let us down so badly" (12).

I sat in my office that day and vowed that I would do my best not to be one of those teachers who let students down so badly, that I would apply myself to being as true a "guide and mediator" to my students as possible. Having been a student in the Vietnam era, I identified with the young narrator, for I knew that many students of my generation had also been let down so badly. I began to understand that it was my responsibility to educate myself as richly as possible and to try to motivate students and help them learn how to explore complex issues and ideas, to make a commitment to a kind of intense teaching which would seek to help nurture them toward a true and sustaining humanity and moral integrity, and that doing such nurturing means I have to have the courage to look at the world realistically and be careful not to romanticize, sanitize, or otherwise distort the realities of the world, realities which literature and writing often explore boldly and powerfully.
A few years later, when I became a teacher and drama director at a small Christian liberal arts college in North Carolina, I knew that the task was particularly challenging, for many of my colleagues, students, parents and various constituencies of the college had mistakenly come to believe that the role of a teacher at such an institution is to offer readings and studies which look at only the good and the beautiful or which deal only with joy and happiness or which support a comfortable philosophy, that there is no room for harsher realities at a Christian institution.

I was amazed to hear some parents talking about sending their students to a private Christian liberal arts college so that their sons and daughters would not have any "new ideas being put in their heads" which would question or challenge what they had been hearing at home. And even more disturbing, I was encountering a number of teachers who seemed to have withdrawn into a safe zone where they avoided any controversial subject matter or realistic readings that might upset a student or parent. I was sometimes warned by some of my more timid colleagues that I should not select plays for production on campus which address issues that could "get me in trouble," such as those plays dealing with issues related to race, sex, violence, and so forth.

Not all of my colleagues were so timid, to be sure, but I did find too much fear among some teachers and administrators, and I think that they were underestimating their students and the power of truth and faith, and they were not aware that freedom to know and to choose is vital to the Christian state of being. Of course, I was aware that it was part of my responsibility to be sensitive to the backgrounds and beliefs of my students and our community and to the mission and persona of the college. I had no desire to use my teaching for the sake of some kind of egotistical or adolescent rebellion. But I also knew that if I really believed what I professed to believe and if I was to act as a true Christian and liberal arts teacher, I must have the courage to face difficult issues and challenge my students to grapple with these issues and to temper and strengthen their own Christian beliefs and values. I must not avoid a powerful work of literature because it has some unpleasant images or harsh language or imposing theme. In fact, such works must be included, for it is vital that Christian students not be sheltered, and free inquiry is essential to the liberal arts college mission. The key, I came to understand, is not to avoid these difficult matters but rather to assume the role of a true mediator and guide, to show my students how to address these works without being afraid.

When I was a freshman in college, I took a course in art appreciation. As we began to look at modern abstract works of art, such as those by Pablo Picasso and Jackson Pollock, we became defensive. My
roommate, when pressed by the art professor to attempt to explain what one of these works meant, blurted out, “I know what I like, and I don’t like this, OK!” The young art teacher responded, "No, that is incorrect. You like what you know, and you don’t know that yet." I never forgot his remark, and I came to understand that great teaching helps us know how to appreciate what is before us. The problem with many of my students, and a number of their parents and teachers, is that they mistakenly believe that as Christians you simply avoid controversy, or anything that you don’t like or that makes you uncomfortable. For them, being a good Christian means to avoid any literary work with a "cuss word" or which addresses controversial issues.

As my own studies continued, I became even more aware of my responsibilities from a Christian perspective through my studies of the great seventeenth-century poet and theologian John Milton, particularly addressed in his prose tract *Areopagitica* and his great Christian epic poems *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*. Milton was facing a great threat to him, other writers, and the nation in general. Officials in the church and in the government were taking it upon themselves to determine what books could be printed and distributed to the public; they were seeking to restrict and censor all matters of printed works that questioned or threatened their particular views. The effect of a new law in England, passed in 1643, was to give Archbishop Laud, who was also Chancellor of the University of Oxford, control of every press in the country. In other words, the church in league with the government, under the control of a few men, would allow only those printings that they deemed appropriate. Milton understood the grave dangers of such restrictions, and in 1644 he published his prose piece entitled *Areopagitica* in which he undertakes to argue against the new law.

Milton begins his argument by warning that when one seeks to destroy a book, he in a sense not only kills the person who wrote it but also reason itself, and "we see a kind of homicide may be thus committed, sometimes a martyrdom; and if it extends to the whole impression, a kind of massacre . . ." (720). Milton points out that the great cultures of the world have developed by avoiding such censorship, and he then addresses the issue specifically from his Christian point of view, arguing that God choose to give human beings freedom by leaving "arbitrary the dieting and repasting of our minds; as wherein every mature man might have to exercise his own leading capacity" (727). He further argues that we have the God-given capacity to choose between good and evil and that, in fact, we can know goodness only by knowing evil, for the knowledge of good is so interwoven with the knowledge of evil that it is "an incessant labor to cull out and sort asunder . . ." (728). In short, it is the very state of human beings, Milton contends, that we
cannot choose and have true being without seeking to know both sides of an issue in all of its complexity. He suggests, then, that we can be Christians only through informed choosing, as Christ did in the wilderness and as we must all do according to God’s will and divine plan. Milton’s key point is this: "He that can apprehend and consider vice with all her baits and seeming pleasures, and yet abstain, and yet distinguish, and yet prefer that which is truly better, he is the true wayfaring Christian" (728). It is Milton’s explicit argument that a Christian who hides from the realities of the world and avoids the challenges of knowing and choosing has no real claim to being a Christian, but rather becomes a kind of artificial puppet following a prescribed course. He asserts, "Assuredly we bring not innocence into the world, we bring impurity much rather: that which purifies us is trial, and trial is by what in contrary" (728).

Milton’s contention is that freedom to choose is what ultimately defines us as Christians. We must, he continues, exercise our faith and knowledge by considering all matters of thought and expression, for truth relies on such exercise, for "if her waters flow not in a perpetual progression, they sicken into a muddy pool of conformity and tradition" (739). If we accept that a few empowered individuals can determine what we are allowed to read or study, then "what a fine conformity would it starch us all into!" (740). We must understand that diversity of opinions is vital to knowledge itself: "Where there is much desire to learn, there of necessity will be much arguing, much writing, many opinions: for opinion in good men is but knowledge in the making" (743). We must, he continues, be generous in our prudence and show forbearance to one another and "join into one general and brotherly search after truth" (744). He proclaims, "Give me liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely above all liberties" (746), and he assures his readers that truth "needs no policies, nor strategems, nor licensings to make her victorious—those are the shifts and defenses that error uses against her power" (747).

In his Apology for Poetry another great writer of the English Renaissance, Sir Philip Sidney, makes a strong case for the power of art and literature to help guide and nurture us in our pursuit of faith and knowledge. Sidney, responding in part to Plato’s rejection of poets from the state as expressed in The Republic, suggests that great literature both delights and instructs us. His idea is that literature has the potential to enrich our emotional lives, expand our minds and spirits, and inform us about our knowledge and spirituality. His notion of the didactic power of literature helped promote the idea that literature and the arts are vital and can elevate us, an idea which some Puritans began to reject with the closing of the theaters in London later in the seven-
teenth century. The great Christian humanists of the Renaissance embraced the flowering of language and the arts as a way offering glory to God and as a way of refining and perfecting ourselves as Christians. All of these writers were guided by what the Roman poet Horace stressed about joining the good and the beautiful together, embodied in the Latin phrase dulce et utile. Thus, a long tradition had developed which presented literature as morally significant and essential to our humanity.

Yet always literature has been under attack, and attempts to censor and restrict have been with us from Plato’s day to our own times. The Online Books Page at the University of Pennsylvania lists all types of classic books that have been censored, particularly in our own day, including such works as Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales, Melville’s Moby Dick, and Twain’s Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn. These attempts to censor and restrict occur throughout the civilized world and are happening daily in schools, churches, colleges, and universities across the United States. Such groups as The National Coalition against Censorship and Pen (an international group of writers) continually protest the routine censorship of literary passages which refer to issues of race, religion, ethnicity, and other "sensitive" subjects which various religious and governmental groups consider undesirable or threatening to their ideas or causes.

The noted writer and culturalist Edward Said, among others, has addressed these issues powerfully and gracefully, warning that if we allow such censorship and control, all we will have is only dogmatism. In his article "Literature and Literalism" Said rightly asserts, "Yet there can be no civilized society in which the life of the mind is ruled dogmatically by laws of what is forbidden and what cannot be read" (3). He stresses that this is especially true for colleges and universities "where it is precisely the role (and the rule) of academic training to teach the young that the mind has capacities for investigation, criticism and inquiry that it would be a crime to stifle, abridge or forbid" (3). Said poses the vital question, asking "who is going to control the controller, who sits in authority over him, who regulates who the most suitable person is for deciding what the young should or should not read (3). He warns that for years now "a vociferous American lobby has tried to bully schools and universities to eliminate books considered "immoral" on grounds that they do not seem to conform to religious dogma or that they are not anti-communist enough" (4), and he points out that these attempts at censorship occur throughout the Islamic, Jewish, and Christian worlds. He concludes, "The only answer to this is not to retreat in cowardice but to open these issues to frank and courageous debate"(4).
If we look clearly at the history of regimes or groups that had attempted to censor books, restrict freethinking, and demand certain conformity we see that such attempts always fail; they degrade us and ultimately lead to a loss of empathy, a dangerous dogmatism, and a propensity for violence, hatred, and destruction. We have seen these dramas unfold in Nazi Germany, and in the Middle East, for example, and here in the United States we have seen the effects of attempts to restrict voices and the expansion of knowledge and culture among such groups as African Americans and Native Americans. Often various churches, schools, private groups and organizations, and even our own governmental officials have readily participated in attempts to restrict readings and stifle or control learning on "moral" grounds. Now, at a time when we most need to understand our Islamic neighbors, many schools and colleges have attempted to ban books dealing with Islamic culture and various sacred and philosophical works from Islamic tradition. Can such restrictions ultimately lead to good and help us live in respect and harmony?

What then, must we do as teachers at Christian liberal arts colleges? We must have the courage and faith to explore, to question, to be willing to consider ideas boldly and openly, even those ideas that make us uncomfortable or challenge us. Otherwise, we will let our students down so badly. We must strive to be true mediators and guides to the world of culture and maturity and religious beliefs and faiths. Admittedly, there are gray areas here. How do we determine what readings we will assign and how can we present controversial materials to our students while honoring the traditions and missions of our colleges?

As part of the prewriting work for an assignment in my freshmen writing classes, I ask each student to identify and analyze the audience he or she plans to address. I stress that a writer must carefully consider the audience in order to make the best decisions about the kinds of language he or she will use to reach the intended audience. I also stress that an effective writer both respects and challenges his or her audience and attempts to take the audience to a higher level of thought and involvement. I follow this same principle as I choose readings and films for my classes, as I think any teacher at a liberal arts college should do. In choosing readings for classes, for example, it is essential that the teacher respect the backgrounds and beliefs of the students, to be deeply thoughtful about the works selected and how these works may affect the students. When I select an important literary work that I know has language, images, or thematic content which I sense may seem offensive or threatening to some of the students, I am careful to prepare my students and acknowledge that the reading may seem disturbing, confusing, or even offensive. I ask them to consider carefully the function
of language or images within the contexts of the work. I explain, for example, that a character in a William Faulkner short story may use offensive language or behave in disturbing and violent ways, but I ask the students to consider Faulkner’s purpose, to discuss how the passage affects them and why Faulkner may have presented the character in such a manner and to appreciate the historical and textual context of the piece. I challenge them to discuss these ideas and try to reach a consensus about how to interpret and appreciate what the passage has to offer. I explain that a student, even a devoutly Christian student, should not be afraid to read the passage but must have the courage to attempt to interpret and discern what the rich implications of the passage are for Faulkner’s readers. This does not mean that the students approve of the harsh language or actions, but rather that they be able to approach the work critically and learn how to read and interpret from a variety of critical approaches and perspectives. Hopefully, the students will gain confidence and become true, mature readers who appreciate the complexity and richness of the literary selection and apply the insights they gain to help them become richer, more insightful thinkers. Free inquiry, open debate, respect for diverse opinions and backgrounds—these are essential to the liberal arts college classroom.

The teacher, then, must be flexible and avoid defensiveness or bias toward students. It is not the role of the teacher to force a particular agenda or indoctrinate students dogmatically but rather to help the students learn how to know more about how to read and think and to appreciate and celebrate the dynamic nature of knowledge and belief and become engaged in the pursuit of truth. Being able to read and think freely allows students to see themselves, other peoples, societies, and traditions in the best light. We must be careful not to reduce our readings and discussions to only “nice” readings that do not challenge us. To see all sides truly does enhance us. As Edward Said asserts in his excellent book *Culture and Imperialism*, "What a sobering and inspiring thing it is, therefore, not just to read one’s own side, as it were" because "we tend often to forget that the world is a crowded place, and that if everyone were to insist on the radical purity or priority of one’s own voice, all we would have would be the awful din of unending strife . . . (xxi).
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The Autism “Epidemic”

Sandra Long

The face on the billboard avoids looking at its audience. It is the face of a young boy, about ten years old and very blonde, looking down, sad, and confused. The message is in large letters to his left, “Every twenty minutes a child is diagnosed with autism.” This billboard can be found along Highway 11-E near Strawberry Plains as well as countless other places across the country. Rock stars on MTV are asking for our help in dealing with the “epidemic” of autism. Print, radio, and television public service announcements all carry the same message: one in every 150 children now has autism, and we need to help these unfortunate children and their parents (Autism Speaks). Seemingly, out of nowhere this once rare disorder now demands our attention. Where on earth did this all come from? And why does it make some of us so uncomfortable?

Descriptions of children with behaviors that we would now call “autistic” have been around at least since 1800, when Jean Itard described the Wild Boy of Aveyron (Williams, 2000). The boy who came to be known as Victor was found wandering in the forest near Saint Sernin in southern France at the turn of the 19th century. He could not speak, behaved violently, and was scarred as though he had been abandoned in the woods for some time. He was thought to be about twelve years old at the time and was given the name Victor after the leading character in a popular play of the day. Victor’s care was turned over to Itard who ran a school for deaf-mutes. Although he worked hard for years to teach Victor to speak and to “civilize” him, he made little progress. Itard considered his work with Victor to be a failure, although the notes he made of his observations over the years are still studied today. Victor died in a Paris institute at the age of forty.

It was not until the 1940s when, working independently, Leo Kanner and Hans Asperger borrowed the term “autism” from Eugen Bleuler to describe the children that they were studying (Williams, 2000; Autism FAQ; AMA Autism History). Bleuler, who had coined the word “autism” from the Greek word “autos” meaning self, used the term to describe a particular subset of schizophrenics who had withdrawn from the outside world to an extreme degree. Children with autism were de-
scribed as lacking the ability to interact with others and to have repetitive and nonfunctional behaviors. Kanner’s children also exhibited marked deficits in, or the total absence of, speech and language. The children that Asperger described (in German and a year after Kanner) were quite similar to those that Kanner described, but his children appeared to have a higher cognitive ability and more typical language development.

Kanner theorized that there was a biological basis for the disorder; yet, autism became prey to the psychodynamic movement popular in the mid-20th century (Autism FAQ). It was thought that parents, primarily mothers, caused autism by withholding warmth and affection from their children. Bruno Bettelheim became famous largely in part for his work with children with autism (Williams, 2000). His belief that “refrigerator mothers” were to blame for autism was the prevailing popular theory for years before mercifully being fully discredited. The children were often removed from their homes and provided psychotherapy in an effort to cure them. It did not work.

It is difficult to say exactly what autism is. This fact is extremely disconcerting now that we throw around the diagnosis as though it were the common cold. Autism is the term used to describe a complex disorder characterized by repetitive behaviors, language deficits, and problems with reciprocal social interactions (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) is the broader term used to describe children with autistic-like behaviors who may be higher functioning and may have more fully developed language skills. The diagnosis of autism or ASD is made by the clinical judgment of trained personnel, usually licensed psychologists, psychiatrists, or pediatricians. At this time there are no biological or genetic markers for the spectrum of disorders that fall under the term autism (Muhle R., Trentacoste S. V., & Rapin I., 2004; CDC 1). One trained person may call a child autistic while another does not. Still, most experts would agree most of the time.

In the 1950s the prevalence rate for autism was estimated at 1 in 10,000 (Autism FAQ). By 1990, when the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (the special education legislation in the U. S.) first recognized autism, the high estimate was 1 in 2,000 (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). The release in early 2007, of the surveillance summary by the Center for Disease Control (CDC) brought the number to 1 in 150 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007), an astonishing figure by all accounts. The central question then is whether more children have autism or we simply are diagnosing more children with autism. A vast difference and no simple answers exist. Let’s take a close look at the CDC report in order to gain some perspective.
The CDC first conducted prevalence studies at six sites across the U.S. in 2000 then extended the study to fourteen sites in 2002 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007). The sites were selected not by how well they represented U.S. demographics, but by the ability of partnering agencies to conduct the study (CDC 3 & 15). The original six sites were the metro areas around Atlanta, Newark, Baltimore, and Phoenix, twenty-three counties around the Medical University of South Carolina, and a statewide study conducted out of Marshall University in West Virginia (CDC 3). Epidemiologists in Atlanta (where CDC is located) and Newark had worked together on autism research previously (CDC 2). The eight sites added in 2002 included thirty-two counties in Alabama, statewide Arkansas, eight central counties in North Carolina, Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania, and the metro areas of Denver, St. Louis, Salt Lake City, and Milwaukee (CDC 13).

Trained analysts at these sites screened records for children born in either 1992 or 1994 (making the child eight years old) (CDC 4 & 15). The records came from public school special education reports and public health clinics. Trained clinician reviewers abstracted information regarding the child’s exceptionality category, verbatim descriptions of behaviors associated with autism, psychometric test results, developmental history, and evaluation summaries. Abstractor staff then coded the information and “scored” statements of developmental concern, behavior regression, or plateaus in skill development. Nearly 60,000 records were reviewed, 11,000 of which were abstracted for further review; and, of those, 5324 were reviewed specifically for autism (CDC 18). Overall inter-rater reliability was in the respectable 80 to 90% range (CDC 4).

The results of this records review were that more children than ever were identified as autistic. Again, the rate now used is one in every 150 children. That is what the CEC study suggests, but closer examination shows how variable the results were from site to site. The variability makes for some interesting findings.

In 2000, the rate in West Virginia (remember a state-wide study) was 4.5 per 1,000 children whereas in New Jersey (metro Newark to be exact) the rate was more than double at 9.9 per 1,000 (CDC 6). The other sites varied between 5.5 and 6.5 per 1,000 (CDC 6). In the larger 2002 study, rates varied from a low of 3.3 per 1,000 in Alabama (a state-wide study) to more than triple that at 10.6 per 1,000, again in metro Newark (CDC 18). In that fourteen-site study, the rates were spread evenly across the range, but both the mean and median rates were between 6.5 and 6.6 per 1,000 (CDC 18).

This variability raises interesting questions. Are there really that many children with autism in New Jersey? Is there something about
being southern children that protects them from the diagnosis? Not surprisingly, at all sites there was significantly higher prevalence for males than females. In the 2002 study, one in 200 eight-year-old boys in Alabama was diagnosed autistic, whereas one in sixty in Newark was so diagnosed. Overall, the male to female ratio ranged from 3.4:1 to 6.5:1 (CDC 19). Being Caucasian also increases the likelihood that a child will be diagnosed with autism. In all sites except Alabama, whites had the highest rate of autism followed by Blacks then Hispanics. In Alabama the rate for Anglo and African Americans were 3.3 and 3.4 respectively (CDC 18).

The proportion of children with autism who also had cognitive impairment (IQ score < 70) ranged from 33.1% in Utah to 58.2% in South Carolina with a mean of 44.6% of children with autism also functioning in the retarded range (CDC 20). This means that the number of children with autism and mental retardation has decreased significantly over the past few years. In 1994, the DSM-IV reported that 75% of children with autism functioned in the retarded range, most often in the moderate (IQ between 30 and 50) range (American Psychiatric Association, 1994).

This wide variability in rates across geography, race, and comorbidity is most likely the result of the difficulty in diagnosing the disorder. The criteria used by CDC are not entirely satisfactory. What they did, they did well; but reading reports is not a great way to establish the existence of a complex disorder. In best practice, public school psychologists use a team of experts in making the diagnosis. Speech pathologists, pediatricians, and occupational and physical therapists are all involved. In preparing their report and recommendations, they interview parents and teachers, conduct observations in the classroom, and administer psychological assessments to the child.

Best practice, however, is not always followed. The information that goes into a report is only as good as the clinician who puts it there. Another flaw in this method is that the information gets taken out of context. CDC staff could tag the child “autistic” if autistic like behaviors were part of the reports. Those behaviors are seen in many individuals, if one goes looking for them. Resistance to making eye contact, poor social interactions, a preference for solitary play, and non-functional and repetitive behaviors are hallmarks of autisms. Yet, not every child who exhibits some of these behaviors should be labeled. The intensity, duration, and implications of the behaviors have to be considered.

A diagnosis of autism should not be the result of where one lives, who the assessor is, or which criterion is used. Recent population surveys in Finland (Mattila M., Kielinen M., Jussilak, et al., 2007) and
Norway (Posserd M. G., Lundenvold A. J., & Gillberg C., 2006), using a different but equally valid assessment instrument, found rates closer to one in 400, rather than one in 150. Clinicians rightly fear that children with borderline IQs or mental retardation are now more likely to be called “autistic” because it is a more acceptable term than “slow” or “retarded.” Black children and children living in rural areas are more likely to continue being called mentally retarded.

Being hyper-vigilant about autism will produce some good. More research monies will be available, more children with language delays will be helped earlier, and sharper focus will be given to teaching children appropriate social skills rather than punishing inappropriate ones. Parents will be taught to recognize behavioral developmental milestones such as smiling, responding to the child’s name, and using language. Those children who appear to be lagging behind in social, behavioral, and physical development will begin receiving earlier intervention.

Perhaps the hyper-vigilance will also lead to a solid answer to the question of whether mercury in vaccinations has led to the increase in the number of cases of autism. Despite significant findings to the contrary, almost 5,000 parents have filed a class action suit against GlaxoSmithKline and Eli Lilly alleging just that. The argument goes like this: A baby born in the 1940s would have received one vaccination around age five and there would have been an insignificant amount of mercury in that vaccine. A baby born in the 1990s, in contrast, received as many as seventeen vaccinations for up to ten different diseases in the first eighteen months of life (Safe Minds). The cumulative effect of the additional mercury is unknown but does surpass Federal Drug Administration guidelines (Kennedy R. F., 2006). These pharmaceutical giants have finally eliminated the use of the preservative thimerosal that contained mercury in vaccinations in the U. S. (Kennedy R. F., 2006). While there is a correlation between the increases in reported cases of autism and the time that American infants were subject to an expanded vaccination schedule, correlation cannot imply causation. There are many other correlates to autism.

One confounding variable is that the year 1990 was also when the autism category was added to IDEA, the funding source for special education in the U. S. Perhaps more children are simply being diagnosed, as society became more aware of and knowledgeable about autism. Advancing maternal and paternal age is also correlated with neurodevelopmental disorders. A large population study in Israel showed that offspring of men over the age of 40 were 5.75 times more likely to have ASD offspring (Reichenberg A., Gross R., Weiser M., et al., 2006). Higher socio-economic status has been significantly associated
with autism, especially autism without mental retardation (Wing L., 1980, Bhasin T. K., & Schendel D., 2007). Even a father’s occupation has been linked (Wheelwright S. & Baron-Cohen, 2001). Fathers and grandfathers of children with autism have been over-represented in the field of engineering (Baron-Cohen et al., 1997). While there is much concern about the pharmaceutical companies’ response to concerns about mercury in the vaccinations, including allegations of overt cover-ups of unflattering data (Kennedy RF, 2006), there have been well-constructed studies in the U. S. (Halseyn A. & Haymen S. L., 2001), Canada (Fombonne E., Zakarian R., Bennet A., et al., 2006), and Britain (Fombonne E. & Chakrabart S., 2001) that have not found reason to link the two. The court case promises to be long, drawn out, and very expensive for all parties.

An important downside to hyper-vigilance for autism is that labeling children stigmatizes them. Good diagnosticians never forget that a diagnosis forever casts a child in a certain light. When children are called autistic, people expect them to act “autistic.” Parents and teachers expect their language and social interactions to be thin and stilted; and the result, all too often, is that people interact with them less. Study after study has shown that teachers expect less of students who are labeled with any kind of disability and that, in turn, the students produce less work and work of a lower quality. The goal is to maintain high expectations while remaining realistic, a goal for teachers of children with or without disabilities.

In the past decade or so, a number of disability groups have sprung up asking that they be accepted as people as they are. Clinicians in the U. S. work on a deficit model. They compare the child with a disability to a “normal” child and try to help the disabled narrow the gap between the two and thus “cure” the problem. These new advocacy groups are saying “fuhgetaboutit.” We’re here. We’re deaf. We’re blind. We can’t walk. We can’t talk. We’re autistic. And, thank you very much, we are fine the way we are.

The Autism Acceptance Project at taaproject.com is a site to explore for those that want to know more about this movement. In it, one can read the comments of a mother who talks of the pain of having her son viewed as a “pathology rather than a human being.” She also talks about how gratifying it is that people who used to be called “emotionally disturbed” or “mentally retarded” are now being called “autistic,” a term that has now replaced the more negative labels that at one time were applied even by clinicians: idiot, moron, and imbecile. Labels easily become slurs.

Children with autism or any other disability are helped by behavior, speech, occupational, and physical therapies. Some are fortunate
enough to receive art and music “therapies,” as well. Regardless of the acceptability of the label, the specific needs of that individual must be met. If a higher prevalence rate produces a hyper-vigilance that helps the child receive therapy, then the CDC report will have served a good purpose. However, if the report only labels more children as “outside the norm,” then it will have done a great deal of harm. Time will tell.

References


Augustine and the Logic of Violence and Faith

Don H. Olive, Sr.

Within and without the Christian faith, violence against others continues in inquisitions, persecutions, tortures, and internecine religious warfare. Physical, psychological, and social violence abound. The carnage is as near as the latest news reports from Iraq and Afghanistan, the interrogation of detainees in the so-called war on terror, and various other violent aspects of American society. But violence is not merely out there. It also manifests itself frequently in “firings” in churches, schools, and other institutions, in efforts to purge the church of variations from stated doctrines, and in numerous other acts of exclusion and harm. So inured is the culture of violence that violence in the service of faith is seldom considered wrong, much less sinful.

