FALL 2006
ISSN 1081-7727
VOL. XI No. 1

Carson-Newman Studies

Inside

Carson-Newman Studies

Vol. XI, No. 1 Fall 2006 ISSN 1081 - 7727

Don H. Olive, Sr.
Dean of Humanities and Professor of Philosophy
Editor

Michael E. Arrington
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Managing Editor

Carson-Newman Studies is published annually by the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, Tennessee. Correspondence should be addressed to the Editor, P.O. Box 71938, Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, TN 37760.

Contents

A Word
from the Editors

With this forty-fifth issue of the *Carson-Newman Studies* (*Faculty Studies*, through 1993), the editor has come to realize that he likely is the only person connected with this journal to have read every article, lecture, and essay published here over the last fourteen years! That in itself has been an experience for which to be grateful.

These fourteen years have seen many changes in the publication, not the least of which has been a new name and format. A most notable change has been the inclusion of a broader range of contributors than was the case in earlier years—faculty, staff, inside and outside lecturers, alumni, graduate students, and an occasional outstanding undergraduate who works under the direct supervision of a faculty member. Each of these has a part to play, as the college continues to be a community of learning where minds are changed in coming to agreement about issues of significance.

Some aspects of this journal, however, remain unchanged. It continues to lead off each issue with the formal address to the faculty of the recipient of the Distinguished Faculty Award. The college needs to hear expertise, advice, and insight from these awardees. Also unchanged is the breadth of the materials included. The diversity, as well as the quality, of thought presented is impressive. This diversity fosters the central goals of any collection of thinkers—the development and refinement of the life of the mind. It is this life that provides the depth resource for the quality teaching that marks Carson-Newman College.

The editors thank all the contributors. 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

Observations about the Future of Carson-Newman College

[2005 Distinguished Faculty Award Address]

Thomas B. Milligan, Jr.

On April 19, of this year, the same day that I received the Distinguished Faculty Award, the director of the Knoxville Opera Company, Frank Graffeo, announced his resignation. I am on the Knoxville Opera's e-mail list, so back in my office, after all the excitement of receiving the award was over, I read the announcement that Mr. Graffeo had resigned. It was obvious to me, reading this e-mail, that this was one of those resignations where the person is not disclosing the real reason for resigning.

The next time I saw Phyllis Driver, I asked her what she knew about the situation. She confirmed what I had already suspected: the Knoxville Opera was in serious financial trouble. The problems went back to Graffeo's predecessor, who during his final year in the position put on a spectacular production of Verdi's *Aida* with live elephants on the stage. Live elephants are extremely costly, and they do not contribute much to the singing. *Aida* left the opera with a large debt.

Then in the fall of 2004, the Knoxville Opera staged a production of Mozart's *Magic Flute.* Ordinarily a small opera company will rent its sets and costumes; building new sets for a two-night production would be prohibitively expensive. However, on this occasion the Knoxville sculptor Richard Jolley was employed at considerable expense to create the set. The idea was that Knoxville could rent the set to other opera companies and recoup some of the money. Jolley is highly regarded in the field of art; however, he had never done an opera set before. Bill Houston attended the production and agreed with the assessment of my wife and me that no other opera company would want to rent this set. So after the *Magic Flute* the Knoxville Opera was in the words of the Tennessee Ernie Ford song "another day older and deeper in debt."

I remember that when I was in college, there was no Knoxville Opera: it started in the 1970s and has been an important contributor to the culture of the region ever since. So, it appeared that my lifetime

would span the beginning and the end of opera in Knoxville. They had no director and no season announced for 2005-06. The rise and fall of musical organizations is nothing new. I was reminded of my own particular research specialty in the history of music: London in the 1790s.

The industrial revolution had made London a wealthy city. Those who had acquired wealth in trade showed off their new status by buying pianos and attending concerts. The titled nobility, not to be outdone, also increased their participation in and support for the city's musical life. Outstanding musicians from all over the Continent settled in London, attracted by the earnings they could enjoy there.

In London in 1790, in addition to the many opera performances that featured the star performers brought over from Italy, there were subscription concert series including vocal and instrumental music. Usually a subscription included twelve concerts, which took place weekly from approximately February through May. Interestingly, the two principal concert managers in London at this time were both Germans. One was Wilhelm Cramer, father of the pianist J. B. Cramer for whom I have published a complete catalogue of his works.

Cramer led a series called the Professional Concerts. Cramer's rival was Johann Peter Salomon. Salomon had come to London as a violinist in 1781, and he gradually worked his way into concert management. Cramer and Salomon vied to present the most famous performers and therefore attract the largest audience. In addition, there were other groups devoted to particular specialties in music, such as the Concert of Ancient Music, which performed music of Handel and his contemporaries. This was the musical life in London in 1790.

Meanwhile, in the swamps of western Hungary, another fine musical group was carrying on its daily activity in a setting that could not be more contrasting to the busy metropolis of London. These were the musicians employed at the palace of Prince Nicolas Esterhazy, nicknamed Nicolas the Magnificent. Kapellmeister Joseph Haydn led the group.

Prince Nicolas had built a new palace in the late 1760s. The palace was out in the middle of nowhere when the prince built it, and it's still out in the middle of nowhere today, as my family can attest. Visiting the Esterhazy Palace is somewhat like going to Chestnut Hill. You travel for miles and miles down Highway 92, passing only an occasional house. Suddenly, you come upon a huge factory. The approach to the Esterhazy Palace is similar. A visitor to the palace in 1784, wrote,

> What increases the magnificence of the place is the contrast with the surrounding countryside. Anything more dull or depressing can

> hardly be imagined. . . . His castle is quite isolated, and he has no one about him except his servants and the strangers who come to admire his beautiful things.

In 1790, Haydn had been working for the Esterhazy family for thirty years: first for Prince Nicolas's older brother, then, after his death, for Nicolas himself. Haydn signed a contract at the beginning of his employment that specified his duties. He had to report to the Prince's antechamber twice a day to inquire whether the Prince wished to order a performance of the orchestra. If so, then he had to communicate this information to the musicians and make sure that all were in their place at the appointed time.

By the late 1770s, the Prince's musical taste had turned to opera. Haydn had the responsibility of performing at the palace approximately two operas per week, sometimes three. He had a company of eight male singers and six female singers, along with a 24-piece orchestra. On the estate the Prince built an opera theatre seating 400 persons. The audience for these performances did not have to pay an admission fee. The Prince paid all the cost of the production, and the audience came as his invited guests.

Of his employment by the Esterhazys, Haydn wrote:

> My Prince was always satisfied with my works: I not only had the encouragement of constant approval but as conductor of the orchestra, I could make experiments, observe what produced an effect and what weakened it, and was thus in a position to improve, alter and make additions or omissions, and be as bold as I pleased. I was cut off from the world, there was no one to confuse or torment me, and I was forced to become original.

The Esterhazy musicians received good pay; they had free medical care from the Prince's three physicians; and they had a full month's vacation every year. January was vacation month at the Esterhazy Palace. Haydn usually spent his Januarys in Vienna. There he could work on compositions without the distraction of preparing and performing operas, negotiate with his publishers, and spend time with his composer friend Mozart. Also, since Haydn was internationally famous, he was always invited to the parties given by the Viennese nobility.

Haydn arrived in Vienna for his January 1790 visit on the 30th of December. He had been invited to Mozart's apartment on the morning of New Year's Eve for a piano rehearsal of a new opera that Mozart was writing: *Cosi fan tutte*. Mozart also invited Haydn to the first orchestra rehearsal on January 20 and the premiere on January 26. The

opera that Haydn was most interested in seeing, however, was one that Mozart had written four years earlier, *The Marriage of Figaro*, based on a Beaumarchais play that glorifies the working classes and ridicules the nobility. This opera was performed in Vienna on January 8. Haydn was particularly interested in *The Marriage of Figaro* because he was considering performing it at the palace during the coming season.

After a wonderful month of opera, parties, and Mozart, February came, and Haydn had to go back to work. He wrote this letter to one of the gracious ladies of Vienna:

> "Nobly born,
> "Most highly respected and kindest Frau von Genzinger,
> "Well, here I sit in my wilderness—forsaken—like a poor waif–almost without any human society—melancholy—full of the memories of past glorious days—yes¡ past alas!—and who knows when these days shall return again? Those wonderful parties? Where the whole circle is one heart, one soul—all these beautiful musical evenings—which can only be remembered, and not described. . . ."

Haydn had decided to perform *The Marriage of Figaro*, so he made arrangements to obtain a score and to get parts copied for the singers and the instrumentalists. Haydn wanted to perform *The Marriage of Figaro* in conjunction with another opera based on the same Beaumarchais trilogy: *The Barber of Seville.* This is not the Rossini *Barber of Seville* that some of you may be familiar with, but rather an earlier opera by Paisiello. *The Barber of Seville* comes first chronologically, so Haydn performed it from May through July with the first performance of *The Marriage of Figaro* coming in August. Then, early in September all musical performances were suspended, while the Prince went to Vienna for medical treatment.

On September 28, Prince Esterhazy died; he was seventy-six. Two days after his father's death the new prince announced that he was no longer going to employ the large group of musicians. The following day he paid them their final salary and sent them on their way. The singers were Italian, and they mostly returned to their home country. The instrumentalists found positions in Vienna and nearly cities. So, in the space of two days, one of the finest musical groups in Europe went out of existence, never to perform together again. The end of the Esterhazy musical establishment was also the end of an era. Never again would a single wealthy individual maintain his own private orchestra and opera company for his personal entertainment and that of his in-

vited guests. The London model of the public concert with paying audience became the model for the nineteenth century.

Haydn came out ahead financially with this change. The late prince had left him an annual stipend in his will. The new prince added an additional sum, enabling Haydn to retire at full salary at age fifty-eight. The prince told him he could retain the title of Kapellmeister to Prince Esterhazy, but he would not be required to perform any duties. He could go and live in Vienna or do anything else he wished. Haydn made the move to Vienna as quickly as he could.

Meanwhile, Salomon from London was doing what he always did in the autumn of each year. He traveled on the continent trying to recruit outstanding performers to come to London for the following season. Salomon was in Cologne when he read in the newspaper of Prince Esterhazy's death. He immediately changed his itinerary and headed for Vienna. A couple of weeks later, there was a knock on Haydn's door. The visitor announced, "My name is Salomon and I have come to take you with me to London. I will have a contract ready for you tomorrow." Salomon offered Haydn very favorable financial terms, including 500 pounds up front, to come to London and compose symphonies for the Salomon Concerts.

Naturally, the first thing Haydn did was to discuss the offer with Mozart. Mozart had been to London at the age of eight and had written his first symphony there. Mozart said, "Papa, don't go." (Mozart always called Haydn "Papa.") He said, "It is a long hard journey, and you don't know the language." Haydn replied, "My language is understood everywhere. I have decided to accept the offer."

On December 14, after a tearful farewell from Mozart, who said, "Papa, I am afraid we shall never see each other again," Salomon and Haydn set out for London. They arrived in England on New Year's Day of 1791. A few days later Haydn wrote to the same Frau von Genzinger,

> My arrival caused a great sensation throughout the whole city, and I went the round of all the newspapers for three successive days. Everyone wants to know me. I had to dine out six times up to now, and if I wanted, I could dine out every day; but first I must consider my health, and second my work.

The 1791, concert season was a great success. Haydn composed four new symphonies that year. Salomon had also promised him a "Mr. Haydn's Night" from which he would receive all the profits; this extra concert brought him 350 pounds. In July of 1791, Haydn traveled to Oxford, where Oxford University awarded him an honorary doctorate.

From that time the London newspapers invariably referred to him as Dr. Haydn. That glorious year 1791, unfortunately ended tragically. Just before Christmas Haydn received news of the death of his good friend, Mozart, at the age of thirty-five. Haydn wrote back to a friend in Vienna,

> For some time I was beside myself about his death, and I could not believe that Providence would so soon claim the life of such an indispensable man. I only regret that before his death he could not convince the English, who walk in darkness in this respect, of his greatness—a subject about which I have been sermonizing to them every single day.

Haydn wrote two more symphonies for the Salomon series in 1792, then, in the summer of 1792, he told Salomon that he needed to return home. He promised to return to London in January of 1793. Haydn on this second trip to London planned to take one of his pupils with him: the young man's name was Beethoven. However, the return to London in 1793, never took place. Austria had gone to war with France, and Prince Esterhazy did not think it was safe for him to travel. By 1794, although the war was still going on and England was now fighting France also; there seemed to be no danger in traveling to London. Haydn returned to this city for his second visit. In the meantime, Beethoven had begun to have some success as a performer in Vienna; and he had lost interest in going with Haydn to London.

Haydn arrived in London to find that the war and its effect on the economy had diminished the musical life of the city. The Professional Concerts had gone out of business; and in 1794, Salomon had the field to himself. By the beginning of 1795, one more year of war had further reduced the Londoners' disposable income and support of the arts, so that the Salomon Concerts also were discontinued.

In 1795, the Opera announced a concert series in the opera house on nights when no opera was being performed. It was for these Opera Concerts that Haydn composed three more symphonies in 1795. In the summer of 1795, Haydn returned to Vienna for good, leaving a city whose musical life was greatly diminished from what he had seen when he first arrived in 1791. England remained at war with France most of the time until the defeat of Napoleon. Throughout these war years, concerts continued, but at a minimal level.

Haydn lived until 1809. A few days before he died, Napoleon captured Vienna. The old man on his deathbed was greatly distressed to hear the sound of artillery in the distance. So, Haydn during his lifetime had witnessed the demise of two great musical organizations with

which he was involved: the Esterhazy musical establishment and the Salomon Concerts. Then, just before his death he saw his own country fall to the enemy.

Now, back to the twenty-first century: the Knoxville Opera did not shut down. The Knoxville Esterhazys made some contributions and kept it afloat. The opera has a new director, and it has announced its 2005-06 season. However, instead of three major productions, there will be one major production and two other performances done jointly with the University of Tennessee student opera. So, the Knoxville Opera did not cease to exist, as did the Esterhazy opera; but rather it continued at a reduced level, like the concert life in London.

To get even closer to home, what is our own future? Is the time coming when there will be no more concerts by the A Cappella Choir? When we will not hear a band at football games every fall? When the Messiah performances at Christmas at the First Baptist Church are only a memory? Will there, perhaps by the end of this century, be a historical marker on the spot where we are now gathered saying that there was once a college here?

We cannot sit back and say that this college has existed for more than 150 years and we are in no danger. We are in great danger. One of our sister Baptist schools in Georgia has within the past four years seen its enrollment decline from 2100 to 350. I know the president of this college; I saw him at a SACS meeting in San Antonio shortly after he had assumed the presidency and when he was still full of enthusiasm about its future. Another Baptist college in the West, on the brink of collapse, was sold to a corporation, which has turned it into a for-profit institution. Two other Southern Baptist colleges are on probation by SACS. A Methodist school in East Tennessee has lost its SACS accreditation and has filed a lawsuit to have it reinstated.

Last year the President of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities was on our campus. He had compiled a list of twenty-two economic variables affecting smaller private colleges. Of the twenty-two, only two were favorable: The public's perceived importance of a degree for better personal income; and increased interest in moral values that some small privates emphasize. The other twenty variables were unfavorable.

If our future is potentially in jeopardy, what can we do about it? For one thing, we can make sure we are in compliance with accreditation requirements, something we have struggled with during the past two years. A year ago, I was appointed as chair of the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee. At first, I was unsure of how to proceed; but after the January retreat led by Jeanette Blazier and the reports submitted to SACS during the spring semester, the path ahead

began to be clearer. My first year as chair was basically spent developing a system. The second year will be devoted to implementing that system.

Planning documents drawn up by the academic departments and administrative units in October will set forth expected outcomes for the year, which will then be evaluated. During the third year of my chairmanship, I hope to move forward into a Quality Enhancement Plan. This is the new approach being taken by SACS. If you have not heard the term Quality Enhancement before, you will definitely be hearing it in the future. My son, who is attending another Baptist school in Georgia, one that is by contrast doing quite well, came home for the summer wearing a T-shirt with the letters Q.E.P. I must admit, I was taken by surprise; however, a school where the students are wearing Quality Enhancement Plan T-shirts is one that predictably will do well with SACS accreditation.

So, the Quality Enhancement Plan is my 2006-07 goal. That will take me to my final year of the three-year rotation, and I will be ready to turn over the chairing of the PIE committee to someone whose leadership style will be optimum for the next phase of the ongoing process.

****

Now, what can the rest of you do? I'm going to preach to everyone today. I'll start with the President and the rest of you can wait your turn.

Dr. Netherton, your administration has come in for some criticism during your first five years; however, in committees and conferences I have observed that you have a keen sense for analyzing the details of a situation and an in-depth knowledge of what is going on in higher education today. My admonition to the President is: always put the welfare of the institution first. Make sure your subordinates give you accurate information, favorable or unfavorable. And never forget the famous words of Harry Truman, "The buck stops here."

Vice-presidents, you have a high level of responsibility. Bad decisions by a vice-president are second only to bad decisions by a president in the damage they can cause to an institution. As much as possible, get to know students. Make those working under you feel that they can come to you with significant issues. Don't be a yes man.

Deans and department chairs, always be looking for ways to improve your program. Evaluate your faculty members. My experience with SACS has led me to the conclusion that we are much less thorough in evaluation of teaching in comparison to many other institutions. Some of you should volunteer to go on SACS visits to other

schools. This will greatly improve Carson-Newman's position when it is our turn to be evaluated.

To my colleagues on the teaching faculty, SACS has set up some hoops we have to jump through. But, if you are the kind of teacher who every semester looks back at your courses evaluating what things were most successful and what things really didn't work; then if you keep doing what succeeded and try something else the next time in place of the less successful; if that's the kind of teacher you are, you should have no trouble jumping through the hoops because you are already doing the essence of what is required. On the other hand, if you are a teacher who says, "I'm not going to spoon-feed these kids. I'll give my lectures and administer my tests, and if half the class fails, I don't care"; a teacher with this attitude is not going to succeed in today's climate of higher education.

To the administrative staff: keep trying to improve the services provided by your unit. Among your coworkers don't be afraid to express your opinions, and at the same time be willing to listen to everyone else's opinions.

Finally, to my new colleagues on the faculty who were introduced this morning. I don't want you to think you have made a mistake in accepting a position here. We have some problems and challenges, some of them potentially quite serious, but you can be a part of the solution.

For all of us, the essence of doing quality enhancement can be summarized in a statement by none other than Haydn. I'll repeat the relevant portion of the quote I gave you earlier. Haydn said, "I could make experiments, observe what produced an effect and what weakened it, and was thus in a position to improve, alter and make additions or omissions, and be as bold as I pleased."

This has not been a cheerful, make-people-feel-good type of speech. It is not a speech that could have been delivered in any year other than the present. You gave me the award in 2005; you got my 2005 speech.

I began with opera, and I'll conclude with opera. In 1939, the composer Douglas Moore, in collaboration with writer Stephen Vincent Benet, produced the opera *The Devil and Daniel Webster*, based on a short story that Benet had written two years earlier. Whenever a play, or in this case a story, is made into an opera, the dialogue has to be severely cut. A two-hour play set to music would produce a six- or seven-hour opera. Among the cuts that Benet made for the operatic version, was this conversation between the devil and Daniel Webster.

The devil said to Webster, "You have made great speeches. You will make more. But the last great speech you make will turn many of

your own against you. They will call you Ichabod; they will call you by other names. Even in New England some will say you have turned your coat and sold your country, and their voices will be loud against you till you die." Daniel Webster’s reply was, "So it is an honest speech, it does not matter what men say."

Is There a Plagiarism Crisis at Carson-Newman College?

Mary V. Ball

Events that Led to This Essay

My first semester at CN, I assigned students in BIO105 the writing of a report on a human disorder. Two students who each wrote a paper on sickle cell anemia both indicated that the condition could sometimes cause a "coronary infraction" (instead of "infarction")! (This was long before the days of having Spell Check automatically "correct" your spelling.) Although they listed no cited references in common, I concluded that one of them had copied from the other, misspelling and all.