Within a faith sensitive to its roots, however, where nonviolence is enshrined as a premier, enjoined virtue, acts of violence against others require justification. Such a justification is even more necessary when acts of violence are countenanced and advocated as a part of the faith. The logic of this justification for the use of overt or covert force in the pursuit of good ends is at least as old as the church father and saint, St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430 A.D.). This essay will detail the intellectual components of his infamous “change of heart” in which he rejected the clear teachings of both Jesus and Plato in favor of violence against the heretic. It will be suggested that the arguments then and now are not convincing without the torturer’s presumption of immediate truth, a truth that is independent from human experience.

For good or ill, Augustine brought together the classical dualism of Plato and the authority of written Scriptures in a powerful synthesis that shaped the Western thought world. His polemics, eristics, and theological writings still provide the lineaments of dogma, confessed in creed and taught in catechism, for most branches of the church. Even though he was not the first to approve violence in support of faith and even though he spoke ambiguously at times, he did become, as far as is known, the first of the Fathers to advocate the use of physical and psychological violence for the purposes of faith in the mission of the church.
Radical Nonviolence

Augustine’s justification of violence against and persecution of those within the faith is detailed in his own account of the referred to change of “heart” claimed by Augustine and noted by Thomas Aquinas in his own justification of violence in the service of faith (Summa Theologica, II, II, 10.8). Augustine did not chronicle the process of his change or directly discuss its stages. He did repeatedly note, however, that his ideas on the use of violence changed drastically. Augustine’s earlier, nonviolent position derived from the paramount authority of the Scriptures and his appreciation of Plato. His earlier writings, commentary, and theology are replete with citations in which he disassociated violence and Christian belief.

This disassociation is found in commentary upon various texts of the New Testament. Before the change of heart, Augustine elevated the texts containing the sayings of Jesus that most straightforwardly enjoin believers to nonviolence. For example, in his tractates on the Gospel of John, Augustine clearly stated that belief cannot be coerced. Discussing John 6.41-59, the bread from heaven passage, Augustine cited the clear significance of the text to be that man can do several things against his will; but belief is not one of them. He affirmed that a man can come to church unwillingly, can approach the altar unwillingly, and partake of the sacrament unwillingly; but he cannot believe unless he is willing. He noted that if men believe with the body, they might be made to believe against their will. But believing is not a thing done with the body (Tractate 26).

For Augustine, assent to the truth ultimately comes by the drawing of the Father, a drawing of “hearing and learning” (John 6.45). This drawing cannot be facilitated by fear and/or pain. In addition, Augustine confessed the Scriptures in general to be opposed to coercion. In this context Augustine set out the teachings of Jesus to suffer injury without retaliation, to love one’s enemies, and to return good for evil, as the way of life for the church.

Warfare is only a spiritual one, wrestling not against flesh and blood. Against a major opponent, the Donatists, Augustine refrained from preaching until their invading army had left Hippo, in order not to incite possible violence against them. He wrote:

. . . [O]n our side the terror of temporal weapons is called off. Let us get busy on the real issue, and act with our reason, supported by the authority of the divine Scriptures; let us ask, seek, knock, in peace and quiet, that we may find and the door may be opened to us (Epistle 23, 7, in Lecler 54).
The second authority for Augustine was the philosophers, particularly Plato. Aristotle’s pronouncement in the *Rhetoric* that “evidence under torture is not trustworthy . . . so that no trust can be placed in [such] evidence . . .” (1.15.26 [1377a6ff]) was well known in the schools of rhetoric such as the one in Carthage where Augustine was educated. The present state of world affairs might well be different had contemporaries a few years ago treated information gained through torture with the same skepticism that Aristotle pronounced upon it 2300 years ago!

But of greater significance to Augustine in light of his frequent praise of Plato was the model of Socrates. Socrates, the quintessential philosopher, regarded truth (beauty and goodness) as mediated through human experience. The theory of forms left immediate truth on the divine side of the divide between the realms of form (divine truth) and appearance (human truth). Platonic studies still struggle to determine how, to what measure, and in what mode Plato envisioned truth to be present in the human world of appearances.

This platonic apprehension of truth was set in relief by the drama already played out in Athens, 750 years prior to Augustine. The fate of Socrates detailed in Plato’s dialogue, *Crito*, can be read as the sin of immediate truth against mediate truth. Socrates, convicted by the Athenian Senate of the crimes of impiety (atheism/heresy) and corrupting the morals of the youth, was sentenced to die upon the arrival of the ceremonial ship from Delos almost a month after his sentencing.

Socrates’ friends urged escape; Crito, among them, offered to bribe the guard and finance an escape to Thessaly. Socrates’ response was that harm never justifies harm in response. He reported that in a dream he had discussed his predicament with the Laws, the embodiment of political, mediate truth. An escape would amount to violence against the Laws that gave him birth, nourished and educated him, and gave him a share in every good that they possessed. Socrates could no more strike out at the Laws, than he could strike out at his parents. Socrates chose to suffer violence, rather than to inflict it, no matter how deserved the violence might be.

One may debate the wisdom of Socrates’ choice (the root meaning of “heresy”), even by Socrates’ own standards. But the conversation with the Laws made clear Socrates’ position. To act against the Laws would amount to a claim by Socrates that the Laws were in error, a claim that only could be established by the counter-claim that Socrates possessed an immediate truth. Socrates could not violate his wisdom, defined by the oracle as Socrates’ knowledge that he did not know. For Socrates, immediate truth exists, but it resides in the world of forms and not in the world of human experience. In the last act of his life,
Socrates chose not to claim immediate truth, as later Jesus was depicted as subservient to the Father with respect to truth. All truth in this life is mediate truth, mediated through humanity’s experiences.

Thus, for Augustine, both Scripture and philosophy agree. Mediate truth is the human domain where truth comes through human experience and humans do not possess the mind of God. The mind of God may be sought, but it is never possessed. Violence and persecution are never efficacious in transforming mediate truth into immediate, divine truth. It comes then as a surprise when Augustine announced in two letters, one to Parmenianus (c. 400 A.D.) and one to Vincentius Victor (408 A.D.), a fateful reversal of his position on the inefficacy of coercion and violence in the service of faith.

Against Parmenianus Augustine argued that the Pauline fruits of the flesh in Gal. 5.19—“fornication, impurity, licentiousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, anger, quarrels, dissensions, factions, envy, drunkenness, carousing, and things like these”—include both civil and religious sins and the same dealings should apply to each. In this work, Augustine gave the first persecutory interpretation of the parable of the wheat and tares of Matt. 13.24-30. Augustine maintained that when one is able to identify each of the two with absolute certainty, “then severe discipline must not remain dormant, for the more diligently charity is preserved, the more efficacious is the correction of perversity” (Parmen., III, II, 13, in Lecler 55).

Augustine’s second letter to Vicentius reveals a mounting frustration with the continuation of the Donatist controversy and a consequent change toward the idea of violent coercion. Augustine wrote: “For originally my opinion was, that no one should be coerced into the unity of Christ, that we must act only by words, fight only by arguments, and prevail by force of reason, lest we should have those whom we knew as avowed heretics feigning themselves to be Catholics” (Vincent. V, 17). This former opinion, however, was overcome by those who pointed out “conclusive instances,” not the least of which was that, by the threat of violence in imperial decree, Augustine’s own city turned from being “wholly on the side of Donatus” and was brought over to the side of “Catholic unity” and so “filled with such detestation of . . . ruinous perversity, that it would scarcely be believed that it had ever been involved in [the Donatist] error” (Ibid.).

The Donatist controversy was the critical event in Augustine’s change. The controversy is named after an early 4th century bishop of Carthage who rebaptised and restored those who had lapsed from the faith during persecution. Such restorative practice was based on the idea that even the act of defecting from religious truth was to be regarded as an act based on the human condition of possessing only me-
diate truth. Such a view shattered the theoretical unity of the Catholic Church. The contest between Rome and Carthage, thus, became a contest of understanding and definition. Augustine weighed in on the side of Rome and by the success of his arguments brought the contest to a conclusion in favor of Rome in the official condemnation of the Donatists in 411 A.D.

Augustine defined the Donatist position as claiming that the universality of the Church resides in “the observance of all Divine precepts and of all the sacraments.” For the Donatists, the Catholic Church possesses truth, but not the whole truth and not the only truth. Fragments of truth may be found even in “heresies here and there” (Vincent., VII, 23). For the Donatists, then, religious truth is mediated, human truth possessed by faithful believers and comes piecemeal to the worthy and the unworthy. Even the failures in faith, the heretics, may be possessed of truth. Thus, the universality of the church is found in the oneness of the human experience of Christ and not in the truth possessed. Sinner and saint alike find truth at the altar.

On the other hand, Augustine argued that the universality of the church resides in the possession of the absolute truth of God held by the church. God the Father vests the Catholic Church through natural and special revelation with patent, unalloyed truth, the dogma of the church, to which each must be held accountable. The Church is neither temporal nor geographical. The indisputable testimony of immediate truth is “the existence of the Church of God in all nations” (Ibid., VII, 12). With this bold stroke, even prior to the writing of the City of God, Augustine announced the title of God in fee simple to the world, to all the world for all times. The church universal possesses absolute truth; this constitutes the universality of the church.

The Gift of Violence

In light of the fundamental truth had by the Catholic Church, Augustine turned his attention to justifying the use of violence, citing the maxim: “Give opportunity to a wise man, and he will be yet wiser (Ibid.). Violence is but a gift of God toward fuller wisdom. Augustine noted the gift of “giving opportunity” in five classes of heretics who are supposedly changed by violence inflicted upon them. Whether these classes are established by experience, as is claimed by Lecler, or whether they are theoretically established to suggest levels of heresy is not a concern here.

The primary distinction among these five classes is that the heresy of the first three classes is passive, for all the members of these classes are bound by nonintellectual fear, custom, or laziness. The latter two
classes contain heretics who are actively complicit in their heresy. The fourth class chooses (again, the root meaning of “heresy”) to believe the calumny of the Donatists and, thus, disregards the immediate truth codified in divinely given dogma of the Catholic Church. The members of the fifth class choose to indemnify themselves against the claims of universality and exclusivity of the Catholic Church.

Among the five classes, the first class consists of those who are already willing to be Catholics “moved by the indisputable plainness of truth,” but who do not so will because of “fear of offending their own party.” People of the second class do not will to be Catholics, for the heavy chains of “inveterate custom” bind them. The third class consists of the lazy, which ease has “made . . . too listless, or conceited, or sluggish, to take pains to examine Catholic truth!” (Ibid.).

The last two classes of heretics are those who have succumbed to the errors of the Donatists, either by, for the fourth class, accepting the calumnious slanders of the Donatists against the Catholic Church, or by, for the fifth class, “believing that it matters not to which party a Christian might belong.” Both these latter two classes consist of heretics who are most pernicious, for they attack the Catholic Church as the possessor of immediate truth. Augustine noted that they require someone to act, for “no one was compelling (Luke 14:23, compelle intrare) them to forsake it [their heresy] and pass over into the Catholic Church!” (Ibid.).

Augustine followed up this enumeration by a stylized accounting of each class’ thankfulness for the violence that brings it to the truth. He provided a litany of “Thanks be to the Lord.” Class one, the fearful ones: “Thanks be to the Lord,” for fear “cut off the hesitancy of procrastination.” Class two, the acculturated ones: “Thanks be to the Lord,” for the power of fear freed those “held prisoners by the force of old custom.” Class three, the lazy ones: “Thanks be to the Lord,” for those “smitten with the loss of temporal things,” have been moved to “become earnest” by being “alarmed” (Ibid., V, 18).

Actively heretical classes four and five also give their thanks: “Thanks be to the Lord,” “who by His scourge took away our timid hesitation, and taught us to find out for ourselves how vain and absurd were the lies which rumor had spread abroad against His Church.” Fear persuades class five to give thanks that there is “no truth” in the authors of heresy and fear gathers their victims “in from a state of schism” and teaches them “that it is fitting that the one God be worshipped in unity” (Ibid.).

For Augustine, these examples were inductively persuasive. He confessed that he could no longer “stand in the way of such conquests of the Lord, and prevent the sheep of Christ . . . from being gathered
into the fold of peace, in which there is one flock and one Shepherd.” The sheep are gathered “from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof,” for the “kingdom bought with His blood . . . extends from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth.” This gathering is prayerfully enabled: “Let the kings of the earth serve Christ by making laws for Him and for His cause” (Ibid., V, 19).

**Justifications of Violence**

Augustine was too much a man of thought to merely adopt violent means even in the struggle with heresy. Torture and the infliction of pain must be plainly stated as serving holy purposes. Even though Augustine confessed persuasion by the success he witnesses in dealing with the classes of heretics, he offered three arguments in anticipation of objections to his newly stated endorsement of violence for the purposes of faith.

For Their Own Good

The first argument Augustine offered is the “for their own good” argument. Augustine noted that many in defense of nonviolence cite the teachings of Christ who admonishes his followers against retaliation and persecution, asserting that they are not to return evil for evil. In response Augustine took great pains to illustrate how doing violence to others is often for their own good.

For example, he cited the peasant warriors called Circumcellions. Their program of social revolution combined with eschatological hopes was claimed to express itself by violent means against themselves and others. The good for such delirious men bent on self-destruction and/or the injury of others is most well enacted by binding “with the cords of those laws which are distasteful. . . .” The good of the sluggish minded, unable to think their way out of received error, is brought about by inflicting “annoyance” (Ibid., I, 2).

Augustine further rejected the claim that violence is ineffective for the malady that is “incurable,” the malady of holding against true dogma. For the good of these incurable heretics, however, something more than fear is necessary. He affirmed that “if they were only made afraid, and not instructed, this might appear to be a kind of inexcusable tyranny.” However, Augustine also claimed that “if they were instructed only, and not made afraid, they would be with more difficulty persuaded to embrace the way of salvation, having become hardened through the inveteracy of custom, . . .” Thus, Augustine spoke of the good regimen: “wholesome instruction is added to means of inspiring
salutary fear . . . [so that] the force of fear may at the same time break the bonds of evil custom” (Ibid.).

Tough Love

Augustine’s second argument consists in interpreting the love of God in terms similar to the contemporary idea of tough love. In support of this argument he offered several aphorisms: “Not every one who is indulgent is a friend; nor is every one an enemy who smites. Better are the wounds of a friend than the proffered kisses of an enemy. It is better with severity to love, than with gentleness to deceive.” God, according to Augustine, often adds to the “soothing remedies by which He comforts men the sharp medicine of tribulation” (Ibid., II, 4).

As the shepherd seeks to profit the wandering sheep by bringing them “back to the flock with his rod,” so the Church uses violent means to force wandering Christians back to the fold of immediate truth, the Catholic Church. Sarah exiled the “insolent bondswoman” Hagar in order to save her from her pride. The true and rightful mother, thus, is not rendering evil for evil, when she inflicts that which seems “severe and bitter.” Rather she seeks by “afflictions and terrors of a temporal kind” “to counteract the evil of sin, not with the hatred which seeks to harm, but with the love which seeks to heal” (Ibid., II, 6).

Augustine confessed that the New Testament teaches that “the essential gentleness of love was to be not only kept in the heart, but also manifested openly: in these the sword of Peter is called back into its sheath by Christ, and we are taught that it ought not to be taken from its sheath even in Christ’s defense.” He immediately followed this statement of nonviolence with a “however.” Turning the transgressor over to Satan illustrated, for Augustine, how violence performs a good work. The true Church breaks the chains of satanic error by using Satan. Thus, the Church would be cruel to consign prisoners “to one less severe” than Satan himself. Compassion dictates that the prisoner be placed in the hands of the “one who is more cruel” (Ibid. II, 7).

Purgation

The final argument for the use of violence consists in the claim that violence is purgative. Augustine claimed that as long as the administrator is cautious and intentional in excising decay with the lancet, the use of the lancet is a good. The key is the intent of the wielder to rid the Church of the gangrene of heresy. (Cf. Thomas Edwards, Gangraena: Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errours, Herefies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time, vented and
acted in England in these four last years, 1646.) For Augustine the
issue is not the legitimacy of violence, but the question, as he asked it:
“Who is on the side of truth; and who is on the side of iniquity?” (Ibid.,
II, 8). He used the account of Daniel where God purged the kingdom of
Daniel’s accusers: “Let the lions now be turned to break in pieces the
bones of the calumniators, and let no intercession be made by Daniel”
(Ibid., V, 19).

For Augustine, then, the duality of truth became oppositional and
absolute. Immediate truth cannot tolerate the mediate truth of humanity,
for none but immediate truth possessed by the church abides. Mediate
truth becomes heresy, becomes the enemy of the church, and cannot
participate in it. The principle of the excluded middle reigns supreme.
All disagreements in religion are decidable in favor of one side or the
other. What is not true is demonstrably false. What is not Christ
is anti-
christ. Time is absorbed into eternity. Past, present, and future are equi-
present to God. Immediate truth obviates faith’s search for truth or any
other response to truth except forced assent by means of induced fear
and violence exercised by those who possess immediate, divine, and
absolute truth.

All three of these arguments hinge upon the distinction between
immediate and mediate truth with the torturer possessing and wielding
immediate truth to the detriment of the one possessing only mediate
truth. The arguments, each in its own way, presume that the authority
for violence against another resides in the torturer’s infallible grasp of
immediate truth. Having the mind of God transforms the torturer from
humanity to divinity and justifies anything and everything.

“For their own good” denies that victims know what their good is
or have rights to their own judgments concerning the choices of life.
The “tough love” paradigm is that of a parent’s action toward the child.
Again, the presumption is that the parent possesses an immediate, su-
perior truth to be exercised upon the child, coercing him into rightful ob-
edience to the parent and truth. The “purgative” argument, likewise,
draws upon a model that in Augustine’s time was hierarchically abso-
lute. The doctor who possesses immediate truth has the ability and right
to prescribe treatment for the passive patient in the name of health.

All such arguments operate out of the unexamined and unconfes-
sed presumption that the torturers possess immediate truth. The pos-
sessors assume the role of God, for as with God that which they know
cannot be in error and, furthermore, is not to be questioned. To raise the
mediate truth issue only confirms how sinful and in need of correction
the questioners are. On the other hand, the possessor cannot admit that
he or she is anything other than the agent of God to impress divine truth
on a humanity that has willfully turned from truth in not holding pre-
cisely the theological, moral, and general truths the possessor of immediate truth holds.

Before the arguments can be persuasive, however, the advocates of immediate truth must make the case that they are not mistaken about the reality and possession of immediate truth. Such an effort, however, is not forthcoming for its necessity cannot be admitted. No justification can be required, for the possessor of immediate truth has been apotheoized. Job 38 reminds the church that creation is out of bounds when it asks questions of the creator.

Augustine and contemporaries who justify violence upon the basis of the possession of immediate truth can give no weight to the teachings of Jesus and the narrative of the death of Socrates. All counter-argument for mediate truth is dismissed out of hand, for humanity is now replaced with divinity. Immediate truth is fundamentally violent, for it sees the other as deficient and lacking any standing whatever. Life operates by decree and not by the rational persuasion of argument. To oppose the possessor of immediate truth, the divine vessel of God’s choosing, is not merely to be in error, but to be demonic. No pain or harm is forestalled when dealing with patent evil.

That Augustine set aside the clear statements of the two authorities of his life—the Christian Scriptures and the philosophers—cannot be doubted. Nor can the monumental impact his change of heart has had on the history of the faith be understated. Violence in the service of the faith has become the established norm, including the ideas of just war and justifiable torture. Augustine’s change significantly advanced the use of physical and psychological violence in service of the Christian faith’s struggle with those, the heretics, who served a less constraining and more human understanding of truth. The arguments that Augustine gave, though designed to convince the convinced, have become the justifications for persecution, war, inquisition, and violence for more than a millennium; but that does not tip the balance in their favor.
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Gender Differences in Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Interests

Heather M. Whaley and Michael Lane Morris

Sexual harassment represents a cost of $6.7 million per year per company for Fortune 500 companies (Lambert, 2004). Comparatively, according to Lambert, efforts aimed at “meaningful preventative steps” (Lambert, 2004) would only cost $200,000 per year for the average company. While many organizations offer sexual harassment prevention training, relatively few offer an explanation or rationale for including selected components in the training. Additionally, few, if any, climate and preference surveys are conducted prior to the training program development and implementation. Training segments within organizations must include a more responsible and detailed examination into what forms of sexual harassment prevention training employees prefer.

Views of sexuality and harassment issues are changing as the face of the workforce changes. As more women continue to participate in the workforce full time for extended periods and as those who began their careers during the sexual liberation movement are in positions of leadership in corporations, issues of sexual harassment today may be quite different from thirty years ago. Training programs designed even five years ago may not be the best option for today’s varied workforce.

The purpose of this study was to assess employees’ preferences regarding sexual harassment prevention training. More specifically, this comprises the prevention training interests, including the prevention of sexual harassment, the victim impact of sexual harassment, and topics related to sexually harassing behaviors. Each area was evaluated to determine what gender differences exist within each area.

Review of Literature

The issue of sexual harassment is more complex than many imagine. To serve the organization well requires that the employees, the Human Resources (HR) directors, and the management know what constitutes harassment and methods for preventing its occurrence. According to Van Detta, Jones, Hahn, Taylor, and Dougherty (2001):
When supervisors and employees are made aware of the legal aspects of sexual harassment, offensive conduct often done in an unthinking manner is often eliminated. Harassment is recognized early and may be dealt with rationally before incidents are blown out of proportion. Inappropriate behavior and relations can be identified and discouraged. (66)

The sooner issues like this are dealt with, and the more the type of behavior that constitutes sexual harassment is understood, the fewer the number of incidences of sexual harassment. In turn, the workplace environment is more positive and healthier for all involved.

Sexual Harassment Training

Training is defined as a premeditated learning experience planned to produce lasting change in a person’s knowledge, attitudes, or skills (Noe, 1986). Training, essential to the holistic approach necessary to deal with sexual harassment prevention, is the single determinate to help employees learn to alter behaviors and to develop the necessary skills to manage work group interactions (Licata & Popovich, 1987).

Needs and Interests

While certain elements are necessary to include in sexual harassment prevention training, other elements may be included based on the audience. Training needs include: (a) the behaviors that constitute sexual harassment, (b) the organization’s policy on sexual harassment, (c) the procedures for filing a grievance, and (d) the elements necessary for a respectful workplace. Other topics may be of interest to trainees. Determining trainees’ views on the primary focus of training will enable trainers to design an effective program that meet both the trainees’ needs and interests.

Keeling, Jones, and Botteril (1998) determined that employees have more confidence in training programs when they feel their personal needs have been considered. “Furthermore, employees were encouraged by those organizations that were flexible in their approach to work-based learning, could identify and incorporate individual needs, and extended their work-based learning policies to all employees . . .” (284). Using a flexible and holistic approach resulted in increased morale and loyalty to the organization.
Methods

The researchers utilized a quantitative method of research for this study. They used a non-experimental design, with closed-ended measures to evaluate the following null hypothesis: *No differences in gender exist in sexual harassment prevention training interests, including interests of training topics related to the following: prevention of sexual harassment, victim impact of sexual harassment, and sexually harassing behaviors.* The survey required respondents to answer general demographic information, which the researchers used for statistical comparisons between and among respondents, with particular emphasis on gender differences.

Sample Selection

The researcher used a convenience sample of city/county governmental employees from a mid-size metropolitan city in the southeast. The employees represented multiple occupational groups. Through discussions with multiple human resource directors and senior management officers at prospective sites, the researcher learned that research involving the sexual harassment topic would be challenging due to the sensitivity of the topic. The researcher contacted no less than 35 organizations and invited the organizations to participate in this study. Of those contacted, the researcher obtained permission only from the organization involved in this study. Because of the sensitive nature of the sexual harassment topic, and the considerable difficulty experienced by the researcher in securing a population to study, the researcher elected to use accidental sampling once the sample in this study was obtained. Although accidental sampling as a sampling method is not as representative of the population-at-large as a random sample, Kerlinger and Lee (2000) attest that accidental sampling “probably does not deserve the bad reputation it has” (179).

The population consisted of employees with work-provided Internet access and email address. The total population contained 1387 employees. Of those employees, 169 chose to respond, yielding a response rate of 12%. While the response rate was low, the researcher was unable to find other research of a very similar nature for benchmarking the response rate, possibly due to the proprietary nature of similar research and to the topic sensitivity.
Sample Characteristics

The survey responses represented n=169. Men represented 52.4% (n =89) of the overall respondents, with 47.6% female (n = 80), and 5 missing values. Percentages reflect removal of missing values from analysis. Due to the near 50/50 split, no stratification of the respondents was necessary. Single respondents equaled 12.2% of the sample, with (a) 69.5% of respondents married, (b) 2.4% of respondents separated, (c) 11.6% divorced, (d) 3.7% remarried, and (e) 0.6% widowed. There were five missing values removed from the analysis. More men were married than were females (73% vs. 65%, respectively) while more women than men were divorced (15.4% vs. 8.1%, respectively). Percentages of the remaining marital status categories were common between genders with less than a 4% difference per category remaining. Racial breakdown of the population was as follows: (a) 8% African-American, (b) 90.7% Caucasian, (c) 0.6% Hispanic, and (d) 0.6% Native American. Seven values were missing, resulting in removal of those seven responses from the analysis.

Demographic Relationship to Community

Although there was a small response rate, the sample is representative of the county in which the research was conducted. The 2000 census results (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/47/47093.html) confirmed the county’s population consisted of 48.7% male and 51.3% female. Caucasians comprised 88.1% of the population, with 8.6% African American, 1.3% Hispanic, 1.3% Asian, and 0.3% Native American. Married couples represented 52.6% of the population during the last census, with 30.7% of the population reporting as single.

Instrumentation

To explore the research questions in this study, the researcher included the Sexual Harassment Training Preferences Climate Survey. A series of demographic items were included. Removal of missing values was the chosen method for the data because the missing values were randomly distributed. According to Howell (1998), when missing values are random, it is appropriate to ignore those missing values. This concurs with the recommendation from the statistical consultant for the preferred method to handle the missing data for this study.

Twelve items assessed respondents’ interest level regarding training on the prevention of sexual harassment. Six items were included to measure respondents’ level of training interest in victim impact topics.
Two items were included to measure respondents’ level of interest regarding training interest in acceptable behaviors related to sexual harassment and its prevention. The 3-point Likert-type scale options included (a) not at all interested, (b) somewhat interested, and (c) extremely interested.

Results

The Mean, Median, Mode, Standard Deviation (SD), Range, and Cronbach’s alphas of each of the Instruments are noted in Table 1. The hypothesis explored the Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Interests of participants in this study. In order to test the hypothesis, a MANOVA test was performed on prevention, victim impact, and acceptable behaviors subscales as related to gender. The factors met the assumption of equal variances and normality. The null hypothesis is the means are equal for all subscales for both males and females. The multivariate F-score indicated statistically significant differences between males and females may exist on at least one subscale, using a significance score $p \geq 0.033$.

Univariate ANOVA tests were performed on each of the three subscales to determine which subscales were statistically significant based on gender. The analysis of each subscale included rank ordering by overall mean. The rank order for each of the following subscales is outlined below: (a) Table 2—prevention subscale; (b) Table 3—victim impact subscale; and (c) Table 4—acceptable behaviors.

The follow-up tests indicated that while the acceptable behaviors subscale approached significant difference, it was not of enough magnitude to be statistically significant. The behavior subscale appears to have a pattern of difference, but it did not qualify as statistically significant at the Bonferroni adjustment $p$-value. Therefore, the researchers failed to reject the null hypothesis: No differences in gender exist in sexual harassment prevention training interests, including the following subscales: prevention, victim impact, and acceptable behaviors.

Discussion

Results of the survey provided insight into current needs regarding sexual harassment prevention training, as well as employees’ desires for training topics. It also provided good news for training developers and training delivery sectors: the lack of differentiation between male and female responses supports one training design for both genders. There is no need to develop separate training components based on gender, as no statistically significant difference exists among delivery
and content preferences. This saves money and time, while also allowing for joint prevention and design efforts among genders. Many of the suggested topics hold interest for employees, despite current knowledge levels of the topic.

Table 1: Statistical Analysis of Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.00-3.00</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Impact</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00-3.00</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable behaviors</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.00-3.00</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Means: Knowledge Factor One - Prevention Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>Male Mean</th>
<th>Female Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The manager’s duty to prevent harassment</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.21 (1)</td>
<td>1.95 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to do if you believe you are being harassed</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.10 (3)</td>
<td>1.95 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The employee’s duty to prevent harassment</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.12 (2)</td>
<td>1.90 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the organization’s harassment</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.06 (5)</td>
<td>1.93 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy and procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to prevent workplace harassment</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.07 (4)</td>
<td>1.82 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to communicate healthy boundaries</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.98 (8)</td>
<td>1.84 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to know whether your environment is hostile, with regard to sexual harassment</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.90 (11)</td>
<td>1.89 (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>Male Mean</th>
<th>Female Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the law relevant to sh</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.94 (10)</td>
<td>1.76 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to file a sh complaint</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.04 (6)</td>
<td>1.59 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual liability for sh</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.00 (7)</td>
<td>1.64 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer liability for sh</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.98 (9)</td>
<td>1.68 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to investigate a sh complaint</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.77 (12)</td>
<td>1.51 (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.955

Table 3: Means: Knowledge Factor Two - Victim Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>Male Mean</th>
<th>Female Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How sexual harassment (sh) affects victims emotionally</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.95 (4)</td>
<td>2.08 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How sh affects victims’ performance on the job</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.01 (1)</td>
<td>1.96 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why sh victims get blamed</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.95 (3)</td>
<td>1.97 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What causes harassment</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.01 (2)</td>
<td>1.89 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How sh affects victims physically</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.94 (5)</td>
<td>1.92 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of people more likely to harass</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.78 (6)</td>
<td>1.74 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.938
Table 4
Means: Knowledge Factor Three - Acceptable Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Male Mean</th>
<th>Female Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to listen to others with respect</td>
<td>2.30 (1)</td>
<td>2.25 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific guidelines of appropriate behavior at work</td>
<td>2.27 (2)</td>
<td>2.20 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations

A limitation of the study is the small sample size. Due to the sensitive nature of the subject, the researcher was unable to secure multiple locations for survey dissemination. The survey should be repeated using a larger population to increase the generalizability of survey results. As well, research using a private sector organization may provide more insight regarding sexual harassment prevention training needs.

The lack of other sexual harassment prevention training needs assessments is a limitation of the study. Research in this area is limited and needs to increase. O’Donohue (1997) calls for more research in many areas related to sexual harassment. The publication of more studies will strengthen the body of research.

Future Research

Focusing on needed areas of training, as indicated by employees, results in improved training outcomes. As well, focus on employees’ training needs can alleviate many of the problems associated with mandatory training efforts. Identifying behaviors defined as sexual harassment opens the door to providing more in-depth training efforts in the future. Development of training program content following best practices models increases training transfer by providing relevance to training participants (Morrison, Ross, & Kemp, 2004).

Summary

This study provides a springboard for future sexual harassment prevention training needs assessments and provides important insights into training design and delivery that meets employees’ needs while at the same time providing necessary information. More training needs assessments are desirable, particularly in private sector organizations. Research into the appropriate frequency of training is needed as well.
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Liberal Arts Is Not Ditto

Carolyn DeArmond Blevins

When she knocked on my door, I looked up. There stood Kim, a student who had failed my class in the fall semester. “You told us last semester,” she said, “that if we had a problem with the class to come and see you, but I didn’t. I have signed up for your class again this semester, and I am here the first week to say I need help.” I invited Kim to come in and have a seat in the rocking chair beside my desk. Soon, I discovered that Kim had worked hard the previous semester, but still failed. Although she studied for three or four hours for a test, she never passed one of them. I was dismayed! How futile her study had seemed; such effort should be rewarded. Clearly Kim wanted to learn, wanted to succeed; but she did not know how. She and I agreed to work together an hour every week that semester so she could learn how to learn!

Kim was faithful to come every week, show me what she was doing and in what ways she needed help. Soon, she was taking clearer notes in class. By the time for the first test, she was better prepared to study for that test; and she passed it. She was elated. Then one day about two-thirds through the semester, she told me how pleased she was with her grades in all her classes. She was not making A’s, but she was doing much better in all her classes. She was so pleased with herself. I was too!

Then she stunned me when she said in her shy, quiet voice, “You know, Mrs. Blevins, some days I would just like to sue my high school!” Sue her high school!!! Shy, timid Kim was talking strong action. “Why?” I wanted to know. Her reply still haunts me, “Because they dittoed me all the way through high school.” When I asked her to explain, she told the story of going to class after class for four years where the teachers would hand her a ditto sheet, ask her to fill it out, return it, and then give her another one. (Ditto was the method of copying that preceded Xerox machines) As a result, she said, she never learned to take notes, or to study for a test. Consequently, she was not prepared for college. All she learned was to fill the blanks with what she had been told. “They dittoed me all the way through high school.” I cannot get away from the consequences of those words.
A few years after that, I sat beside a freshman honors student at a very nice dinner of steak, baked potato, and all the trimmings. Noticing that she seemed to be just pushing her food around her plate and not eating it, I inquired if she were ill or if she could not eat those foods. She replied that she did not like steak and potatoes. Having not met many people who did not like steak and potatoes, I asked what she did like. She replied, “I mainly just eat peanut butter sandwiches.” Then I wondered, “How did you manage in the high school cafeteria?” She said, “I never ate the cafeteria food. Mother always packed me a peanut butter sandwich every day.”

Ditto and peanut butter sandwiches! What a life! Always repeating only the familiar, stifling new ideas and new experiences. Yet, I learned that these two young women were by far not the only two college students who were victims of stalled learning. Perhaps you know a person who came to college and wants to hear or read only information he already knows. He does not want to be exposed to anything new. That is not a liberal arts education; it is ditto. It is like eating peanut butter sandwiches every day. And liberal arts study is not ditto and peanut butter sandwiches.

Carson-Newman College is proudly a liberal arts institution. We believe that liberal arts education empowers us—frees us from the limitations of our own experiences and views by exposing us to the experience and ideas of others. We intend to be a place where all of us, faculty and students, are continuing to learn to think, to examine the information, and to weigh the evidence in order to make sound decisions and take responsible action. Liberal arts education is a program of study, but it is also an attitude—a state of mind. A state of mind that is ready to face new challenges, new ideas, and new patterns.

One of the most exciting stories in the Bible is the account of Moses leading thousands of slaves from Egypt to freedom. For centuries freedom was the impossible dream of the Israelites. No doubt many of them had given up on ever being free again. As Moses wore Pharaoh down, the Israelites’ hopes rose that they might actually escape the brutal hands of the Egyptian ruler. Then the impossible happened. Pharaoh agreed that they could go. Quickly, they gathered their belongings and made for the border. And it happened! They won the race with Pharaoh and breathed free air for the first time in four hundred years! Free at last! Thank God and Moses and Aaron and Miriam! They were free at last! All was well.

Or was it? No sooner had the Israelites tasted freedom than some of them began to long for the land of slavery! Some of the Hebrew people preferred to be a slave to what they knew rather than face the uncertainty and responsibility of their new world. Think about that!
Can you imagine a person wanting to be a slave to what he knows rather than experiencing the excitement of discovering what he does not know? When we read that story, we are astonished that people would want to retreat to slavery when they stood in the door of freedom. The problem was their state of mind. They feared the unknown.

The word “liberal” comes from the Latin word, “liber,” that means free. A liberal arts education frees one from being a slave to previous knowledge. Liberal arts study is a liberating state of mind, freeing us to explore what is new. A liberal arts student is grateful for what she already knows, but curious about those things she has not yet learned. He eagerly examines new ideas, evaluates them, and determines whether he will accept or reject those ideas. Liberal arts learning is a state of mind, an attitude of being an eager learner. That attitude has several crucial components. I want to address two of them.

Trust is the first critical component of the liberal arts attitude. Trust recognizes that every person has the ability and responsibility to make decisions. God created us with the ability to make decisions. As a baby, we had limited abilities to choose. The older we got, the more opportunities we had to make decisions. As our parents trusted us more, we were allowed to make more decisions. As young adults, you are now trusted in ways you have not been previously. With that trust comes the responsibility of making your own decisions.

Trust is a key factor in a liberal arts curriculum. The school trusts the faculty to be good scholars, bringing updated, respected research before the students. The faculty trusts the students to explore that information. The students trust themselves to handle the information they are exposed to in a thoughtful and responsible manner. How sad it is when a student does not trust himself even to explore new ideas. Some students seem to fear that a new idea will wash away all they have learned and leave them drained of meaning. Of course, a student will not accept every new idea she hears or he reads! Every idea does not serve every person well. At different stages of our lives we are ready for concepts that we were not ready for previously. But we create our own handicaps and cheat ourselves if we let new concepts get past us before we examine and assess them for ourselves.

Let’s be honest. New ideas challenge us in ways that make us uncomfortable at times—in fact, they may even make us angry. But that is not always bad. Several years ago I was reading an article about the story of Adam and Eve in Genesis 3. This theologian introduced me to some new interpretations of that story. I was not sure I agreed, but the reading stimulated me. Then it happened! Suddenly I read these words, “Adam was a passive brute who just did whatever Eve said.” What? Passive brute? I slammed the journal shut as my blood pressure rose to
I was not about to read any more from this wild-eyed author! I was so mad. I stewed and stewed over that sentence for several days. How outrageous! How stupid! How insulting!

Gradually, as my blood pressure returned to below 1000, I began to say, “Well, that is no worse that all the things that have been said about Eve all these years! In fact, it may not be as bad as some things said about Eve.” Then a terrific thing occurred. I actually went back to Genesis 3, read it for myself again, and began to study it more carefully. That is the benefit of confronting new ideas; it makes us reassess what we believe. And sometimes getting angry about what we hear or read pushes us to begin to think for ourselves.

As long as I read or hear only those thoughts I agree with, I do not do much thinking. When I hear something I disagree with, it causes me to ask: What is it about that idea that I do not like? Do I agree with part of it? Why do I reject part of it? Sorting out what I agree with and disagree with and why is a vital part of the liberal arts tradition. Trusting ourselves to handle that process of examination is crucial to the liberal arts experience. Sure, we are going to be uncomfortable. It is much easier to keep exactly what we know and never challenge it.

How sad it will be, if years from now, our friends say as they bury us, “Well, she hasn’t had a new idea since she left high school.” As long as we hear only what we already know, we are not challenged to re-evaluate what we know. When we are confronted with new concepts that challenge our previous learning, we are prodded to ask ourselves a very good question: “What do I believe about this idea?” We trust ourselves to explore the new, in order to sort out more clearly what we think.

A liberal arts curriculum trusts the student to learn a variety of concepts and sort them out for herself. Starting college as a freshman is full of major and minor adjustments, such as having no Mom to wake you up if you fall back to sleep in the mornings, having to do your own laundry, getting used to a new roommate, being away from home that day when you wake up feeling terrible, and on top of that having to study a lot more. One of my crises came with what I believed. Sitting around the dorm talking late at night, I always had an answer to any question that started, “Carolyn, what do you think about . . .?” I had an opinion about everything and freely shared it. It was the following question that threw me for a loop, “Why do you think that?” I had a ready answer but it fell flat as a flat tire: “Because my Dad said so.”

Quickly, I learned that my friends did not give a flip what my Dad thought; they wanted to know what I thought, and I really didn’t know. What I had been taught was important; it formed a foundation upon which I needed to build and adapt my own beliefs. But I wasn’t build-
ing or adapting. All I was doing was parroting or echoing what I had heard. Suddenly, I was being pushed to figure out for myself what I thought. It was very uncomfortable. But it was also a very valuable experience. Trust. We must trust ourselves to process what we learn and think.

A second crucial component of the liberal arts attitude is respect. Few things are harder than respecting someone whose ideas differ from ours. Once we have wrestled with ideas and come to our conclusions, it only seems logical that others would reach the same conclusions. To our amazement we discover that other folks churn that same information and come to different conclusions. “How dare they?” we think. “Surely all intelligent, thinking people will agree with me.” And that is when respect becomes so difficult and yet so crucial.

Liberal arts study asks us to know what we think and give room, lots of room, for others to have different opinions. The best liberal arts tradition cultivates the exchange of ideas, encourages us to examine them, and teaches how to assess them. Learning to listen respectfully to the views of others is a necessary step for living successfully in a pluralistic society. As John Donne reminded us, “No man is an island.” We live and work in a world full of differences. We cannot tuck ourselves into a protective bubble that shields us from all with which we disagree. Such a shield would lead to the impoverishment of the mind.

Respecting the ideas, opinions, and beliefs of others, opens the door to our understanding the world in which we live. Giving that respect teaches us the value of living in community with others and celebrating the diversity it offers. The person who chooses to keep his head stuck in the sand rather than discover the many varieties of shells on the beach is a seriously diminished person. That person is stuck on ditto.

Respecting the views of others means we are willing to think outside our box. But we like our boxes! They are full of those things we know and with which we are very comfortable. In fact, we have spent a couple of decades or more constructing the box we like. When we begin to listen attentively to differing views, we have opened the flaps of our boxes. As we sort out what we hear and read, we reshape our box. Thinking outside the box and reshaping our own box of ideas is a lifelong process because a true liberal arts education is only the launching pad for a life-long quest to know more.

As a liberal arts student focuses on the major he has chosen, he also becomes acquainted with various other disciplines. Few situations are more annoying that trying to talk to a person who knows a lot about one field of knowledge and is truly ignorant about knowledge outside her field. Broadening college study beyond the major field of study provides a student with the context for his primary interest. A well-
educated person is one who knows the basics of scientific theory, who appreciates the medium of art, who understands the role of economics in society and government. A liberal arts student learns another language to be a better citizen of our shrinking world. She studies the great thinkers and writers to learn from them. He asks: “In what ways can math teach me to think? What are my religious beliefs and how do they compare to others?” A liberal arts student wants to know how to communicate effectively in diverse situations. She seeks knowledge about her body and how to properly care for it. The beauty of music becomes a part of his experience. Most importantly, she knows the importance of continuing to learn; and she knows how to find the resources she needs for learning. This liberal arts package will serve him well for the rest of his life.

That breadth of knowledge will serve well the person who in the twenty-first century may change careers five or six times. Corporations are realizing that in today’s fast changing world the most valuable employees are those who can learn quickly and communicate effectively. David Kearns, former CEO of Xerox Corporation said, “The only education that prepares us for change is liberal education. . . . We need the flexible, intellectual tools to be problem solvers, to be able to continue learning over time. . . . Today the race goes not just to the swift, but also to the inventive, the resourceful, and the curious. And that is what liberal education is all about.”1 Agreeing with Kearns, Roger Herman, CEO of The Herman Group said, “In the years ahead we will need more and more workers who can think, collaborate, create, solve problems, communicate and lead. Demand will be high for people who have learned how to learn, who have strong, multidisciplinary education, and who can adapt easily to whatever comes their way.”2

The world is not seeking people who are stuck on ditto. The world needs people who trust themselves with new ideas, who respect the views of others, who have a breadth of knowledge, and who know how to keep on learning in a global community that is changing every day. Students with a liberal arts background can be those people the world is seeking.

---

1 Liberal Education Outcomes: A Preliminary Report on Student Achievement in College, 2005, pp. 6, 16.

2 Ibid., p. 17.
The Priesthood of the Will of God

Earl R. Martin

[The original article was published in several state Baptist papers in May/June 1985. At that time I was Professor of Missions and World Religions at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary—Earl Martin]

There is an alarming trend among Southern Baptists in the life of the churches and denomination. It is the practice of elevating oneself as the receiver of some special knowledge of God’s will. More often than not it is something that has to do with the personal advantage of the receiver of such knowledge. It is a matter of concern that this phenomenon seems to be increasing and spreading widely. What we are seeing is a rising generation of self-styled priests of the will of God.

Recently a chapel speaker at Southwestern Seminary, a renowned Southern Baptist pastor, spoke on knowing the will of God absolutely and unquestionably. Although the message was no-doubt well intended, it encouraged a host of students to believe that they can know perfectly God’s will and then use that knowledge to withstand those who oppose them. Although it was unsaid, it clearly leads to the use of the will of God to manipulate others. The usual insistence is that others must accept without question one’s decisions and actions as coming directly from God.

This style of leadership should be exposed as unbiblical and dangerous. Such a priesthood must be resisted in our churches and in the denomination. We need to recover the biblical principles for realizing God’s good, and acceptable, and perfect will . . . (Rom. 12:2). The priesthood of the will of God is an unfortunate perversion of the priesthood of the believer. The cherished doctrine of the competency of the soul before God gives no support to the unwholesome practice of claiming God’s will to justify one’s actions. This represents a privatized Christianity that ignores the biblical example of the body of believers seeking together to understand and do God’s will.

The assertion that one has a direct hot line with God can lead to a misunderstanding of the Christian doctrines of God, man and revelation. It is an extraordinary thing to say that one knows the mind of God. An extravagant claim such as this is always open to question. Isaiah relayed God’s answer to such presumption with the words, For my
thoughts are not your thoughts. . . For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts (Is. 55:9-10). Ours is the transcendent God. We must not lose our sense of awe toward him. We must not forget that mortal man, even a child of God, is finite. Paul reminds us, for now we see through a glass darkly . . . now we know in part . . . (1 Cor. 113:12). Our life in Christ is rightly surrounded by an aura of mystery that cannot be dissolved by alleged claims of perfect knowledge. Absolute certainty concerning God’s will leaves no room for faith. Remember we walk by faith, not by sight (2 Cor. 5:7).

Further, there is a distortion of the doctrine of divine revelation. We must be careful not to dilute the significance of the revelation given by Jesus Christ. God’s revelation is final. It is rather presumptuous for one to assert that God has given private knowledge. Even if it were possible, God’s word clearly indicates that any such revelations are to be put to the Christian body for clarification and edification (1 Cor. 14). They are never to be used for personal benefit.

The priesthood of the will of God is dangerous for several reasons. It offers a clear temptation to pride. Its assertiveness contradicts fundamental servanthood. It is a subtle form of spiritualized name-dropping. It advocates a sense of spiritual superiority reminiscent of that ancient Gnosticism that was so strenuously opposed by the apostles. The Gnostics infiltrated the churches forming a spiritual elite. They claimed to be the privileged knowers of the mysteries of God. Today’s Gnostics are seen as the priests of the will of God. They have found a favorable opportunity in what has been called the cult of the pastor. In this the position of the pastor is elevated to excessive importance. He assumes authority that has no precedent in the New Testament. A cunning doctrine of the divine right of pastors results. An arrogant individualism comes to the surface. The self-appointed knower of God’s will embarks on a reckless ego trip.

At a recent conference of associational directors of missions, authoritarian and independent-minded pastors were cited as blight among the churches and in the associations. Pastors who dogmatically insist they have been blessed to know God’s will about certain things are a constant divisive problem. Ask any pastoral search committee about the number of letters they receive stating that God has told a man that he should be their pastor. There is no difference between this flagrant abuse of God’s alleged will and the one who announces that God has informed him that he should be elected to a denominational position! Such perverse egotism must be refuted at every level.

There is a better way. We should take seriously the scriptural admonition of understanding what the will of the Lord is (Eph. 5:17). To
be sure it is the normal experience for believers to receive guidance in their Christian walk. Through the faithful practice of prayer and searching God’s word we have his constant leadership. There is one essential, however, that must not be by-passed. It is the clarifying of God’s will as the community of believers seeks it together. This means that the insights gained by individuals are questioned, tested, reinforced refined, and even revised. In this way God’s will becomes more clearly known.

This is the way of humble servanthood. It does not blow trumpets announcing from the pulpit or at a news conference, *I have discovered the will of God.* But rather it is in keeping with Paul’s urging that we become, *as servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart* (Eph. 6:6). In most cases any special enlightenment obtained should be modestly kept between the believer and his Lord. This is the way of humility. It honors the Giver of the insight more than the receiver. Paul put it in true perspective when he said, *that you may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God* (Rom. 12:2-3). It is the way of realizing the will of God without manipulating others. It preserves the sense of mystery and awe that evidences a healthy faith.
At the heart of the biblical message is an imperative to all who dare face the burden of ultimate responsibility: “I have set before you life and death. Choose life.” While many theologians have struggled with the responsibility inherent in such freedom to choose, few thinkers have ever dared to question the inherent goodness of choice itself.

Enter Barry Schwartz, author of *The Paradox of Choice: Why More Is Less.* Echoing such recent works as *The American Paradox: Spiritual Hunger in an Age of Plenty* by David G. Myers and *How Much Is Enough?* by Arthur Simon, Schwartz adds to the growing number of writers who are noting a rather disconcerting discontent among Americans today that, by all indications, is, paradoxically, a result of our abundance.

**We Have Nothing To Fear but . . . Choice?**

Schwartz’s thesis is simple but both counterintuitive and countercultural: “The fact that some choice is good doesn’t necessarily mean that more choice is better.” Indeed, as Schwartz takes pains to point

---


out, the saturation of choice that we experience in many forms today (endless aisles of jeans, toothpastes, etc.) actually seems to be worse. While the theory that having too many choices is a bad thing may sound rather absurd, Schwartz takes page upon page to explore the research that backs up such a premise.

According to Schwartz, the proliferation of options among us today has three specific negative effects: (1) decisions require more effort, (2) mistakes are more likely, and (3) psychological consequences of mistakes become more severe. Schwartz’s summary of these findings is simple, yet staggering: “The effort that the decision requires detracts from the enjoyment derived from the results.” More specifically, “Losses have more than twice the psychological impact as equivalent gains.” Thus, while we continue to stand to gain only one positive gain from our choices, the exponential expansion of our options to choose results in an equally exponentially-increasing number of losses. Simply put, when we have more choices, we may gain more, but we inevitably lose more. In Schwartz’s harrowing words, “The more options you have, the more likely it is that you will experience regret.”

The (My)Space between Us

In all likelihood, I am younger than nearly everyone who is going to read this article. While I would like to consider myself some sort of a bridge between generations, I have to be completely honest: the joy of MySpace escapes me. Or, should I say, it escaped me until I took an afternoon to play around with my own MySpace site. What I eventually discovered was one of the central allures of MySpace—the ability to make endless choices about one’s public identity that was both flexible and reversible. In short, MySpace offers an identity workshop for anyone willing to hammer out the details of his persona via a computer terminal.

In many ways, MySpace (which is now one of the top ten most visited Internet sites in the world) provides a glimpse into our students’

---

5 Ibid., 74.
6 Ibid., 20.
7 Ibid., 70.
8 Ibid., 148.
lives that is reflected in many other places today, most notably (on our campus) on Facebook.com. For those of you who have not been on Facebook yet, allow me to give you a brief tour. To begin with, you have the opportunity to select settings for your site under the somewhat redundant moniker, “My Privacy.” Once you have done that (and, of course, you can always choose to do this part later—you do not even want to know the number of privacy options you have), feel free to explore “My Friends,” “My Parties,” “My Groups,” “My Events,” etc.

While this bit of personalization may seem a little excessive to many of us, how can we expect anything less from a generation that is growing up listening to their own specialized play lists on their IPods? Even store-bought, one-artist-only compact discs represent a burden of forced conformity to our students today.

Furthermore, digital media has increased our choice and control in virtually every aspect of our lives. If we want to communicate with our friends, we can call (landline, cell phone, or even Voice over Internet Protocol), e-mail, write on “their wall” (a la Facebook), instant message, text message, write a letter, or just make a plain visit. This generation surprisingly reads more news than most faculty members do, but with one major difference. Even beyond the choice-centered realities created by hypertext, programs pioneered by Amazon.com have enabled students to receive what media expert Nicolas Negroponte calls “the Daily Me,” news feeds based solely on the web user’s interests. If McLuhan were alive today, surely he would point out that the message is now the medium.10

Such independence, however, does not come without a price tag. Humans have always struggled with issues of identity. But never before, at least on this level, have individuals been forced with the necessity of struggling so much with the choosing of their identity and virtual vaporous quality of what has become little more than a daily identity (because, of course, it can be changed, and frequently is, on an hourly schedule). While students are being constantly reminded of the posterity of their seemingly innocuous and innocent postings, it is non-

---


10 Not to be confused with Wikimedia, another suitable moniker that is unfortunately already taken by the Wikimedia Foundation, which operates Wikipedia and other similar ventures.
ethereal equally true that their ever-evolving identities simply disappear on a daily basis, as well. Were Bellah and his associates to revisit their findings from twenty-two years ago,\(^{11}\) we would not be surprised to find that commitment among young Americans has continued its downward spiral, because students today are trained by their mediums to not even have a commitment to their own identity!