When one of my sons was in second grade, he came home with the assignment to "write a report on water pollution using an encyclopedia." What kind of report can you expect a second grader to write using an encyclopedia? (I refused to allow him to do the assignment as given, but instead helped him to create a poster on water pollution in Tennessee, based on actually looking in gutters and streams after a rainstorm.)

When one of my daughters was a senior at "Jeff County High," her English teacher assigned her a report on the War of the Roses. My daughter informed me of her intentions to print off and submit the article on War of the Roses from an electronic Encyclopedia (on a CD). I made such a fuss that she complained to her teacher about my "attitude." Her teacher's reply? "Well, technically it **is** plagiarism, and you won't be allowed to do it in college, but I **do** accept it."

I once observed a C-N student teacher who had checked out resources from the high school Media Center and instructed her students to research the uses of fermentation (wine making, etc.). After watching them make notes for several minutes, I suggested she discuss plagiarism with them, and she reluctantly agreed to do so. From my vantage point at the back of the room, I could observe the students' responses. About half of them enclosed their entire set of notes in a single pair of quotation marks. Many of the others turned to one another and whispered advice such as, "Change 'an' to 'the'!"

Fast forwarding to the present, I have experienced five unpleasant plagiarism incidents during this current school year and find myself again pondering the phenomenon—what explains the continued occurrence of plagiarism and what can we do differently to avoid its occurrence?

Why Do Students Plagiarize?

To me, the most basic problem that we face is that plagiarism is frequently allowed (and even rewarded) in K-12 education. Why is that? I have always begun class discussions of plagiarism by admitting that every parent I know lets their children cheat when they are first learning to play a board game. However, as these children grow up, most parents eventually expect them to "play by the rules." I think that's one reason K-12 teachers tolerate plagiarism and one reason that students have an inclination to plagiarize.

Another contributing factor has got to be the ability to "cut and paste," using the Internet and a word processing program. One of the instances of plagiarism I dealt with this year was, I am convinced, the product of a "race to the finish line" effort to get a paper in on time. Thinking about it, I can see how "composing at the keyboard" as you read background information could promote plagiarism even in a well-intentioned student.

An honor student recently confided in me that she had just last semester come to understand that citing a scientific reference properly does not confer permission to paraphrase the authors' wording. (This misunderstanding probably accounts for two of the five incidents of plagiarism I dealt with this year. In these two cases, the zero the students received lowered their grades in the course from a B+ to a B-, but tears were shed and a record is now on file in Provost Arrington's office.)

Two of my recent plagiarism incidents involved verbatim use of entire sentences from un-cited sources. It may not be possible to prevent these incidents, but I think it is important to detect them. The two "verbatim cut and paste" incidents resulted in rather severe impacts on these students. On one level, I believe the consequences they suffered were just, but, on another level, I think we failed them, making me conclude that we need to seriously consider some sort of campus-wide anti-plagiarism campaign.

What Should We Do?

One thing I believe we need to do is to begin openly talking with one another about the issue. We need to grapple with such questions as what plagiarism is, why it happens, and who is doing it.

If, as I have argued, students are initially allowed to plagiarize, then we need to make certain that they "learn to play by the rules," and the sooner the better. Admittedly, this may be harder in the case of writing than it is in the case of learning the rules of Scrabble. Can we even agree among ourselves what "the rules" are? The suggestion that a string of four to six words requires quotation marks may not really apply in science, where a more limited vocabulary may be available to express certain ideas. (How many ways can you say that food travels from the mouth through the esophagus to the stomach?)

I sometimes wonder why I seem to "notice" more plagiarism than other people do. I have to admit that doing so is probably easier for me, for some reason. (I once served on a SACS review committee where the chairman asked if anyone on the committee had a "gift" for noting typos and grammatical problems in a draft report. He said that at his school such a person was referred to as "Miss Picky." I rather sheepishly raised my hand, and edited the draft report.)

I don't know if anyone else will find my experiences helpful, but "suspiciously awkward phrases," "suspiciously bookish phrases," and "suspiciously irrelevant phrases" in student writings are often the ones that lead to my discovery of plagiarism. I also "spot check" students' Internet sources by actually going to the websites that they cite in their references.

Over the years I have frequently specified the outline for a report or required the prior approval of an outline, which a paper must then follow. This seems to greatly reduce the students' chances of being able to find material that "fits perfectly" and can just be pasted in. I also often require persuasive writing rather than "library research." (In the "race to the finish line" incident, I had not required prior approval of an outline because the specified paper length was only 1,500 words. I now believe that not requiring an approved outline was a mistake.)

I have not used "TurnItIn," but have read reviews that make me cautious about concluding that such sites are a substitute for or an improvement over a "sharp eye." I would like to see us submit some deliberate examples of plagiarism and see how accurate the program's "diagnosis" is! I understand some professors require students to submit their own writings to the site before they submit them for final grading. I may try that this fall.

Whatever we do, this issue (in my opinion) is never going to “go away,” because every “new crop of freshmen” will need to be “taught the rules.” What can happen, I believe, is that the process can be made less painful for both students and faculty! (I personally dread my next tearful confrontation more than you can imagine.)

Faith, Family Values, and Force: Farewell to FDR?

James L. Baumgardner

Democrats must launch a concerted and united effort to rearrange the national debate in such a way as to give center stage to issues that play to their strength. As a part of this effort, they must find ways to neutralize the impact of issues that have placed the Republicans in the position of strength they currently hold. If they are unable to do so and events do not do it for them, their party is in danger of becoming irrelevant and incapable of offering a meaningful alternative to the Republican Party. Indeed, it is not totally inconceivable that the Democratic Party might go the way of the Federalists and Whigs. Ironically, if such a scenario were to become reality, the white South, once a bulwark of the party, will have played a major role in its demise.

National security and family values gathered under the present rubric of "moral values" are the issues currently at the center of national debate. Unfortunately for the Democrats, as this paper shall attempt to illustrate, these concerns are working almost entirely to the Republican advantage because a traditional Democratic emphasis upon personal liberty and popular interpretation of certain events in the nation's past have served to render the national party almost helpless in these areas.

In one form or another, the Democratic Party has been an integral part of the nation's political history since the 1790s. While the popular impression may be that the Democrats have been the predominant force during much of that time, there are certain qualifiers that should be noted in order to understand the reason they presently are nearing a state of near impotence on the national level.

The real strength of the Democratic Party consistently has rested on economic or, so-called, pocketbook issues. When Alexander Hamilton proposed a commercial and industrial-based economy designed to benefit the nation's socio-economic elite, Thomas Jefferson successfully countered with an agrarian-based argument that had wide appeal to a large majority of the common people, particularly in the South and West, people whose livelihood depended upon agricultural pursuits. Federalist/Hamiltonian inability to convince rank-and-file voters that its view of the nation's economic wellbeing was the proper one ultimately

contributed to the Federalist Party demise and a brief period of total Republican dominance on the national level during the rather misleadingly named Era of Good Feelings.

For his 1824 national campaign, Henry Clay of Kentucky set forth perhaps the most comprehensive economic platform ever developed by a presidential hopeful. Known as the American System, it was designed to offer every key segment of the national economy something—protective tariffs for the newly emerging industrial class, federally-funded internal improvements for the farmers of the South and West who were seeking ways to move their commodities to market, and a national bank to facilitate the flow of currency throughout the nation.

Although the American System did not bring its designer the presidency, it did provide the central issues over which National Republicans/Whigs and Democrats (as the erstwhile Republicans now had taken to calling themselves) fought throughout the late 1820s, 1830s, and well into the 1840s. Although the so-called Second Party System (Whigs vs. Democrats) became the nearest thing to a truly competitive nationwide political system (as opposed to one in which the strength of the two major parties is based on different regains of the country) the United States ever has witnessed, the Democrats generally managed to maintain the upper hand throughout the so-called Jacksonian Era by arguing a governmental *laissez faire* approach to the economy, while attempting to ensure that no group would be allowed special privileges and by convincing the majority of the voters that converting the planks of the American System into public policy was not in their best interest. Since the general rule was for the Whigs to promote these stances as being good for the national economy and for the Democrats to oppose them, the Democratic Party almost always prevailed in the national elections of this period and controlled both the White House and the Congress the great bulk of the time.[1]

The issue of slavery expansion in the 1850s served to destroy a divided Whig Party as a national entity and propelled the newly emergent Republican Party to the fore as the chief opposition to the Democrats. With the Democrats attempting to straddle the issue in order to preserve party unity, the Republicans were left free to exploit the slavery expansion controversy to their advantage. A purely sectional party based in the nonSouth, the Republican Party had no need to cater to white Southerners. Hence, its leaders wrapped the central issue around which

---

[1]The Democrats gained additional clout by supporting westward expansion of the country that the Whigs tended to oppose. Since popular imagination embraced so-called Manifest Destiny, the Democrats reaped the benefits.

the party had formed, opposition to the extension of slavery into territories and areas of the United States that had not yet become states, in economic garb, arguing that these vast expanses should be reserved for nonslaveholders and holding forth the promise of free homesteads to would-be settlers. Additionally, the support of northern businessmen was cultivated by promising them special economic considerations such as protective tariffs.

During the 1860s, Democrats were rendered powerless by the absence of the states of the South in the halls of Congress, and Republicans took advantage of their total domination of national politics to advance their economic agenda. With the recovery of white southern political fortunes in the early to mid-1870s, however, the Democratic Party, serving as the vehicle of white supremacy in the South and of the aspirations of newly arriving immigrants in the NonSouth, once again became a major player on the national political scene. Economically, the Democrats continued to push their version of *laissez faire* government, while the Republicans advanced an activist agenda designed to serve the monied interests of the society and ultimately (they argued) all Americans.

The later 1870s, 1880s, and first part of the 1890s were characterized by a stalemate in national politics, with neither major party willing to take decisive, clearly differentiated stances on most key issues for fear of losing voters. The economic crisis of the mid-1890s, the worse one the country yet had witnessed, came with the Democrats controlling the White House and both houses of Congress for the first time since before the Civil War. This chance convergence of events allowed the Republicans to gain the political and economic high ground. With the temporary exception of the first six years of Woodrow Wilson's presidency, they would hold this position until the early 1930s, a dominance that greatly was aided by the fantastic prosperity that characterized most of the 1920s and for which the Republicans took full credit. "Coolidge Prosperity" they called it.

By this time, the activist Republican economic policy had developed as its themes "rugged individualism" (a concept much admired by later Republican President Ronald Reagan), voluntary cooperation among business, labor, and consumers to keep the economy stable (Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover's favored formula for continued prosperity), and Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon's "trickle down" theory of economics that argued for special concessions

such as tax cuts for the wealthy in order to encourage the investments necessary to allow all Americans to share in the nation's prosperity.[2]

Unfortunately for the Republicans, "Coolidge Prosperity" turned into "Hoover Depression" at the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s, as the greatest economic crisis in the nation's history, aptly designated by historians as the Great Depression, hit the country and plunged it into a steep and seemingly endless economic nosedive. This ill financial wind, however, provided a major political windfall for the Democrats, moving them into a dominant position unlike any they had known since well before the Civil War.

So desperate were conditions by the fall of 1932, that the Democratic presidential candidate, Franklin D. Roosevelt, only had to play in very broad terms upon the promise he had made in his acceptance speech, "I pledge you, I pledge myself, to a new deal for the American people" (Warren 1968, 238). Nothing resembling anything other than a very vague foreshadowing of that new deal emerged from his not always consistent campaign speeches. Nonetheless, voters received the impression that major changes would be made if FDR were elected, and he was swept to victory over the hapless incumbent, Herbert Hoover, whose voluntary approach to the economy had proven wholly inadequate (Warren 1968, 251).

Despite subsequent vehement charges to the contrary, FDR was no socialist, but the extent of the economic problems confronted by the country during most of the 1930s was so great that any meaningful moves toward relief, recovery, and reform (the three "R's of the New Deal) required an ever-greater involvement of the federal government. Growing demands that the national economy and individual economic security should be shored up by governmental efforts ultimately led to at least some of the trappings of a modern welfare state, howbeit a far cry from the institutions that appeared in a number of the more developed countries of western and northern Europe.

With supporters of the New Deal pushing for more reform of the nation's economic institutions and political conservatives fighting to halt what they regarded as "creeping socialism," the country by the 1936 elections was verging on class warfare. From this struggle emerged the so-called New Deal coalition—urban dwellers, Catholics and Jews, unionized workers, northern blacks, and southern whites – that would serve to keep the Democrats in power for the next three dec-

---

[2]Echoes of Mellon's "trickle down" policy clearly could be heard in the 1980s in Ronald Reagan's supply side economics and in the early 21st century in George W. Bush's desire for permanent tax cuts and the Republican push for an end to the "death tax."

ades, almost invariably on the strength of economic themes. While a conservative coalition of southern Democrats and Midwestern Republicans appeared from the congressional elections of 1938 to block further New Deal reforms and to hinder social welfare reform efforts by Democratic Presidents Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy, the 1964 elections temporarily broke the grip of that bloc and paved the way for a staggering new round of social welfare legislation that in many ways would rival the New Deal.

Lyndon B. Johnson, promising Americans a Great Society that would lift the elderly, poor, and underprivileged of American society by means of economic growth and therefore coming at no increased cost to taxpayers, gained the presidency in his own right with a popular vote percentage unlike anything seen before or since. Also swept into power was a congressional group of liberal Democrats who, at LBJ's fervent urging, addressed a wide sweep of social welfare concerns, including civil rights, poverty, health care, education, and the environment. In addition to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that would give southern blacks a political clout unlike anything even their Reconstruction forebears had seen, there emerged at least two programs that subsequently would become fixtures of American life and the impact of which looms ever, larger, Medicare and Medicaid.

To the present day, economic/social welfare issues, subjects that FDR made the Democratic bulwark, remain at the core of Democratic appeal to the voters, and political success has continued to ride on the party's ability to keep them at the center of voter attention. Unfortunately for the Democratic Party, the appearance of the so-called culture war in the 1970s and its continued growth has put that body on its heels and now is threatening its ability to present itself as a meaningful contender for national power.

Faith

From the very outset, the Democratic Party (in its 1790s embodiment as the Republican Party) embraced the key ideas of liberty and individual rights espoused by its founder, Thomas Jefferson. Hence, it was not surprising that the party's adherents were drawn to the support of the French Revolution with its rallying cries of liberty and equality nor that the party came to embrace the idea that matters of faith and morals should be the concern of each individual and the church which he might happen to attend and not the state. The government should have no say in such decisions.

The notion of personal liberty in regard to matters of faith and morals gave conservative Christians of the time spiritual heartburn, and

the increasingly godless turn of the French Revolution as the 1790s progressed made their anguish concerning the possible capture of national power by the Republicans in 1800 that much greater. Jefferson, the party's presidential nominee, was denounced as both an atheist and a deist, since, either way, he was not a follower of the one true God. His followers were labeled Jacobins, after the extremist element of the French Revolution. One anti-Republican broadside clearly set forth the matter as these fervent Christians saw it, "Can serious and reflecting men look about them and doubt that if Jefferson is elected, and the Jacobins get to authority, that these morals which protect our lives from the knife of the assassins—which guard the chastity of our wives and daughters form seduction and violence—defend our property from plunder and devastation, and shield our religion from contempt and profanation, will not be trampled on and exploded" (Warren 1968, 38).

One of the dirtiest presidential campaigns in American history, the 1800 contest was an early harbinger of what the Democrats would confront in their contests with Ronald Reagan in the 1980s and even more so with George W. Bush in 2000 and especially in 2004, i.e., what would become known as culture war. Indeed, it was a signal as to what the party would confront periodically throughout its history, given its devotion to concepts of personal liberty and individual rights. To Democrats good fortune during most of that time, rarely did this sociocultural article of faith cost them national elections.

Rather ironically, the people with whom the Democrats repeatedly have clashed over the years are evangelical Christians of various stripes. i.e., people who place major emphasis upon individual responsibility before God and personal accountability to Him and who traditionally have championed separation of church and state. Yet, the Democratic Party, which emphasizes much the same thing regarding individuals and their respective views toward morality during their earthly sojourn, frequently has incurred the righteous wrath of these extremely devout individuals because of the party's unwillingness to use the power of the state to promote and protect their version of piety.[3]

Given this reluctance on the art of Democrats, evangelicals traditionally have looked to the party's opposition for aid in the use of the state to help enforce their version of morality. During the Jacksonian Era, they turned to the Whigs, who displayed a disposition to engage in such an activity. While the presence of slavery conditioned the views of white Southerners of both parties, one allegedly could tell a northern

[3]Southern Baptists, long the predominant religious body in the South, are a prime example of this religious version of split personality (Eighmy 1972, 52-53).

Whig from a Democrat on the basis of his Sunday behavior. If he regularly attended an evangelistic Protestant church, he likely was a Whig. If he belonged to a church with a ritualized service or rarely, if ever, went to church, he likely was a Democrat (Divine 2005, 264).

During the 1870s and 1880s, the heart of the so-called Gilded Age, much the same distinction was made between the Democratic and Republican parties in the nonSouth. Since the Republicans displayed a willingness to allow use of the government to enforce community standards of behavior, northern Protestant, old-stock middle and upper class Americans (the so-called WASPs) flocked to the support of the party. Many of them referred to it or at least thought of it as the Party of Piety or Party of the Community. Those northern voters who were not disposed toward the evangelistic mindset turned to the Democratic Part for support, viewing it as the Party of Personal Liberty and looking to it to uphold the right of individuals to determine for themselves their respective moral standards of living (Harrell, Jr 2005, 697).

One hundred years later, basically the same battle lines were drawn as the two major parties faced off in the so-called culture war. White evangelicals, who constitute presently 17% of the electorate, have come to occupy the Republican center stage. "The Faithful," as Stanley Greenberg labels them in his *The Two Americas*, "vote for the Republicans, as if it were an article of their faith" (Greenberg 2005, 98). Eighty percent of them voted for Bush in 2000, a support that increased in 2004 to 82%. In the intervening 2003 congressional elections, 75% of their votes were cast for Republican candidates. Of all Republican loyalists, there are perhaps the most steadfast, with 80% indicating that they would not be open to the possibility of switching their support to a Democratic candidate (Greenberg 2005, 97, 98, 325). They were instrumental in giving Bush his electoral victory in 2000 and his popular vote margin in 2004. So long as the present political, economic, and social circumstances continue to prevail, they are capable of doing the same thing for any future Republican presidential candidate whom they deem acceptable.

While those hostile to the white evangelicals see them as trying to impose their restrictive views on society as a whole, they see themselves as simply trying to defend their preferred way of life and to restore a religious balance to American life that they feel once was there but now is becoming endangered (Greenberg 2005, 97). In the 19th Century, such people saw the danger as being posed by immigrants pouring into the country, first Irish and German Catholics and later in the century an even more bewildering movement of a wide variety of peoples from southern and eastern Europe. In present-day America, the problem is presented by secularists who (they firmly believe) are seek-

ing to purge American society of all remaining vestiges of the true Christian faith and values. In reviewing a book by Robert Bowie Johnson, Jr. entitled *The Parthenon Code* (which argues that the art and architecture found in the Parthenon represent the rebellious side of man, the "line of Cain"), a Southern Baptist leader sums up this point of view by stating that "in our sociological settling it is what the *Culture War* is all about. Western culture is divided between those of us who are committed to the right of God to direct our lives, including our public lives, and those who believe that direction is to be resisted" (Merrill 2006, 17).

"Those who believe that direction is to be resisted" are to be found at the core of Democratic support. At that center is to be found "a growing group of voters, profane and secular and determined to protect their emerging way of life" (Greenberg 2005, 129). These people, who rarely (if ever) attend church, are increasing in numbers. They represent 15% of the electorate, and their support goes overwhelmingly to the Democratic Party. These Secular Warriors, as Greenberg calls them, are "the true loyalists in this modern Democratic world" (Greenberg 2005, 129).