**The Chosen One(s)**

This disavowal of a static self of restrained and disciplined continuity, however, is most certainly not a relinquishment of self. On the contrary, as the title of Jean Twenge’s book *Generation Me: Why Today’s Young Americans Are More Confident, Assertive, Entitled—and More Miserable Than Ever Before* suggests, “Generation Me” is little more than “an army of little narcissists.”\(^{12}\)

When I was born, in 1979, one particular critical evaluation of American culture became so popular that it was even mentioned in a speech by then-President Jimmy Carter. The book, *The Culture of Narcissism* by Christopher Lasch, was meant to be an appraisal of the contemporary culture but has uniquely served as prophecy, as well.

The fact that this generation has sprung from the loins of Lasch’s indicted narcissists may be as important, if not more so, than many of the other factors that have shaped the students before us. As Twenge autobiographically points out, “Reliable birth control, legalized abortion, and a cultural shift toward parenthood as a choice made us the most wanted generation of children in American history.”\(^{13}\) Like good Presbyterians, the members of the current generation of college students know they are special because they were “chosen.”


12. Twenge, *Generation Me*, 223. Eerily, during the time I was writing this, David Von Drehle wrote an essay in *Time* magazine entitled “It’s All About Him,” that pointed to narcissism as the chief illness plaguing teenage killers such as Cho Seung-Hui, Eric Harris, and Dylan Klebold (Von Drehle, “It’s All About Him,” *Time* [April 30, 2007], 76).

13. Ibid., 4.
Montessori Gone Wild!

However, current online mediums of social exchange and procreational shifts are not the only culprits in this emphasis upon a proliferation of choices. Today, choice is more a part of the educational system than ever before. It seems as though many educators today have just met a theory named Maria (Montessori), and it is clear that they have never been the same.

Curiously, Montessori students include Jeff Bezos (founder of Amazon), Sergey Brin and Lawrence E. Page (co-founders of Google), and Jimmy Wales (founder of Wikipedia), four of the most influential mavens of the Internet, the hypertext medium based largely around choice, e.g., “Where do you want to go today?”

The Montessori Method and other choice-driven pedagogical methods have created a new frontier of education with worlds to be gained; but, at least according to Schwartz’s premise, our students may not be psychologically prepared to reap such benefits without many possibly damaging unintended consequences. If we seek to help our students develop discernment in a world of choice, we must ask ourselves if we are, in the words of a recently popular song, only “adding to the noise” by adding choice upon choice to their daily decision diet. 14

Choose Your Own Adventure

In my own division, Student Affairs, life is presented to students much like a Choose-Your-Own-Adventure story, where students are given a dizzying array of choices in everyday activities. The easiest and most obvious example of this is the Co-Curricular Portfolio (available, of course, in two options—print and online), which is essentially an

14 It remains to be seen, of course, whether humanity (on a macro level) and individuals (on a micro level) may be able to adapt to handle these psychological stresses more successfully. Current research seems to indicate that, while negative side effects may exist, they may not be as prevalent in younger generations as assumed. As a loosely affiliated example, many of us deplore text messaging because so much can be “lost in translation.” However, many adults neglect how fluent teenagers have actually become at interpreting mere text clues toward a deeper interpersonal understanding than many of us assume is even possible.
extracurricular transcript available to students to record their out-of-class involvement during their college years. So, just how many opportunities are available to students? In the admittedly non-exhaustive Co-Curricular Bulletin, some 235 opportunities are listed over a staggering 155 pages. If we go so far as to “limit” our options to leadership positions (as opposed to mere participation), a conservative estimate\(^\text{15}\) allows for a staggering 500 opportunities for leadership, which means that we easily offer one leadership opportunity for every four undergraduate students at C-N!\(^\text{16}\)

Traditionally, approaches to student development could be distinguished into one of two categories: cognitive structural and psychosocial/identity. However, as Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience points out, these two theories can no longer afford to be divided and competing with each other.\(^\text{17}\) Rather, as our look at the “identity workshop” of MySpace made evident, a unified theory is now needed to understand what effects such social development is having upon the cognitive structures of our students, as well

---

\(^{15}\) This estimate is the total number of recognized leadership positions (President, Treasurer, etc.) merely of the clubs and organizations recognized by and chartered with the Department of Student Activities. It does not include such leadership opportunities as ROTC, participation on varsity athletic teams, on- and off-campus jobs, etc.

\(^{16}\) This ratio becomes even more impressive when you take into consideration that, according to the Fall 2006 Quality of Life Survey (hereinafter QOL) administered by our Student Affairs Division, 25% of survey respondents do NOT agree with the statement, “C-N offers me opportunities for leadership development.” This number may be even higher, given that the survey did not take into account non-traditional students living off-campus.

\(^{17}\) Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience (Washington: NASPA/ACPA, 2004), 12. Rather wisely, Student Affairs experts have included “cognitive complexity” as one of the seven suggested learning outcomes. It remains to be seen, however, whether applications of this outcome will take into consideration the ability of students to become better choice-connoisseurs.
as how such structures are in turn shaping our students’ abilities to cope with the increasing difficulty of identity development.\footnote{Taking this a step further, and borrowing liberally from McLuhan, Al Gore has pointed to the expansiveness of this “new information ecology”: “Any new dominant communications medium leads to a new information ecology in society that inevitably changes the way ideas, feelings, wealth, power and influence are distributed and the way collective decisions are made” (Gore 20).}

In developing and integrating a theory, we should also be prepared to embrace practices that may seem counterintuitive and perhaps even worthy of inclusion in a higher-education-based \textit{Freakanomics} sequel. For instance, is it possible that decreasing the amount of clubs and organizations on campus would actually increase student satisfaction in these experiences? Would students surprisingly be more satisfied with cafeteria options if fewer options existed?\footnote{My own hunch that this was true of cafeteria options is not reflected in the results of the QOL, which indicates a negligible percentage difference of students agreeing that they are pleased with the variety of food options available on campus between the 2004 and 2006 surveys. This difference remains the same even when taking into account only junior and senior responses on the 2006 survey.} Of course, these suppositions seem borderline ludicrous, but, as Levitt and Dubner have argued, sociological realities are not always reflective of apparent logic.\footnote{Steven D. Levitt and Stephen J. Dubner, \textit{Freakanomics: A Rogue Economist Explores the Hidden Side of Everything} (William Morrow/HarperCollins, 2005).} It may be the case that, in order to provide more effective student services to students of the present and future, we will need to revisit even some of our most-cherished beliefs and theories about choice and diversity of options.

\textbf{The Fundamentalists May Be Right}

Shifting to academic matters, one of the hallmarks of a liberal arts education is the free flow of ideas. In religion and philosophy classes (among others), students are presented with a broad range of concepts and thinkers in order to see the various and multi-faceted lines of thought that are reasonable regarding many issues. Indeed, the learning
outcome of “cognitive complexity” lauded by Learning Reconsidered sits side-by-side with (and is perhaps even predicated upon) the learning outcome of “knowledge acquisition,” which itself belies a faith in the freedom to access such knowledge.

One of the criticisms often leveled against Carson-Newman in particular and the liberal arts in general is not that students are presented with choices, but rather that faculty and staff do not appropriately encourage students enough in making recommended decisions among such choices. While having a sustainable dialogue with such critics is often about as productive and painless as trying to clap with one hand, it may be that there is ground to share on this issue. From an educational standpoint (particularly in the liberal arts), Schwartz’s analysis of the negative power of choice in our lives today begs the pressing question: Does a liberal arts education run the risk of presenting students with debilitating choice? In other words, as globalization simultaneously shrinks our world but enlarges our world of ideas, are we throwing our students into the deep end without having first taught them to swim?

My hunch is that, with most students, we have not yet reached this tipping point. But, I also fear that many educators are headed in this direction. For instance, I find the words of Daniel Dennett on the teaching of religions fraught with difficulties both philosophical and practical: “No religion should be favored, and none should be ignored.”

In contrast to Dennett’s conclusion, however, it seems we should affirm the following crucial job of any educator: to sift ideas and arguments in lieu of the student in order to present what the educator deems most relevant and appropriate to the learning outcomes. In a very real sense, an educator’s job is to preemptively eliminate choices for students. The buffet table can only be so long before the student grows weary, or worse, apathetic. In this regard, what exactly a professor professes is the most beneficial of choices (from an educational standpoint). She is the choice-connoisseur par excellence.

---

21 Learning Reconsidered, 18.

Throughout Christian history, the issue of personal freedom has been a noteworthy point of division, most notably in the ongoing debate over Calvinism. On a smaller scale, however, it is quite easy to find any number of college students sitting around the residence halls on a given evening debating exactly what Christian freedom means. Undoubtedly, the first salvo fired is often Jesus’ statement that “the truth will set you free” (Jn. 8:33), frequently followed by a liberal dose of Galatians and “it is for freedom that you have been set free” (Gal. 5:1), leading to a nifty justification of premarital sex, avoidance of homework, or simply an extra Krispy Kreme donut. Throw in a dash of free market ethics and a hint of democratic capitalism and, voila! The promise of choice becomes the Holy Grail of our hypothetical student, as well as freedom-seekers everywhere.

On the contrary, though, it is also possible to imagine overhearing one of our slightly more socially conservative students rebutting his good friend. As he would take exegetical pains to point out, Jesus, in John’s preceding words, very clearly connected freedom with discipleship (Jn. 8:32). Furthermore, as Galatians goes on, the author writes that freedom should be used, not as a license for pleasure, but as a license for service (Gal. 5:13). Thus, the substance of freedom is not merely the right to choose, but is rather a more positive freedom with necessary boundaries.23 Similarly, as Schwartz takes sociological pains to point out, liberation and choice are not always correlative. On the contrary, the prospective of choice, as well as its after-effects, often binds us. In a strange paradox befitting of Huxley, more freedom leads to less freedom.

Ironically, one of the central tenets of so-called “liberation theology” is that all individuals deserve the right to be self-governing in matters of conscience. While this idea is certainly to be supported and practiced (and indeed finds a close cousin in the Baptist emphasis upon “soul freedom”), it has unfortunately been correlated with the unequal concept that more choices equal more freedom. On the contrary, according to Schwartz, the continued expansion of opportunity has in

23 Perhaps our wise student has read Schwartz: “And if ‘constraint’ sometimes affords a kind of liberation while ‘freedom’ affords a kind of enslavement, then people would be wise to seek out some measure of appropriate constraint” (113).
reality served to be the very thing we need to be liberated from: “Counterintuitive as it may appear, what seems to contribute most to happiness binds us rather than liberates us.”

**Choosing Not To Choose**

In a concerted and largely successful attempt to avoid the Scylla of authoritarian control, we have smashed headlong into the Charbydis of undirected anarchism. We have allowed our students to shipwreck themselves in a whirlpool of choice; it is high time we venture into safer waters; but we must first become a life preserve for our drowning students.

Schwartz sums up the predicament that our students and we face rather cogently: “Learning to choose is hard. Learning to choose well is harder. And learning to choose well in a world of unlimited possibilities is harder still, perhaps too hard.” In a world of choice, we do not serve our students by merely reducing their choices and limiting their freedoms. This only prepares them to be woefully under-prepared in such a world. So, what is our task? Quite simply, our task is to create discerning students, students who are aware not only of the power of their own choices, but also of the power that the very possibilities of choices exert over them. In short, we must help our students choose to be choice-conscious.

We will continue to offer our students choices, but we may prove more Solomonic by stressing a certain responsibility, accountability,

---

24 Ibid., 108.

25 Ibid., 144.

26 Another way of putting this educational mandate is that we help students to develop what Howard Gardner calls “synthesizing minds” (Gardner, *Five Minds for the Future* [Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 2006]). Such a mind succeeds not only at pulling together disparate and cross-disciplinary information and ideas, but also at discerning which information to choose in an information-overloaded world. It seems as though an emphasis upon liberal arts would not only be especially conducive to developing synthesizing minds, but indeed must uniquely address such a goal in our world’s current state of affairs.
even fidelity, that is required of and to such choices.\textsuperscript{27} To paraphrase Dr. King, our choice today is not merely between boundaries and freedom, but between life and death. We can continue to stick our heads in the sand, but only at the cost of maintaining the appearance of a large rear end growing out of the ground.\textsuperscript{28} In the words of Amartya Sen, “Instead of being fetishistic about freedom of choice, we should ask ourselves whether it nourishes us or deprives us, whether it makes us mobile or hems us in, whether it enhances self-respect or diminishes it, and whether it enables us to participate in our communities or prevents us from doing so.”\textsuperscript{29}

Ultimately, the greatest mistake we may make would be the very mistake that flips our profession on its head. That is, we would be taking the cue from our students as to what is best for their development and the quality of their lives.\textsuperscript{30} However, we do well to heed the advice

\textsuperscript{27} One of the seeming corollaries of our society’s emphasis on choice, especially when taken in the context of America’s over-consumption of resources, is the development of a mentality of disposability. In other words, not only can we dispose of our products quickly and cheaply, but we can also dispose of our choices and their consequences cheaply and quickly (insert favorite divorce rate statistic here). In this type of milieu, developing a sense of fidelity and responsibility to choices may be the most difficult task of all.

\textsuperscript{28} Indeed, it seems as though the expansion of choices in our everyday lives is not going to abate any time soon, if ever. As economist Chris Anderson has argued, the long and expanding charted tail of proliferation of choice has the ability to expand infinitely and quite possibly will (Anderson, \textit{The Long Tail: Why the Future of Business Is Selling Less of More} [Hyperion Publishers, 2006]).

\textsuperscript{29} Quoted in Schwartz, \textit{Paradox}, 4. Schwartz’s conclusion is similar: “I believe that we make the most of our freedom by learning to make good choices about the things that matter, while at the same time unburdening ourselves from too much concern about the things that don’t” (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{30} This is, of course, much easier resisted in word than in deed. Along with such monikers as “Generation Me” and “Generation M” (for Multitasking), one of the most fitting names for the current generation of college students has been “The Entitlement Generation.” Simply put, they have a strong sense of entitlement that is often not correlated
of Schwartz and Durning\textsuperscript{31}, who remind us (however painful it may be) that more choice does not necessarily lead to a higher quality of (student) life. On the contrary, it frequently contributes to students’ discontent and our frustration.
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The Bride

Hank T. Niceley

Her beauty was known throughout the world. People from everywhere were drawn to her because of her uniqueness. She loved art and culture and learning of all kinds. She was known for her patronage of drama and fine arts. She was known to have very high spiritual and moral values. Students and admirers traveled great distances to spend time with her.

She had seen much history and she had much to offer those who came to learn from her. She had a lasting impact on those with whom she had interacted. Although she was getting older, her beauty and goodness had not faded with time. Those who had spent time with her never forgot her and often returned for a visit.

She is known as “The Bride of the Adriatic.” She is one of a kind, and original. She is Venice, Italy. She welcomes people of many cultures to her doors and values the cultural mixture of people and architecture. The spirit of Venice leaves a lasting imprint on the spirits of those who are fortunate enough to become part of her world.

Most of her streets are canals. The Grand Canal (Main Street) is lined with beautiful marble palaces. She is a city of unique beauty. Through the years, many rulers have ruled in Venice. She had been a prosperous and stable city throughout most of her existence. Beautiful buildings accent her unique beauty as they are reflected in the waters of her many canal-streets. She had everything: culture, academics, music, art, theatre, and a worldwide reputation for her uniqueness. Those who had been fortunate enough to become permanent residents love her.

A new ruler had just come to power there. He remembered reading about an American president who had made a comment while visiting Venice many years earlier. Theodore Roosevelt had said, “She would be a first rate city if she were drained. My engineers on the Mississippi River could do the job.” The new ruler had his own vision of how the city could be improved and he set about pursuing his own plans.

The new ruler had a winning smile and soon he had won over the local rulers. “Now I will implement my plan to improve this city,” he said to himself. “I will drain her.” He called in a few people that he could count on to follow his orders and set about draining Venice one
canal at a time. His new vassals began to carry out his orders. In return for their homage and loyalty, they were awarded a better way of life than other citizens of Venice. Little by little the clear waters of her canals were redirected and removed. Soon, the city began to look very different. It was not the same city. The flow of optimism had faded and the crowds of people coming from any places slowed. As they saw the ugliness of the muddy bottoms of the canals, those who had lived there and loved her began to leave Venice. They all feared that their beloved city would soon become a place that they would not recognize, or even worse, it might become extinct.

Canal after canal was drained until all the streets were deep mud. The beautiful palaces, museums, academies, and theatres began to deteriorate. People were afraid to stay because it might be their canal that the new ruler would drain down to the mud next. Venice was getting uglier and uglier by the day.

The new ruler had restored the large Ducal Palace on Saint Mark’s Square for his own dwelling. It was a splendid place for a man of his greatness to live but he completely renovated the interior to suit his own taste and that of his queen. He has used up much of the city’s treasury for the palace renovation and other personal projects. Although the city was now in financial ruin and rapidly deteriorating, he continued to live well in his luxurious restored palace. Fewer and fewer people were coming to Venice. The future of the city did not look promising.

The ruler’s winning smile and his gifts of a better life style to his vassals continued to convince them that everything was all right. The local rulers lived so far from the muddy canal bottoms they could not see the changes in Venice. They all gathered periodically for a fine banquet in the new ruler’s palace. After gorging on the wine and words of the palace, they were in no shape to notice the deterioration just outside the palace.

Those who had lived there and loved Venice were wondering if her glorious legacy would soon disappear forever. Some of them began to make plans to save their beloved Venice from the new ruler and his vision for her. They organized groups to explain the grave problems of their beloved city. He listened to them for a while and then dismissed them as he continued his own plans.

Today, Venice is in a badly deteriorated state. It has regular flooding and many of the buildings are in disrepair. There seems to be no money for maintenance. Her reputation as the “Bride of the Adriatic” has deteriorated along with her buildings. The vibrant community of learned and artistic people who once populated Venice was gone. People who had no emotional ties to the city had replaced those that
had. The mud to them was normal because they had never known the beauty of the canals.

Fewer and fewer visitors come to Venice each year. I first visited Venice many years ago and loved her at first glance. After spending time there, my love and respect for her uniqueness grew. I still remember the vibrant optimistic beauty of Venice the way she was. My most recent visit to Venice was this very year. She has changed so much that she is barely recognizable.

The last I heard, there was a meeting in the Ducal Palace. A notice was posted on the big wooden door of Saint Mark’s Cathedral next door. The official notice from the new ruler read:

Hear ye, hear ye. We have heard about your plans to change our plans. We have studied the problem and considered your position. We have a few more canals to drain before all Venice will be mud.

It is early on Saturday morning, and I think I can hear the sound of many people headed for Saint Mark’s Square to stand in front of the big pumps. They’re singing, “Bring back our beautiful bride.”

Venice is a wonderful city and it is worth saving and restoring to its past glories. She reminds me of another beautiful, unique place. More than a century and a half ago, Carson College and Newman College formed a union which blossomed into what might be called the “Bride of Mossy Creek.” Like Venice, Carson-Newman College is unique. Like Venice, time and circumstances have taken their toll on the “Bride of Mossy Creek.”

Both places are in need of restoration to return them to their past glories. Both “brides” are worthy of our best efforts. Venice can be restored. Carson-Newman College can be restored, so that once again her beauty will reveal the truth of her goodness. It is not too late. For all those who have loved Carson-Newman College, I am optimistic, as I lend my efforts for the return of the “Bride of Mossy Creek.”
Hegemony or Dissent: Baptist Identity and Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century

[2006 Carlyle Marney Lecture]

Bill J. Leonard

In 1890, William Whitsitt, President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, wrote:

I am casting about to begin writing a work on American Baptist History. It is an Herculean task, and I must keep it all to myself. Baptist History is a department in which ‘the wise man concealeth knowledge.’ It is likely I shall not be able to publish the work while I live, but I can write it out in full and make arrangements to publish it after my death, when I shall be out of the reach of bigots and fools.”

Whitsitt knew whereof he spoke. By 1899, he had resigned his position under pressure from those Landmark leaders whose theology of Baptist succession he challenged. Today, few would dispute Whitsitt’s findings that Baptists did not begin to practice immersion until 1641, some thirty years after the movement began. Yet the conflict that surrounded his research anticipated controversies that have swept over Baptist institutions for over a century.

Issues are diverse and divisive, creating tensions among trustees, administrators and faculty, often spilling over to students, alumni, and churchly constituencies. Over the last century, controversies included such issues as the teaching of evolution and the historical-critical method, dancing on campus, acceptance of government funds, faculty

---

publications, adherence to confessions of faith, required chapel, and institutional governance.

Baptist higher education in America began as early as 1765, when the College of Rhode Island (later Brown University) was founded. Historian Donald Mathews observed that, “By the 1830s Methodists and Baptists were energetically establishing educational societies throughout the South in an attempt to broaden the scope and constituency of Evangelical [and denominational] education.”

Other Baptists resisted this effort, however. In the “Black Rock Address,” (1832) Old School (Primitive) Baptists attacked Baptist-based higher education in insightful anticipation of the difficulties these schools would encounter. First, they opposed “sectarian colleges”—denominational schools—because they implied “that our distinct views of church government, of gospel doctrine and gospel ordinances, are connected with human sciences, a principle we cannot admit.” In other words, Baptist identity would be swept away or watered down when associated with the liberal arts.

Second, they objected to the creation of “divinity” or religion faculties and programs since teaching those subjects suggested that God’s truth was merely “a human science on a footing with mathematics, philosophy, law, etc.” Making it simply another academic subject would undermine Christian distinctiveness.

Third, the “Address” repudiated the idea that those “called to preach” should have formal theological education. Instead, God called “no man to preach his gospel, till he has made him experimentally acquainted with that gospel, and endowed him with the proper measure of gifts suiting the field he designs him to occupy.” God, not theological faculties, would take care of the “called.”

These Old School Baptists were insightful, I think, in their awareness of the dangers Baptists would face then and, amazingly, now in their programs of higher education. They anticipated some of the very problems that we continue to discuss and debate. Indeed, the concerns they raised are with us yet, perhaps with a vengeance in some schools.

---

2 Donald G. Mathews, Religion in the Old South (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 88.


They include: How can Baptist identity be maintained amid the pluralism required by a liberal arts education, especially in communities and churches where fewer people know or care about “Baptistness” in religion? How is a religious studies curriculum distinct from and parallel to other aspects of a liberal arts curriculum at a Baptist-related school? What is the nature of ministerial education for a generation more concerned about generic Christianity of non-denominationalism than the sectarian tribalism?

Earlier controversies in Baptist higher education in the South were moderated—a relative term, perhaps—by the cultural hegemony that Baptists maintained inside Southern culture. Indeed, as I have written elsewhere, the links between southern culture and the Southern Baptist denominational system forestalled or localized many controversies that descended on seminaries and colleges in much of the 20th century. Baptist schools received young people from Baptist churches, educated them in a context of liberal arts and required religion chapel, mandatory chapel attendance, Baptist campus ministry, seasonal revivals, and summer missions.

Graduation sent them back to their respective churches to serve as laity and clergy in service to the community and the kingdom of God. Those called to ministry moved on to a Baptist seminary where they were taught by Baptist professors who prepared them for service in Baptist churches or for teaching positions in religion departments in the Baptist colleges.

Early debates involved internal struggles over the nature of Baptist history and polity represented in Landmarkism, a movement that set agendas for churches and schools regarding the nature of the church, baptism, communion, localism, and history. Professors were disciplined or terminated over issues of biblical authority, the nature of salvation, excessive Calvinism or Arminianism, and other positions that seemed outside the Baptist (sometimes Landmark) norm. External struggles regarding new science, philosophy and theology spilled over into Baptist life in debates over the teaching of evolution, the use of the historical-critical method of biblical studies, German theology, and other signs of liberalism. Yet as intense as many of these debates became, they were often moderated by the constituent’s commitment to Baptist denominational identity in the context of southern regionalism.

A relatively intact denominational culture meant that there was general consensus as to what it meant to be Baptist and the Baptist system created both protection and vulnerability for denominationally-controlled schools. Culture carried with it a kind of de facto establishment with Baptists as the unofficial official religion throughout the
region. Controversies and conflicts often set the conservative middle of the constituency against the “orthodox” right and the “progressive” left.

Maintaining traditional Baptist identity is now complicated by the essential collapse of Anglo-Baptist culture in the South during the last thirty years. Transitions shaped by racial integration, ecumenism, pluralism, evangelicalism, non-denominationalism, and secularism have contributed to the collapse of Baptist culture and numerous “disconnects” in the traditional denominational system.

These tensions were exacerbated during the 1970s and 80s through concerted efforts of the “orthodox” party to create “course correction” that would retake the entire denominational system of the Southern Baptist Convention. Much of this initial effort was focused on the presence of liberalism in Baptist related schools of higher education. Orthodoxy required conformity to a particular type of confessionalism centered in the doctrine of biblical inerrancy.  

These developments in the national SBC produced varying responses from state Baptist convention-related colleges and universities across the South. Some institutions have redefined and renegotiated, their traditional relationship with their parent Baptist bodies changing their charters and gaining institutional control of their respective boards of trustees. Some of these schools minimize their Baptist heritage and largely leave faith-based conversations to the religion department, the chaplain’s office, campus ministers, or unofficial student-led religious communities.

Still other schools retain their traditional relationships and continue to negotiate with an increasingly divided state constituency. Certain of these schools struggle with whether to emphasize Baptist identity or a Christian/evangelical ethos. Others have experienced controversy regarding orthodoxy, institutional control, and confessional conformity, often with significant upheaval and unrest on campus.

Ironically, while these internal discussions and debates continue, the overall religious ethos of students and churches has changed considerably. Many Baptist churches are dropping or minimizing the name Baptist in their own identity. A new generation of clergy and laity is increasingly disconnected to denominational controversies and alignments in any form. The number of nonBaptist students, Catholic and Protestant, increases annually on many old-line Baptist campuses. Indeed, social historians and other analysts now describe a very different

---

religious culture in the South than existed in the 1980s.\textsuperscript{6} Conservative students and constituents seem less concerned with whether professors “believe the Bible” than where they stand on the decisive moral and political issues of the time—abortion, homosexuality, capital punishment, and Hillary Clinton.