What, then, is the impact of faith on voting preferences? If one equates faith with frequency of church attendance (which evangelicals generally do), the foregoing comments lead to an obvious conclusion, i.e., the more frequent church attendance, the more likely a Republican vote, an assumption that can be supported statistically for the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections (Flanigan & Zingale 2006, 114-15; Mellow 2005, 81). While such statistics are not readily available for the 19th Century, one would expect the rule to be much the same for those attracted to the Democratic Party, as opposed to those conservative non-southern Christians aligned with whomever (Federalist, Whig, Republican) representing the pious opposition.[4]

Family Values

As the culture war erupted on the national political scene in the 1970s, evangelicals tended to lump all of their complaints concerning the developing socio-cultural climate under the general category of concern for preserving traditional "family values." In the last two

[4]Writing before the full development of the culture war, Paul Kleppner, in a 1982 study of election turnout in the period 1870-1980, indicated a belief that church membership did not play as predominant a rile as some other factors in determining voting behavior.

presidential elections, conservative Christian voters have shortened the list to what they view as the necessity of standing for "moral values."

Regardless of the form it takes, what it may be called, or the specific bone(s) of contention, what presently is called "moral values" consistently has placed the Democratic Party at a disadvantage with voters who are more concerned about socio-cultural issues than about economic ones.

Do the issues that clearly are Democratic ones—a living wage, social security, health care (Medicare and Medicaid), education, care of the poor, disadvantaged, and the elderly, civil rights, the environment, and (thanks to Bill Clinton) federal debt reduction—possess a moral language of their own? While some who are familiar with Jesus' ministry might see such concerns falling clearly under Jesus' command of "the second is like unto it [the first]" (Matt. 22:39, KJV) in identifying relationship with God with relationship to others, many white evangelicals, especially in the South were evangelicalism has deep historical roots, often have refused to make that connection.

Indeed, despite the fact that white as well as black Southerners stood to benefit from the social welfare agenda of FDR's so-called Second New Deal, it was conservative southern Democrats who joined with conservative midwestern Republicans following the 1938 congressional elections effectually to kill any additional social welfare programs. Further, it was this bloc, as previously noted, that prevented any further advances of this agenda by either Truman or Kennedy. Only the temporary breaking of this coalition by an overwhelming tide of liberal, largely nonsouthern Democrats swept into Congress by the 1964 elections allowed the creation of such programs as Medicare and Medicaid and a temporary attempt to address the problems of poverty, education, and the environment, as well as the political rights of southern blacks.

The ambiguity of evangelicals concerning such issues clearly can be seen in a recent controversy among them concerning the issue of global warming. A newly formed coalition known as the Evangelical Christian Initiative (ECI) on February 8, 2006, issued a statement that declared global warming to be a reality that most heavily will impact the world's poor and stated that "Christian moral convictions demand our response to the climate change problem" (B&R 2006, 3). Included among its eighty-six signers was Rick Warren, mega-church pastor, famed author, and nominal Southern Baptist.

For other evangelical leaders, the fact that the ECI's declaration, among other things, ran counter to the position of the Bush administration was troubling. While some secondary Southern Baptist leaders were among those who signed it, neither the SBC's current president

nor any of its past ones were among the signatories; and the same was true of the presidents of all six SBC seminaries.

Richard Land, head of the SBC's Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission and whose pronouncements on social issues almost always parallel the stances of the Bush White House, rushed to the attack. Noting that the signers did not include such prominent did not include such prominent evangelicals as James Dobson, Charles Colson, and Franklin Graham, Land declared that it "would be unethical and irresponsible for me to sign such a statement giving the impression that there is a consensus among Southern Baptists on this issue when there is not one" (B&R 2006, 4). Conservative Christian columnist Cal Thomas also noted this lack of consensus among evangelicals generally and declared that they instead should focus on "the eternal message" which 'cleans up' the insides of the hearts of men and women and places them in a position to more powerfully influence this world and prepare themselves and others for the world to come" (Thomas 2006, 4).

Interestingly, both sides to this controversy cited passages from the first chapters of Genesis to reinforce their respective positions. One took the stance that the Bible commands Christians to be good stewards of the earth, while the other emphasized that God created man to be master of the earth, even if that mastery might prove detrimental to other forms of life.

This refusal to link morality with stances on socio-cultural issues which the Democrats have championed and the use of the Bible to reinforce positions is nowhere more glaring than in the field of civil rights, and is nowhere more pronounced than among white southern evangelicals. For a hundred years, the Democratic Party reigned supreme in the South, not because of its stance on personal liberty but rather due to its defense of white supremacy, first in the condoning of slavery and then in the upholding of segregation. As is usually the case, however, politics in these situations simply was reflecting the society, and southern society was unified in its belief in black inferiority. Accordingly, pastors of the evangelical churches that many southern whites attended found in the Bible passages with which to defend slavery even while northern abolitionist preachers biblically condemned the institution as an abomination before God.

Following the demise of slavery, southern evangelical ministers until well into the 1960s stood in their pulpits to assure their white flocks that the Scriptures clearly supported segregation of the races. That message, however, stood in sharp contrast to what the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. and his fellow, largely black Baptist ministers of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) were finding in their Bibles.

Meanwhile, in the mid-1850s, the Republican Party had been born in an atmosphere of moral crusading. As the body came together, reformers of all stripes flocked to its banner in the hopes of gaining a platform for their respective causes. As a result, the party gained an air of moral rectitude that the Democrats could not match. Nonetheless, the core issue around which the new political grouping formed, opposition to the extension of slavery into territories and areas under the control of the federal government that were yet to become states, smacked of racism.

Despite the fact that abolitionists were attracted to it simply because it was the closest thing to a meaningful political home available to them, the party's concern was not with freedom for the victims of slavery but rather freedom of the land into which southern whites might attempt to project their "peculiar institution." In his famous 1858 senatorial debates with Democrat Stephen A. Douglas, even Abraham Lincoln, who ultimately would be remembered in history as the Great Emancipator, found it politically expedient to declare his belief in white supremacy (Divine, 2005, 353-54).

In the aftermath of the Civil War, a small faction of the Republican Party, the so-called Radicals, attempted to force upon the South the principle of white and black equality. Only a small proportion of them, however, did so because they really believed in that concept (which most of their northern constituencies also would have rejected) but rather because it was politically expedient for them to do so, both because many of their constituents wanted to see "fruits of victory" (as long as that did not include former slaves moving north) and because it was the only way they saw of cultivating a following in the South that might transform their party from a sectional to a national political organization.

When Republicans finally realized, however, that having a southern political base was not necessary for their party to contest for power, they quite willingly left the fate of the former slaves to be decided by southern whites.[5] A hundred years later, their successors would come to realize that, that same genteel racism that accompanied the crusading zeal surrounding their party's birth could be translated into a sociocultural moral fervor that could reap huge political dividends among the descendants of the same white Southerners on whom a few of their more zealous members had attempted to force racial equality.

---

[5]Any good text on the Civil War and Reconstruction will verify these observations concerning the early years of the Republican Party. An outstanding work on this topic is James M. McPherson's *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction*.

This Republican epiphany occurred in the mid-1960s as liberal Democratic elements in Congress, urged onward by a white southern president from Texas, moved to make a reality of the principle of equality that is so deeply embedded in the American credo. Passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (designed to deliver a death blow to racial segregation) and of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (designed to give the vote guarantee of the Fifteenth Amendment genuine meaning) sent tremors of foreboding through southern white supremacists and elicited from them cries of outrage over these gross violations of accepted social norms.

While George C. Wallace strove to legitimize southern grievances by wrapping them in the garb of protests against unwarranted governmental interference in the lives of law-abiding citizens, the Republican Party nominated as its 1964 presidential candidate a senator of Arizona who had voted against the Civil Rights Act. The candidacy of Barry M. Goldwater sent a clear signal to white southerners that civil rights for all was not as great a concern for Republicans as were grievances of the white social classes. The appearance of Richard M. Nixon and his "southern strategy" in the late 1960s began sealing the deal, as the white southern movement into the Republican Party on the presidential level that began in 1964 now started to take on quite distinctive features.

Ronald Reagan would move these people firmly into the party ranks and begin the process of moving this alliance from the presidential level down the political ladder to the congressional and state levels. A key in this process was Reagan's ability to manipulate the growing culture war to the Republican advantage (Greenberg 2005, 57-58). In turn, the culture war helped wash away any taint of racism that might be attached to the political garments of either the Republican Party or the white South. God, not race, now became the moving force.

The inability of the Democrats to dress their issues in a moral garb recognizable by white Christian evangelicals is the result of that evangelical split personality that insists that economic and social welfare issues and similar topics do not occupy the same level of importance before God as do the socio-cultural issues which almost invariably place the Democrats on the defensive due to their attachment to personal liberty. Hence, be it such 19th Century evangelical concerns as observance of the Sabbath (Sunday) or prohibition or late 20th Century lamentations about the erosion of traditional family values, the sinners invariably were/are to be found flocking into the Democratic ranks.

Consequently, the Democratic Party should not have been caught by surprise when the newly emergent Christian, or Religious, Right began its march on the nation's ballot boxes in the 1970s with the de-

termination to defend against a renewed assault on conservative Christian values and that those votes increasingly fell to Republican presidential, congressional, and state candidates. Out of the turbulent 1960s had come such things as the disintegration of the family, removal of God from the public classrooms and substitution of so-called secular humanism, an antiwar movement that smacked heavily of disloyalty to country, a civil rights movement gone awry as it left the South in the middle and later 1960s to challenge the economic and social inequalities that existed in the cities of the nonSouth (thereby giving an appearance of legitimacy to concerns about the direction of the entire civil rights movement), homosexuals coming out of the closet to demand an equal place in American life, and an increasingly militant feminist movement that found its most abhorrent expression in the Supreme Court's 1973 decision in *Roe v. Wade* recognizing a woman's constitutional right to an abortion.

As evangelicals looked upon this full-scale assault on traditional family values with growing dismay and horror, it seemed to them that the champions of all these wrong things—secular humanists, antiwar activists, violent civil rights proponents, homosexuals, militant feminists—were finding aid and comfort around the fires of the Democratic political camp. By contrast, the Republican Party, still dressed in its late 19th Century robes of the Party of Piety or the Party of the Community, shook its political head in rhythm with their anguish and distress and beckoned unto them to come warm themselves around the fires of political righteousness, a call to which they responded in ever-increasing numbers until, by the presidential elections of 2000 and 2004, they were in a position to play a key role in determining their respective outcomes.

Force

When attention turns to the topic of national security, the Republican Party's readiness to champion the use of force in situations in which that alternative seems the preferable and most easily understood course of action to many Americans has given it another definite edge over its Democratic opposition.

Apparently, the Democratic Party irretrievably surrendered any claim it might have had to being the guardian of national security with the coming of the Civil War. Southern Democrats were in the forefront of the secession movement that attempted to destroy the Union. It was the extreme peace wing of the party that used its base in the Midwest to attempt to disrupt the war effort by discouraging enlistment in the military and encouraging desertion and to demand a negotiated settlement

of the struggle that would have allowed the southern states to continue as the rival of the United States on the North American continent.

By contrast, it was a unified Republican Party that guided the United States to victory and then in a restoration of the Union. With that turn of events, Republicans wrapped themselves in the American flag and have insisted on remaining in those illustrious garments to the present day.[6]

Granted, it was a Democratic president, Woodrow Wilson, who led the United States through World War I, during the course of which it changed its economic status from a debtor to a creditor nation. All that effort seemed to achieve, however, was to get him tagged as the first president to send American troops to fight in Europe and to leave many conservative Americans maintaining throughout the 1920s and well into the 1930s that he had led the country into a war that it could have and should have avoided.

It is true that it was a Democratic president, FDR, who led the United States to a victory over Nazi Germany and militaristic Japan (although he did not live to see that final outcome), but he never could quite cleanse himself of the charge that conservative Republicans pinned on his administration in the 1930s in the aftermath of his diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union and the arrival in Washington of a number of young American leftists who had flirted with communism in their college days to work in various New Deal programs, i.e., that the Democrats were "soft on communism." Complaints that Roosevelt had "sold out" the Eastern European countries to Communist Russia at the February, 1945 Yalta Conference subsequently merged with the "loyalty investigations" of federal employees ordered by the Truman administration in a vain effort to head off a Republican communist witch hunt and the "who lost China" debates at the end of the 1940s and beginning of the 1950s to deepen suspicions of numerous American patriots about the extent to which the Democrats could be trusted to protect the country's vital interests at home and abroad.

Despite the fact that it was a Democratic president, Harry S. Truman, who launched the policy of containment to halt expansion of a supposedly aggressive Soviet Union bent on spreading communism worldwide and who confronted an attempt by a Soviet-backed commu-

---

[6]One might view the ubiquitous American flag lapel pins worn by President Bush, Vice-President Cheney, and others in their administration, as well as by many of their supporters, as the most current manifestation of this phenomenon. Too, every four years, viewers of the Republican national convention are treated to a venue awash in red, white, and blue.

nist regime to seize control of all of Korea, the idea of simply limiting an assumed threat to American security rather than totally eliminating it did not set well with conservative Americans accustomed to nothing less than victory in the country's encounters with its foes. An ultimately futile but highly costly (in terms of both manpower and dollars) military involvement in Vietnam under the direction of two Democratic presidents, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson (both of whom were haunted by the furor over the "loss" of China and who did not want a "who lost Vietnam" debate that focused on them) further served to make the Democrats appear to be not only weak but also inept.

The 1972 presidential candidacy of Senator George McGovern of South Dakota sealed in the minds of many conservative Americans the thought that the Democratic Party basically remained untrustworthy in times of challenges to American security. Although the Republican presidential incumbent, Richard M. Nixon, was deeply involved in a phased military disengagement from Vietnam by the time of the campaign which would end less than five months after the election with the last American combat troops leaving the country, Nixon nonetheless used McGovern's demand for an immediate American withdrawal to reinforce suspicions that the Democrats were unpatriotic and unreliable when it came to protecting national interests and championing American honor abroad.[7]

In the end, it would be a Republican president, Ronald Reagan, who would engage in massive deficit spending in order to force the Soviet Union to the economic wall with an unprecedented peacetime military buildup that the Soviets could not hope to match. With the subsequent disintegration of the USSR, his followers could and would claim that it was a Republican who ultimately won the Cold War and ended the threat of communist aggression.

The end of the Cold War left the next two American presidents, one a Republican and the other a Democrat, seeking a new center around which American foreign and military policy could be wrapped. What neither of them was able to find literally dropped from a clear blue sky on 9-11-01, and presented Republican George W. Bush, whose administration had appeared largely rudderless to that point,

---

[7]So effective was this approach that the Democratic Party to this day remains in a "damned if you do, damned if you don't "situation when it comes to military involvement abroad. John Kerry's futile 2004 campaign would illustrate this point, as does the fact that virtually all hopefuls for the 2008 Democratic presidential nod are doing little more than condemning George Bush's approach to the struggle in Iraq while offering no meaningful alternatives to his "stay the course" litany.

with a new "ism" with which Americans could do battle in defense of national security, terrorism. This war on terrorism would become a key to his successful 2004 re-election bid.

If Democratic activists and those who voted for it in the 2004 presidential primaries thought that they had found in Senator John F. Kerry of Massachusetts a war hero who could match up against a self-declared wartime president, they apparently had forgotten that the most prominent newsreel footage of their man was not about a war hero but about a disillusioned, long-haired, rather unkempt looking Vietnam War veteran wearing an ill-fitting faded fatigue shirt siding with the antiwar movement in testimony before a congressional committee or engaging in other antiwar activities.

Ironically, the man who was determined not to repeat the inept campaign of the last Democratic nominee from Massachusetts, Michael Dukakis, committed a "Dukakis moment" by preceding his nomination acceptance speech with a rather inane sounding and appearing "reporting for duty" introduction. Whatever Kerry intended to convey with such an opening, the Republicans jumped at him with glee. Rather than a war hero, Kerry was presented to the voting public as a flip-flopping "peacenik" who could not be trusted to protect the nation's vital interests in such a dangerous time.

As if to assure that Kerry would be unable to gain any traction on the basis of his war record, a free-floating group calling itself Swift Boat Veterans for Truth appeared on the scene shortly after Kerry's nomination to question the true nature of his military service. Although their charges that he had fabricated the accounts that had led to his receipt of medals for heroism initially reached only a limited audience, they were picked up first by cable networks and then by mainstream news outlets, quickly expanding the recipients of the group's message from a few limited areas to nationwide. While the group ostensibly was operating on its own, it certainly served the Bush campaign well, as had other similar supposedly independent groups that had appeared in preceding Bush gubernatorial and presidential campaigns to smear whoever his opponent might be.

The group's attack and the Kerry campaign's initial indecision in relation as to how or if to respond to the charges being leveled against their man left Kerry's true war record in doubt long enough to render it harmless as far as the Republican cause was concerned. Kerry's ultimate attempts to respond and subsequent media checks raising serious doubts about the veracity of the Swift Boat Veterans for Truth's charges came too little and too late to make any real impression on the public mind (Abramson 2006, 39-40; Pomper 2005, 56-57).

In addition to its traditionally strong appeal to major veterans' groups (dating back to Union Civil War veterans who organized themselves as the Grand Army of the Republic, GAR, in the 19th c. in order to support the party and to receive benefits from it), the Republicans receive the dedicated support of the National Rifle association (NRA), a group devoted to its own version of the use of force to keep order in the world. Wrapping the stigma of gun control around the Democratic neck, this group quite possibly contributed to Al Gore's 2000 defeat in his home state, thereby denying him the presidency. It attracts to its ranks especially such voters as the men whom Stanley Greenberg colorfully labels the "F-you Boys" and the "F-You Old Men." As the titles imply, these people bristle at the thought of the various forms of governmental interference in their lives; and they vehemently express a desire to be left alone. They are proud of their SUVs, pickups, and guns, are militantly patriotic, and are fed up with all these weird (to them) groups that have appeared in recent decades to threaten the old order of things. Together, they comprise about 13% of the Republican electorate and are devoted totally to that party (Greenberg 2005, 110-15).

Since these NRA devotees are among those groups least likely to support the Democratic Party, it is hard to understand the reason for another Kerry "Dukakis moment," i.e., appearing at one point during the campaign dressed in hunting clothes (painfully new looking) and carrying a shotgun on a goose-hunting trip. The biggest thing this bit of obvious pandering to the anti-gun control segment of the electorate accomplished was howls of derision from NRA members and smirking critiques from both Bush and Cheney.

In the final analysis, it is unlikely that Kerry or any other Democratic challenger effectively could have offset Bush's standing as a wartime president. While voters expressed doubts about the progress of the war in Iraq, they agreed with the President's contention that it was a part of the larger war on terror; and they overwhelmingly indicated a belief that Bush was the candidate they most trusted to direct that war (Abramson 2006, 48). It was this faith in Bush's overall approach to a war that he repeatedly emphasized had no end in the foreseeable future that contributed to his victory (Flanigan & Zingale 2006, 212). The aggressiveness with which Bush ultimately responded to the 9-11 attacks simply had served to reinforce long-standing views among many Americans that the Republicans are the people to whom to turn when the nation's security appears to be on the line (Mellow 2005, 84).

Farewell to FDR?

Since the 1930s, the political well being of the Democratic Party has rested squarely upon the economic foundation created by FDR and his New Deal. When the economy and social welfare issues have taken center stage in the voters' minds, as they did in the 1930s, the mid-1960s, and the 1990s, Democratic political fortunes go up. When they turn to socio-cultural issues, as they did in the 1960s with an increasingly intense civil rights campaign, in the 1970s and 1980s with an intensifying culture war, and in the early 21st Century with both so-called "moral values" and national security at stake, the Republicans step prominently to the fore.

In 2000, the country still was enjoying the benefits of the economic resurgence that came to characterize the Clinton presidential years. Yet, Al Gore was unable to ride that prosperous wave to victory in the presidential contest of that year. Four years later, voters were expressing dissatisfaction with the economic direction in which the country was going. Still, Kerry, who made the economy the central theme of his campaign despite later charges to the contrary, was unable to ride that seemingly swelling tide of discontent to victory. The irony of these results is that in a year when the economy appeared strong and many voters viewed the country as heading in the right direction, the Democratic candidate lost. With the subsequent presidential election taking place in a year in which the economy seemed shaky and with many voters believing that the country economically was going in the wrong direction, the Democratic challenger again lost (Nelson 2005, 5). Farewell to FDR? Is the Democratic Party on the verge of being rendered in ineffectual opposition party?

With the control of Congress since 1994, (with the brief exception of the Senate in 2001-02) and two consecutive presidential victories, the Republican Party is in the best shape it has seen since the late 1920s (Jacobsen 2005, 199). Basically, the only hope the Democrats have of reversing this situation is a change in the issues about which the electorate in concerned. As long as public attention is focused upon national security concerns and culture war, Democratic prospects will remain dim, although a successful Democratic redefining of what constitutes security ("that animating feature of modern American politics") could well change that portion of the political quotient (Mellow 2005, 85).

Even if the issue environment should become more favorable to the Democrats, the long-term future of the party is very much in doubt. Redistricting and partisan gerrymandering of House districts since 2000

have worked in favor of the Republicans (Jacobsen 2005, 201, 202). By decreasing the number of competitive seats, these activities have placed the Democratic Party at greater disadvantage than it previously had in its hopes of recovering control of that body. Even if the party should manage to regain control in a given congressional election,[8] it will be almost impossible for it to retain that position for any meaningful length of time short of the Democrats re-establishing a hold on at least a few state legislatures in the so-called Red States and reordering congressional districts in their favor.

In the Senate, the nature of the present political landscape is even less promising for the Democrats. As one student of current congressional politics has summed it, "In the future contests for control of either chamber, a continuation of the current era of relatively high partisan loyalty and sharply partisan polarization would appear to serve congressional Republicans well" (Jacobsen 2005, 218).

On the presidential level, the immediate outlook for the Democrats is somewhat better. The year 2008 offers a definite possibility of success for the party. As a number of political commentators (including this author) had predicted, Ohio proved the key to the outcome of the 2004 contest. Despite a three-state sway (New Hampshire from Republican to Democrat and New Mexico and Iowa *vice versa*) that resulted in a net gain of eight electoral votes for the Republicans, the Democrats still would have prevailed if they been successful in swinging Ohio into their column. Assuming that there is not a similar swap favoring the Republicans in 2008 (which is not a safe bet), capturing Ohio would mean victory for the Democrats.

The real challenge for the Democratic Party rests not in the 2006-2010 period, but rather in 2012 and beyond. The 2010 census and at least the next one or two beyond it likely will result in an increased electoral advantage for the Republicans, as population movements continue away from the present so-called Blue States and in the direction of the Red States. A major beneficiary of these shifts likely will be the states of the South, which seem to be increasing their redness with each election year.

While it may be true that there is increasing growth in the ranks of the so-called Secular Warriors (Greenberg 2005, 129), white evangelicals still constitute 17% of the voting population. Much more signifi-

[8]Traditionally, the sixth year of a president's tenure results in congressional losses for his party. If the Democratic Party should fail to regain control of at least the House of Representatives in the 2006 elections, the present plight of the party would be graphically and starkly illustrated.

cantly, however, they represent 30% to 40% of the electorate in a number of the states of the South and West (Mellow 2005, 81). To such voters, economic concerns pale in comparison to moral issues such as abortion and gay marriage or to national security being maintained during what some members of the Bush administration are beginning to call the "Long War" rather than the War on Terrorism (and likening it to the prolonged struggle with communism in the latter half of the 20th century). The Democrats can only hope that the people who will be moving into these areas in the foreseeable future will not simply reinforce the strong Republican partisan base that presently exists there.

The obvious point is that the Democrats must increase their appeal in at least some of those states that currently appear to be safely in the Republican camp. They cannot achieve this objective by attempting to lure people from the Republican partisan base because, if anything, these individuals are more loyal to their party than many Democratic partisans are to theirs.[9]

Neither does the Democratic hope for the future necessarily rest in seeking to increase voter turnout. The traditional axiom that increasing the number of people coming to the polls will help the Democrats proved to be false in 2004. The Democrats did engage in successful voter mobilization, but the Republicans did even better in their determination to turn out supporters of their cause (Campbell 2005, 237-38). In the key state of Ohio, Democrats exceeded their voter mobilization expectations but still were swamped by a Republican effort that proved even more effective (Abramson 2006, 48).

The real hope of the Democratic Party to remain a viable national option to the Republicans in 2012 and beyond must be based upon an effort to appeal to voters who may have leaned toward the Republicans in recent years but who have not firmly joined their partisan base. Such individuals must be led to recognize that moral values involve much more than merely being opposed to abortion, gay marriage, and so-called secular humanism, that it is possible to achieve national security in the "Long War" by something other than merely the use of military force, and that national security for a country in which many of its citizens do not possess economic security is rendered largely meaningless to many potential voters.

Nowhere must this effort be pursued more vigorously than in the South, the bastion of white evangelicalism. While economic concerns

---

[9]In his *The Two Americas*, Stanley Greenberg gives very descriptive and colorful versions of the core supporters of both the Republicans and the Democrats, including some sense of the degree of loyalty of each group on each side.

there will continue to loom extremely large for black voters, even a massive voter turnout on their part will not result in victory in the states that comprise that region unless a sizable percentage of white voters can be moved in the Democratic direction. If that movement cannot be achieved, FDR may have to bid farewell and allow his place to be taken by Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush. If such a scenario should become reality, the real irony will be that southern whites, a people whose political ancestors represented a mainstay of the New Deal coalition, will have played a major role in the dismantling of the party to which white southerners once were devoted and to which FDR gave a new national lease on life.

References

Abramson, Paul R., John H. Aldrich, and David W. Rohde. 2006. "Change and Continuity in the 2004 Elections." Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Abramson, Paul R., John H. Aldrich, and David W. Rohde. 2005. "The 2004 Presidential Election: The Emergence of a Permanent Majority?" *Political Science Quarterly*, Summer.

Campbell, James E. 2005. "Why Bush Won the Presidential Election of 2004: Incumbency, Ideology, Terrorism, and Turnout." *Political Science Quarterly*, Summer.

Divine, Robert A., et al. 2005. *The American Story*. Second Edition. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

"Dockery among evangelical leaders taking stance on global warming." 2006. *Baptist & Reflector*, February 15.

Eighmy, John Lee. 1972, 1987. *Churches in Cultural Captivity: A History of the Social Attitudes of Southern Baptists*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Flanigan, William H., and Nancy H. Zingale. 2006. *Political Behavior of the American Electorate*. Eleventh Edition. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Greenberg, Stanley B. 2004, 2005. *The Two Americas: Our Current Political Deadlock and How to Break It.* New York: Thomas Dunne Books.

Harrell, Jr., David Edwin, *et al*. 2005. *Unto a Good Land: A History of the American People*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Jacobsen, Gary C. 2005. "Polarized Politics and the 2004 Congressional and Presidential Elections." *Political Science Quarterly*, Summer.

Kennedy, David M., Thomas A. Bailey, and Lizabeth Cohen. 1998. *The American Pageant*. Eleventh Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Kleppner, Paul. 1982. *Who Voted? The Dynamics of Electoral Turnout, 1870-1980*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

McPherson, James M. 2001. *Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Mellow, Nicole. 2005. "Voting Behavior: The 2004 Election and the Roots of Republican Success." In *The Elections of 2004*, ed. Michael Nelson. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Merrell, A. William. 2006. "*The Parthenon Code*: A Book Review." *SBC Life*, February/March.

Nelson, Michael. 2005. "The Setting: George W. Bush, Majority President." In *The Elections of 2004*, ed., Michael Nelson. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Pomper, Gerald M. 2005. "The Presidential Election: The Ills of American Politics after 9/11." In *The Elections of 2004*, ed. Michael Nelson. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Thomas, Cal. 2006. "Living the agenda-driven life." *The Oak Ridger*. February 15.

Warren, Stanley. 1968. *The Battle for the Presidency*. New York: J. P. Lippincott Company.

The Art of Statistical Interpretation: The Evolution of Validating Personality Constructs

James E. Collins II

I suppose this paper could be alternatively entitled "Portrait of a Middle-Aged Psychologist as a Social Scientist." My intent is threefold: 1) provide a brief history of measurement issues in personality psychology and 2) describe in some detail the preeminent statistical procedure for questionnaire construction, factor analysis. My discussion is not intended as a mathematical treatise, but as an overview of why and how psychologists try to concretize their theoretical notions. Lastly, 3) I will review a program of research, from my own lab, that traces a variable moving from experiments to being a candidate for validation as a new personality construct.

A Too Brief History of Empirical Psychology

In the discipline, generally. Students of psychology (of whom I'm one) have observed a pendulum swing within the overall history of our discipline. After the extremely introspective mentalism in the early 1900s (a focus on *un*observable thought processes), the scientific study of the mind swung hard toward Watson's and Skinner's behaviorism in the 1930s. Only that which is observable and overt was fair game to a respectable psychologist (only outward behaviors). Skimming epochs that deserve more than a nonmention, the 1960s saw a "cognitive revolution" and a return to endorsing the study of thought as entirely appropriate for research psychologists. The 1980s (until the present day) added the "hot" element of emotion to the mix. Thinking about thinking has thus regained the spotlight, yet is greatly changed since the days of an often-untestable Freud.

Within quantitative psychology. A similar progression is reflected in the history of psychological measurement, which has been especially apparent as various concepts of personality proliferated into intelligence tests, motivational profiles, and surveys tapping enduring traits (as opposed to affective states). It seems we began theorizing unfettered

as it were by strict statistical methodology. Indeed some of our most useful and therefore cherished statistics had yet to be invented. Most notable are Guilford's factor analytic procedures (1936) and Fisher's (1925) analysis of variance (ANOVAs are nearly ubiquitous in today's psychological literature). We then saw behaviorism take hold of content areas (such as decades of classical and operant conditioning studies). Likewise the study of personality came to embrace a rigorous, mathematical foundation. This tradition can be termed a departure from a **rational** approach to a statistical one (Morey, 2003). The evolution included a step away from relying purely on *content validity*. Validity became more than simply including items that seemed to be in line with one's research topic, no matter how logical and rational one's argument.

Any theory begins with assumptions and it is vital to recognize one's own stance. A hidden agenda, even if hidden from one's self, is still an agenda. A lack of self-insight will only serve to muddy conceptual waters. Conversely, a clear explication of underlying assumptions helps to put a theoretical model—be it fresh or seemingly well established—under the appropriate threat of refutation. So I do not mean to imply that the rational approach is not worthwhile. It was a grand starting point.

Beyond content validity. As an intermediate next step, psychologists emphatically accepted a total adherence to item selections based on a kind of closed statistical system. The logic was to establish if answering questions in a certain fashion reliably co-varied with being in a particular group. The MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Hathaway & McKinley, 1967) is an example of a personality test in high use today that was born of an **empirical** approach. Items were kept in the lengthy survey (441 items) based upon members of specific groups (who matched criteria targeted by therapists) answering differently than a comparison group. The MMPI measures psychopathology via 14 scales, including three "lie" scales to detect faking good or bad (Welsh, 1952).

Inaccurate self-reports, especially if deliberately false, are a problem that haunts a narrowly empirical approach. A person could choose to distort their responses and form a more socially desirable (or undesirable) impression than is actually true. Furthermore items that distinguish between normal and clinically elevated responses may *not* be able to differentiate *between* pathologies. The next step, "psychometrics," was a huge progression that out-stripped a merely empirical approach.

The stronger alternative to the rational approach is based on more complex statistics, now termed psychometrics. With this statistical ap-

proach, we kept the quantification goals of empiricism, kept the logic of the rational approach, and began looking at test construction from the inside. As well as needing to be tied to external criteria, item *inter*-correlations became paramount.

A well-refined statistical tool. A host of such within-scale reliability methods can now be gathered on one's statistical tool belt. Among the most oft-used construction techniques is a wonderful way to reduce a large data set of responses to a few scales. This technique is far from arbitrary, requiring both foreknowledge of a content area and an intuition of how to interpret any resulting structure. What technique? Factor analysis.

The factor structure is an underlying blueprint of the more intricate person that does not re-present the innumerable nuances of individuality. A blueprint of a house does not tend to show a given family's choice of interior decorating, for example. Again, if psychometricians seek an underlying pattern in just a few factors, they seek a simplified, reliable set of scores that will predict how a group of individuals will think, feel, and/or act. Permit a couple more analogies. If an individual is a full-color, extremely detailed painting, then a few key personality factors are a sketch, a simplified sketch. The simplification provides for comparison to others and for classifications that may enhance mental and physical health. A map must simplify an environment to be useful. It can't be overly reductionistic, but it must offer a simplified representation and reduce detail to be practical. So it is with personality measurement.

Some specifics. A crucial assumption for factor analytic techniques is that the revealed "factors" will be *uni*-dimensional. That is, a large set of questions could be represented more efficiently by a much smaller set of factors, each capturing a unique amount of the variance from a respondent's answers. If an entire scale is tapping a single basic opinion, only one viewpoint, or a solitary personality trait, then all items should "load" on a single dimension. There would be but one factor. Furthermore, we could see *how much* any one item reflects this one factor quantitatively (like correlations, factor loadings range from – 1.00 to + 1.00). This discernment is highly useful to a psychologist in the process of editing a new or revised personality test (or *any* multi-item scale used in survey or interview research). A powerful tool indeed.

If multiple dimensions underlie a set of responses, then multiple factors should be able to describe the myriad of answers given across the entire questionnaire. How to begin such a psychometric journey? A journey of a few items begins with a 1000, well a few 100 or so, earlier items. Select items based on sound theory and then hone them down to

a favored few items that best represent these theoretical assumptions. Thus with factor analysis we begin by letting a clear theory guide our writing items to tap desired concepts, such as a personality trait (extraverted), a form of intelligence (such as creativity), an opinion (on the literal nature of the Bible), or being motivated (to gain social approval or to monitor one's own behaviors). Statistical packages on computers then analyze hundreds upon hundreds of inter-correlations. Items are excluded if they are inefficient or ineffective predictors, in that their information is *redundant* with other items that load on a factor more strongly. Such unreliable and unnecessary items will not be kept on a future draft of the questionnaire.

In broadest terms, we can utilize factor analysis in two stages of research: first to explore and second to confirm. Let us back up for a moment, take a playfully ignorant position, and reconsider why we would want to reduce data to a few underlying factors in the first place.

An Explanation of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Data reduced but not oversimplified. Factor analysis is a statistical procedure often used by psychologists to reduce a large set of responses, such as opinions, attitudes, and self-reports, into a smaller number of dimensions. The basic question answered by a factor analysis: Are responses reflecting a single factor (termed unidimensional) *or* are participants thinking along a series of dimensions that are separate from one another? If many items can be reduced to a few dimensions, then one's results section and subsequent explanations achieve a desired brevity.

Why use many items. Why encourage participants to answer many items in the first place? Why tap an opinion from different angles with questions worded in alternative ways? It is a matter of sampling. If a single item is worded oddly, provocatively, poorly, or in any way that slants the likely response to being *other* than the actual opinion of a given respondent, then that item introduces error. And not just any error, but systematic error that would not cancel out across time or multiple assessments. Systematic error is to be avoided or, more precisely put, minimized.

Recognize that such biased wording is unintended by the researcher, but could become a subjective reality in the mind of the test-taker, in the phenomenology of the survey-respondent. Hence including many items is worthwhile if a few oddly worded questions become a minority. That is, their slanting influence is lost in a preponderance of well-worded items that document the person's actual opinions. There is, however, another benefit to asking many questions rather than a few.

The Logic of Constructing a Questionnaire

Don't be too obvious. A large number of items can obscure the true nature of a survey. If a survey does not overtly cue the participant to underlying dimensions, then presumably a researcher could tap deep motivations of a respondent. To restate in personality or social psychological terms, a covert measure could tap an implicit theory that a person holds about a topic area or target person. The key is to end up with what people naturally think about an issue. The key is to avoid artificiality.

> From a respondent's point of view, it would be difficult to fake a pattern of opinion (good, bad, or whatever you think the psychologist wants to hear) across a longer set of items with a variety of phrasings. So psychologists often ask about a single opinion using many items, but then they need to reduce it all back down to a manageable set of underlying dimensions. They add correlated items together to reflect these dimensions. Factor analysis, with "varimax" (variance maximized) or "oblmin" (oblique minimal) rotations, offers a rigorous statistical justification for creating such composites.

Efficient *and* more reliable. Thus a researcher can create a composite scale from multiple items to assess an underlying thought process. If the scale is unidimensional (at least within a factor), then it would be an efficient measure of underlying opinions and certainly less arduous than reporting 30, 50, or 100 individual items. Such a scale could serve as either a predictor or criterion, depending upon the causal flow of one's model and the construct validity of the measure (convergent and discriminant validities to the rescue). Such a scale—by its very nature of being a composite variable and not merely a single item—should be more stable across time and more reliable within a single individual.

The Logic of Exploratory Research

Form, order, insight. An obvious benefit would be to scientists who are in the exploratory phase of a research program. Such a person would glean from existing theoretical work and published data to posit their best – albeit *early* -- model of an under-researched phenomenon. Hypothesis testing is still possible. The difference between exploratory and confirmatory research is readily apparent. Unlike testing the limits of established cause-effect sequences, or extending implications for established theories, exploratory research must put shape to what may

only be vague predictions. Even useful theories are not always born with rigor. To *begin* to put them to empirical test, early versions of constructs (the abstract side of variables as suggested in a theory) must hone definitions even as they are operationally defined (the concrete side of a variable in a specific study).

Statistical rigor. At first, using factor analysis is a very exact procedure. "Eigenvalues" guide one's choice as to the number of factors to retain. If one looks at the top of a computer printout of a factor analysis, the first numbers are eigenvalues. If the personality test taps a single concept, this uni-dimensionality will be reflected like this: the first factor will have an eigenvalue well above 1 and all other factors will be far below 1. How many other factors are possible? Quite simply, there could be as many factors as there are test items. Of course, a 20-item test that produces 20 factors is exceptionally lousy. That would mean every item taps a unique underlying response tendency. Remember, we are in the business of *reducing* data, not merely replicating it redundantly.

A plot of the eigenvalues is easily available. A "scree plot" (of eigenvalues) helps to keep only as many factors as seem to be distinctly unique. One looks to see where the line of plotted eigenvalues flattens toward little to no slope. Keep the number of factors *before* that flat lining. Or less, if an *a priori* theory legitimizes such reduction. The printout does not provide the final answer; we make that choice.

Loadings of each item on each factor usually help an investigator discern which items "go where" in terms of this or that factor. The items are grouped, *not* based on the original order of the questionnaire *or* on what may seem to be similar wordings, but instead on the actual co-variances between *all* participants' responses to *all* items. What emerge are constellations of underlying patterns of response. The researcher "sees" not only *what* respondents believe, but also ***how*** they organize their belief systems in memory. We are not reading minds, but we are covertly reading sets of opinions for which we openly and overtly prompted.

The computer and the human mind. Such a multitude of intercorrelations ("iterations" of vectors) makes factor analysis untenable without a computer. A huge number of correlations are required, with an assessment of the best solution based on "communalities" and covariances, until the analysis "converges" on the final pattern. It should be noted – readily admitted – that at this point some subjectivity enters the interpretation of a factor analysis. The investigator must look at the items that load on a particular factor, read them as a combined unit of response, and then produce a name for this factor. Of course, if the researcher has chosen items well and has read the existing literature

(rarely is a model *entirely* new), the naming of factors should be rather obvious and useful to their own endeavors and to those that follow related programs of research.

What Is Gained: Deeper Understanding from Precision Made Explicit

New frontiers, new topics. The usefulness of factor analysis has surprised even the psychologists who have employed this statistical technique. Order has been brought to the study of what appeared for a long time to be off-limits or irreducible to empirical tests, for instance love relationships and how attachment styles from childhood partly determine adult relationships (Feeney, Noller, & Callan, 1994). The same held for how humans perceive time (for example, the impact of focusing on the past, present and future in either positive, fatalistic, hedonistic or negative manners, Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999). The end result, if these dimensions do capture the thought process, is that they could serve as reliable predictors. What may initially appear as states may in fact be traits.