Public debates often suggest that the primary, perhaps the only, choices lie between blatant secularization of the college campus and the explicit Christianization (if not Baptistification) of a school’s educational ethos. But are there other choices than becoming Dartmouth or Wheaton? How might the Baptist past inform the individual and institutional future?

Questions of Baptist theological and political dissent are at the heart of this study. First, it suggests that contemporary attempts to delimit Baptist identity might explore the relationship between believers’ church, conscience, and dissent in early Baptist life. Such dissent did not exist for itself, but was a direct outgrowth of Baptist commitment to a church composed only of believers, those who could testify to a work of grace in their hearts. Likewise, dissent was intricately related to Baptists’ concern for the freedom of conscience and the nature of uncoerced faith. Second, these aspects of early Baptist identity might be helpful in addressing the unending quest for what it means to be Baptist in the postmodern era, especially in terms of higher education at Baptist-related colleges and universities. Might these early sources of identity inform religious conversations on campuses where questions of diversity, pluralism and “voice” seem unending?

Baptists began as a community of dissent. They challenged establishmentarian hegemony in a variety of ways. First, they were non-conformists who refused to abide by the imposition of religious uniformity demanded by the state-based church of their day. Second, they often spoke out against the idea that individuals should be compelled to support financially and devotionally a church in which they had no VOICE. Third, they defied a church that compelled belief by virtue of birth, status, or culture; and sought to separate from it.

Anglican Daniel Featley’s critique of 17th century Baptists illustrates their basic nonconformity. His list of Baptist distinctions is clearly an establishmentarian nightmare. They include:

First, that none are rightly baptized but those who are dipt.
Secondly, that no children ought to be baptized.
Thirdly, that there ought to be no set form of Liturgy or prayer by the Book, but onely by the Spirit.
Fourthly, that there ought to be no distinction by the Word of God between the Clergy and the Laity but that all who are gifted may preach the Word, and administer the Sacraments.
Fifthly, that it is not lawful to take an oath at all, no, not though it be demanded by the magistrate.
Sixthly, that no Christian may with good conscience execute the office of civil magistrate.

Worse yet, they proliferated their views throughout the land, as Featley said: “The presses sweat and groan under the load of their blasphemies.”

Every article in this fascinating list reflects degrees of nonconformity among Baptists in terms of theology, worship, and civic activity. In short, Baptists, like other sectarians in 17th century England, were political and religious dissenters.

A similar dissent was evident among Baptists in the American colonies, this time in response to the Puritan establishment. Roger Williams, the erstwhile proto-Baptist, was thrown out of godly Boston in 1636 and into the “howling wilderness” of the New England winter for preaching “the same course of rigid separation and anabaptistry which Mr John Smith at Amsterdam had done.” In exile, Williams was saved by the Narragansett Indians from whom he purchased land to found Providence Plantation, a place he hoped would “be for a shelter for persons distressed of conscience. . . .”

---

7 Daniel Featley, *The Dippers Dipt, or, the Anabaptists Duck’d and Plung’d over Head and Eares, at a Disputation at Southward*, 36.

8 Ibid.

For these Baptists, dissent was grounded in the freedom of conscience, individual and communal. Indeed, references to conscience punctuate early Baptist responses to religious and political establishments. Baptist leader Leonard Busher wrote in a 1614 treatise entitled *Religions Peace: or, A Plea for Liberty of Conscience* warned: “And as kings and bishops cannot command the wind, so they cannot command faith; You may force men to church against their consciences, but they will believe as they did afore, when they come there; for God giveth a blessing only to his own ordinance, and abhorreth antichrist’s.”

Thomas Helwys’ classic work, *A Short Declaration of the Mystery of Iniquity* (ca. 1612) was perhaps the earliest Baptist document to articulate issues of conscience directly. Perhaps his most quoted passage begins: “Let the King judge, it not most equal that men should choose their religion themselves, seeing they only must stand themselves before the judgment seat of God to answer for themselves, when it shall be no excuse for them to say, we were commanded or compelled to be of this religion by the king or by them that had no authority from him.” Helwys apparently went beyond John Smyth in extending liberty of conscience to nonChristians and atheists alike. He wrote: “Let them be heretics, Turks, Jews, or whatsoever, it appertains not to the earthly power to punish them in the least measure.”

Some 17th century Baptist confessions also address issues of conscience. These include the General Baptist *Standard Confession* of 1660 and the Particular Baptist *Second London Confession* of 1688. The *Standard Confession* asserts: “That it is the will, and mind of God (in these Gospel times) that all men should have the free liberty of their

---


own Consciences in matters of Religion, or Worship, without the least oppression, or persecution, as simply upon that account.”\(^{14}\) It also affirms Baptists’ desire to “be subject to the higher Powers, to obey the Magistrates,” but quickly adds: “But in case the Civil Powers do, or shall at any time impose, things about matters of Religion, which we through conscience to God cannot actually obey, then we with Peter also do say, that we ought (in such cases) to obey God rather than men; 

\textit{Acts} 5.29.\(^{15}\)

The \textit{Second London Confession}, a hallmark of English Baptist Calvinism that parallels the Westminster Confession, states clearly “God alone is Lord of the Conscience, and hath left it free from the Doctrines and Commandments of men which are in any thinking contrary to his Word, or not contained in it.”\(^{16}\) However, as a solidly Reformed document, \textit{Second London} cautions: “So that to believe such Doctrines, [that are contrary to his Word, or not contained in it] or obey such Commands out of Conscience, is to betray true liberty of Conscience; and the requiring of an implicit Faith, and absolute and blind Obedience, is to destroy Liberty of Conscience, and Reason also.”\(^{17}\)

Similar phrases are utilized in the so-called \textit{Orthodox Creed} of 1679 written by General Baptists who apparently flirted with Calvinism.\(^{18}\) It states:

\begin{quote}
The Lord Jesus Christ, who is king of kings, and lord of all by purchase, and is judge of quick and dead, is only Lord of Conscience; having a peculiar right so to be. He having died for that end, to take away the guilt, and to destroy the filth of sin, that keeps the consciences of all men in thralldom, and bondage, till they are set free by his special grace. And therefore he would not have the consciences of men in bondage to, or imposed upon, by any usurpation, tyranny, or command whatsoever, contrary to his revealed will in his word, which is the only rule he hath left, for the con-
\end{quote}


\(^{15}\) Ibid, 233.

\(^{16}\) Ibid, 279.

\(^{17}\) Ibid, 279-280.

\(^{18}\) Ibid, 296.
sciences of all men to be ruled, and regulated, guided by, through the assistance of his spirit. And therefore the obedience to any command, or decree, that is not revealed in, or consonant to his word, in the holy oracles of scripture, is a betraying of the true liberty of conscience. And the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute blind obedience, destroys liberty of conscience, and reason also, it being repugnant to both, and that any man, can make that action, obedience, or practice, lawful and good, that is not grounded in, or upon the authority of holy scripture, or right reason agreeable thereunto.  

This is perhaps the strongest and clearest statement in any of the Baptist confessions delineating the relationship between conscience, scripture, and uncoerced faith. Its opposition to the “requiring of an implicit faith” seems as relevant in 21st century Saudi Arabia and Tennessee as in 17th century Britain.

These references have significant implications for understanding the role of conscience in contemporary Baptist life, in the church and in the public square. First, it appears that for these early Baptists conscience was closely related to uncoerced faith. Faith that was required or based in “blind obedience” was no faith at all. Second, this understanding of the radical nature of conscience did not exist for itself but was somehow bound up in the overall work of Christ and faithfulness to the word of God. It was a belief that the individual could indeed determine the meaning of scripture and challenge the prevailing hermeneutics of religious establishments and tradition. Third, it is clear that issues of conscience had implications inside and outside the church. Inside the community of faith, conscience and dissent were inseparable from the idea of a believers’ church and the authority of Christ mediated through the congregation.

Dissent and conscience did not exist for themselves; this was no rotary club, no gang of grumblers. It was a community of believers. Baptist concern for dissent and conscience is distinct in that it is founded on an experience of God’s grace through Jesus Christ. They spoke of a regenerate church membership, as the Orthodox Creed noted: ‘those who are united unto Christ by effectual faith, are regenerated, and have a new heart and spirit created in them through the virtue
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of Christ his death, resurrection, and intercession, and by the efficacy of the holy spirit, received by faith.”

Baptists believed that the authority of Christ was mediated to the congregation of believers beyond bishops, presbyteries or conferences and other judicatories. Paul Fiddes suggests that the foundation of the “Baptist experience” begins with the belief that,

The liberty of local churches to make decisions about their own life and ministry is not based in a human view of autonomy or independence, or in selfish individualism, but in a sense of being under the direct rule of Christ who relativizes other rules. This liberating rule of Christ is the foundation of what makes for the distinctive ‘feel’ of Baptist congregational life. . . .

It was, in short, a covenantal relationship between Christ and the community of faith. Smyth’s 1612 confession from Amsterdam gives evidence of this idea early on in its assertion: “That the church off CHRIST is a company off faithful people I Cor. 1.2. Eph. 1.1. separated from the world by the word & Spirit off GOD. 2 Cor. 6, 17. being knit unto the LORD, & one unto another, by Baptisme. I Cor. 12.13. Upon their owne confession of the faith. At. 8.37. and sinnes. Mat. 3.6.” “Knit unto the Lord and to one another by baptism” is a powerful description of a covenant community of believers. Thus the idea of covenant was intricately related to the foundation of a believers’ church. God made covenant with the redeemed and they made covenant with one another.

These dissenting ideas regarding congregationalism and conscience had (and have) implications for Baptist responses to hermeneutics, church polity, religious liberty, and ultimately pluralism. Yet it created an inevitable tension between individual and communal appropriation of conscience. That is, while Baptists assert the intricate relationship between the individual and the community of faith, they have a theology and polity in which conscience can set the individual against the community, and one local congregation against other congregations, all while remaining faithful to various Baptist identities and con-

20 William L. Lumpkin, Baptist Confessions of Faith, 316.
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victions. Recent divisions in the United States have revealed frustrations at both ends of that spectrum as some have bemoaned the rabid individualism evident in those who (it is said) use the idea of the priesthood of all believers as a kind of carte blanche for believing anything they wish and still remaining Baptist, and those who demand uniformity to creed, confession or ideological positions and exclude those who disagree.  

From the beginning of their movement, Baptists anchored conscience and its resulting dissent solidly in their theological understanding of the nature of the church as a believers’ community through which the authority of Christ was directly mediated. Yet this kind of personal and communal autonomy meant that Baptists could and did divide over multiple ways of interpreting Scripture and being Baptist, an ever-present possibility that conscience could lead to divisions inside the church.

In the public square, Baptists’ understanding of church, conscience, and dissent produced what in many cases turned out to be even more radical results. In fact, one might suggest that in their concerns for freedom of conscience and religious liberty in the general society, Baptists anticipated religious pluralism more immediately than any other Protestant communion.

Many Baptists in England and America insisted that God alone was judge of conscience, and therefore no religious or political establishment could judge the non-conformist, the heretic, or even the atheist. The belief that liberty could be extended to heretics and atheists was radical for its time and came to highlight Baptist identity in the New World of the world.”  

Dr. John Clarke, he founder of Newport colony, was also an outspoken proponent of freedom of conscience and its implications for religious liberty. In a treatise known as *Ill Newes from New England; or, a Narrative of New-Englands Persecution*, Clarke acknowledged that: “No such believer, or Servant of Christ Jesus hath any liberty, much less Authority, from his Lord, to smite his fellow servant, nor yet with outward force, or arme of flesh, to constrain, or restrain his Con-
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23 This is evident in some of the pronouncements of the group promoting a Baptist “Manifesto” and in the activities of the Southern Baptist Convention in demanding a particular kind of conformity to the denomination’s confession of faith.

science, no nor yet his outward man for Conscience sake." The charter of Rhode Island incorporated these ideals, noting,

No person within said Colony, at any time hereafter, shall be in any wise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question for any differences of opinion in matters of religion, . . . but that all and any persons may, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, freely and fully have and enjoy his and their own judgments and consciences in matters of religious concernments throughout the tract of land hereafter mentioned.

Thus Rhode Island became, in the eyes of many New England Puritans, a “rogue’s harbor,” seedbed for dissenters and religious perverts from throughout the colonies. Thomas Cobbet, the Puritan anti-Baptist knew exactly what would happen if such a Baptist vision of church and society prevailed. He wrote that if the dissenters “are to be let alone unrestrained and [un]published, both civil government and state and churches here [in New England] would soon be blown up and we should become a very chaos.” And he was right, in a way. Rhode Island seemed a religiously chaotic place if ever there was one.

Conscience and religious liberty did not mean silence or nebulous syncretism, however. Baptists debated, dissented, and argued with their opponents (and each other) unashamedly. And that is the paradox. Baptists spoke of ideas freely, strongly, passionately, but began by asserting the right of others to do the same. Conscience is not merely tolerated by an actual or de facto majority; it belongs to every individual. Yet the right to belief according to conscience does not mean that everyone is right. Baptists have not hesitated to express their disagreement with those—Quakers, for example—with whom they differed.

The response of these 17th century Baptists to their social and ecclesial contexts may have implications for contemporary educational institutions with Christian and perhaps Baptist roots as they confront
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the changing religious landscapes. The dilemma is nothing new; it has simply become more intensified. Historian Richard T. Hughes asks the central question: “How is it possible for Christian institutions of higher learning to develop into academic institutions of the first order and, at the same time, to nurture in creative ways the faith commitments that called these institutions into existence in the first place? More than this, how is it possible for Christian Colleges and universities to weave first-class academic programs from the very fabric of their faith commitments?”

Hughes traces quite a spectrum. At one end, Hughes says, are those “Christian educators in America [who] have established numerous Christian colleges and universities, only to see those institutions eventually abandon their Christian orientations in the interest of a purely Enlightenment-based search for truth.” At the other end are those schools that “cling so tightly to a particularistic, a priori, Christian worldview that they place limits on the search for truth, largely abandon the Enlightenment-based presuppositions of higher education, and thwart any possibility that they might eventually take their place in the larger American culture as serious colleges and universities of the highest order.”

This discussion is nothing new, but intensified in the United States through the 1980s and 90s, especially as Baptist schools began to reexamine their relationship with their parent Baptist bodies, some deepening those connections confessionally, even dogmatically, and others distancing themselves from formal connections to varying degrees. Many are caught somewhere in the middle.

Likewise, Hughes points out that there are many ways in which denominationally-related schools might respond to these issues that are distinct from the Reformed-based agendas that have received attention from many school administrators. These include the Mennonites, for whom “the driving force for higher education is not the sovereignty of God over all creation, but a vision of radical discipleship,” often connected to service and even dissent. Lutherans have often grounded their educational philosophy in the tradition of the “two kingdoms” centered in the world and the kingdom of God.


Catholics, Hughes suggests, are “incarnation and sacramental” in their approach to education, in ways that lead them to ask “how Christian scholars—and graduates of Catholic institutions—can bring the presence of Christ into a world filled with suffering, poverty, and injustice.”

I would add that a major difference between Catholic and Protestant institutions, especially Baptist institutions, is the existence of a sacramental presence in the midst of the campus in chapels or churches. In other words, Catholics bring Christ’s real presence into the center of campus in ways that cannot be compared with Baptist tendency to minimize the sacramental and replace it with the verbal (the spoken or preached word).

I would suggest that one Baptist way (no doubt among many) for responding to the changing nature of campus life would be a reassertion of those early Baptist ideals of dissent, conscience, and believers’ church. That is, Baptists should be at the forefront of the quest for “voice” on college and university campus, not as a tepid, grudging response to nebulous political correctness, but because “voice” is endemic to the nature of Baptist identity, perhaps even its most profound distinctive. Baptist schools might lead the way in drawing on this heritage to encourage and facilitate dialogue, dissent, and cultivation of conscience, not because that is the secular wave of the future, but because their tradition recognized the value of these ideals earlier than any other modern Protestant communion. Two examples, one negative, the other positive, must suffice. They are related explicitly to the Southern Baptist Convention, but no doubt could be found in other Baptist-related schools.

In their first edition of the Baptist Faith and Message, approved in 1925, the denominational confession of faith, Southern Baptists seemed to celebrate diversity in the quest for truth, while anchoring it to their Christian heritage. The section on “Education” suggests:

Christianity is the religion of enlightenment and intelligence. In Jesus Christ are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. All sound learning is therefore a part of our Christian heritage. The
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new birth opens all human faculties and creates a thirst for knowledge.\textsuperscript{32}

In this document Christ is the door to “wisdom and knowledge” and the faith of the believers impels them to seek education.

After numerous controversies in Baptist-related educational institutions, many a direct outgrowth of issues of dissent and conscience, the 1963 revision of the \textit{Baptist Faith and Message} took a different response to education. The article declared:

In Christian education there should be a proper balance between academic freedom and academic responsibility. Freedom in any orderly relationship of human life is always limited and never absolute. The freedom of a teacher in a Christian school, college, or seminary is limited by the pre-eminence of Jesus Christ, by the authoritative nature of the Scriptures, and by the distinct purpose for which the school exists.\textsuperscript{33}

In a little less than forty years Christ ceased to be the door to all truth and learning and became the wall that “limited” the teachers’ “freedom,” and set the boundaries for conscience and the possibility of dissent. In a sense, therefore, Baptist-related schools, at least in the South, have mirrored that dichotomy in their approach to divisive issues and “voice” on campus. The third revision of the Baptist Faith and Message (2000) combines both of the statements with brief editorial changes. Perhaps these revisionists felt that if the inerrancy of the Bible was secure, they could have it both ways academically. They cannot.

Yet there is another historic circumstance that illustrates the way in which certain Southern Baptist schools were forced to come to terms with dissent and conscience because of their commitment to and rhetoric of evangelism and a believers’ church. It began with efforts to desegregate schools connected to Baptist state conventions in the American South. Dissenters could not get a hearing from trustees and administrators when they called for admission of African Americans so they turned evangelism on its head by insisting that Southern Baptists could
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not in good conscience send missionaries to Africa to evangelism native peoples and then refuse to admit them to their schools in the United States, should they qualify and seek admission. In *The Stem of Jesse*, Will Campbell tells of the admission of Nigerian Baptist Sam Oni to Mercer in 1963. He cites the letter sent to the University president by John Mitchell, admissions director. It stated:

Mr. Oni was converted through the work of a young man who was graduated from our university. Would this young Christian understand that the doors of the university that prepared the missionary who brought the Gospel are closed to his converts? Indeed, he has a closer relationship to our university than the Negro of Macon, Georgia. He is one of our constituents.\(^{34}\)

The admissions director held the university’s feet to the evangelical fire and on April 18, 1963 the Mercer board of trustees voted thirteen to five (with three abstentions) “that Mercer University consider applicants for admission based on qualifications, without regard to race, color of skin, creed, or place of origin.”\(^{35}\) Sam Oni became the first black student but others, specifically African Americans, would follow. The color line at Mercer University was broken, at least in part, because of the commitment of Baptist dissenters to freedom of conscience alongside evangelical imperatives.

Today I would suggest that Baptist-related schools and Baptists in other kinds of schools consider dissent, conscience, and believers’ church as resources for responding to transitions in American private higher education. They would thus own up to a heritage, in which pluralism was not simply tolerated but demanded; where dialogue between ideologies was strong and divisive, but where, ideally, no one was silenced and everyone had voice.

They also acknowledge that pluralism does not mean compromise with conscience and that their commitments to individual and communal faith should be taken seriously, or at least permitted amid the many voices sounded out on any one campus. That is, they are free to make clear that their concerns for pluralism and voice are grounded in their understanding of the nature of faith, faith in Jesus Christ. They
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acknowledge with the rest of the college or university that the campus may nurture church communities, but it is not a church and that the term “Christian University” must be used with caution both in terms providing a context for multiple voices and for the school’s own moral commitments to provide fairly for all its employees.

This approach could be its own kind of “witness,” especially in situations where representatives of both the left and the right work to silence dissent that seems unorthodox to them in one way or another. It may mean that on some campuses, Baptists relinquish their traditionally privileged status either because it no longer exists or because it is no longer appropriate. It does not mean that Baptists representing multiple ideologies and subgroups remain silent about their convictions regarding politics, ethics, and theology on the campus and in the world. Indeed, individual Baptists on any given campus will surely exercise conscience and dissent very differently even as they claim a common faith in Christ.

Some conservatives believe that secularism represents a new religious establishment that demands their counter-culture witness against abortion, same-sex unions, and the displacement of Judeo-Christian traditions in the public square. Others believe that gospel liberation impels them to challenge efforts by religious majorities perpetuate an implicit religious establishment in a privileged Protestantism. Still other Baptists may eschew a traditional privilege in the campus and in the culture, while reasserting a concern for radical freedom and radical discipleship. This is not without danger, especially since the energy in many private schools is for dogmatism left or right that minimizes voice or redefines the nature of dialogue.

Paul Fiddes writes insightfully about British universities in ways that may inform the American situation. He notes that in spite of the “advantages of a non-confessional stance of theology in the universities, we in Britain have also paid a price for it. Theology in some university faculties has become detached from the life and mission of the church. It has become a field of study using the same methods of investigation and research as other humanities, and has often obtained respectability by becoming simply identified with religious studies. . . .”36 He concludes that, “In a variety of ways, then, a ‘non-confessional’ approach to theology at university level may result in the sundering of academic theology from the experience and practice of actual church communities.

36 Paul S. Fiddes, Tracts and Traces, 5.
A better way forward is surely a ‘multi-confessional’ one, enabling students to reflect on a plurality of ways of life in community, across the separated Christian families. In such an approach the distinctive life-style of Baptist communities, marked by a particular Baptist experience, will have a part to play.” Increasingly, Fiddes’ call for a “multi-confessional” approach has implications for non-Christian individuals and communities on campus, expanding the complexity of voice in ways the founders of Rhode Island anticipated before anyone else.

For me, that “particular Baptist experience,” is inseparable from issues of dissent, conscience, and unashamed faith. So, to return to Thomas Helwys’ radical insight, bring on the “heretics, Turks, Jews or whatsoever,” along with the unashamedly Christocentric Baptists. In Daniel Featley’s memorable line, let the “presses sweat and groan with the load” of our 21st century “blasphemies.” And through it all let us all confess with humility, the words of the First London Confession, 1644: “that we know in part, and that we are ignorant of many things which we desire and seek to know; and if any shall do us that friendly part to show us from the Word of God that we see not, we shall have cause to be thankful to God and them.” Now there is pluralism worth exploring, one more time.
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The Kingdom of God Is at Hand

[2006 T. B. Maston Lecture]

Anthony (Tony) Campolo

The kingdom of God is at hand. Check it out in Mark 1:15! Jesus was all about the kingdom of God. And when he told the disciples to pray, he told them to pray for the kingdom. To this day, when his disciples say the prayer, “Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth,” there is emphasis on the kingdom. It cannot be minimized; the Scripture says it is a Holy Grail.

The kingdom of God has obviously transformed people and transformed social systems. It seems to me that the church has veered either in one direction or the other and has failed to bring those two transformations together. There are those who emphasize reaching individuals, and kingdom individuals are transformed into the power of the Holy Spirit. There are others who have been focused on transforming society. Jesus did not make that dichotomy. The kingdom of God is a holistic entity, it transforms people, and it transforms societies.

Now, I have to say, there is no question but that he began to transform people. And it is interesting to note that he put great emphasis on prayer, as he talked about this movement that he initiated and that would transform the world into the world it ought to be. Now, you have to understand, I do not come from a position that really understands prayer very deeply. I am Baptist, and what Baptists do is ask God for something. That’s our whole understanding of prayer. I mean we are like my son when he was seven years old. He came in and said, “I’m going to bed; I’m going to be praying, anybody want anything?” You begin to sense that for him prayer is like calling upon a transcendent Santa Claus to deliver the desires of your heart.

I have to say that is very, very weak, especially in light of the fact that the 8th chapter of Romans says: “When we pray we don’t know what we can pray for and how to pray.” That’s not my theology, that’s Paul’s. And, when I reflect on it, he’s right. I think back on the things I have prayed for, and I am glad that God did not take me seriously. There are a lot of things that I prayed for that would have been disastr-
ous. I remember when I was in high school, there was this girl that I knew with my Calvinistic theology (I understand Calvin is becoming big time in Southern Baptist circles) had been ordained for me before the foundation of the earth. I prayed that God would deliver her into my hands, but she chose to live outside of the will of God. She married somebody else. I ran into her while I was lecturing in Washington State, and she asked me out for coffee. I thought, my goodness, after all of these years she has realized her mistake! We went out for coffee, and she talked, and talked, and talked, and talked, and talked, and talked. When I left that restaurant, I kid you not, I was singing the Doxology. “Praise God from whom all blessings flow!” Thank you, Jesus!

We don’t know how to pray, as we ought to pray. I don’t worry about that because the eighth chapter of Romans says that the Holy Spirit maketh intercessions for the saints with groanings that cannot be uttered. I always imagined that after I finished my stupid prayer, the Holy Spirit says to the Father, “Father, I know that was a stupid prayer. This is what he should have said!” The Holy Spirit then repackages whatever I said in a way that is pleasing to God and really says what needs to be said.

But there are other ways of praying. I have become fascinated, as of the last ten to fifteen years with re-centering prayer. I wake up in the morning, and I do the centering prayer thing. I focused on Jesus. There is an old African American spiritual that goes, “Woke up this morning with my mind stayed on Jesus. Woke up this morning with my mind stayed on Jesus.” That’s what I do. I get up in the morning before I have to, and I drive everything else out of my mind. It takes me about ten to fifteen minutes to become inwardly filled. Stillness is not simply the absence of noise, it is the condition of the heart and mind and soul.

You can be in a noisy room and be filled and be in a quiet room and be noisy inside. It takes me quite a while to get still, to get focused on Jesus. I say his name over and over again. And there are those who accuse me of vocalizing things because I say the name of Jesus over and over again. But, there is something about that name that drives back the animals and creates sacred space.

Sacred space is so rarified that there is nothing there save the presence of Christ. In the stillness of the morning, I don’t ask God for anything. Mother Teresa was once asked, “When you pray, what do you say to God?” She replied, “I don’t say anything. I listen.” So, Dan Rather said. “All right, when you pray, what does God say to you?” She said, “God doesn’t say anything; God listens. And, if you don’t understand that, I can’t explain it to you.” I do understand it. I do understand that kind of praying where you say nothing and you hear nothing. But in quietude and stillness you center down and you simply connect. In
that connectedness you wait for the spirit of God to flow into you, to penetrate, to saturate your being.