My own interest is retrospection, the retrieving of memories from one's past either accurately or with bias. Either way, we maintain our self-esteem or debilitate our mood and outlook by retrieving memories of past successes and failures. The current need to concretize the notions of "rumination" vs. "problem-solving" (see cognitive theories) and "worry" vs. "disclosure" (see counseling applications) are no exceptions. We will soon turn to such theoretical refinements in retrospection, remembering and subsequent on-line thinking.

The defining qualities of retrospection. What aspects of thinking about a negative life event actually provide self-insight? What distinctions between getting ready to problem-solve vs. getting stuck thinking about the problem or solution are keys to successful therapy? Mild to severe dysfunction follows from catastrophizing about the problem or obsessing about which one of an ever-proliferating set of solutions is the best. Earlier theorists did not distinguish between problem solving and worrying. They saw them as interchangeable terms that simply described thoughts that served planning to avoid trouble (either encountered in the past or anticipated in the future). In extreme cases of unnecessary ambiguity, *rumination* was claimed to be a good thing, a prerequisite to problem solving, and a necessary by-product of defining one's problem set. Later theorists have shown vastly different outcomes for folks who recall negative episodes from their autobiography. A possible continuum is offered here:

Problem-solve ← disclose negative emotional information ← → worry → ruminate → obsess.

Clinical research on the extreme forms of repetitive thinking. The points of differentiation become increasingly complex as one reviews the scientific literature on clinical disorders such as (placed in order of what interested scholars, from past to more recently published): Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD), Post-Traumatic Disorder (PTSD) and General Anxiety Disorder (GAD). Likewise some theoretical battle lines have been drawn concerning the very definition of "rumination."

A problem deeper than a thought "just" being negative. Is rumination merely intrusive? One wishes a thought or image had not come to mind. Or is it also unwanted and difficult to *remove* from thought once it enters one's awareness? Negative in what way? That the content is unpleasant seems obvious to the point of triviality. But wait, this seemingly obvious part of the definition stirs some controversy. For instance, even a *positive* bit of imagery (actual autobiography or conjured fantasy) could become intrusive, could become uncontrollable, and hence could precipitate an obsessive attempt to censor such thoughts.

Unwanted fantasy, undesirable pleasure. Thus arise new research questions: Could we obsess about positive events? Could positive events become unwanted by their very nature of being too intrusive, too commanding of our working memory? If so it should be possible to set up an experiment that highlights the deeper danger of repetitive thinking: indulge in repeating a thought sequence → discern a need to control one's thoughts → worry → ruminate → obsess. The problem with repetitive thinking is not so much the negative content that is *usually* associated with rumination/obsession. The problem is 1) the lack of control and 2) the exacerbation of thoughts intruding when one repeatedly tries to squelch such thoughts (see Wegner's strong work on Ironic Processes regarding misguided attempts at thought control, 1989).

Most often this co-varies with negative thought content, and negative thinking quite often follows from negative life experiences such as failure, disappointment, and disillusionment. As stated above, theoretically an intrusive thought does not have to be negative. Thus a controlled experiment involving positive thoughts could be very revealing. Still, researchers are well served to consider the wealth of past data on the connection between negative events, negative feelings, and negative thoughts.

Cast a nomological net. In the end, current assessment of personality can be summarized in two words: construct validation. Constructs are cast in what Cronbach and Meehl (1955) term a "nomological network." The hypothetical constructs live in the abstract world of the

theorist's mind and see the shared light of the research community via "operational definitions." An operationalized construct is measured or manipulated in a very specific manner based on a priori reasoning from the theory of interest. To operationalize a construct is to specify exactly how it was measured. Often psychologists call the methods section of an article "the recipe." Any investigator should be able to follow your instructions and, if desired, produce an exact replication. This places an established measure in the methods of an article, whereas a new measure will first receive validation in a results section.

We must first build a new psychometrically valid personality test. The new (or improved) measure would be the star of a quantification paper that documents both its reliability and validity. Later articles might employ such a measure as a predictor (or independent variable). If so, the measure is lifted into the logic of an introduction, into acknowledged, preexisting theories. If it is in the methods, it must be a key operational definition of a theoretically driven predictor.

First the tool is built, and then it is used. Across years of experiments and surveys, after cross-validation by other psychologists in other research camps, it will likely be whittled down, slightly altered, perhaps refitted. Such are the necessary steps when psychologists, as scientists and statisticians, turn their focus inward to their own concepts and transform them from abstractions to a set of survey questions. These refined questionnaires elicit answers from clients and research participants, answers that can be compared to norms. Just how these answers repeatedly hang together—and why these opinions form reliable constellations—is a scientific study in itself.

Construct validation, with statistical techniques such as factor analysis, helps make one of my favorite sayings from a social psychology pioneer come true. Kurt Lewin (1951) is said to have said, "There's nothing so practical as a good theory." Content, criterion, and construct validities enliven and enable this practicality.

My Own Theorizing

Early experiments. An initial interest in how the wording of a question affects subsequent answers—an innocent enough curiosity for a social psychologist with cognitive leanings—seduced me into nearly twenty years of programmatic research. My work as a post-doc laid down strong experimental support for contrast versus assimilation effects being elicited by merely switching the wording of a prompt to retrospect. Collins & Clark (1989) and Clark & Collins (1993) found that by asking individuals either to tell us "why?" or "how?" a personal event unfolded subsequently influenced most self-reports that followed.

For instance, if a person writes a brief paragraph explaining why they fell out of love in a previous relationship, they tend not to relive any negative emotions and instead to compartmentalize this bit of autobiography as "in the past." Comparisons are then made to this negative past and a host of assessments of their present life appear to benefit by the comparison. A nasty break-up, phenomenologically long ago, makes "now" seem much better. People in the "why" condition reported that their *current* love relationship to be significantly higher than did those in other prompt conditions (Clark & Collins, 1989). This contrast effect also held for measures of general well-being and overall life satisfaction. We tested for actual time effects and found these results generalized to recent and distant events, that is, it did not matter how long ago they were in their chosen, defunct relationship (Clark & Collins, 1987). The passage of time was insignificant; the prompt drove the effect.

What were they thinking? We even counted the number of reasons that they generated as they wrote their paragraph of autobiography. What matters most is the contextualizing of a past negative event by discussing it in cool, analytic terms. The reverse held for those answering why a past positive event took place. After recalling falling in love (with a person with whom they are *not* currently dating), individuals felt worse about their present life (their current partner was rated less pleasing, their current life satisfaction was significantly lower relative to other groups). Our contrast effects thus worked in both directions of valence: *positive* memories, held as "back then," led to current dissatisfaction, whereas *negative* memories led to enhancement of current satisfaction (Clark, Collins, & Henry, 1994). Did we also establish patterns for an assimilation effect?

One-word triggers. Yes, and by merely changing the word "why" to "how." Our instructions explicitly asked for people to tell us the specific details of a past event, some key moment of falling in or out of love with a previous partner. As predicted, mood effects suddenly appeared (and the number of reasons generated in any given paragraph dropped precipitously). Upon reliving a positive interlude with a past partner (though entirely out of the current picture, mind you), subsequent life assessments went up. That is, retelling of the good old days with an old flame (to one's self and on paper) seems to benefit one's current partner. They even felt significantly better about life in general. The converse effect was obtained by having participants recall falling out of love in behavioral detail. After such a "how" prompt they felt worse in terms of mood, their current partner, and their overall life.

Clearly our prompts could reverse how a person filtered their own autobiography and altered the gist meaning of that version of what happened (which was unique to each person and thus achieved some meas-

ure of nonartificiality). Please note that they were perceiving their own life and writing freely, openly and confidentially. Collins & Clark (1987) showed that the same event (be it negative or positive) could produce opposite effects on judgment (contrast vs. assimilation) and required only a change of prompts (why vs. how). The power of these trigger words greatly intrigued me. The radically divergent impact of retrieving information through semantic memory (analytic) or episodic memory (emotive) led me to ask a research question worthy of a personality psychologist (Collins, 1988, 1989). What if individuals provided such prompts to themselves?

Toward a personality variable (or *individual difference*). What if each of us walked around, in any given moment, with a propensity to recall our own life in either a why-focus or how-focus mode of retrospection? Combine that with a tendency to pull up either positive or negative thoughts into working memory, and I was faced with a daunting, exciting task, namely to find a measure for these four possible memory filters. Specifically I'm attempting to demonstrate an individual difference to retrospect in these distinct manners: 1) recalling how positive events unfolded, 2) recalling how negative events unfolded, 3) analyzing why a memory is positive, and 4) analyzing why a negative event took place. Thus began my long program of research on the Quadrants of Remembering Styles, or QRS.

I will refer to these four memory filters as follows: 1) *Reminiscing* = How focus + positive memories (Rem), 2) *Ruminating* = How focus + negative memories (Rum), 3) *Over-analyzing* = Why focus + positive memories (OA), and 4) *Problem-solving* = Why focus + negative memories (PS). Thus my earlier 2 x 2 factorial design for research has neatly morphed into a four-part personality construct (Collins, 1991).

Allow me a small yet potentially important side note. For ease of reading I refer to these four self-induced information-processing filters as personality variables. Theoretically they could be individual differences more on the order of states rather than traits. That is, one might tend to problem-solve in a healthy manner today and be prone to ruminate by the end of next week. Change is possible, for better or worse.

This notion of state versus trait is a necessary distinction if I am to test for reliability. It is somewhat obvious that a trait (that is enduring) will be more easily measured reliably across time than would be a state. Less obvious are the many ramifications of how a slippery predictor can over- or under-estimate a given criterion. Suffice it to say that if these quadrants are more temporary, then it does little to dissuade me. I will be just as happy to document a temporary mental state so long as it still predicts emotional judgments.

If how a person filters their (living) autobiography, in a given moment, greatly determines their mood and subsequent assessments, then my theory is an attempt to show that one can bring moods and biased judgments under control. Whichever the case, the QRS approach can benefit counselors and an informed public. If I'm chasing a trait, I will eventually document a pre-existing, enduring aspect of personality. If I seek a state, I will be trying to identify a filter that, once self-selected, will have consequences on decisions made in the wake of any mood or bias that filter invokes. The fact that this filter could be deselected (or avoided altogether) only serves to underscore the real possibility for therapy (and self-analysis) to intervene. Every day people could come to guide their own thoughts toward healthy retrospection (via problem-solving and/or reminiscing) and away from unhealthy retrospection (via over-analyzing and/or ruminating). In either case, my fervent, decades-long wish is to offer help by conducting research on bringing self-awareness under deliberate control.

Did my quadrants perform as clean four factors? As I narrowed my survey to twenty-four items, six per quadrant (PS, OA, Rum, & Rem), I became admittedly curious, invested, even endeared to each question. Would they behave psychometrically and deserve continued inclusion? Here's a quick scorecard by which to make such an assessment:

1. Do the eigenvalues = 1 or preferably crest above 1?
2. If so, does the screeplot (of eigenvalues) justify keeping four factors and *only* four factors? Are they "my" four factors derived from experimental work and theorizing?
3. Do the factors' loadings for each item consistently remain above .50?
4. How about the Cronbach alpha levels, informing us about the reliability within each subscale (PS, OA, Rum, and Rem)? (Note: A Cronbach alpha of .60 typically begins to demand respect for a questionnaire, scale, or subscale.)
5. In a related aspect, does the *ex*clusion of any item improve the inter-scale reliability? Of course, I hope that all six PS items are required to maximize the PS subscale's reliability, but I defer to the numeric evidence (of course). Likewise I must test to see if all OA items are necessary to best capture the OA quadrant way of retrospection. The same holds for reminiscing and ruminating items.
6. Are the items that comprise the four theory-driven factors *distinct* from one another? That is, do items load separately, as predicted?

Keep in mind that I really have two dimensions cross-tabulated. One continuum is concerned with processing level, from thinking abstractly to thinking concretely. The other continuum is of memory valence, from positive to negative. And yet I do not wish for two stable measures; I want four. It is essential that recalling a positive memory *abstractly* has a unique impact on subsequent judgment as compared to recalling that same positive memory in a *concrete* fashion. For instance, a problem-solving item taps abstract thinking and should load highly on the PS factor, but not on the other abstract quadrant, over-analyzing (or on any other factor for that matter). Again does each item behave consistently, distinctively, and as predicted?

The briefest report: 1) Yes, 2) Yes, 3) Yes, 4) Yes, 5) Yes, and 6) Yes. The sweeping affirmation of this 24-item measure of the QRS model, in terms of psychometrics, has happened more than once. In fact, I have evidence from different studies in 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, as well as from a large data set after 2000 and more recent applications. As a summary of Collins (2000) that is itself a summation of five years' worth of data, I'll peruse a few highlights. From 1995 until 1999, annual studies yielded factor analyses with four factors being retained, with the lowest eigenvalues being 1.50 every time. Thus most eigenvalues were well above 1.00 cut-offs (some on the order of 5, 6, 7 or more).

Factor 1 was comprised of *only* my six $QRS_{\mathbf{RUM}}$ items. Highest loadings per item to this factor ranged from .85 to .89, with five-year averages across all six items ranging from .73 to .79 (M = .76). Recall that we get excited at .50 loadings or higher. Ruminating Scale reliability alphas (Cronbach) ranged from .86 to .89, very nice with all six items needed to provide top reliability for each year. Again alphas at .60 are sufficient.

Factor 2 kept all six of my Reminiscing items with nothing else loading above about .30. Highest loadings ranged from .72 to .83, with five-year averages ranging from .66 to .69 (M = .67). Reminiscing Scale reliability alphas (Cronbach) ranged from, .77 to .81, with all six items retained to maximize said reliability.

Factor 3 kept all six of my Over-Analyzing items with nothing else loading above about .30. Highest loadings ranged from .70 to .78, with five-year averages ranging from .55 to .62 (M = .57). Over-Analyzing Scale reliability alphas (Cronbach) ranged from .74 to .84 across these five years, with all six items retained to maximize $QRS_{\mathbf{OA}}$ reliability.

Before I list the final factor's statistics, let me mention the sample sizes per year: $N_{1995} = 95$, $N_{1996} = 55$, $N_{1997} = 44$, $N_{1998} = 76$, and $N_{1999} = 80$. Let me also mention a reason behind a trend an astute reader may have discerned. The strength of the loadings and Cronbach alphas does

diminish as we move from Factor 1 to Factor 4. Why? Because as factor analysis reduces the 24 responses of each person to scores on only four factors—four underlying patterns of response—the first factor takes the lion's share of the variance. Next, the second factor takes what is uniquely left to it, while the third factor must compete for a dwindling amount of unique (nonredundant) variation in response patterns. The fourth factor scoops up whatever remains (and has not been taken into account by the previous factor loadings per item).

Factor 4 kept all six of my Problem-Solving items with no other item loading above about .30. Thus all four factors consistently measured *different* remembering styles. Highest loadings on PS ranged from .62 to .79, with five-year averages ranging from .43 to .58 (M = .50). Problem-Solving Scale reliability alphas (Cronbach) ranged from .63 to .80, with all six items retained to maximize this last reliability.

All of these factor analyses yielded similar results whether I chose the slightly advantageous "Varimax" rotation or the more conservative "Oblimin" rotation. I have reported Oblimin results here. Furthermore, with an N = 261 obtained in November 2000, the same four factors were revealed, with highly similar loading patterns. These four (Rum, Rem, OA, and PS) factors did not have any cross-loadings. That is to say, each factor appears to be unique and not terribly correlated with each other, even though two factors tap abstract thinking, two factors tap concrete thinking, two share a negative wording and two share a positive wording. I arrived at four distinct remembering styles, as I'd hoped.

Convergent and discriminant validities. There are a host of psychological variables that are related to each of the quadrant styles. The exact nature of these relationships can help establish the QRS as nonredundant (and hence worth adding to the pantheon of personality variables already awaiting use in research labs and counseling sessions). Convergent validity essentially asks if a new variable is positively correlated to established variables that "should" be similar. Collins & Harville (2000) found that a different measure of rumination from Horowitz (1999) did correlate nicely to QRS_{RUM}, not too high to be redundant and yet high enough to show a predicted relationship. Furthermore QRS_{PS} correlated positively, as predicted, with "Need for Cognition" which is a measure of a desire to think (Cacioppo, Petty, & Kao, 1984). People who like to know how a device works, to solve puzzles, and to apply analytic thought across many situations score high on Need for Cognition and QRS_{PS}. Additionally we found that each QRS subscale interacted in expected directions with a fairly recent measure, "Linking" from McIntosh, Harlow, & Martin (1995). High Linkers keep pushing their happiness into the future by believing that

they would be happy *if only* they attained some far off goal (career, mate, material property etc.). Low Linkers tend not to link their contentment to anything they do not already have (appearing to live in the present, much akin to someone successfully practicing Zen). Ruminators and Over-Analyzers (a la QRS) compound the discontentment that arises from being a High Linker.

A very well established dimension, optimism-pessimism, has added further convergent and discriminant validity. Seligman (1975, 2002) has long studied these attributional belief systems. In short order, Smith & Collins (2002) has shown the two healthy QRS styles of PS and Rem co-vary with higher optimism and lower pessimism (not the same, by the way). The two unhealthy remembering styles of OA and Rum show the reverse pattern, as predicted. What's more, if you are particularly high on PS and especially low on OA you are particularly optimistic about life (Collins & Wadlington, 2002).

External validity. Much of my research is based on responses of undergraduates. Although they span such campuses as Memphis, Corpus Christi, Athens (Georgia), Champaign-Urbana, West Lafayette (Purdue), various California universities, and Jefferson City, one may despair at the lack of nonstudents in my samples. It is a common lament in psychology. I offer two responses. First, if the QRS model describes thought processes that are *fairly universal* (at least applicable to Western nations and similar cultures), then it will not matter to an appreciable degree whom I survey. Secondly, I have converging data from Germany (see especially the programmatic efforts of Norbert Schwarz and Fritz Strack, from Mannheim and Heidelberg to the University of Michigan) and know of related work from colleagues in Belgium. Furthermore I have QRS results from an elderly sample (Clark & Collins, 1990) and from Hospice patients and their families (Stamatiades, Heinrich, & Collins, 1999). These divergent samples produced results in line with other studies involving the QRS. Even while working from our own campus of Carson-Newman College, I have data from 17 to 80 year olds. The QRS findings appear to generalize across age, parts of the United States, across campuses of different size and student configuration, and there's some evidence from Europe.

Evidence of predictive validity. So the four scales seems to be internally reliable, they have external validity, and they converge toward constructs to which they are similar while diverging from dissimilar constructs. Where does that get us? In a position to make predictions, we hope. Space permits only a very brief list of some studies offering predictive validity. Lepper, Ward, & Collins (1996) is one of several studies that show the unhealthy remembering styles (over-analyzing and ruminating) can predict coping with stress a month into the future.

Rumination, in particular, with over-analyzing contributing unique variance, successfully predicted 14 out of 15 physical symptoms reported by students facing December final examinations. Such students were more likely to report sleeping difficulties, digestion problems, muscle aches, headaches, and even depression than did those scoring lower on QRS_{OA} and QRS_{RUM} in the previous mid-November. More recent data has also shown concurrent physical symptoms are tied to QRS_{OA} and QRS_{RUM}.

Collins & Heinrich (2004) took a different tack. We found that divergent counseling techniques can be matched to QRS scores. For example, rational-emotive therapy (from Albert Ellis) is embraced by problem-solvers, and to some degree over-analyzers, but not by reminiscers. The more concrete thinkers (ruminators as well) preferred person-centered therapy (from Carl Rogers). Actual psychotherapy sessions were viewed by our sample and these patterns held across a variety of dependent variables. We hope to empower future counselors to begin therapy sessions with the best frame of reference, to promote comfort and requisite change in a client.

Collins & Stinnett (2005) took an even more diversifying approach. We found that combinations of scoring either high or low (relatively speaking) on all factors can very effectively predict variations in art appreciation. Purely abstract paintings (with no discernible figure) were preferred by individuals who were "purely" problem-solvers (high on PS, low on all other factors). Realistic portraits (with both a clear figure and executed with realism) were most preferred by "pure" reminiscers. What of those scoring high on both problem solving and reminiscing (both healthy styles of retrospection)? Beautifully (to me) they preferred paintings with a clear figure (e.g., a face) that was painted in a very abstract manner. To be able to predict aesthetic appreciation from how people recall their own past events indicates that the QRS model taps an *underlying* mental process, as hypothesized.