Such a mystical infilling of the Spirit is crucial in our day and age. I am not Pentecostal, I do not speak in tongues. I talk so fast that people think I speak in tongues, but I do not speak in tongues. But all of us who observe the world scene know that the Pentecostal Movement has swept around the world. A little over a hundred years old, it initiated itself in 1906, in the streets of California; and it has grown and grown until today there are 600 hundred million people who have been transformed under the Pentecostal spirit.

Now, I like those people. I mean they are fun. If you have been to a Pentecostal Church, you know they are a lot more fun than Southern Baptists. They really get into it. I just do not have the DNA for that kind of thing, however. It is just not I. I have been in the meetings, I felt the Spirit of God moving; but it never really hit me that way. For me, the infilling of the Holy Spirit in the context of Christ is in stillness.

In Christ in stillness, I surrender; and I allow the Spirit of God to invade me, to flow into my being. The Spirit penetrates my personhood to settle me down so that Christ may invade me. The Spirit of God invading the individual is the initiation of the kingdom of God. Jesus said, “The kingdom of God must first of all be within you.” If there is going to be a Lordship of God, it must start within, but it does not end there. The whole purpose of being “saved” and filled with the Holy Spirit is that you might become a person through whom God begins to build his kingdom in this world.

I didn’t catch that when I was a kid growing up in my Baptist church, because salvation was all about the next world. I felt that the real purpose of being “saved and filled with the Spirit” was so that if died you would go to Heaven. I was twelve years old sitting on the front row in the church, and the minister was screaming at the top of his lungs, “Are you ready to die?” I’m only twelve years old!

When that didn’t work there was always step number two: “You don’t have to die, but you could be left behind!” Man, now, that scared me! No matter what I wanted to do, that was the warning. What if you were there, and the trumpet sounds? Man, that was scary! The next time I went to the movies, I was scared. I was scared that halfway through the movie the trumpet was going to sound and throughout eternity I would be grabbing people and saying do you know how that movie ended, do you have any idea?

Now, I believe in the Second Coming, and I believe that I could die at any moment, as you undoubtedly do. The reality, however, is this. Christ wants to invade us, wants to penetrate us, and wants to be-
come Lord within our being; not so that we are ready for the next world, but that through us he might, in fact, begin to change things in this world. When the Spirit of God invades you, when the Spirit of God possesses you, you are transformed into someone through whom Christ can do his work in the world.

Consider this. Christ always worked; before the foundation of the world, Christ was. He is the second member of the Trinity, as a matter of fact. The first chapter of John says that he is the one who created the universe. All things were made by him, without him was not anything made that was made. Christ always was. Two thousand years ago, however, Christ took on human flesh, he became a human being, and he lived among us. He was a person like you and me. He was a physical being. Christ was incarnate in one named Jesus of Nazareth, he lived among us, and he was crucified, dead and buried. But, before he ascended into heaven, he let his disciples know that he was coming back as a spirit that would invade people.

This is the good news. He has come back. To as many as receive him, they become the body of Christ. But, you say, “Wait a minute, Campolo, I am quite willing to admit that two thousand years ago Christ was incarnated in Jesus; but you are not suggesting that Christ is incarnated in us, are you? I mean not in the same way. Jesus is the body of Christ, I will agree; but are you suggesting that we are the body of Christ?” I think I read that in the Bible, didn’t you? We are the body of Christ.

You say, “Wait a minute; I don’t live like Jesus!” No? It is about time to start trying! The same spirit that was in Christ Jesus, says the eighth chapter of Romans, and raised him from the dead, that same spirit shall be in your mortal body. You are the body of Christ, and it is time that you “walk worthy of the vocation for which you were called.” Christ invades people and possesses them. As many as receive him, to them he gives power to become the sons and daughters of God.

You say, “I don’t quite get it yet.” Then, try this. Romans, the 8th chapter, says that when the Spirit of God invades you, you become an heir of God, you call him Abba, Father, and you become a joint heir together with Christ. Christ is alive in you, living through you, transforming the world through you. And, if you are not an agent of transformation, you are failing to live up to your calling. We are not saved and filled with the spirit of Christ in order to leave the world, but to become the instruments through whom God is at work in the world.

Romans eight says that he shall bring into subjection to himself (end of first chapter of Ephesians) all principalities, all powers, all dominions, all thrones; and, then, this great phrase, “through the church.”
We are the body of Christ, the instruments through which God is at work to change the world that is into the world that ought to be.

I remember as a kid, sitting in church; and the minister tells you how bad the world is getting, how everything is slip-sliding away, how divorce is increasing, and crime is on the increase, drugs, pornography, and on and on. The woman behind me says, “Thank you Jesus, thank you, thank you!” I said to my mother, “Why is she so happy?” My mother said, “Well, the world is getting worse, and worse!” I said, “Then, why does that make her happy?” Well, you know why she was so happy! The crazy theology that gets propagated in the church is this: the world is going to get so bad, that Jesus will return. It is going to get so rotten, so corrupt, that he will come back. They call this the good news?

Now, it is about time that you get your eschatology from Jesus, rather than from Tim LaHaye. That the world is getting worse and worse has a truth to it. You cannot pick up a newspaper without being aware that something is wrong in this world. There is disintegration in society, but here is what Jesus says, “You want to know what my kingdom is all about? The kingdom is like the man who goes out and sows some wheat. When the wheat begins to grow, the evil one comes and sows weeds. The weeds grow alongside the wheat. When the wheat and the weeds grow up together, the field hands come to the master and say, what shall we do? Shall we pull out the weeds? And he said to them, “You can’t do that without messing up the wheat! Let the wheat and the weeds grow up together until the end; and, then, there will be a separation of the wheat and the tares.”

The point is clear. Is evil on the increase? Are the tares growing? Of course, they are. Evil is on the increase. But, people, don’t be blinded! So is the kingdom of God on the increase. May I point out that while America seems to be slip sliding, the truth is the kingdom of God is bursting loose in most places of the world. Go to Latin American, the church is exploding. Go to Asia, the church is exploding. Go to Africa, they are adding fifty thousand new members to the church every single week. There is an influx, there is a growth, there is a movement, and God is at work in the world.

Contrary to T. S. Elliott, this world will not end with a bang or a whimper. This is the way the world will end: the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdom of our God; and he shall reign forever, and ever, Hallelujah, Hallelujah! I see history moving toward this triumphant climax and the church being the primary instrument of God’s work. The facilitator has changed.

Now, when you start talking about changing the world, there are a variety of issues you must address. But, among all the issues, one do-
minates. If you are going to see the kingdom of God break loose, you have to address the issue of poverty. If you go to the 65th chapter of Isaiah, you will see all of the evidences of the kingdom of God cannot emerge unless you attack the problem of poverty. You know that passage in the 65th chapter of Isaiah! Verse seventeen says that God creates anew. In this new creation, first of all, no more will children die in infancy. What a great line. Thirty-five thousand children die every single day from starvation or diseases related to malnutrition. That won’t happen any more. And, incidentally, that is a vast improvement over where we were merely ten years ago.

Ten years ago I would have had to say that 45,000 children die every single day because of starvation or diseases related to malnutrition. We listen to prophets of doom so much that we begin to believe what they are saying. The truth is that tremendous inroads have been made on poverty; and it is really the case that we could end poverty, should we address ourselves to the task over the next twenty-five years. It can be done. It can be done. Great progress is being made. Whether we will pull it off, I’m not sure; but I do know this. We can address it, and all people will live out their lives in full health and well being. I like that. I am at an age where that is really great news. Old people will be taken care of. We won’t live in a society where elderly people will have to choose between buying food and buying medicine and where, if a man dies at 100, he will be considered unfortunate.

I like that because I’m old. You know you are old when your wife says, “Let’s go upstairs and have sex,” and, you say, “I can’t do both.” You know you’re old! Old people will live out their lives in perfect health. It says this, “Children will not be born to calamity.” Mothers and fathers won’t worry that their kids, when they become teenagers, are going to join gangs and be blown away. You read in that passage where people will build houses and get to live in their own houses and that they will have vineyards. Everybody is going to have a job, a good job, good housing, good health, and children that don’t die in infancy. Old people are taken care of, and the environment is protected. They do not hurt the mountain any more, it said.

All of these things happen, and this is the task of the church: to propagate a Christ who invades people, transforms them, and makes them into agents in whom Christ can work in the world. We are the body of Christ to bring into subjection to him all principalities, all powers, all dominions, and all thrones. That is our calling! To change the world that is into the world that ought to be, and we need to deal with the issue of poverty.

Now, when you deal with the issue of poverty, let me say that there are many levels at which we work. Because I think everything collates
around it, it is not surprising to me that there are 2000 verses of Scripture that deal with poverty directly. Two thousand verses of Scripture! The evangelical church of which I am a part has become fixated on abortion and homosexuality. That is all we talk about these days. The truth is that Jesus never mentions homosexuality. Please, Paul makes it clear that we need to do something about this, I guess; but there is only a handful of verses out there.

Poverty is the overwhelming issue of Scripture. You’re not going to argue with me on that one, are you? As a matter of fact, the only description Jesus gives us of Judgment Day is judgment concerning how we handle the poor. I wish it concerned theology (certainly, in Southern Baptist circles you want to make it concern theology and want to make sure that only sound people get in!). I can just see it on Judgment Day, Campolo, before we let you in: Virgin Birth, slowly agree, disagree, fairly disagree, check one!

On theology I am one of the “in people.” I am orthodox, I am evangelical, and I believe the Bible from cover to cover. I even believe the leather is genuine. But those are not the questions. Here’s the question: on Judgment Day you will be asked about the poor. Jesus will say, “I was hungry, did you feed me? Naked, did you clothe me, sick, did you care for me? I was a stranger, an alien, did you take me in? For inasmuch as you failed to do unto the least of these, you failed to do it unto me.”

You and I will be judged in those terms. What did we do for the last and the lame, for the brothers and sisters? Caring for the poor—it is the dominant issue. I am not suggesting that we ignore the homosexuality issue or that we ignore the abortion issue. I am just saying they are not the defining issues in Scripture. They are “in” within American Evangelicalism, but they are not the defining issues in Scripture. The defining issue is what we are going to do to alleviate the poverty of the world. One of my friends sarcastically accused me of being one of those evangelicals who believes that life begins at conception and ends at birth. We are too ready to protect life up until birth, but after birth we don’t really step forward and do what needs to be done to speak for the poor and the oppressed of the world. We kindly become social Darwinists and say it is up to every individual to survive on his own, to solve his or her own problems, and to make his or her own way in the world.

Many ways exist to address poverty. First of all, there is the micro, the opportunity to rescue a child in the Third World. For thirty-two dollars a month (about a $1.10 a day), you can feed, clothe, house, educate, and deliver the whole ball of wax to a child in a Third World country. That is why, when I come to an occasion like this, I always ask Compassion International to show up and put a table in the back. I
don’t want you to get out of here without having an opportunity to take the first step in eliminating poverty. Adopt a child. Now, that does not solve the problems of the world, but it does solve the problems of the world for that child. Besides, don’t you want a kid standing next to you on Judgment Day? When the Lord says, “I was hungry did you feed me, naked did you clothe me, sick did you care for me,” you can get the kid and say, . . . (laughter).

I was in Haiti where I, along with some of my former students, started a program. We run a network of ninety-five schools for slave children. Slave children in Haiti number 300,000. These are children who come from families who are so poor that their families give them away. When you go to Haiti and see one of the schools with kids in nice uniforms, they are not the ones we are talking about. The slave children cannot go to school until 4:30 or 5:00 p.m., because they have to first do their slave labor. We have to run our classes in our schools from about 4:30 to 9:00 p.m. These children don’t get uniforms. We struggle with these children.

I was in a town in the north of Haiti and saw the slave children lying in the streets at night. Because they are so beaten and maltreated, they would rather run away and die in the streets than to continue in their present conditions. I asked the pastor of the church how many are sleeping on the streets tonight? He said, “Oh, I counted them one night and there were close to forty.” We sat down and figured out how much money it would take to build a residence hall, a clinic, and a school for them to attend. A quarter of a million dollars would do it.

I went back and begged all the people I knew to put up money to build the facilities. The day that we opened the place, I got on the school bus. We went to the central plaza of the community where the local priest had gotten out the word that all the children who had no place to live could come to this plaza and we would give them a place. When we got there, there weren’t forty kids; there were 300! The word had gotten out to other villages and towns, and 300 had come! Agonizingly, we had to pick only forty. That meant that simultaneously we had to choose 260 of them to die. I tried not to look back on the kids I was leaving behind. As I was loading the forty, I tried to forget the faces of the kids I had to leave behind. I could not do it; they are etched indelibly in my consciousness. There was a little choir singing, “God is so good, God is so good. God is so good. He’s so good to me, He loves me so, God is so good to me.”

Something within me screamed against God, and I thought to myself: “God you are not good and you don’t care! If you were so good and if you cared, I would not have had to leave those kids back there to die!” As sure as I am that I am here, I felt God break into my con-
sciousness. I felt the word, and the word was this: “I am good and I do care, but those children will die not because I am not good and don’t care. They will die because the people into whom I put my Spirit, those who call themselves my body, and those who I have given myself to save, they don’t care.”

I don’t know whether you are supporting a child in a Third World country. The big things of poverty will only be addressed when we become committed on the micro level, and the micro level is supporting a child in a Third World country. So, before you leave tonight, if you are not supporting a child, you had better pick one up. Now, you don’t have to do this! But, if you don’t, all the elastic in your underwear will snap before you get to your car. So, if you see people walking across the parking lot holding up their trousers, you will know that person is not supporting a child in a Third World country.

We have to do what we can do on the micro level before we have any legitimacy on the macro level. One of my former students from East Tennessee was Shane Colburn. Shane came to Eastern and began to take Jesus seriously, a strange thing for a Baptist. I spoke only once at the Southern Baptist Convention. My opening line was an easy one. I said, “I don’t know why you are so upset about the inerrancy of Scripture. When you prove the Bible is inerrant, you are not going to do what it tells you to do anyway!”

Jesus meant what he said when he said to the rich young ruler, “Sell what you have and give to the poor.” You say, “You’re making it sound like it is going to be hard for rich people to get to heaven.” That’s not my line. You say, “Campolo, you almost make being a follower of Jesus irreconcilable with the upper middle class, affluent, American consumerist life style.” Yes, I am. I don’t see how you can be a follower of Jesus and buy into American consumerism. Jesus calls us to a radical counter-cultural lifestyle, and you don’t have to embrace it, but please don’t call yourself a follower of Jesus until you do.

A father brought his student son to my office to yell at me: “You got him into all of this radical stuff. You got him into all this radical Jesus stuff. He’s selling and giving to the poor, the pimps and whores on the street.” He said, “Now, don’t get me wrong Campolo, I don’t mind being Christian up to a point.” What an interesting statement. I don’t mind being a Christian up to a point. Dietrich was right on target when he said that when Jesus calls a person, he calls him to come and die. But, are we going to take Jesus seriously? There is a whole group of us now, who are no longer calling ourselves evangelicals, because the word “evangelical” in the popular secular mind has become synonymous with gay-bashing, anti-environmentalism, anti-feminism, and a pro-war, pro-gun mindset. Instead, we have taken the name given to
us by a secular, Jewish, country and western disk jockey in Nashville, Tennessee.

The disk jockey said, “Oh, you are those who are just into the ‘red letters’ of the Bible and everything you read in the Bible has to be seen in those terms.” Not bad! You remember the old Bibles that had the words of Jesus in red? Richard Land has accused me of minimizing the rest of the Bible because I call myself a “red letter” person. I’m not minimizing the rest of the Bible; I’m just saying you don’t understand the rest of the Bible until you first come to grips with Jesus. Jesus is the one that enlightens the rest of the Scripture and enables you to interpret it. If you don’t have Jesus, then you don’t have the message.

Another aspect of addressing poverty is in creating jobs. We must create jobs in order to do the work of the kingdom. Whenever I come to a Christian college like Carson-Newman, I always ask, “What is the Business Department doing?” for the Business Department is crucial determining the future of an institution. The Business Department can incorporate values of the kingdom of God or the values of the American culture. At Eastern we started a graduate program in the business department that eventually revolutionized the department. The people who were there, half of them left and the other half got converted.

We started a graduate program in which we trained young men and women to go to the Third World to start small businesses and cottage industries. In the end, you can only eliminate poverty among the poor by creating jobs. We began to experiment some years ago in the slums on the outskirts of Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic. We taught a group of men and women to make sandals out of worn out and discarded automobile tires. We gave children fifty cents every time they bought us a worn-out, discarded automobile tire. It wasn’t long before we had every worn out discarded automobile tire in Santo Domingo. Then, we started getting a lot of new automobile tires. Needless to say, we had to change our modus operandi.

We started many different kinds of businesses. But the most important thing we did was to train people to go in among the poor, get people together, get them to dream, get them into the future, and get them to believe that they can do something. Poor people are so put down by their poverty that they don’t have any confidence in themselves. But, when they are filled with the Holy Spirit, they do believe that they can do it! If you can get them into that Holy Spirit mindset, they won’t attribute a good idea to themselves. They will attribute it to God. They don’t have any confidence in themselves, but they have great confidence in God. “If God be for us, who can be against us! We can do all things through Christ who strengthens us.”
Calvinist, Mack Davis, the sociologist, points out that clearly Calvinism creates an incredible work ethic. I grew up on that thinking, “Be careful little hands, what you do.” Did you grow up on that, singing that song? “Be careful little hands what you do. God is up above, he is looking down.” That song ruined my dating life. I would be in a car waiting to make my move, when this voice came from heaven saying, “Careful little hands what you do!” But, if you can believe when you go to work, that God is watching you in everything and that you are serving God not your employer, you will become a diligent worker.

To make people good stewards of their money, to make them hard workers, to make them spiritually inspired, that’s what we do. Our students have gone out and worked primarily though one organization called Opportunity International. In the last fifteen years our students have created 350,000 jobs in the Third World. Let me repeat, 350,000 jobs. Each job ends up feeding six people. That many people are delivered from poverty, not for a day, not for a week, but for the rest of their lives. According to the calculations of the World Bank, if this little faith based organization continues on its present growth rate, we will have cut into world poverty by 10% by the year 2015. Now that’s quiet incredible!

Students from a school like Carson-Newman can make that kind of impact on the world. A school has no right simply to educate people to take their place in society. We have to educate a generation of young people who will change society and make the kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of our God. That’s our calling, and so we operate on that level. We have entered a new phrase where we are training people to do the same thing in urban America and in Appalachia, because you don’t have to go to the Third World to go to the Third World anymore. You can go into the hills of East Tennessee and find the Third World. You can go into the inner city of Nashville and find the Third World. You can go into Atlanta, Philadelphia, and New York and find the Third World in your own backyards.

So there’s a first level, which is micro; children, there is a middle level, job creation and, incidentally, I love that. Of course, the last level is the macro level. We can’t solve the problems of poverty unless we deal with governmental issues. You must get political. This war in Iraq is not only taking lives, but it is also costing $355,000 a minute. Let me repeat that. $355,000 a minute. We are spending a half a billion dollars a day. Incidentally, we are borrowing one billion dollars a week from the People’s Republic of China. Now, I want to know the implications of this society’s becoming totally indebted to a Communist state.

Poverty and war go hand in hand. War is the major cause of poverty in the world today, and we are called to be peacemakers. You say, “It
is not that easy. We are there now, and we can’t get out.” Can’t we? Three years ago the Arab League said, “Pull the American troops out, pull the British troops out, and let us replace those troops with an all Arab army. You don’t understand the culture or the religion; you are being interpreted as a bunch of Crusaders taking over a Muslin country. Let us Arabs take care of the Arabs.” Sounds right to me! I think it’s time to negotiate. You don’t negotiate with your friends. You negotiate with your enemies.

Let me point out that the federal budget, this year, has allotted less than four-tenths of one percent to deal with the poor of the world. Poverty in the world cannot be dealt with “through the church,” as much as you might wish it could. To eliminate poverty you have got to build roads, airports, and other infrastructures in Third World countries. Churches are not going to be able or willing to provide for the poor while committed to a lifestyle where six percent of the world’s population consumes forty-three percent of the world’s resources. It’s time for us to respond to the needs of the poor of the world and say we are going to put money there.

We need to be writing to our senators and our congressmen. We need to speak to those who are in power. We’ve got to take a stand. If the kingdom of God is to become a reality and if we are going to be kingdom people, we need to address the poverty issue. There are other issues, but this is the dominant one. We have no authority in any of this, unless we ourselves are willing to be changed in the Spirit of Christ. I’m only defining what it means to be a Christian. A Christian is one who responds on every level to the needs of the poor. A Christian is someone who is ready to become the body of Christ, living in this world, not only telling other people about Christ and winning them to the Lord, but in recruiting them to join in the movement of God in history.

Let me wrap it up. I belong to a black church in West Philadelphia and I love it. I didn’t join a black church. It was a white church when I joined. When black people moved in, all the white people moved out, except for our family—we’re Italian, we don’t move. Once a year in our church we have student recognition day. The young men and young woman who are away at universities come back and one by one they come to the pulpit. They simply announce what they are doing, and that’s enough to thrill the congregation: “I’m studying law at Harvard.” You will hear grandmothers and grandfathers say, “My, my, whooo—Thank you Jesus. Thank you Jesus!” Somebody else will say, “I’m studying music at Julliard.” “Who—Thank you Lord, thank you Jesus!” Somebody else says, “I’m studying engineering at M.I.T.” “Oh yeah, oh bless Jesus, yes, yes. Thank you Jesus!” You think you’ve
heard great music, but you have not heard the greatest music until you’ve heard 500 grandmothers and grandfathers moaning and groaning with joy, because their grandchildren are becoming what America never let them be!

When they were all finished and seated, all bright eyed and bushy tailed, our pastor got up and looked at them and said, “Children, Children, you gonna die, you gonna die!” That’s a good thing to tell college students. They somehow cannot conceptualize that; it’s beyond them. He said, “You gonna die. You don’t think you are going to die? They are going to take you to the cemetery, they are gonna drop you in a hole, they are going to throw dirt in your face, and they are going to go back to the church and eat the potato salad.”

“When you were born you were the only one that cried. Everybody else was happy. That’s not important. Here’s what’s important, when you die, will you be the only one that is happy, and everyone else will cry? That depends, that depends on what your life has been about. Right now you are collecting titles, doctors degrees, masters degrees, bachelor degrees. You’re collecting titles. Is that what’s it about, collecting titles? Or, is it about collecting testimonies?”

See, that’s black preaching. White guys can’t do that. Titles, testimonies that have “literation,” that have poetry, that have rhyme. And then he did what only black preachers can do. He swept through the Bible in five minutes. Certainly, white guys can’t do that. We get bogged down: “Today, we are going to exegete the first verse of the second chapter of . . . .” The black preacher started in Genesis and worked through Revelation in one sweep. He said, “There was Moses. There was Pharaoh. Pharaoh had the title of ruler of Egypt. Good title. Good Title, Ruler of Egypt! But, when it was all over, that’s all he had. He had a title. But, Moses had TESTIMONIES!! That’s good. That’s good.”

He said, “Jezebel, Queen Jezebel. Good title, Queen. Oh, that’s a beautiful title. She was going to destroy the life of a prophet of God; but, when it was all over, all she had was a title. She had the title but Elijah had the (response from audience) TESTIMONIES!!” We are going to “de-honky-ize” this congregation. I’ll give you one more shot, just one more shot. “There’s King Darius, King Darius. He threw Daniel into the lion’s den. But, when it was all over, all Darius had was a title. He had the title, but Daniel had the (from the audience) TESTIMONIES!!

People of God, one of these days, they will drop you in a hole, throw dirt in your face, and go back to the church and eat potato salad. And what will it all mean in the end? I wish for you titles; but, more importantly, I wish you so to live out the kingdom of God that, when
you hand up your sneakers at the end, there will be people standing around your grave giving testimonies, testimonies about how you told them about Christ and the Cross, how you led them into a relationship with Jesus and transformed them into kingdom builders. They will give testimonies of how you inspired them to take care of the poor and the needy on the micro and middle levels. They will speak of how you engaged the great macro issues of war and poverty of your time. Pray that when it’s all over, to the people standing around your grave, you will have TESTIMONIES!

Thank You.
Twilight at Monticello*

[An Except from An Evening with Thomas Jefferson]

J. D. Sutton

My friends. Good evening. Please forgive me if I have kept you waiting long. I was...otherwise engaged...and grew neglectful of the hour.

Please forgive me.

My dear young lady, I am delighted to see you in our company this night. And my good sir! I had been told you would not be joining us. I am so very pleased you have come. Indeed, I am honored—and most flattered—that you should all have such interest in passing your time in the company of one old man.

When finally I retired to Monticello following my service as President, my daughter, Patsy—Mrs. Randolph—inquired of me on what scale I wished to entertain. And I assured her that, although I might from time to time enjoy the company of an occasional guest, it was my intention in retirement to live “like a plain country gentleman.”

This, however, I have been unable to do. Unlike yourselves, un-asked-for visitors come at all times, from all nations, and from every state of the Union, paying shorter or longer visits. And as Dr. Franklin has observed, after three days both fish and visitors stink. Present company excepted, of course. Most are drawn, no doubt, by idle curiosity. Though one young gentleman assured me it was his privilege, as an American citizen, to satisfy himself how I lived. Though I do not recall that as an article in our Bill of Rights! And a female visitor punctured her parasol through my window, that she might view me better! Though what good she derived for my...pane...I cannot say.

In any event, I am pleased—and relieved—to be this night in the company of friends, and not merely the idle or the curious.
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Apart from such unwelcome intrusions, however, I live my days in the bosom of my family, my farm, and my books—I cannot live without books!—and imagine myself as blest as the most blessed of the patriarchs. In truth I live so much like other people that I might refer to ordinary life as the history of my own.

I have lived temperately, eating little animal food, and that not as an aliment so much as a condiment to the vegetables which constitute my primary diet.

(Pouring wine from a decanter.) Dr. Rush, I know, subscribes to a daily glass and a half of wine, but I double that, and even treble it with a friend, but halve its effects by drinking the weak wines only. The ardent wines I do not drink, nor do I use ardent spirits in any form. À Votre santé! (He takes a sip, is satisfied, and downs the entire glass.)

I have been blest with organs of digestion that accept and concoct, without ever murmuring, whatever the palate chooses to consign to them. And I have not yet lost a tooth by age. Unlike a certain general I could mention.

I was a hard student before I entered on the business of life, and now, retired, I am again a hard student. Indeed, my fondness for reading and studying revolts me from the drudgery of letter writing. And a stiff wrist, the consequence of an early dislocation, makes writing both slow and painful. So I apologize to any of you to whom I may owe correspondence.

I generally devote from five to eight hours to my sleep, according as the book I am reading or my company (ahem!) interests me, and I never go to bed without an hour, or half hour’s previous reading of something moral, whereupon to ruminate in the intervals of sleep.

But whether I retire to bed early or late, I rise with the sun.

I use spectacles at night, but not necessarily in the day, unless in reading small print. My hearing, sir, is distinct in particular conversation, but confused when several voices cross each other, which now unfits me for the society of the table.

I have been so free from colds that I have not had one—in the chest, I mean—on an average of eight or ten years through life. I ascribe this
exemption partly to the habit of bathing my feet in ice-cold water every morning for sixty years past. And young (Sir/Miss) I recommend that practice to you!

Indeed, except on a late occasion of indisposition, I enjoy good health. Too feeble, indeed, to walk much, but I still enjoy riding, and do so without fatigue six or eight miles a day, and sometimes thirty or forty. And our University, four miles distant, gives me frequent exercise, and the oftener now as I direct its architecture.

I may end these egotisms therefore as I began, by saying to you all, as Horace said, “With a change of name, the tale may be told of you.”

I read no newspapers now but the Richmond Enquirer, and in that chiefly the advertisements, since they contain the only truths to be relied on in a newspaper. As you surely know, during the course of our administration, and in order to disturb it, the artillery of the press was regularly leveled against us, charged with whatsoever its licentiousness could devise or dare.

Many of these abuses befell myself from the scurrilous pen of one James Thomson Callender, whose reputation as a scandalmonger is much deserved. Madame, you need not pretend. You know these slanders as well as I. That I increase my stock of servants by keeping what he pleases to call a “Congo Harem,” who I summon to my side as I desire from the kitchen. Or the pig-stye! As if such a thing were possible with my sister living with me, as well as my daughter and her family.

Such abuses by an institution so important to freedom and to knowledge are deeply to be regretted, inasmuch as they tend to lessen its usefulness, and to sap its safety.

Nor is it uninteresting to the world whether freedom of discussion, unaided by authority, is not itself sufficient for the propagation and protection of truth. Whether a government, conducting itself in the true spirit of its constitution, and doing no act which it would be unwilling the whole world should witness, can be written down by falsehood and defamation. Yet wonderful is the effect of impudent and persevering lying.

I have sometimes thought that perhaps an editor might begin a reformation in some such way as this: by dividing his newspaper into four
chapters, heading the first “Truths;” the second, “Probabilities;” the third, “Possibilities;” and the fourth, “Lies.”

The first chapter, “Truth,” would be very short, as it would contain little more than authentic papers and information from such sources as the editor would be willing to risk his reputation for their truth. The second chapter, “Probabilities,” would contain what, from a mature consideration of all the circumstances, his judgment should conclude to be probably true. This, however, should rather contain too little than too much. The chapters of “Possibilities” and “Lies” would be voluminous, and should be professedly for those readers who would rather have lies for their money than the blank paper they should occupy. For even those who do not believe these abominations still read them, and betray a secret pleasure in the possibility that some may believe them, though they themselves do not.

Yet I have ever believed that, were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate to prefer the latter. For the people are the only censors of their government and even their errors will tend to keep their elected officials to the true principles of their institution?

Still, I feel a much greater interest in knowing what has passed two or three thousand years ago, than in what is now passes for “news.”

And as to Mr. Callender’s stories … I need say nothing further in that way. But because I wish to stand with you on the Ground of Truth, neither better or worse than that makes me, I plead guilty to one of his charges: that when young and single I offered love to a handsome lady who was already married. I acknowledge its incorrectness. It is the only one founded in truth among all his allegations against me.

In truth, I have ever found that a determination never to do what is wrong, prudence, and good humor will go far towards securing the estimation of the world. And indeed, for many years now I have kept a decalogue of “Canons for Observation in Practical Life.” These may, perhaps, be of interest to you.

~ Canon the First: Never put off till tomorrow what you can do today, and
~ Never trouble another for what you can do yourself.
~ Never spend your money before you have it, and
~ Never buy what you do not want because it is cheap; it will be dear to you.
~ Pride costs us more than hunger, thirst, and cold.
~ We never repent for having eaten too little.
~ Nothing is troublesome that we do willingly.
~ How much pain have cost us the evils which have never happened.
~ Take things always by the smooth handle. And finally,
~ When angry, count ten before you speak. If very angry, an hundred.

By these rules, and these canons I have sought to live my life. My success in this, as well as my reputation, is in the hands of you, my fellow citizens, and will be consigned to honor or infamy according to what you yourselves will have seen, not what your enemies and mine shall have said.

I appreciate, of course, that you have not joined me here this evening merely to pass your time exchanging pleasantries. Even with an old friend. And indeed, apparently some of you have already conveyed to my servant, Burwell, certain inquiries which you desire me to address in the course of our time together this evening. With the permission of the rest of you, may I endeavor to do so? Thank you.

I have a question from a Miss (________) who asks (Starts to read, stopped by the thought that ‘Oops! I can’t read that aloud!’) … Well … My dear lady, I am indeed most flattered. What can I say but (A moment of consideration in which he brings the note to his nose, aware of its perfume.) “Yes!” (He tucks the note back in his waistcoat pocket.)

Mr. (______)? (Pause.) You ask, sir, … You ask what I consider to have been my “most enduring services” to our country. Well, sir, the greatest service anyone can render his country is to add an useful plant to its culture, especially a bread grain. While serving in France as our Minister Plenipotentiary there, I satisfied myself that the rice of Lombardy is of a different species from our South Carolina rice. However, its exportation in the husk being prohibited under penalty of death, I could not bring any with me … but as much as my pockets would hold.

Forgive me, sir, I do not mean to jest, or to take your inquiry lightly. In truth, yours is a question that of late I have been much asking myself.

You all wonder, no doubt, why I have asked you here this evening. I shall tell you. It has always been my intention to commit to writing
some notes and explanations of those particular and leading transactions which history should know. And so but lately, at the age now of 77, I have begun to make some memoranda, and to state some recollections of dates and facts concerning myself. Both for my own more ready reference, and for the information of my family. As well as for the public record of posterity. While doing so I came upon a letter that my friend, Mr. Adams, had written me some years ago, in which he says that “You and I ought not to die, before we have explained ourselves to each other.” And he says right. We ought not. And so, my friends, I have asked you here tonight. In recent years, some things have been said of me and of my character, and the events of my life that I wish to clarify and explain while I yet have time.

My “most enduring services” . . . ?

In truth, sir, I have sometimes asked myself whether our country is the better for my having lived at all? I do not know that it is. I have been the instrument of doing some things, but they would have been done by others. Some of them, perhaps, a little better.

When I was still a boy, I noted that the Rivanna—the north branch of the James, which flows close to the lands on which I still live—had never been used for navigation. Indeed, scarcely an empty canoe had ever passed down it, let alone commercial goods. Soon after I came of age, I examined its obstructions, set afoot a subscription for removing them, got an Act of Assembly passed, and had the obstructions removed, so that now the river may be used completely and fully for carrying down all our produce to market. And perhaps it is fitting that even my first service to our country involved the removing of obstructions.

As such it is not doubt true that some hundred—or even two hundred years from now—I shall be best remembered as the author of our Declaration of Independence. Yet I would also hope to be remembered as the author of our Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom and also as founder of our University of Virginia. And you will all indulge me, I hope, if I answer this gentleman’s (or “Mr. ________’s”) question by recollecting these events to you.

As to the Declaration . . . You must know, in truth, I did not wish to write the document at all! Indeed, when our committee first met, I proposed to Mr. Adams that he should make the draft. He preferred instead that I should write it. “Why?” I asked. “Reasons enough,” said he.
“What can be your reasons?” “Reason first,” said he, “you are a Virginian, and a Virginian ought to appear at the head of this business. Reason second, you can write ten times better than I can. Reason third, I am obnoxious, suspected, and unpopular. You are very much the otherwise.” And so it was desired by the committee that I should draft our declaration.

This decision being made, I repaired immediately to my lodgings, some blocks from the State House where we met, and set to work at my portable writing box. And though the Congress, I knew, was impatient, it was yet two weeks before I showed what I had written to Mr. Adams and Dr. Franklin for their emendations.

Neither aiming at originality of principle or sentiment, nor yet copied from any particular and previous writing, it was intended to be an expression of the American mind, and to give to that expression the proper tone and spirit called for by the occasion. All its authority rests on the harmonizing sentiments of the day, whether expressed in conversation, or in letters, or in printed essays, or in the elementary books of public rights, such as may be found in Aristotle, or Cicero, or Locke, or in the writings of Algernon Sidney.

While none believed that we should ever again be united with Great Britain, some argued that they were against adopting such a declaration at that time. Among these, of course, was John Dickinson of Pennsylvania, who ever argued for the cause of moderation. And as Dr. Franklin has noted, we ought to observe moderation in all things … including moderation! On the other side, it was urged that the question was not whether, by a Declaration of Independence, we should make ourselves what we were not, but whether we should declare a fact that already existed. That as to the people or Parliament of England, we had always been independent of them. And as to the King, we had been bound to him by allegiance, but that this bond was now dissolved by his assent to the last act of Parliament, by which he had declared us out of his protection. And by his levying war on us, a fact which had long proved us out of his “protection!”

For with respect to our rights, and the acts of Parliament contravening those rights, there was but one opinion on this side of the water. When forced, therefore, to resort to arms for redress, an appeal to the tribunal of the world was deemed proper for our justification. This was the object of the Declaration of Independence. Not to find out new principles, or new arguments never before thought of, not merely to say things
which had never been said before, but to place before mankind the common sense of the subject, in terms so plain and firm as to command their assent, and to justify ourselves in the independent stand we were compelled to take.

This declaration being drafted, and approved by the committee, I reported it to the House on Friday, the twenty-eighth of June, when it was read and ordered to lie on the table for consideration by the other members.

While under consideration, there were two or three unlucky expressions in the document that gave offense to some members. Some threatening, indeed, to quit the Congress altogether because of them. The pusillanimous idea that we had friends in England worth keeping terms with still haunted the minds of many, and for that reason, all those passages conveying censures against the people of England were struck out. Lest they should give offense.

The clause, too, reproving the enslaving of inhabitants of Africa, was struck out. This was done in complaisance to South Carolina and Georgia, who had never attempted to restrain the importation of slaves, and who, on the contrary, still wished to continue it. Our northern brethren, I believe, also felt a little tender under these censures, for though their people had very few slaves themselves, yet they had been pretty considerable carriers of them to others.

What a stupendous, what an incomprehensible machine is man! Who can endure toil, famine, stripes, imprisonment, and death itself in vindication of his own liberty, and in the next moment be deaf to all those motives which supported him through his trial, and inflict on his fellow men a bondage, one hour of which is fraught with more misery than ages of that which he rose in rebellion to oppose.

And although the offending expressions were immediately yielded, lest our Declaration not be approved at all, these “gentlemen” continued their depredations on other parts of the instrument. I was sitting by Dr. Franklin, who perceived that I was not insensible to these mutilations. “This is why I have made it a rule,” said he, “whenever in my power, to avoid becoming the draftsman of papers to be reviewed by a public body.”

And in truth, in the course of a debate I never heard Dr. Franklin speak ten minutes at a time, nor to any but the main point that was to decide
the subject. And I believe, sir, that if members of deliberative bodies were to observe this course generally, they would do in a day what it takes them a week. Indeed, if the present Congress errs in too much talking, how can it be otherwise? In a body to which the people now send one hundred and fifty lawyers, whose trade it is to question everything, yield nothing, and talk by the hour? That one hundred and fifty lawyers should do business together ought not to be expected! *(Speechless at the thought!)*

One! Two! Three! Four! Five, six, seven, eight . . . nine . . . Ten.

Be there any lawyers in our company this night? In that event, my apologies. To those of you sitting next to them!

But to return to our subject.

These debates had taken up the greater parts of the second, and the third, and the fourth days of July. And oft times, I must tell you, their outcome was far from certain, for they were long, frustrating days, much filled with bitter quarrel and contention. With bitter personal accusation. As well as with compromise. Such that finally, on the evening of the 4th, the debates were closed. The committee reported the revised Declaration, approved by the House, and signed by every member present, except Mr. Dickinson, who would not give it the sanction of his name.

“A Declaration by the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress Assembled”

“When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute new government, laying
its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to affect their safety and happiness.

“Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies, and such is now the necessity that constrains them to alter their former systems of government.

“The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these states. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.”

Thereupon follows an enumeration of the several general and exact offenses committed by the King and his ministers against the freedoms and liberties of our people and of our governments. These are, of course, well known to you all. We conclude: “We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America in General Congress assembled, appealing to the supreme judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do in the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states.

“And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.”

I can scarce believe that so many years have passed since we approved this instrument of freedom. Now remains but a small band of that host of worthies who were joined that day in the bold and doubtful election we were to make between submission and the sword. And it is consolatory after all these years that you, our fellow citizens, continue to approve the choice we made that day.

Yet, although our Declaration of Independence had been published, five long and bitter years of struggle and bloodshed yet remained before Cornwallis and his forces were taken prisoner at Yorktown. It was he, you may know, who left my holdings at Elk Hill an absolute waste.
He destroyed all my crops, burned all my barns, and carried off all the horses capable of service; of those too young he cut the throats. He carried off also some thirty of my slaves. Had this been to give them their freedom he would have done right; but it was instead to consign them to inevitable death from the smallpox and putrid fever then raging in his camps.

King George, you may know, never forgave us for calling him a tyrant. Some years later, after I had succeeded Dr. Franklin in France, and while Mr. Adams was serving as Minister Plenipotentiary in London, we were both to be received at the Court of St. James. Well! No sooner were we two presented to “His Majesty” than he rose, turned his fat Hanovarian rump upon us, and left the chamber. So it was with some small satisfaction that I learned last year that George had ended in his days bound in the confines of a straight-waistcoat. And I was not surprised!

That session of the Congress being ended, our entire Virginia delegation had been renewed for the ensuing year’s term. But at the same time, I was also found myself elected to a seat in our Virginia Legislature. And as I knew that our laws, under the regal government, had many vicious points which urgently required reformation, and as I honestly thought that I could be of more use in forwarding that work, I retired from my seat in the Congress, and took my place in the Legislature of my state.

And this change, perhaps I should confess, also brought me closer to Monticello, and to my family and my wife. But that is a story for another time.

Now, many of the laws which were in force during the monarchy being relative only to that form of government, it was determined that our whole legal code should be reviewed and corrected in all its parts, with a single eye to reason, and the good of those for whose government it was framed. And to this end, of course, a committee was appointed to execute the work. A committee being, you know, a body that keeps minutes and wastes hours.

As a part of these revisals, I presented several bills for the consideration of the Legislature. And I consider these bills as forming a system by which every fiber would be eradicated of ancient or future aristocracy, and at the same time a foundation laid for a government which would be truly republican. That is, as Cicero defined it: a government that is
representative of the peoples’ will. And all this would be affected without the violation of a single natural right of any one individual citizen.

Among these bills I proposed the demolition of the church establishment, and the establishment religious freedom.

As you well know, the first settlers of our Virginia colony were Englishmen, and the grant of land contained an express Proviso that their laws “should not be against the true Christian faith, now professed in the Church of England.” As soon as the colony was settled, it was divided into parishes, in each of which was established a minister of the Anglican Church, endowed with a fixed salary, a glebe house, and land with the other necessary appendages. To meet these expenses all the inhabitants of the parishes were taxed, whether or not they were members of the established church.

We are well aware that the opinions of men are not the object of civil government, or under its jurisdiction, and to make them so is to corrupt the principles of the very religion it is meant to encourage. Indeed, the legitimate powers of government extend to such acts only as are injurious to others. But it does me no injury for my friend here, Mr. . . . forgive me, dear sir. I have forgotten your name. Yes, of course, forgive me. It does me no injury for Mr. (______) here to say that there are twenty gods, or no god. It neither picks my pocket nor breaks my leg. But to compel Mr. (______) to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions that he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical. Nor should our civil rights have any dependence on our religious opinions, anymore than our opinions in physics or geometry. And the proscribing of any citizen as unworthy of public office unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which he has a natural right. For all men should be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and by so doing neither diminish, nor enlarge, nor affect in any way their civil capacities.

Accordingly, though over some nine years, and then only by small degrees, the legislature enacted this bill, thereby establishing religious freedom for all the citizens of the state. By which act “No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever. Nor should he be restrained, or molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor otherwise made to suffer on account of his religious opinions.” And I am certain you will agree, sir that religion is
a matter that lies solely between a man and his God, and he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship.

Thus was enacted our Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom.

Now, finally in retirement from public office, and against the *tedium vitae*, I am mounted on a Hobby, which indeed I should have better managed some thirty or forty years ago, but whose easy amble is still sufficient to give exercise and amusement to an almost-octogenary rider. And, after all, Madame (indicating the woman who “asked” the first question), I have long maintained that one is only as old as one feels. This is the establishment of an university, here, near Charlottesville, where every branch of learning will be taught in the highest degree to which the human mind has carried it. For I have ever believed that if a nation expects to be both ignorant and free, it expects what never was, and never will be. For knowledge is power. And safety. And happiness. And as Dr. Franklin oft observed, genius without education is like silver left in the mine!

In truth, my own father’s formal education had been quite neglected, but being of strong mind and eager after information, he read much and improved himself, by his own industry rising in the world and in the respect of his fellow men. And with Joshua Fry he helped to survey and draw the first true map of Virginia that had ever been made.

No doubt because of his own experience he placed great value on the benefits of learning. At the age of five he placed me at the English school and at the Latin school at nine, where along with the rudiments of Latin and Greek I also learned the French. Though my teacher there, Mr. Douglas, was from Scotland, and I am told even to this day I yet speak French with a Scottish accent. *Mais, pour moi-même... je ne me parle pas!* And upon my father’s death, I continued for two years with the Rev. Mr. Maury, a correct classical scholar, until my guardians gave permission that I might go to William and Mary College.

Which fixed the destinies of my life.

And yet ... the establishment of our university has been met with some resistance. For some good men—some even of respectable information! —consider that a person’s private education, like his private and individual concerns, should be left to his private and individual effort, not reflecting that an establishment embracing all the disciplines which may be useful, and even necessary in the various vocations of life, are
far beyond the reach of individual means, and must either derive existence from public patronage, or not exist at all. This would leave us, then, without those callings that depend on education, or else send us to other countries to seek the instruction they require.

We should be far, too, from the discouraging persuasion that man is fixed by the law of his nature, and the hope delusive of rendering ourselves wiser, or happier, or better than our forefathers were. As well might it be urged that the wild and uncultivated tree can never be made to yield better fruit. Yet we know that the grafting art implants a new tree on the savage stock, producing what is most estimable in kind and degree. Education, in like manner, engrafts a new man on the native stock, and improves what in his nature was vicious and perverse into qualities of virtue and social worth.

The advantages, then, of a well-directed education—moral, practical, and economical—are above all estimate. And these are the benefits and blessings that the Legislature now proposes for the good and ornament of their State by the establishing here, near Charlottesville, our University of Virginia.

And so, sir, to finally answer your question: These, then, are what I hope will be my most-enduring services to our country: as author of both our Declaration of American Independence, and also of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, and now as Father of the University of Virginia. For by these three things, as testimonials that I have lived, I wish most to be remembered.

You observe, dear (Sir/Madame) that I do not speak of my service as President. It is, after all, merely an office, the attainment of which is certainly no great achievement. Yet I served two terms as President, as well as a term as Vice President under Mr. Adams. And I will assure you all that the second office of our country is much to be preferred, being honorable and easy. The Presidency itself is but a splendid misery!

Yet you must forgive me, for I have not yet spoken of that for which I asked you to join me here this night.

You all wonder, no doubt, how it is that I, who wrote that “all men are created equal,” should have kept and maintained slaves throughout my life. Yet I have. And although you did not ask it, sir, you must know that I have also had one enduring disappointment in my life, that having
been my failure, despite several efforts, to bring an end to the enslavement of Negroes. Or even to ameliorate their condition.

My sentiments on the subject of slavery have long since been in possession of the public, and time has only served to give them stronger root. The love of justice and the love of country plead equally the cause of these people, and it is a moral reproach to us that they should have pleaded it so long in vain, and that we have produced not a single successful effort to relieve both them and ourselves from our present condition of moral and political reprobation. Yet we have not.

I have already spoken of what passed at the time of the debates for the Declaration. But many years before, indeed, in the first or second session of the Legislature after I became a member, I had drawn to this subject the attention of my kinsman Colonel Richard Bland, one of the oldest, ablest, and most respected members of that body. And because of our discussions, he undertook to move for certain moderate extensions of the protection of the laws to these unfortunate people, allowing masters the right to free their slaves of their own accord—as is their natural right to do!—without first obtaining permission of our Legislature.

For as you well know, sir, even if you wish to free a slave, unless you first obtain the express permission of our Legislature—which it is loathe to give—that former slave must then leave the state within one year. Or else risk being claimed by another, and sold again into slavery to someone whose use of him we cannot control.

I seconded Colonel Bland’s motion, and as a younger member was more spared in the debate. But he was denounced as an enemy of his country! And treated with the grossest indecorum imaginable. Indeed, until he withdrew the measure the entire Assembly shunned him. His opinions were ignored in our committees, and he was insulted even to his face. Even he.

Later, as a part of the revisals of our Virginia statutes, I proposed also an act prohibiting the further importation of slaves. But with the business of the war pressing constantly on the Legislature, this subject was not acted on finally for almost two years, when it did pass without opposition, stopping the increase of this evil by importation, though leaving to future efforts its final eradication.
Towards that end, however, my mentor, George Wythe, and I presented an amendment that would have allowed for the gradual emancipation of slaves. What we proposed was the freeing of all those born after a given day, that they should continue with their parents until of a certain age, and then to be educated at the public expense, according to their geniuses until of a proper age for deportation, perhaps to Africa, or to some other country. And the old stock remaining in bondage would die off in the ordinary course of nature, lessening each year until its final disappearance. This would give time for a gradual extinction of that species of labor, and the substitution of another, thereby lessening the severity of the shock, which such an alteration—in a system so fundamental to our State’s economic welfare—could not fail to produce.

This was the result of my reflections on the subject five and forty years ago, and I have never yet been able to conceive any other practicable plan.

It will certainly be asked, “Why not retain and incorporate the blacks into the state?” There are several reasons. Deep-rooted prejudices entertained by whites. Ten thousand recollections by the blacks of the injuries they have received. New provocations. And many other circumstances, will divide us into factions, and produce convulsions that will probably never end but in the extermination of the one or the other race. Nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government.

Yet our amendment for a gradual emancipation was not enacted, for it was found that the public mind would not bear it. Nor will it bear it even at this day. For still our laws do not permit us to turn them loose, if that were for their good. And although our northern brethren speak much of abolition, yet many of their states have laws prohibiting the entry of free blacks. Where are they then to go?

Following my term as Governor, I was again appointed by the Legislature as a delegate to the Congress. While there I drafted a Report on Government for the Western Territories, establishing provisions for the admission of new states into the Union. One of these provisions would have prohibited the spread of slavery into these territories. Yet though most of the Report passed intact, this provision failed by an individual vote only.

Ten states are then present, and an affirmative vote from but seven will make the matter law. Six states are for the clause, as Jersey would also
be. But one of its delegates is sick that day, and remains abed in his chambers.

So . . . but for the voice of a single individual—a single individual vote!—this abominable crime would have been prevented from spreading itself over the new country. Thus we see the fate of millions hanging on the tongue of one man, and Heaven was silent in that awful moment.

Yet the hour of emancipation is advancing in the march of Time, for nothing is more certainly written in the Book of Fate than that these people are to be free, whether brought on by the generous energy of our own minds, or by the bloody process of insurrection. Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just. God is just! And His justice cannot sleep forever. The Almighty has no attribute that can take side with us in such a contest.

You see! We have the wolf by the ears! And we can neither hold him, nor safely let him go. Justice is in the one scale, and our self-preservation in the other.

And I have attempted all these things! What more now would you have me do?

But Time, which outlives all things, will outlive this evil also. I look to the rising generation—to you, sir, and to you, miss, and to you—and not to that now in power for these great reformations, for it is an encouraging observation that no good measure was ever proposed which, if duly pursued, failed to prevail in the end. Indeed, the happiness of governments like ours, wherein the people—the people!—are truly the mainspring, is that they are never to be despaired of. When an evil becomes so glaring as to strike us generally, we arouse ourselves, and it is redressed.

And that day, my friends, will come.

Yet, despite even this failure—despite the struggles I have lived through and the disappointments I have endured—were you to ask if I would agree to live my life over again, I would say “yea.” I think that it is a good world on the whole, that it has been framed on a principle of benevolence, and more pleasure than pain [is] dealt out to us.
There are indeed those who might say “nay”: Gloomy and hypochondriac minds, disgusted with the present and despairing of the future, always counting that the worst will happen because it may happen. To these I say, “How much pain has cost us the evils which have never happened?”

My temperament is sanguine. I steer my bark with Hope in the head, leaving Fear astern. My hopes indeed sometimes fail, but not oftener than the forebodings of the gloomy.

Forgive me. I had promised that if our time allowed I would attempt to reply to those you who might also have questions that I have perhaps not yet satisfied in the course of this somewhat lop-sided conversation. I believe we have time for perhaps . . . a half-dozen questions.

A moment, please. Burwell. Burwell! Ah, Burwell, there you are. Would you be so good as to light a few more tapers that I might see our company better? (The lights in the House rise.) Thank you, Burwell.

My friends, I attend you.

(Q&A)

Indeed, there is a question that of late I have been much asking myself. And that is the question of: “What will be the legacy of all these struggles for our freedoms?”

Before the establishment of our American states, nothing was known to history but the Man of the Old World, crowded within limits either small or over-charged, and steeped in the vices which that situation generates. A government adapted to such men would be one thing, but a very different one that for the Man of these states. Here everyone may have land to labor for himself, if he chooses. Or preferring the exercise of any other industry, may exact for it such compensation as not only to afford a comfortable subsistence, but wherewith to provide for a cessation from labor in old age.