The results are too complex and match pinpointed predictions too well to allow much concern that our participants faked or forced their responses. High PS + Low Rem folks prefer very abstract landscapes; those who score Low PS + High Rem prefer impressionistic landscapes (with the figure already "solved" and easily discerned). High scores on Rem predict a desire for realism in portraitures as well; High score on both PS + Rem (which indicates enjoying both abstract ***and*** concrete remembering) predicts preference for an exaggerated face with wild unrealistic colors. Collins & Stinnett (2005) offer intricate support of the QRS model.

Recent data (Collins, 2006) has yielded another coveted counter-intuitive effect. Because over-analyzers question their own good for-

tune, they would be expected to "misuse" positive information, at least with the end product being a negative self-assessment. We found that high scores on QRS_{OA} coupled with a *positive* mood led to the lowest (relative to all other groups) self-esteem measured by subtle, published techniques. Positive moods almost invariably enhance self-esteem. However, for over-analyzers positive mood hurt their self-opinions even more than did a negative mood.

Final thoughts on filtering memories. A wide range of loosely related concepts may be able to speak to each other via the QRS model. Rumination could be an unnecessary spin-off from problem solving. Reminiscing could turn into unwanted rumination. The data of one's past life may be better reviewed from a concrete or an abstract perspective, for therapeutic results. Perhaps the same is not true of retrospection for sheer pleasure. My current theorizing is attempting to bridge the wide gap between learned helplessness and learned optimism. I believe that with a reliable, theoretically-driven measurement in hand I will have a higher chance of unraveling some memory processes that can return us to delight (Rem), drive us to obsessive despair (Rum), undo what joy life may bring us (OA), and help us overcome obstacles (PS).

References

Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., & Kao, C. F. (1984). The efficient assessment of the need for cognition. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, **48**, 306-307.

Clark, L., & Collins, J. (1993). Remembering old flames: How the past affects assessments of the present. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, **19**, 399-408.

Clark, L., & Collins, J. (1990, November). *Reliving and reminiscing: Effects on the judgments of an elderly population*. Conference on Remembering, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.

Clark, L., & Collins, J. (1989, May). Autobiographical memory as context for judgments of life satisfaction: The effects of concrete and abstract thinking**.** In L.L. Martin (Chair), *Explanations of contrast and assimilation effects in social judgments*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Clark, L., & Collins, J. (1987, March). *Ruminations and relationships: Entering, exiting, and exerting control.* International Conference on Ruminations, Self-Relevant Cognitions, and Stress, Memphis, Tennessee.

Clark, L., Collins, J., & Henry, S. (1994). Biasing effects of retrospective reports on current self-assessments. In N. Schwarz & F. Sudman (Eds.), *Autobiographical Memory and Validity of Retrospective Reports*, New York: Springer-Verlag.

Collins, J. E. (2006). Unpublished data.

Collins, J. E. (2001, March). *Comparison effects in judging teaching excellence: Winners and losers.* Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, Georgia.

Collins, J. E. (2000, November). *Filtering valenced memories: Quadrants of remembering styles.* Society of Southeastern Social Psychology, Macon, Georgia.

Collins, J. (1991, May). *Ruminating, reminiscing, and remembering styles*. Third Invitational Conference on Mental Control, Highland Beach, Florida.

Collins, J. (1989, July). Questioning versus congratulating one's self: Salient thoughts in a goal situation. In R. Wicklund (Chair), *Psychological perspectives on knowledge of the self.* Symposium conducted at the First European Congress of Psychology, Amsterdam, Holland.

Collins, J. (1988, May). *The impact of retrospective control on current judgment*. International Conference on Self-Control of Thought and Emotion, Nags Head, North Carolina.

Collins, J., & Clark, L. (1989). Responsibility and rumination: The trouble with understanding the dissolution of a relationship. *Social Cognition*, **2**, 152-173.

Collins, J., & Clark, L. (1987, August). *Falling in and out of love: When do thoughts intrude?* American Psychological Association, New York, New York.

Collins, J. & Harville, K. (2000, March). *Dwell in the past or future thoughts: Ruminating, reminiscing, and linking*. Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Collins, J., & Heinrich, M. (2004, March). *Matching remembering style with counseling technique.* Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, Georgia.

Collins, J., & Stinnett, K. N. (2005, April). *From brushstrokes to self-concepts: Making abstract art meaningful.* Southeastern Psychological Association, Nashville, Tennessee.

Collins, J., & Wadlington, L. (2002, October). *Optimism-Pessimism and Styles of Remembering***.** Hartman Institute of Axiology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee.

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *PsychologicalBulletin*, **52**, 281-302.

Feeney, J., Noller, P., & Callan, V. J. (1994). Attachment style, communication, and satisfaction in early years of marriage. *Advances in Personal Relationships*, **5**, 269-308.

Fisher, R. A. (1925). *Statistical methods for research workers*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.

Guilford, J. P. (1936). *Psychometric methods*. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1967). *MMPI manual (Rev. ed.).* New York: Psychological Corporation.

Horowitz, M. (1999). Modes of conscious representation and their exploration through psychotherapy. In J. A. Singer & P. Salovey (Eds.) *At play in the fields of consciousness: Essays in honor of Jerome L. Singer*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 271-286.

Lepper, E., Ward, K., & Collins, J. (1996, March). *Further validation of the questionnaire of remembering styles: Predicting poor coping to stress.* Southeastern Psychological Association, Norfolk, Virginia.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science; selected theoretical papers*. New York, New York: Harper.

McIntosh, W. D., Harlow, T. F., & Martin, L. L. (1995). Linkers and nonlinkers: Goal beliefs as a moderator of the effects of everyday hassles on rumination, depression, and physical complaints. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Special issue: Rumination and intrusive thoughts, **25**, 1231-1244.

Morey, L. C. (2003). Measuring personality and psychopathology. In J. Schinka & W. Velicer (Eds.) *Handbook of Psychology: Research methods in psychology*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). Positive psychology, positive prevention, and positive therapy. In C. R. Snyder and S. J. Lopez (Eds.) *Handbook of positive psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). *Helplessness: On depression, development, and death*. San Francisco, California: Freeman Press.

Smith, G., & Collins, J. (2002, April). *Don't question success: When over-analyzing turns optimism to pessimism*. Georgia Undergraduate Research in Psychology, Kennesaw, Georgia.

Stamatiades, C., Heinrich, M., & Collins, J. (1999, March). *Fear of death, styles of remembering, and life closure: Impact on the coping of clergy, hospice patients, and their caregivers.* Southeastern Psychological Association, Savannah, Georgia.

Wegner, D. M. (1989). *White bears and other unwanted thoughts: Suppression, obsession, and the psychology of mental control*. New York, New York: Penguin Press.

Welsh, G. S. (1952). A factor study of the MMPI using scales with item overlap eliminated. *American Psychologist*, **7**, 341.

Zimbardo, P. G., & Boyd, J. N. (1999). Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable individual-differences metric. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **77**, 1271-1288.

Setting the Stories Straight: A Reading of Margaret Atwood's *The Penelopiad*

Shannon Carpenter Collins

The wife hangs on the words of her husband's tale . . .
Ovid, Heroides

Homer's *Odyssey* is a story about storytelling itself. A recitation of a blind poet, who recounts the stories told by a famous liar and adventurer, the poem contains narrative nested within narrative. The epic begins with the Goddess Athena relating to her father the story of Odysseus' troubles getting home from the siege at Troy. Telemachus leaves Ithaca in search of news of his father, and is regaled by the stories of Nestor and of Menelaus, about their own exploits, those of Odysseus, as well as the other heroes of the Trojan War. Odysseus narrates his wanderings to an enthralled Phaecian court. Even in the Underworld, Anticleia tells Odysseus the story of his besieged wife, left back home.

But storytelling is a tricky business, else why would poets need to invoke the inspiration and assistance of the Muse? A storyteller needs all the help he can get. Or all the help she can get; assistance is especially needed when the storyteller is a woman. In the Greek epics, women do not star in their own tales so much as play supporting roles in the adventures of others. The *Odyssey* is, after all, Odysseus' story. But each of the women characters also has a story to tell, though their versions may be different from the official one. Our own stories are by necessity different than the stories told about us by others. The storytellers may claim to tell an objective truth, but who can know the truths of our own individual stories? Nowhere is this more evident than in the case Penelope, Odysseus' long-suffering and faithful wife, who has been left behind in Ithaca to fight off the advances of marriage hungry suitors intent on appropriating Odysseus' possessions.

In the story of Odysseus, Homer tells of a patient and faithful wife, one who protects the rights of her husband and son. She is favorably compared to the wicked wife, Clytemnestra, who murders her husband

upon his return from Troy. Homer makes it clear: Penelope is the example to follow; Clytemnestra is the example to avoid. But those readers who are familiar with the work of Greek dramatist Euripides, specifically *Iphigenia at Aulis*, know that there is more to the story of Clytemnestra than Homer relates. There is always more to the story, a history of causes that have led to present effects. Clytemnestra avenges the murder of the daughter she shares with Agamemnon, Iphigenia, who is sacrificed by her father in order to raise favorable winds to carry the Greek fleet to the shores of Troy. In the *Odyssey*, Agamemnon's brother Menelaus tells a tale of his sister-in-law as being murderous and adulterous – in a wife, there is perhaps not much difference between the two. However, we might imagine Clytemnestra telling a different tale. She might explain the history behind her betrayal of her husband, explicate her reasons, and thereby justify her actions. She might make a convincing argument, an indictment against her hero husband that would revise his story. She might say what is intimated in Euripides' play: a man who will sacrifice his own child to maintain his position of power over an army makes but an ambiguous hero.

Penelope, however, is not given the opportunity, in the literature of Ancient Greece, at any rate, to tell her own story.[1] What might that story be like? Would her truth be different from the truth of the blind poet and from the truth of Odysseus? Like Clytemnestra, would she have justifications for her own for her actions? But she is the classical world's most perfect wife; there is no need for her to defend herself. The story told about her in the *Odyssey* makes clear the fact that she is blameless. Like everything else in this epic, however, this estimation of her guiltlessness depends on one's perspective. From the perspective of Odysseus, who comes home to a wife who has been faithful—or so the stories go—she is blameless. From the perspective of her son, Telemachus, for whom she has protected his father's estate, she is blameless. From the perspective of her twelve young female slaves, condemned by Odysseus and hanged by Telemachus, however, she may implicitly share in the guilt of their murders.

It is from this last viewpoint that Margaret turns to Homer's poem about storytelling. As far as the tale of Penelope goes, "The story as told in the *Odyssey* doesn't hold water: there are too many inconsistencies" (xv). Atwood asks, "What was Penelope really up to?" (xv). The fate of the twelve maids of Penelope bothered Atwood. Why are these maids killed? Their role in the story of Odysseus and Penelope lacks

[1] However, in *Heroides*, Ovid does have Penelope compose a letter to Odysseus, in which she swears her love, worries that he stays away because he's found a new love, and urges him to come home.

coherence; here the story telling falls short. Some piece of the narrative seems to be missing, someone isn't telling the whole story. Being slaves themselves, the maids are not granted the voices to narrate their own stories; they cannot justify their actions themselves. Not being able to craft a defense, they are hanged. Storytelling, it becomes apparent, might have a political dimension.

To explore possible answers to these two questions, "what led to the hanging of the maids, and what was Penelope really up to?" Atwood wrote *The Penelopiad: The Myth of Penelope and Odysseus*, where the storytelling is done by Penelope herself, in hindsight, from the privileged vantage point of the dead. And while hindsight should give us the clearest view, in fact, there is still too much that she can't see: "*Now that I'm dead I know everything*. That is what I wished would happen, but like so many of my wishes it failed to come true" (1). But her vision is also clouded by her own motives for setting the record straight, which at the same time obscures the record of others.

While poets and writers of the last 2800 years have re-imagined the story from Penelope's point of view, what Atwood does that is different is give voice to those voiceless maidens, the slaves of Penelope, the consorts of the suitors, and the victims of Odysseus and Telemachus. It is actually their story that, while still not being fully articulated, slips through the cracks and openings of others' storytelling, erupting in song and ditties. The story the Maids manage to tell will, in the end, indict the politics of storytelling itself.

What we will be exploring are the myriad threads of storytelling that operate simultaneously in *The Penelopiad*. There are three "protagonists" whose stories will be considered: Odysseus, Penelope, and the Maids. Each of these three protagonists has a story to tell: Odysseus through the public performance of a hero recounting his adventures in an epic poem, Penelope within the text of Atwood's novel, and the Maids obliquely through the voice of the chorus, through songs and rhymes. Keep in mind that folk genres don't carry the cultural weight of epics and novels. Epics are essentially a masculine genre, while many theorists consider the novel a feminine, or at least feminized, genre—but both are legitimate and legitimating narrative structures. Folk genres, on the other hand, are not taken as seriously, and are not considered to be repositories of truth, either universal or cultural. Like slave songs and chain gang songs, they tell stories, but most of the time no one of importance pays attention to them.

In addition to the stories that Odysseus, Penelope, and the Maids tell about themselves, there are also the stories told *about* them by others. Through these tales, as well, each protagonist is defined to the world. The stories told about Odysseus make him a hero. The stories

told about Penelope make her either a good wife or a bad wife, depending on whom you listen to. But the stories told about the Maids turn them into traitors. It is clear that what is said about these protagonists has real consequences in their ultimate fates. Odysseus will thrive, Penelope will survive, but the Maids will die. The stakes are high; our survival can depend on what others say about us, which may explain why Penelope feels compelled to set the record straight and tell her own story. The Maids, however, are not afforded this luxury.

The storytelling of Odysseus and Penelope is suspect from the beginning, since they are both "by [their] own admission—*proficient and shameless liars of long standing"* (173). However, Odysseus' listeners are usually seduced into believing him. As Penelope explains, "He was always so plausible. Many people have believed that his version of events was the true one, give or take a few murders, a few beautiful seductresses, a few one-eyed monsters" (2). His exploits, as he recites them to the Phaecians in the *Odyssey*, are heroic. Odysseus constructs a heroic identity for himself, the purpose of which is to provide a model for the rest of his society. The hero of the epic, after all, embodies the best virtues of a culture. The hero is not only to be admired but also emulated.

Penelope's role in the "official version" is as the "considerate," "trustworthy," and "all-suffering" wife (2). This role, however, she cautions women to avoid. She describes this official version of herself as "An edifying legend. A stick used to bat other women with" (2). Penelope warns other women off: "*Don't follow my example . . .* (2). But the only other narrative option, besides the official version, turns out to be slanderous. Official storytellers may have known what side their bread was buttered on, but Penelope recognizes that there are also those "laughing at me behind my back," and these gossips, she claims, "were turning me into a story, or into several stories, though not the kind of stories I'd prefer to hear about myself" (3). The “slanderous gossip” (143) claims that she either slept with one of the suitors, Amphinomus, or that she slept with all of them consecutively. The result of these unions, it is said, is the god Pan.[2] Not liking either version, the official or

[2] Robert Graves, Atwood’s source for gossip, tells us that “Some deny that Penelope remained faithful to Odysseus. They accuse her of companying with Amphinomus of Dulichium, or with the suitors in turn, and say that the fruit of this union was the monstrous god Pan – at sight of whom Odysseus fled for shame to Aetolia after sending Penelope away in disgrace to her father Icarius at Mantinea, where her tomb is still shown. Others record that she bore Pan to Hermes . . .” (735-36).

the unofficial, she decides that, after death, "Now that all the others have run out of air, it's my turn to do a little story-making" (3).

Odysseus' version itself is not immune to the power of rumor. Back in Ithaca, ships bring contradictory news. The island of the Lotus flower is reinterpreted as a mutiny by his drunken crew; the victory over the Cyclops as a financial disagreement with a one-eyed tavern keeper; the battle with the cannibal Lystrogonians merely a "brawl of the usual kind" (83). The rumors continue:

> Odysseus had been to the Land of the Dead to consult the spirits, said some. No, he'd merely spent the night in a gloomy old cave full of bats, said others. He'd made his men put wax in their ears, said one, while sailing past the alluring Sirens—half-bird, half-woman—who enticed men to their island and then ate them, though he'd tied himself to the mast so he could listen to their irresistible singing without jumping overboard. No, said another, it was a high-class Sicilian knocking shop—the courtesans there were known for their musical talents and their fancy feathered outfits. (91)

As Penelope notes, it is "hard to know what to believe" (91).

While the official story about Odysseus matches the story that he tells of himself, what we might call the "true" version, in the sense that it is the version of the story as the character himself sees it, the official version about Penelope does not fit the "true" version according to her own perspective. Neither, however, does the slander or the gossip, the jokes told behind her back. Her "truth" occupies a third position, one that, she claims, hasn't been articulated.

If we examine these two storytellers and the stories told about them, an interesting pattern emerges. Calling the stories they tell about themselves the “truth,” and the stories told about them by others “slander,” we find a curious reversal. Odysseus’ truth turns him into a mythic figure, one who fights monsters and seduces goddesses. Penelope’s truth, on the other hand, remains firmly planted in the mundane. Her tools are commonsense and patience. Yet, if we look at the stories told *about* these two, what we’re calling “slander,” we find that the designations are switched. The slander about Odysseus—that the goddesses were whores, and that the monsters were innkeepers—is mundane. The slander about Penelope becomes mythic. Conceiving and bearing the Great God Pan is hardly the work of an average woman.

However, the rumors about Odysseus, while they may cause a few snickers behind his back, do nothing to tarnish his reputation or affect his status. The rumors about Penelope operate differently. If Odysseus

were to believe the rumors, her status and even her life might be forfeit. In Robert Graves' recounting of the Pan story, Penelope is sent back to her father, in disgrace (736). Damage control, which here means controlling the narrative, is serious business for her.

Penelope is able to survive with her status intact because, like Odysseus, Penelope is clever (29). She would prefer to be beautiful, but she ruefully concedes that "I was not a maneater, I was not a Siren, I was not like cousin Helen . . ." (29). But like her more beautiful cousin, whose power lies in her ability to sway men, Penelope also gains power through her association and access to powerful men. Where Helen's tool is beauty, Penelope must use her wits in order to align herself with the men who control the conditions of her life. She makes use of the one piece of advice her mother, a Naiad (water nymph), gives her on her wedding day. Her mother cryptically tells her:

> Water does not resist. Water flows. When you plunge your hand into it, all you feel is a caress. Water is not a solid wall; it will not stop you. But water always goes where it wants to go, and nothing in the end can stand against it. Water is patient. Dripping water wears away a stone. Remember that, my child. Remember you are half water. If you can't go through an obstacle, go around it. Water does. (43)

Therefore Penelope becomes like water, running in between the cracks of everyone else's story. Her patience, if not a virtue, is certainly good strategy. Wait for the husband to come home; wait as long as it takes. Then, surely, no one can question your devotion and your virtue. Penelope's patience wears away the rumors.

That a woman's only way to power—and ultimately her very survival—is through access to powerful men can be demonstrated through Penelope's relationship to the other women in the story. Penelope is in constant competition with her cousin Helen, with her mother-in-law Anticleia, and even with Odysseus' old nurse Eurycleia. What these women compete for is the attention and approval of the men around them.

Helen, although conventionally viewed as a kind of archetypal female, would have made a good Greek hero. Her desires were those of a man of Greece, not a woman. Atwood writes that Helen "wanted to make a name for herself. She longed to stand out from the herd" (76). This ambition is the ambition of a Greek hero, to make a mark and ensure his name and his story would be remembered. Helen's battlefield, however, must be the field of romance, because that's the only venue through which she can have access to those with power. But the costs

are the same; she counts her victories through the number of men who have died for her. Even after her return from Troy, she is able to make conquests. Penelope's own son describes the now middle-aged Helen as being "radiant as golden Aphrodite" (132). And in death she is followed around by an adoring horde of spirits, all waiting for her to take a bath. Even without a body, she is willing to disrobe, '"even in the spirit,'" she cattily tells Penelope. '"I do feel that because so many of them died for me—well, because of me—surely I owe them something in return'" (154). Thus female rivalry survives even the grave.

At home in Ithaca, Penelope the young bride finds herself in competition with her mother-in-law, Anticleia, both for dominance in the household and the preeminent place in the eyes of Odysseus. In theory Penelope is a plum of a prize for her son, for after all, "a princess of Sparta is not to be sneezed at" (62). The reality of Penelope, however, is all too inconvenient. Penelope tells us that Anticleia

> would have been better pleased if I'd died of seasickness on the way to Ithaca and Odysseus had arrived home with the bridal presents but not the bride. Her most frequent expression to me was, "you don't look well." (62)

Penelope would have been quite bereft of an ally in Ithaca if it had not been for Odysseus' old nurse, Eurycleia, who, Penelope says, "made a point of taking me under her wing, leading me about the palace to show me where everything was, and, as she kept saying, 'how we do things here'" (61). But even this kindness is colored by competition for an “inside position” (161) with Odysseus:

> [Eurycleia] talked all the time, and nobody was the world's expert on Odysseus the way she was. She was full of information about what he liked and how he had to be treated, for hadn't she nursed him at her own breast and tended him when he was an infant and brought him up as a youth? Nobody but she must give him his baths, oil his shoulders, prepare his breakfasts, lock up his valuables, lay out his robed for him, and so on and so forth. She left me with nothing to do, no little office I might perform for my husband, for if I tried to carry out any small wifely task she would be right there to tell me that wasn't how Odysseus liked things done. (63)

Eurycleia will also take over the care of Penelope's son when he is born. Thus Penelope’s only way of making herself indispensable to her husband is through her "ability to appreciate his stories" (45). It is, she

claims, "an underrated talent in women" (45). This is what Odysseus "valued most" (45) in his wife.

So Penelope must compete with Helen's superior beauty, Anticleia's superior attitude, and Eurycleia's superior knowledge and experience. But it is not mere pettiness that drives this feminine competition. Penelope may need her husband's affection and approval for psychological reasons, but more importantly her very survival depends upon it. Who would she be if she were not the wife of the king of Ithaca? At least as Odysseus' wife, she is afforded some protection and care. Without that protection and care, she would be as vulnerable as the maids.

Penelope's need to align herself with the men in power is underscored by her handling of the suitors who besiege her home. She needs to please them enough to be able to put them off, to prevent them from acting precipitously, to keep them from harming Telemachus and forcing her to marry one of them. Her survival, and that of her son, depends on the continual deferral of the suitors' desire. So she manipulates them. "It's . . . true," Penelope admits, "that I led the Suitors on and made private promises to some of them, but this was a matter of policy" (143). Survival means keeping the suitors happy without losing either her virtue or her hand. This balancing act calls for as much daring and cleverness as Odysseus ever needed in his adventures.

Penelope's survival, however, is not without its cost. In the end she is unable to save her Maids from Odysseus' vengeance. Penelope has been using the Maids as spies in order to stay ahead of the Suitors, although she decides to keep this strategy to herself, not telling Eurycleia what she was doing. But from the beginning, her policy works against the best interest of her twelve favorite Maids: "This plan came to grief. Several of the girls were unfortunately raped, others were seduced, or were hard pressed and decided that it was better to give in than to resist" (115). Even Penelope recognizes, after the fact, of course, that her "actions were ill-considered and caused harm" (118). But in order to survive, she has to please the suitors enough so that they will continue to be patient.

When Odysseus returns home, he is informed by Eurycleia of which Maids consorted with the enemy, as it were. These are forced to cleanse the hall of the blood of the suitors, then their childhood companion, Telemachus, hangs them, suspending above the ground "twenty-four twitching feet" (191). Penelope has been locked away in her room during the slaughter of the Suitors and its aftermath, but because she hadn't shared her scheme with Eurycleia, Penelope recognizes her own complicity in their deaths. But she goes to meet Odys-

seus calmly, and without comment about the twelve dead Maids. As always, she takes the prudent path:

> What could I do? Lamentation wouldn't bring my lovely girls back to life. I bit my tongue. It's a wonder I had any tongue left, so frequently had I bitten it over the years. Dead is dead, I told myself. I'll say prayers and perform sacrifices for their souls. But I'll have to do it in secret, or Odysseus will suspect me, as well. (160)

To protect her own reputation, she cannot openly mourn for the young women, for whose deaths she is indirectly responsible. She must remain allied with the men.

Within this men's world there exists a systemic double standard. Males are more powerful than females, and aristocrats are more powerful than slaves. There is a sexual double standard as well. For men, being sexually experienced is more admirable than being inexperienced. Odysseus's time with Circe is not held against him in the least. His hero status is confirmed by his being the lover of a goddess. For women, however, being sexually pure, either through monogamy or virginity, confers much more status than does being sexually active. (Unless, of course, one is as beautiful as Helen!) Within the economy of this system, the Maids lose on all fronts. They are female, they are slaves, and whether through rape or through seduction, they are sexually active. To ally herself openly with the Maids, Penelope would have to lose the approval of the powerful males of her world, and in doing so lose her own status. She is unwilling to do so, perhaps even afraid of doing so. Yet, by not doing so, she become complicit in the murder of the Maids. As much as her husband and her son, she is guilty of their deaths.

Ultimately, this guilt is the impetus for her storytelling. Why does this most perfect wife feel compelled to defend herself by telling the story in her own words, from her own perspective? Because she must justify her actions that allowed the Maids to be hanged. She was responsible for the Maids. She had raised them, they had been her slaves, and she claims that she had loved them. In the end, though, she allowed them to be expendable. When choosing sides, she chose the side of the powerful. And thus today we still tell the story of faithful and patient Penelope.

Works Cited

Atwood, Margaret. *The Penelopiad*. New York: Canongate, 2005.

Graves, Robert. *The Greek Myths*. Combined Edition. London: Penguin, 1992.

To Russia with Love: Reflections on Grace

[St. Petersburg, May 2006]

David E. Crutchley

For while we were still helpless, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly. For one will hardly die for a righteous man; though perhaps for the good man someone would dare even to die. But God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. (Romans 5:6-8. NASB)

The Unpredictability of Grace—Sergei Nikolai

Sunday morning May 21, 2006, I made my way down the moving escalator deep into the bowels of the earth. I have traveled on the Paris *Metro* and the London Underground but the Russian engineers have cut deep into the earth to realize this mass communication system that avoided the lakes and rivers of St Petersburg. I had to pinch myself that this was real as I sat with my Bible on my lap in the car moving at sixty mph towards the city center. After all this was Russia. We had fought against communism in the countries of southern Africa in the 1970s. God's grace will not partner any stereotypes and human prejudice.

As we approached our place of worship the building in view seemed on the outside to be falling apart. The brick and outward décor gave no clue to what lay inside—a vibrant family of "living stones." This evangelical church was a refurbished Russian Orthodox Church that the city officials had reluctantly given to a group of Christians. Later that week I heard how God's dream came to fruition though the obedience of a man by the name of Sergei Nikolai. It is a story reminding me of the predictable unpredictability of God's grace.

In 1988 Sergei was involved in a horrific car accident in Norway. The car in which he was traveling was crushed under an eighteen-wheeler and emergency personnel took two hours to free him from the car. Sergei's body was broken in seventeen places and his torso moved adjacent to his spine. He came under the care of a leading Norwegian medical academic that night. Few thought he would live and he was

placed in a ward designated for the dying. In the days that followed he became conscious of God's presence and impelling call to start a church, a theological academy, and to send out students on mission throughout the world.

Eighteen months later, still on crutches before the advent of *Perestroika*, he made his request known to incredulous Communist city officials in St Petersburg. Without an appointment he announced at the city office that "the Baptist bishop is here with a message from God."

Out of protracted negotiations this church site was granted. On the front wall of the church is a vestige of Russian Orthodoxy, a beautiful and ornate picture of Jesus holding the scriptures in one hand and the letters alpha and omega written across the text. The Ten Commandments are carved on pillars on either side of the bottom auditorium. Services that morning included poignant worship and two sermons rich in metaphor, narrative, and relevance.

The Irresistibility of Grace—The New Israel

The students that occupy the desks in front of me at the Evangelical Theological Academy remind me of the historical moment when Jesus made his way up the mountain – always a place of happening and special revelation. That day Jesus issued a divine summons and constituted a new Israel, not according to the Old Testament model of twelve tribes, but located in a diverse representation of backgrounds and human stories. Jesus shapes *de nova* the embryonic framework of the early church. Interviewing each one of these students reveals the sovereign solicitation of divine grace. Here is a new group of twelve twenty-first century disciples:

> Maria Kazakova lives forty miles from Moscow but as a fifteen year old she gave her heart to Christ after watching the *Jesus* film on a private television showing.
>
> Victoria Shimchuk grew up in a little village close to the Finnish border. As a twelve-year-old girl she became a Christian when Pentecostal Finnish missionaries shared the 'Living Water' in her village. She loves Hebrew and Greek and plans to be a Bible translator.
>
> Catherine Fominyh hails from Siberia and is a music major with a powerful soprano voice and the longest fingers I have ever seen that move across the keys of a piano with breathtaking dexterity.

[*Errata:* This page was inadvertently omitted from the article by Professor David Crutchley in *Carson-Newman Studies*, Fall 2006. Please insert at line 30, page 68, before "Maria Kazakova lives . . . ."]

Andrei Shatrov is a young lawyer grappling with seminary training and the expectations of a family that has witnessed six generations of ministers. Reading law at a university in St Petersburg, with a specialty in public international law, he finds himself caught in the moral battle of corrupt legal practice where fraud is endemic and the firm's expectation is 'win at all costs'—even if one has to manufacture one's own evidence. He awaits God's leading as to whether he will start a firm of Christian lawyers or pastor a church.

Alexei Morkovin from Tashkent, near the border of Afghanistan, became a Christian at the age of twenty-five after spending the early part of his life as a robber. The witness of Canadian missionaries, who to this day do not know of the life changing impact of their witness, was responsible for his conversion. He read his Bible for four years before aligning with a church.

Sergei Yanitsin grew up in St Petersburg and experimented with drugs until the police arrested him at the age of seventeen. In the ensuing month, after a miraculous release and serious car accident, his family visited a Presbyterian church that was taking seriously the mandate to feed the poor with bread. It was here he found physical bread and the 'Living Bread.' His dream is now to pastor and shepherd youth.

Sergei Fomenko hails from Siberia, home of the infamous gulags, and was born into a generation of Baptists. He works with public radio and one of his programs beamed across this former isolated region of communism was entitled, "Words of Life."

Anastasia Popova, my delightful and brilliant translator, has a first name that signals resurrection. The Russians have no word for Sunday and refer to it as *Anastasia*—the day of resurrection. As a young girl she actually lived on the street called "Faithfulness" and is a winsome testimony to resurrection grace. She studied English at high school where her teachers told her that it was im-

possible to study Russian literature, Leo Tolstoy and Fyodor Dostoevsky, without reading the gospels. Her favorite themes in theology are grace and the fatherhood of God.

Lev Shults is the son of a Baptist pastor whose family endured the sufferings of the KGB in the 1960s. As a young man his first love was soccer and he was recruited and touted by professional clubs. One year after breaking both legs he literally crawled to the church. Today he is an avid student of Paul's writings and a gifted pastoral leader.

Alexander Shablinsky lived in a village that experienced the effects of the radioactive cloud from the Chernobyl meltdown twenty years ago. Contaminated and ending up in hospital he was given a Bible by missionaries that led to his discovery of Christ and healing.

Anatoly Korabel, short in stature—a Russian "Zaccheus"—is one of the leading church planters and pastors in the southern part of Russia. He operated an excavating machine and crane until God intercepted him.

Elena Radosteva, whose roots are Siberian, volunteered as a young adolescent and then was elected each year to teach her high school peers the ways of Stalin in the "Soviet Children's Organization." Becoming disillusioned with the Communist political system that she claimed was "dying from the inside," she wrote a paper at the end of her high school days critiquing Stalin. She wrote in her journal during that time, "Is there a higher power—whether it is a he or she—I need the power to show up." She set down her pen, turned on the radio, and heard a message on short wave about Jesus that changed her life. Her miracle of rebirth has gone full circle and she now works in Christian radio.

She found the Lord when presented with a Gideon's Bible as a seventeen year old.

Michael Sibikovsky, a leading Jewish businessman, refused to pay bribes to the local bureaucracy, and found himself crippled financially. Out of business, and broken physically with tuberculosis, he was invited to a church. Through the power play of the underworld his eyes were opened to a supernatural world. With five children he now pastors a church.

The Costliness of Grace—Jeremy and Lindsay Fresques

Four different words for "love" occur in the Greek New Testament: *erôs*, *phileô*, *agape*, and *stergô*. It is the last one that confronts me as I read an American newspaper in the Frankfurt airport on the homeward journey: a love of parents for their children and the love of a citizen for his country—patriotic love.

Jeremy Fresques was a hard worker, deep thinker, who joked that he chose the Air Force Academy over the West Point Academy because the female cadets were better looking! One of his superior officers, taking a cue from the film *Top Gun*, sent him a note inviting him to dinner. They were married in 2004, and honeymooned in the Canary Islands. Jeremy was overseas on his only wedding anniversary. He found Jesus during his senior year at the Academy.

A month to go before his tour in Iraq ended he emailed his parents on May 26—"I'm definitely ready" to come home. Three days later he writes in his journal that he is not afraid of dying but only the "process of dying." He says his fondest desire is be "raptured with his wife Lindsay" into heaven to be with Jesus.

On Memorial Day 2005, the day Fresques (26) is promoted to captain; he boards a surveillance plane to scout potential emergency landing sites. He has no time to celebrate; no time to put on his new silver bars. He is one of an elite few cadets chosen from the Air Force Academy to wear the Red Beret of the Air Forces Special Tactic Unit. Called combat controllers their task is to land in hostile enemy territory, set up and protect landing fields, and direct aircraft into them.

The weather is calm that day but in the early afternoon news comes through that four U.S. airmen and an Iraqi air force pilot were killed when their light plane crashed and exploded into flames eighty miles northeast of Baghdad. The plane went down about an hour after takeoff from Kirkuk. Investigators searching the wreckage recover only a few personal items. One of these is a silver cross Jeremy had bought from Jerusalem and worn around his neck. His widow now wears that cross

around her neck. The bodies are burned too badly for identification and the intermingled ashes are buried in Arlington National Cemetery. The pilot becomes the first Iraqi interred there.

The *missio dei* of Creator to creature—the stoop from heaven—reminds of another Memorial Day—when the Suffering Servant embraced death for alienated humanity on the instrument of death—the cross. This is no cheap grace but the universal surrender of power on God's part. This is *agape*—not reciprocal love but an "in spite of" love and commitment.

The Patience of Grace—*The Hermitage*

Few museums in the world exude the ambience of *The Hermitage*. Situated on the banks of the River Neva on the one side and the Palace Square with the Alexander column on the other, this home to the Russian Czars boasts priceless art treasures. The name means "place of retreat" and the walls of the museum have witnessed seminal moments in Russian history.

Alexander I, future victor over Napoleon Bonaparte, came to live here after the assassination of his father Paul I. Nicholas I left this palace in 1825, to suppress an uprising and fought a raging fire here in later days. Stepan Khalturin exploded a bomb under the royal dining room in the palace and Alexander II was brought to die here after another bomb explosion. Nicholas II opened the first Russian parliament here—the state *duma*—and the palace was assaulted and stormed by the Bolsheviks during the Russian Revolution in 1917.

The Hermitage offers the widest range of art from Matisse to Gauguin, from Rubens to Picasso, from Monet to Raphael. There is one painting that I seek out in the labyrinth of this museum. It is that of the Dutch Master, Rembrandt, "The Prodigal Son." I sit in front of this masterpiece for thirty minutes processing the Dutch artist's message and intent. Why are prodigals so often drawn from the ranks of the youngest? The father's face seems almost passionless and his eyes dim with old age or almost blindness.

My colleague from the Academy remarks with keen insight, "He looks like he has been waiting a long time." There is a durative dimension to the mercy and grace of God. He waits and He waits. The hands of the father rest upon the prodigal's shoulders. There, one finds the "face" of God. The tenderness and compassion are striking. In fact the hands of the father are different in shape and texture. One is larger and gnarled representing the masculinity and strength of the father, the other smaller and softer in appearance perhaps representing the feminine and mercy of the mother who also accepts the prodigal's return.

God's persona is a reflection of both traits: deep-seated compassion and tenderness (Hosea 11) and strength and unswerving love.

A journey of ten days into the cultural capital of Russia leaves impressions that will last a lifetime. Is it not paradoxical that these images of grace burn so brightly in a land not known for its robust faith?

The Prison of Calvinism: The Tollbooth as Religious Symbol in the Heart of Midlothian

David N. Goff

The central image in Walter Scott's *The Heart of Midlothian* is the Tollbooth, the prison that stands at the center of Edinburgh. The novel juxtaposes two parallel stories of attempted rescue and retribution, both connected to the Tollbooth in the context of the historical events surrounding the infamous Porteous Affair. The successful escape of George Robertson, affected by the efforts of Andrew Wilson, his partner in crime, is set in vivid contrast with the initial failure of Jeanie Deans to affect the release of her sister Euphemia ("Effie"), due to the constraints of her Covenanting Presbyterian faith. Though Effie is eventually pardoned due to the heroic efforts of Jeanie on her behalf, she never truly recovers from the stigma of her guilt. The reader is left to wonder whether Effie's pardon is worth the effort Jeanie expends to procure it.

Scott uses the Tollbooth, the ancient prison at the heart of the city of Edinburgh, as a symbol of the grim, legalistic, Calvinistic religion that shackles the hearts and minds of the Scottish people, most forcibly represented by Jeanie and Davie Deans. Those who escape the power of the Tollbooth, and the religion it represents, such as Geordie Robertson and Effie Deans, are forever embittered by its condemning influence, while those who remain faithful, like Jeanie Deans, find themselves imprisoned by the religion that is the central focus of their lives.

Andrew Wilson and George Robertson were eighteenth century Scottish smugglers who were arrested while breaking into a customhouse. While they were in prison, supporters smuggled a file to them so they could cut through the bars and make their escape. Wilson, the larger of the two men, was impatient and insisted upon being the first to try to squeeze through the opening they had made. He got himself stuck between the remaining bars and the escape attempt was a failure.

Disturbed not only that he had failed, but that his failure would cost the life of his young associate, Wilson made his move while the

prisoners were attending their final church service before execution, in the company of four guards. Wilson threw himself on the guards, restraining three of them, and shouted, "Run, Geordie, Run!" Hesitating only momentarily, Robertson made good his escape and Wilson was taken back to prison.

Popular sentiment was on the side of Wilson, so when his time of execution arrived, a riot erupted and was forcibly put down by John Porteous, Chief of the Edinburgh City Guard, and several people were killed. Porteous' response was so harsh that he was subsequently imprisoned for murder and sentenced to death. When the Queen of England extended a pardon to Porteous, on the basis that he was acting in the line of duty, a mob broke into the Tollbooth, seized him and executed him (Lamont viii-x).

The story of Jeanie Deans' walk to London to obtain a pardon for her sister is also based on what appears to be a true story. Scott received an anonymous letter in 1817, that told the story of Helen Walker who had refused to lie in court to protect her sister, Jeanie Deans, from a charge of child murder. Jeanie Deans subsequently walked to London and received a pardon through the services of the Duke of Argyle. Scott later discovered that his anonymous correspondent was Mrs. Helen Goldie who had met Helen Walker when Mrs. Walker was between seventy and eighty years old (Lamont vii-viii).

Scott's brilliance as a writer of historical fiction is demonstrated by his blending of these two unrelated stories into a seamless whole. George Robertson, the escaped smuggler, becomes in Scott's version of the tale the seducer of Effie Deans as well as the primary force behind the lynch mob in the Porteous incident. Davie Deans, father of Jeanie and Effie, is given roots in Scottish history by making him a survivor of the Battle of Bothwell Bridge. Jeannie Deans not only enlists the aid of the Duke of Argyle in her sister's cause, but also with his assistance has an audience with the Queen of England who personally agrees to the pardon. It is not, however, Jeanie's successful petitioning of the Queen for a pardon that is the philosophical center for the novel; it is rather Jeanie's inability to lie and save her sister that make's the Queen's pardon necessary.