Men such as this may safely reserve to themselves, through their elective power of placing their interests into the hands of honest men, a healthful control over their public affairs, and a degree of freedom that in the hands of the rabble of Europe would be instantly perverted to the demolition and destruction of everything public and private.
But even in Europe a change has sensibly taken place in the mind of Man. Education has liberated the ideas of those who read and reflect, and our American example has kindled feelings of right in the people. A just and solid representative democracy, maintained here, will be an example for the aim and imitation of people everywhere.

All eyes are now opened—or opening!—to the rights of man. The general spread of the light of learning has already laid open to every view the palpable truth: That the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the Grace of God.

And my friends, I shall not die without a hope that light and liberty are on steady advance. For even should the clouds of barbarism and despotism again obscure the science and liberties of Europe, our country remains to preserve and restore light and liberty to them.

May our American Independence be to the world what I believe it will be: the signal of arousing men to burst the chains under which monkish ignorance and superstition had persuaded them to bind themselves. And to assume for themselves the blessings and security of self-government. That we have established these rights here are grounds of hope for others throughout the world.

It must now have been some time since you began to cry out, “Mercy!” In mercy then I will here finish. Night is now fast upon us, and some of you, I know, have yet some distance to travel before you reach your lodgings. Therefore I will bid you “Good night.” Yet before we part company, allow me to thank you again for joining me here this evening. It is such a pleasure—such a relief!—to be in the company of friends, and not merely the idle or the curious. So as we part company, and as you travel down our mountain, I trust that you will each take with you the assurance of my highest respect and friendly attachments. My dear, dear friends, I am most humbly yours, Thomas Jefferson.
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First, let me thank the Alumni Association and Carolyn Blevins, who found me worthy of this award. I am truly honored and moved to be joining the list of distinguished alumni from this institution. I am trying not to feel too old or too self-conscious. So, I am accepting this award in honor of my mother, my husband, my in-laws, my public interest colleagues, and my current and former clients on North Carolina’s death row and their families and friends.

This occasion has caused me to reflect on how my Carson-Newman experience shaped my personal development, my life journey. I am often asked how I got to where I am or how I can do what I do. These are hard questions to answer; but, certainly, my faith and intellectual growth here at Carson-Newman played a pivotal role.

I came to Carson-Newman as a seventeen year old who was serious about her faith and her call to follow Jesus. Since the age of nine, I was intent on discerning God’s will for my life. In high school, I felt called by God to “full-time Christian ministry.” I decided I needed to go to a Christian college to figure out what that meant. There was Shorter Baptist College in my hometown of Rome, Georgia; but I felt the need to go where the trappings of daily life in one’s hometown would not distract me. I was a small town girl with a big wanderlust.

The problem was that my family had little money. I grew up moving around a lot with my mother. Our safety net was my grandparents’ trailer park. So, unless I got significant financial aid, I would not be able to pursue my private college dream. Thank God for government loans and grants and institutional scholarships, for without them I would not have been able to enroll here, nor would I have been able to stay for four years.

As I looked back through my pictures and scrapbooks of my college years, I remembered the young girl who is probably best described as “raw material.” She lacked confidence, style, and experience, but she
had determination, strength of character, and an open heart and mind (much like her mother). Carson-Newman was a refuge for me—a beautiful place to study, a safe place to study, but not too safe.

My values and thinking were challenged here—in a good way. My classmates and professors—Dr. Brewer, Dr. Garner, and Dr. Blevins, among others—challenged me to think harder about how Christian values play out in the world. Carolyn Blevins became my mentor. She introduced me to strong women of faith. Through her teaching and mentoring, I came to appreciate how God has worked through women throughout history and how women must be strong for one another and for a better world. Carolyn introduced me to the feminine face of God.

Meanwhile, in the psychology department (perhaps foreshadowing my future work), I found myself fascinated by the study of human behavior—how the experiences in our childhood shape our personality and worldview; how the brain is a mysterious machine that can go tragically bad; and how social groups shape beliefs and actions.

As for the death penalty, I don’t think I thought much about it while I was here. I do, however, remember a formative moment, an introduction to a man that left an indelible impression. I actually didn’t meet him in person, but through a book entitled *Race, Rock, & Religion*. The man was Will Campbell, a Southern preacher and a minister to the South’s most dispossessed—KKK clansmen, heavy drinking country singers, and inmates on death row. His message was so simple, so Christ-like. We are all sinners, but God loves us anyway. We are forgiven; and we must hate no more, kill no more. His was a ministry to the least of these. I remember thinking, if only I could ever be as courageous and as fortunate as Will Campbell to have a ministry of such import.

By the time I left Carson-Newman, the “raw material” that I was had been shaped into a feminist Baptist bent on helping the poor, an empowered woman seeking justice. Imagine that from the mountains of Tennessee.

Thankfully, there was an inexpensive quality seminary to which I could go to be further seasoned—Southern Seminary. During my seminary years, I worked with orphans, rape victims, battered women, and psychiatric patients. I gained strength and confidence. I had never considered being a lawyer and, in fact, seriously doubted that one could be a Christian AND a lawyer. Christian ethics and legal ethics could not coexist, could they? Besides, lawyers might as well have been aliens to me. I didn’t know any, didn’t know any children of any. But I continued to listen to God, my heart, mind, and soul. I decided I had to learn the law to better help others.
Fast forward and here I stand before you—a lawyer, an incredibly fortunate lawyer. I have had the good fortune to be able to stand up for the most despised—in court, in the press, and before politicians who have the power to spare a life or condemn it. I have had the good fortune to speak truth to power about the injustices in our criminal system. But, most importantly, I have had the good fortune to be a vehicle of love and forgiveness for men and women who needed it more than anything, more than life itself.

I have had five clients executed by lethal injection. For four, I sat behind glass just a couple of feet away, keeping them in a space of love and peace while they were killed. My first was Zane Hill—a grandfather from the mountains—who was offered a second-degree plea for shooting his adult son in an argument, but got a death sentence. He didn’t want to spend his life in prison and threatened constantly to give up his appeals. But he was willing not to end his life early—if I would be there fighting for him.

There was Timmy Keel, a borderline mentally retarded man who shot and killed his stepfather. For many years, I was the advisor to his attorneys; but, whenever his mental state slipped, he would only see me. As he lay dying, he repeatedly mouthed to us on the other side, “I love you, and look up! Look up; look up. I love you, look up.” He loved Jesus so.

Two of my clients were ministers on death row—Ernest Basden and Willie Fisher. Ernest’s case was riddled with injustices—poor lawyering, corrupt law enforcement, jurors who didn’t even mean for Ernest to be executed, and more culpable perpetrators who are parole-eligible—just to name a few. I sat with his family singing hymns as he was killed upstairs. I preached at his funeral and prayed at his gravesite—surely, one of the few lawyers to literally represent a client all the way to the grave.

And there was Steve McHone, whom I represented for ten years. When the Governor denied clemency, I was (once again) devastated, but Steve reassured me that I had given him the best present ever—pointing to his siblings in the outer room. “You did this.” Just a few weeks prior, his siblings were not talking to him or to each other. You see, in one very bad night of hopelessness and heavy intoxication, Steve shot and killed their parents, his parents. His siblings supported the death penalty at trial; but, as time passed, three of his four siblings forgave him. They had not told each other or Steve. When an execution date was set, we visited one sister, an act that began a series of events uncovering the individual journeys of forgiveness. They made the difficult decision to visit Steve. The result was that they went to the Governor and begged him for mercy. The Governor had none. Now, one of
them, Tina, serves on the board of the restorative justice project I started with Ernest Basden’s sister, Rose.

It is not lost on me that the woman who has tirelessly nominated me for this award lost her beloved daughter, Kym, to murder. For that reason, this award says much more about her than it says about me. She continues to amaze and inspire me. Thank you, Carolyn, for believing in me. Thank you Carson-Newman for all you have given me and those that I love.

**********

2006-07 Outstanding Young Alumnus Response

C. S. Mathews ('93)

Good Evening. Thank you for honoring me as the recipient of the Outstanding Young Alumnus Award. I am truly grateful and humbled to have been selected, especially when I look at the list of previous honorees. It is truly an honor to be in the company of such outstanding and distinguished alumni. The recognition is even more rewarding when I realize that there are many deserving of this award. My entire family is here to share in this celebration with me, and I must tell you that no one is prouder or more stunned than my own mother, Linda Greene. After she was forcefully persuaded to hold me back in kindergarten, I am fairly confident that she had serious concerns about my ability to make anything of myself.

I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to mention what inspired me to attend Carson-Newman College. From an early age, I knew that I wanted to pursue a career in one of the health-related professions. As a high school student in Chattanooga, I learned that pre-health profession students at Carson-Newman gained acceptance to their choice graduate schools at an exceptionally high rate in comparison to other institutions. I came to discover that the statistics in this area are attributable not only to the caliber of the students at Carson-Newman, but also to the talent and support of its gifted faculty. A great deal of credit goes to Carson-Newman College, its faculty, and fellow classmates from whom I learned the skills and tools that I would later apply in my professional career. Attending Carson-Newman was one of the best decisions I made in my life, and it proved to be a rewarding endeavor.
My experience with the faculty was highly personal and motivational. They are people of high integrity and competence. From them I learned much, and I owe them a great deal of gratitude for having taken me under their wing, so to speak.

Specifically, the interest that my science professors took in me extended far beyond the classroom. Some of them invited me to play golf and tennis. Others graciously invited me into their homes. *Maybe not more than once, but many invited me at least once.* Many of my professors were more than academic instructors. Rather, they became my personal mentors.

Some of these professors were somewhat passive-aggressive in their approaches. Dr. Frank Pinkerton, for example, would invite students into his home for pancakes but then coldly lock them out of his classroom if they were late to organic chemistry. Dr. Steve Wright would kindly invite you to play a round of golf, only to ridicule your golf game for eighteen holes and make wild coughing noises during your backswing. And once you felt you had mentally blocked out all of the distractions, he would unsuspectingly place an exploding golf ball on his tee just to keep you off balance.

To me, Carson-Newman is not an institution; it is a group of individuals. While I am forever indebted to all of the staff at this wonderful college, the most tangible, and memorable lessons that I learned at Carson-Newman came directly from my professors. Finally, I learned that taking a personal interest in an individual can inspire that person to do better and attain more. These lessons and others from my college days permeate all aspects my life, including business and home with my wife Holly and our sons Mills and McGee.

Carson-Newman College was very giving to me. Not only in the literal sense of an education, but also financially in terms of various academic scholarships. This is the reason that Holly and I have felt a sense of gratitude for Carson-Newman. This gratitude has led us to establish two scholarships to provide students, like me, with funds for pre-dental and biochemistry studies.

I want to be brief, but in closing I wish to express my thanks to the individuals here and to those who are not here who serve the students of this college. I sincerely believe that neither you nor I have a realistic grasp of how many lives you have changed for the better. I can only speak about my own experience, and mine has been that there was no better choice for me. To this college and to you, I am eternally grateful.

**********
2006-2007 R. R. Turner
Spirit of the College Award Recipient

Donald W. Garner
Professor of Religion

Can you remember the first time you met Dr. Robert Randolph Turner? I recall quite clearly my first encounter with this gentleman scholar, this articulate and effusive professor of English, who so personified the spirit of Carson-Newman College. And I must say that tonight represents for me both a joyous memory and a humbling honor as we seek to remember his spirit in our midst.

That first day I met him, he popped out of the English Department doorway, walking directly toward me, down the hallway on the third floor of Henderson Humanities Building. Beaming his jolly smile, he greeted me with his characteristically cheery “Heh-LO, Doctor Garner! Welcome to our campus. Did you have a good flight from Louisville?”

He had in his hand a styrofoam cup filled with hot coffee that he had prepared for me. He offered it to me to slake the thirst of my long day’s journey. And I accepted his gift, the first of many I received across the years that would follow: A cup of hot coffee in Jesus’ name—or certainly in the sharing spirit of Jesus. I remember now that I immediately had tried to explain to him that I wasn’t really a “Doctor” yet, but he would have none of my self-effacing quibbling over a mere technicality. He was much too busy affirming me—a lowly graduate student, substitute teacher in a Monday seminary course taught on C-N’s campus by my doctoral supervisor who could not come that day and had sent his student assistant in his place. However, if you had been there in that hallway to observe the warm hospitality extended to me by Dr. Turner—who prior to that moment was a complete and total stranger to me—you might have concluded that I was right up there next to the King of England!

My next clear memory of R. R. Turner relates to his expressed confidence in me not long after I had joined the faculty. Dr. Turner honored me with his invitation to teach in the summer Elderhostel program that he directed. He boldly trusted me with the somewhat controversial assignment of teaching his Elderhostel enrollees the creation passages in Genesis 1 & 2, including their ancient Near Eastern parallels as well as their connections with modern science. Whew! He sure had a great deal of faith in this young, “green” Assistant Professor—and his confidence in me had the effect of boosting my self-confidence. I still can remember that buoyant feeling of collegial affirmation of my work from a supportive senior member of the faculty.
At that same time, I had the opportunity to observe the untiring investment of himself that Dr. Turner gave to those senior citizen Elderhostel visitors who came from all over the country. He provided watermelon cuttings, Gatlinburg-area side trips, and dozens of other carefully planned treats to give his Elderhostel guests a genuine taste of his native Appalachian home and hospitality.

And speaking of Appalachia, how many of us can remember Dr. Turner’s course, taught annually during the May term, on “Appalachian Literature and Culture”? He spent the month regaling his students with regional stories, sharing amusing autobiographical anecdotes, and indefatigably recalling one vignette of mountain lore after another. He concluded the course experience with a big meal of Appalachian recipes he planned for lunch on the last day. He worked for several days, personally cooking and preparing what seems in my memory to have been dozens of dishes to share with those fortunate students and a few others of us he might invite to dine with them.

He loved to share with others. Late one afternoon, as Dr. Turner was about to enter the local drugstore, he noticed me waiting outside in the car. I was feverishly trying to occupy our two older sons, who were quite young and energetic at that time. Using his typically soft, non-threatening and genuinely concerned line of questioning, he quickly determined that my wife was inside shopping and I was alone and outnumbered by two rambunctious boys. Just a couple of minutes later he emerged from the store with two inexpensive but brightly colored plastic toy cars which he presented to the boys as a new diversion for them—and as a respite for me. To this day, that moment remains one of the most remarkable experiences of gift-giving that I have ever known.

Years later my sons were on campus, spending a public school holiday with their Dad; and Dr. Turner spontaneously invited them as his guests to lunch in the Carson-Newman cafeteria. They were impressed by his warm generosity, as well as the “all-you-can-eat” buffet he opened up to them; and they told him so a few days later in a simple, handwritten thank-you note. The last time I spoke at length with Dr. Turner prior to his death, he approached me more quietly and softly than he had on that very first day we met over two decades before. His quietude was not because he was aging and slowing down, though that fact certainly was true of him by that time. No, he approached me in sensitivity as he handed me that same thank-you note my sons had written him years ago. “I thought you might want to have this since it has Aaron’s signature in it.”

A man of many gifts, Dr. Turner shared them willingly. He was a perennial preacher and interim pastor in local churches and his was an influential spiritual presence across campus, too. He was the sponsor of
an annual Advent Service that he planned, organized, and offered each Christmas as his gift to the community. I recall that we would be invited to gather on that same third floor of Henderson, room 318, for a community-wide service of the lighting of the Advent wreath and reading of various scriptures and seasonal poetry selections which he himself so carefully and thoughtfully had redacted. What I remember most, however, is not a particular detail of the program contents from any one of those services. I was most impressed with how intentional he was with regard to those whom he invited to participate in the service each year. He was scrupulously sensitive to include the newest pastor in town, the student far from home who needed to become attached to a community of belonging, and the young professor who had just arrived that very fall and was seeking his or her place within the faculty.

Our memories of R. R. Turner lead us to recall the spirit of the man; and remembering him reminds us of the spirit of the College. He was affirming and respectful of others, regardless of their title—commoner or king; scared freshman or seasoned faculty member; humble day laborer in his congregation or guest academic lecturer on the campus. He was empathetic and vigilent concerning the needs of others—plastic toy cars, sumptuous meals, and sensitively returned mementos. And he unselfishly shared his giftedness and his gifts to enhance the lives of others.

We each may aspire to follow in his train and to seek to approximate something of his persona in our own relationships. I am humbled to receive this honor named for him and somehow to be associated by the Alumni Association with his legacy in this very special place of education and nurture along the banks of Mossy Creek. But I feel some unection to adapt on this occasion that pointed response by Vice Presidential candidate Lloyd Bentsen. “I knew R.R. Turner—and I am no R.R. Turner.” And yet I almost can hear the gentle attitude of Dr. Turner himself who almost certainly would counsel me, “There, there, Doctor Garner. Accept with graciousness and gratitude.” And so that is what I will do. I simply say “Thank you!” to the Alumni Association for this deeply meaningful recognition.

I am grateful that the Religion Department is represented here tonight. They all must be included in this honor with me as my colleagues, past and present, who provided for me a supportive and encouraging context across these twenty-seven years. Without their mentoring, patience, and support for me to do what I do in our work together, this award could never have come my way. So, I share it with my colleagues in the Religion Department as an emblem of our joint accomplishments in the significant education and spiritual nurture of young people. And I will borrow another memorable Turner-ism as I
say to you, my cherished Department colleagues, as my own affirmation of your commitment to your life’s work: “Good, good, good!!!”

May each of us, in the spirit of Dr. R. R. Turner, daily rekindle the energy of optimism and the lifestyle of affirmation that so characteristically was his. And to each of you who are present tonight, I must quote him just once more as I wish you: “Happy day!”

*******

Founder’s Day Address
(October 2006)

Calvin S. Metcalf (’56)

Dr. Netherton, Administration, Students, Fellow Trustees, Program Personalities, and Friends. Thank you for that generous introduction, Dr. Netherton. I have admired your eloquence on many occasions and feel honored to be the recipient of it in your introduction of me today. You certainly have the gift of appropriate words.

Today is Founder’s Day and some of you students are saying, “So what?” You are much more interested in what is happening today at Carson-Newman than what happened over 150 years ago. And that is not all bad. We live in the “now,” not in the “then.”

Administrators see Founder’s Day as another anniversary to commemorate, so, they find a speaker who looks enough like Father Time to symbolize the past. I am old enough and ugly enough to play the role. Faculty and staff have sat through enough boring Founder’s Day addresses to qualify them for institutional sainthood or Carson-Newman’s hall of pain.

So here we are today with a serious matter before us. We need to have a birthday party. Not necessarily like the recent sesquicentennial celebration, but at least we could sing “Happy Birthday to Carson-Newman. Let’s do it!” (Singing the song) Well, that is all the participation I will ask of you. Now just settle back and take your nap. Not!!! Not really.

My topic today is “Re-dreaming the Dream” and that involves everyone. So, sit up on the edge of your pew and let us do some dreaming—some Carson-Newman dreaming. Our presence here today means we all have an investment in this place and we all need to be doing some serious dreaming.
Have you ever considered the place of dreams in your personal happiness? What kinds of goals keep you anticipating the future and challenging you toward tomorrow’s events? It is important that you and I are vision minded and hopefully committed to a better day. Our joy is limited only by our lack of dreams. Only a dimming of our vision conquers our zeal. Our life loses its meaning only when there is no ambition. When our dreams die we are dead no matter what our pulse rate says. Just as this is true for us personally so it is doubly true for our beloved school.

Of course, there is risk here. The journey of life is littered with the wreckage of many dreams. What do we do when the house of our emotional, educational, and spiritual dreams burns down; and we do not have any dream insurance? We “Re-dream the Dream.” That is our dream insurance.

Jesus Christ, not only inspires our best dreams, but he also set us the best example. As he knelt that night in Gethsemane it appeared that his dreams for humankind were crushed. They were not going to let him live. But, he had dream insurance. Even as he prayed for relief “Let this cup pass,” it was not at the expense of his dream. His words were clear: “Nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done.” He had dream insurance. Thus we see that he went to the cross, suffered and died to keep the dream of salvation alive for all who would believe on his name.

The truth here is, God has created all of us with a capacity to dream his dream for ourselves and for Carson-Newman; and we must not let it die.

What, then, is this dream for Carson-Newman? I’m not sure any one person has it in its totality. In fact it is the accumulated dreams of all of us who love this place and labor for its survival.

Surely, the Carson-Newman dream includes quality Christian education. Education happens in many institutions. Many of you students could have gone to other colleges. But, we see ours at Carson-Newman as being different. As a former leader often said “Carson-Newman is unashamedly Christian and unapologetically Baptist.” It is from this perspective that we dream the Carson-Newman dream.

Surely, the dream includes teaching and learning with integrity in the context of academic freedom. Surely the dream involves wholesome participation from students, faculty, and administration in building a strong sense of community. It is called an esprit de corps.

Surely, the Carson-Newman dream is immersed in an “agape” type love that discourages ulterior motives and hidden agendas. Surely the dream has ministry and meaning far beyond its borders.
This dream of Carson-Newman is bigger than any one student, any single faculty member and any individual administrator. It encompasses the entire Carson-Newman family, past, present, and future. No, we have not begun to define the dream because it is so deeply profound and so far reaching in scope and so spiritual in nature that only God can grasp and inspire its fulfillment.

Therefore, with at least some appreciation and understanding of the Carson-Newman dream, how do we renew it and how do we implement it across this campus and around our world?

For one thing we re-dream the dream by honoring our past. Yes, this is Founder’s Day; and we have it for a reason. A sense of history is necessary for a healthy understanding of who we are. We cannot explain ourselves apart from those who birthed us along with the ideas and circumstances that have surrounded us. The parenting process is just as spiritual as it is biological. We have become the sons and daughters of many folk who have helped shape our thinking and our commitments. As someone has said, “Any person who will not remember past his or her own birth is indeed an orphan. Whether we like it or not we must deal with the past. But how do we do it?"

(1) For one thing we can learn from it. It has lessons if we are humble and wise enough to learn.
(2) We can improve on it and build on it. It is foundational for everything we do today. Let us make it better.
(3) We can respect the past. Our predecessors are to be congratulated not denigrated.
(4) Whatever we do, we must not, we cannot, ignore the past. When we honor our past we honor God who is the thread running through decades of Carson-Newman existence.

We also re-dream the dream by constantly and consistently search for truth. For many, many years Carson-Newman has been committed to truth that has liberated thousands, who otherwise would be incarcerated by ignorance. Ignorance is a terrible blight upon the human soul. It escalates evil and confuses us with misinformation. It discourages us from looking at all the facts. Ignorance arouses suspicion of anyone with a different idea.

Ignorance causes us to place far more emphasis on adjectives than on nouns. As Dr. Bass used to tell us, “Adjectives are helping words used to describe people, places, and things. We tend to use a variety to put people into certain categories. Student is an adjective. Faculty is an adjective. Administration is an adjective. Staff and maintenance work-
ers are adjectives. Athlete is an adjective. Trustee is an adjective. Alumnus is an adjective. Donor is an adjective.

These are all adjectives of people who are players in the Carson-Newman drama. The noun is “humankind.” The pronoun is “us” as a community of people working for the good of an educational institution in search of truth, where dialog is encouraged.

Truth also leads to trust, which is another ingredient in re-dreaming the dream. Trust is not only a theological position, but it is also a daily activity. It is the way we do life. Trust is the ability to have confidence in another person because of his or her God-given worth as a human being. Trust does not require perfection. It bases its belief in another person on his or her ability to repent and grow.

Without trust our goals are limited and our dreams are lost in a meaningless maze of suspicion and mistrust. Only God can equip us to trust people who are just as unreliable as we are. With trust we find reasons to believe in Carson-Newman and that helps us to re-dream the dream. Surely, “In God we trust” and “In God we are trustworthy.”

Finally, we re-dream the dream with integrity. Integrity is a virtue that has multiple possibilities for our well being. If God calls, really calls us, to an assignment, our integrity requires us to act godly. We do not have to follow a lie simply because it is popular to do so. We do not have to assassinate our brains nor violate our intellectual integrity to be a Christian college. Knowledge and not ignorance was our Lord’s contribution to the stale spiritual environment into which he came. Therefore, let us re-dream the dream with integrity.

Let me conclude with a parable. A certain college was going down from the 20th to the 21st century and fell among thieves that punished the school mercilessly. The thieves were spiraling costs, a nervous stock market, building repairs, declining enrolment, faltering faculty morale, administrative anxieties, deficit spending, poor student retention, a weakening sense of purpose and any number of bothersome problems. The thieves left the college struggling for life beside the highway of opportunity.

Some trustees, alumni, and potential caregivers came along but passed by on the other side. They turned their back on the plight of their grand old school. They would not listen to the painful appeals for support.

But a Good Samaritan came along and began to care for the institution. He committed himself to help bind the economic and dispirited wounds of the college. He rallied a host of friends, alumni, and others to be faithful caregivers. He inspired faculty and administrators to do their best. He helped students feel that they too were part of the healing
process. He came to everyone time and time again to remind us how we could help move the school successfully into the 21st century.

Now who do you think could be this Good Samaritan? Would it be a wiser, gentler, kinder administration with a fresh infusion of orange and blue blood into the veins of an ailing institution? Could it be a faculty who give themselves sacrificially to keeping Carson-Newman academically solvent and our historic values in tact? Could it be supportive staff, maintenance workers, and athletic leaders sensing a divine calling to their important assignments? Could it be students who create a climate of happy learning and responsible student-hood during their four years? Could it be trustees and alumni asking the right questions, prompting a candid and honest response that involves everyone in the restoration of health?

Who then is the Good Samaritan? Perhaps it is all of us making an honest commitment to re-dream the dream and once again making this college the college of choice for potential students. Although we cannot go back and make a brand new start, we can start now to make a brand new ending.

Charles Plumb flew seventy-five combat missions in World War II. On his last flight he was shot down. He baled out, and as his parachute carried him to the ground he drifted into enemy territory. He was captured and spent several years as a prisoner of war. After the war ended he spent a lot of time lecturing on his experiences as a POW. One day in a restaurant a man came up to him and asked if he was Charles Plumb. He answered that he was. The man proceeded to tell him that he was the one who packed his chute and that it must have worked. Plumb said it surely did, or he would not be there that day. In later lectures Plumb would tell this story followed by a serious question. Who is packing your chute? We all need someone to pack our emotional, educational, and spiritual parachutes because one day we may have to jump.

I see the Carson-Newman experience doing that for you students. And for that reason we must keep dreaming the dream.
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