Jeanie's moral crisis is preceded by the tale of Andrew Wilson's heroic efforts to enable Geordie Robertson to escape the gallows after their previously aborted escape attempt. Wilson, though a smuggler, is willing to lay down his life for his friend Robertson. To Scott's biblically literate nineteenth century audience, this action would have struck a familiar chord. The words of Jesus that, "greater love has no one than this, that he lay down his life for his friends" (John 15:13) would resonate with Wilson's actions. Though not portrayed as an exceptionally

religious man, Wilson does not hesitate, but sacrifices his own liberty, and ultimately his life, for Robertson's freedom.

Jeanie Deans, on the contrary, is a deeply religious young woman. She is raised in one of the strictest, most conservative sects of the Presbyterian faith, the Cameronians. She is chaste and pious and devoted to the duties of her home, her family, and her religion. Her natural instinct, when invited to meet Robertson secretly, is to pray for guidance (Scott 144). In the course of their conversation she provides him with religious counsel (152) and says, "May God forgive you," when he threatens her with a gun (153).

It is ironic that the same religious beliefs that enable her to have the courage to confront Robertson's apparent threats are the barrier that prevents her from rescuing her sister from the judgment of the court. Though she knows from Robertson that Effie is innocent of child-murder, and though she thinks (incorrectly) that she even has the endorsement of her father, the unshakeable Cameronian zealot Davie Deans, she is unable to speak the lie that is, to the best of her knowledge at that moment, the only means of saving the life of her innocent sister. She is so immured in the laws of her religion that she is completely unable to speak the outward lie that will uphold the inward truth—the innocence of her beloved sister Effie. Locked in the spiritual prison of her Puritan ideology, Jeanie speaks the truth that condemns her sister to death for a crime that she did not commit.

Scott's portrayal of Calvinism is not a distortion. The religion of the Puritans, a conservative Presbyterianism based on the teachings of John Calvin, was as stern and rigid as the Tollbooth prison which functions as its symbolic counterpart in *The Heart of Midlothian.* Barry describes the religion of the Calvinists as follows:

> The cold, hard, but upright disposition characteristic of the Reformed Churches . . . is due entirely to their founder himself. Its essence is a concentrated pride, a love of disputation, a scorn of opponents. The only art that it tolerates is music, and that not instrumental. It will have no Christian feasts in its calendar, and it is austere to the verge of Manichaean hatred of the body (par. 15).

Carpenter supports this view of the Calvinist religion, describing it as "an ecclesiastical system that turns aside from the preaching of the Gospel of grace and tries to drive men into the Kingdom of God by means of the rigors of the law and the lash of civil authority" (150). The history of Calvinism in general and of the Scottish Kirk in particular will demonstrate that the Scottish Calvinists were in the mainstream of the Presbyterian tradition.

John Calvin was born in Noyon, France, in 1509. He was trained for the practice of law at the University of Orleans and the University of Bourges at the instigation of his father, but gave it up for the study of Greek and Hebrew at the humanist College de France when his father died in 1531. Somewhere between the publication of his first book, *Commentary on Seneca's Treatment on Clemency*, in 1532, and the beginning of 1534, Calvin experienced a profound religious conversion, after which "religion had henceforth the first place in his thoughts" (Walker 349).

Calvin moved to Paris in 1534, but fled to Strasburg in 1535, and then on to Basel, with his friend Du Tillet, to escape the persecution that had arisen against Protestants. In 1536, at the age of twenty-six, Calvin published the first edition of his famous *Institutes of the Christian Religion* that established him as the foremost spokesman for Protestantism in France (Newman 204-06).

While returning to Basel from a visit to France, Calvin stopped in Geneva and a meeting took place that set the course of his future endeavors. Guillame Farel was struggling to mold Geneva into a city where the Protestants held the political as well as religious power. Though they had made some progress in both areas, the Catholic party was still powerful. Farel, desperately in need of assistance, prevailed upon Calvin to join him in his labors in Geneva (Wendel 48-50). Ultimately, as a result of the efforts of Calvin, Geneva became "the stronghold of Protestantism, not only for Switzerland, but for the world, 'the Protestant Rome'" (Newman 206).

In 1554, Calvin was joined in Geneva by John Knox, a Scotsman who had been laboring at the side of the Scottish reformer, George Wishart, "often with sword in hand to protect him from violence" (Newman 240), to promote Protestantism in Scotland. After the death of Wishart, Knox became an ardent preacher in his own right. He was captured with a group of other Protestants in the siege of the castle of St. Andrews by the French in 1547, and was forced into servitude as a galley slave for two years. Upon his release, he preached in England for a time while the Protestant Edward IV was king, but was forced to flee England to avoid persecution by the accession of the Catholic Queen Mary (Newman 239-241).

Knox eventually made his way to Geneva, where he allied himself with Calvin and became one of his most ardent disciples. During the years that followed, he pastored a congregation of English exiles and labored on the Genevan version of the English Bible, a version that was later to become very popular with English Puritans (Newman 240; Walker 369-70). Knox has been described as a theological "revolutionary for God . . . and he had all the single-minded fanaticism and the

self-righteousness of a man convinced that he alone knew what God was saying" (Magnusson 343).

John Knox returned to Scotland in 1559 where his fiery preaching quickly led to political rebellion. When the smoke of battle cleared, the rebels had won, Scotland had maintained its political independence, and the Scottish Parliament had adopted a Calvinistic confession of faith as the official creed of the nation. They also abolished Papal authority, and forbade the practice of the Catholic mass (Walker 370-71). Calvinism had become the official religion of Scotland. What was the nature of this Reformed religion that had gripped Scotland as a nation, and was such a powerful force throughout Europe, England, and in the colonies that would later become the United States?

The core doctrines of Calvinism and the basic practices of the practitioners of that faith provide a clearer understanding of Scott's characters in *The Heart of Midlothian* and will support the assertion that the Tollbooth is a powerful symbol of the Calvinistic religion of eighteenth century Scotland. Calvinism can be described in terms of five essential doctrines. These are sometimes committed to memory by use of the acrostic T.U.L.I.P.: total depravity, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of the saints (Rose vii; Steele 16-19). Each of these doctrines is part of a holistic world-view in which God is completely in control of all things and the salvation of humankind is a matter of his choice and not dependent on any human decision or action. As Wendel expresses it,

> From the beginning of his work, Calvin places all his theology under the sign of what was one of the essential principles of the Reform: the absolute transcendence of God and his total "otherness" in relation to man. No theology is Christian and in conformity with the Scriptures but in the degree to which it respects the infinite distance separating God from his creature. . . . Above all, God and man must again be seen in their rightful places. That is the idea that dominates the whole of Calvin's theological exposition. (Wendel 151)

The importance of this foundational tenet, often referred to as the sovereignty of God, is obvious in each point of T.U.L.I.P. Total depravity is the term that describes Calvin's view of humanity as a fallen creature. Steele explains the doctrine of total depravity as meaning that "man's nature is corrupt, perverse, and sinful throughout" (25). Rose states that "human nature has been and is utterly corrupted by sin so that man is totally incapable of doing anything to accomplish his salvation" (2). Both authors concur that this does not mean that there is no

goodness in humanity or that humankind is as bad as it possibly can be or that individuals have no conscience. Rather, Calvin taught that every aspect of the human person has been corrupted by sin. There is no part of the human person that is untouched by this corruption. There is nothing a person may do to achieve salvation without the intervention of the grace of God.

Unconditional election means, in its simplest expression, "God has done some choosing" (Rose 10). Steele explains it in this way: "The doctrine of election declares that God, before the foundation of the world, chose certain individuals from among the fallen members of Adam's race to be the object of his undeserved favor. These, and these only, he purposed to save" (30). This choice was solely his decision, not determined by any action or inaction on the part of the individuals chosen. To those who would question the justice of such a choice, the Calvinist would answer that the creature has no right to question the Creator who is beyond any human conception of justice.

Limited atonement or "particular atonement" flows naturally from the doctrine of unconditional election. Election, as Steele explains, "marked out particular sinners for salvation." Christ's death on the cross then accomplished that salvation for those selected individuals. It is not a limitation on the efficacy of that sacrifice, but rather the specific choice by God as to which individuals will receive the benefit of that sacrifice (38-39).

Irresistible grace means, according to Rose, "salvation from beginning to end is the work of God alone" (35). It comes before the existence of the individual, based on the doctrine of election, and the faith required to receive it is itself a gift from God. No human has the power to offer any resistance to the grace of God; therefore, when it is offered to those who are elected to receive it, and God supplies the faith, there is no desire or ability on the part of the chosen person to resist the grace of God. This grace is always successful in bringing the elect to God (Rose 36-37; Steele 48-49).

The doctrine of the perseverance of the saints is also referred to as the doctrine of the eternal security of the believer. Rose explains that "once God has begun the work of salvation in any person, he will persevere therein to the end and will never let any of His own be lost" (49). Steele concurs, stating that "they are also kept in faith by the almighty power of God" (56). The emphasis here is again on the sovereignty of God. God has elected particular individuals for salvation, given them his grace, provided them with the faith to respond to that grace, and will actively preserve them in that grace. Therefore, perhaps, it would be more aptly called the preservation of the saints, as it is God who preserves, rather than the saints who persevere (Rose 50-51).

Steele explains further that not all who profess faith in Christ are necessarily part of the elect. Some who are not of the elect may profess and fall away. But those who are chosen for salvation will persevere to the end (56). Wendel states, "The elect cannot lose salvation whatever they do" (277).

Calvinist thought had political as well as theological ramifications. Calvin developed his philosophy of church government while also assisting in the political government of the city of Geneva. There, as Carpenter expresses it, "he soon became more or less a tyrant, ruling with an iron hand" and "enforced the rigors of the law in a manner as strict as the most tyrannical of them" (148). Knox, likewise, put a strong emphasis on the political establishment of Calvinism as the state religion of Scotland. As Reid explains:

> . . . John Knox developed the doctrine of the covenant very clearly, not only as a theological concept, but also as a political theory. His view was that Scotland, having accepted the Reformation, had become a "covenanted nation" in much the same way as Israel in Old Testament times. . . . Knox sought to implement Old Testament covenant thinking by setting up a covenanted nation in which even the "commonality" had a say in government. (529)

Gardner concurs with Reid, stating that "the collective implications of the covenant are seen most clearly in the idea of a national covenant based upon the paradigm of Israel" (43). This covenant emphasis was a persistent theme in Scottish history, leading to the development of the "Solemn League and Covenant" that was passed by the Scottish Parliament and later ratified by the English Parliament. This document involved the recognition of Scottish Presbyterianism, and encouraged its adoption in England and Ireland. It also strongly rejected the Catholic religion as well as the more moderate Anglican church (Newman 286). Those of the Presbyterian (Calvinist) faith who supported this Covenant against the incursion of Anglicanism into Scotland were nicknamed "Covenanters."

One of the most extreme factions among the Covenanters was a group called the Cameronians. They were, as Magnus Magnusson relates, "associated with a young exiled schoolteacher and field-preacher, Richard Cameron: they advocated unrelenting pursuit of the Solemn League and Covenant, and refused to recognize an uncovenanted government or even work with anyone who did" (488). They were, as Starkey describes them, "a small fringe group unrepresentative of the thinking of most Presbyterians" (491).

In 1679, the Cameronians were decimated when they joined ranks with other, more moderate Covenanters, to hold Bothwell Bridge against the English under the Duke of Monmouth (Magnusson 488-90). Cameron himself and some of his followers survived this battle, but were killed a year later at Airds Moss by English dragoons (Magnusson 493). The few remaining Cameronians continued to conduct "guerilla raids and murders" (Magnusson 495), until the English captured and executed James Renwick, a militant Cameronian preacher. He was one of the last to die for the Covenanting beliefs in Scotland (Magnusson 497). Other examples of Calvinism in politics could be explored by examining the English Commonwealth under Oliver Cromwell and the Massachusetts Bay Colony in North America.

A closer look at *The Heart of Midlothian* reveals that Calvinist theology plays a significant role in the novel. Davie Deans is portrayed by Walter Scott as a member of the Cameronian sect and a survivor of the battle of Bothwell Bridge. The Cameronians, as mentioned above, were one of the strictest and most Calvinistic of the Scottish Covenanters. Scott describes Davie Deans as:

> A sturdy Scotchman, with all sorts of prejudices against the southern, and the spawn of the southern. Moreover, Deans was as we have said, a staunch Presbyterian, of the most rigid and unbending adherence to what he conceived to be the only possible straight line, as he was wont to express himself, between right-hand heats and extremes and left-hand defections; and, therefore, he held in high dread and horror all independents, and whomsoever he supposed allied to them (81).

Despite his outward rigidity, Deans loves his family deeply. In the following passage, Scott gives a powerful description of this man who is bound so firmly by his personal religious beliefs:

> It was not either in the nature or habits of David Deans to seem a fond father; nor was he often observed to experience, or at least to evince, that fullness of the heart, which seeks to expand itself in tender expression or caresses even to those who were dearest to him. On the contrary, he used to censure this as a degree of weakness in several of his neighbors, and particularly in poor widow Butler. It followed, however, from the rarity of such emotions in this self-denied and reserved man that his children attached to occasional marks of his affection and approbation a degree of high interest and solemnity; well considering them as evidences of feel-

> ings which were only expressed when they became too intense for suppression or concealment. (146)

When Rebecca, his second wife, dies, Deans grieves for her, while maintaining an outward stoicism, an "assumed fortitude . . . that he conceived to be the discharge of a Christian duty" (92). Years later, when Effie is arrested on the charge of child-murder, he faints in anguish, but after his arousal speaks harsh words of rejection. The next day, Scott says, he was "sternly supporting his load of ill through a proud sense of religious duty" (106-7). At Effie's trial, when Jeanie speaks her fatal word of testimony, stating that Effie had told her nothing about her pregnancy, Davie Deans is stricken with grief and collapses:

> A deep groan passed through the Court. It was echoed by one deeper and more agonized from the unfortunate father. The hope, to which unconsciously, and in spite of himself, he had still secretly clung, had now dissolved, and the venerable old man fell forward senseless on the floor of the courthouse, with his head at the foot of his terrified daughter. (231)

It is clear from these passages that Davie Deans was in an emotional and spiritual prison. His strict Calvinistic religion restrained him from expressing the natural feelings of love and devotion that a father feels for his children. Though outwardly a free man, Davie Deans was as much a prisoner as Effie, perhaps even more so. Effie was confined in a physical prison, the infamous Tollbooth, the "Heart of Midlothian."

David Deans, on the other hand, was confined by the religious tenets of legalistic Calvinism. His prison was one of the spirit. This religion that was at the heart of Midlothian was strong and virtually irresistible to its adherents. From that prison, escape was even less likely than escape from the Tollbooth.

The spiritual struggle of Jeanie Deans is the central focus of the novel. After the death of Effie's mother, Jeanie had exercised "all the love and care of a mother" in the raising of her younger sister, though her authority "became gradually limited and diminished" (97) as Effie approached adulthood. Jeanie became aware of Effie's involvement with a young man, but thinking it an innocent flirtation, was relieved when the opportunity came for Effie to go to work for Mrs. Saddletree in Edinburgh.

It was not until Effie returned home after her pregnancy and the death of her child, that Jeanie had any idea that her sister was in trouble. Before Jeanie could do anything to aid her distressed sister, the

officers of the law had come to arrest Effie on the charge of child murder (98-105). Jeanie's most severe trial thus began with her sister's arrest. Though she would later face great challenges and dangers in her journey to London, the most significant conflict in her life was about to take place as she awaited Effie's trial.

The first issue that Jeanie confronts after Effie's arrest is her own guilt. Though she is engaged to be married to Reuben Butler, she determines that she must withdraw from that engagement for the sake of his reputation. When Butler objects, she argues that the guilt will descend on their children for generations to come and concludes by resolving that she will, "bear [her] load alone" (120). Jeanie here is clearly in the grip of the Calvinistic doctrine of total depravity, and has no hope of grace, love, or forgiveness. God, as she believes, has brought this to pass through his sovereignty, and all she can do is bear her suffering. Butler also, though not so rigid a Calvinist as the Deans, is bound by many of the same beliefs.

When Jeanie tries to break their engagement because of Effie's sins, he replies, "I grant this is a heavy dispensation, but it lies neither at your door nor mine—it's an evil of God's sending, and it must be borne; but it cannot break plighted troth, Jeanie, while they that plighted their word wish to keep it" (119). Butler agrees with Jeanie that God has sent Effie's problems, but does not believe that Jeanie bears any blame for her sister's sins. Jeanie, however, is adamant in clinging to her guilt, and in her intention to end their engagement so as not to taint the reputation of Mr. Butler.

Jeanie's greatest challenge begins that night when she has a secret meeting with Robertson. In meeting with him, she goes against Butler's wishes, violates the customs of her society as to what is appropriate behavior for a young woman, and risks her own life and reputation. The courage she evinces in this encounter cannot be doubted. It is during this encounter that she learns the truth of Effie's innocence, and that it is in her power to save Effie's life by testifying that Effie had told her about the pregnancy. Jeanie resists any temptation to perjure her testimony.

When initially confronted by Robertson and ordered at gunpoint to swear that she will do as he orders to save her sister, she will only reply, "I can promise nothing…that is unlawful for a Christian (153). When he then explains Effie's innocence and pleads with her to save Effie by testifying that she had been told of the pregnancy, her reply is to firmly assert, ". . . I cannot remember . . . what Effie never told me" (155). Robertson argues, "you *must* remember that she told you all this whether she ever said a syllable of it or no" (155), but Jeanie remains adamant in her unwillingness to give false testimony, stating, "I may

not do evil, even that good may come of it" (156). Robertson is forced to flee from officers seeking to arrest him before he can make further attempts to persuade her.

It is not until Jeanie discussed her pending testimony at the trial with her father that serious doubts began to arise in her mind. Davie, as a Cameronian, had serious reservations about testifying in a court that did not measure up to his Covenanting principles. He resolved, however, not to try to influence Jeanie in this regard, but to "leave her to the light of her own conscience" (197). Jeanie, fresh from her secret meeting with Robertson, misunderstood the import of Davie's words. She had no concerns or doubts about the propriety of appearing in the court as a witness. She was simply burdened by the fact that she "was to be dragged forward into the court of justice, in order to place her in the cruel position of either sacrificing her sister by telling the truth, or committing perjury in order to save her life" (198).

In the conversation that follows between them, both father and daughter are so careful of one another's feelings that their vague and cautious statements lead them to a complete misunderstanding. Jeanie is left with the horrified feeling that Davie is suggesting that she commit perjury to save Effie. She is astounded, but does not pursue the matter further, as she is "afraid to communicate her thoughts freely to her father, lest she should draw forth an opinion with which she could not comply . . ." (199). In her own mind, Jeanie is facing an incredibly difficult temptation.

Through Robertson, she has learned that her sister is indeed innocent of the crime with which she has been charged. Her father, previously a bastion of moral and religious strength, seems to have yielded to his human weakness and to be urging her to perjure herself to save her sister. Jeanie is "wrung with distress on her sister's account, rendered the more acute by reflecting that the means of saving her were in her power, but were such as her conscience prohibited her from using" (199). How can she resist the temptation to lie if it means saving the life of her falsely accused sister?

Jeanie's resolution to have "faith in Providence, and . . . to discharge her duty" (200) had yet to endure one final test. On the night before the trial, Jeanie is brought to the Tollbooth to visit Effie. In the course of their conversation, Jeanie tells Effie about her meeting with Robertson and his demand that she testify falsely to save her sister. Effie, knowing her sister well, says, "And you tauld [told] him . . . that ye wadna [would not] hear o' coming between me and the death I am to die . . ." (207). When Jeanie tries to defend her position, and express her belief in Effie's innocence, Effie responds with words that challenge the root of Jeanie's religion: "It's whiles the fault of very good

folk like you, Jeanie, that they think a' the rest of the world are as bad as the warst temptations can make them" (207).

This is clearly an allusion to one of the main principles of Calvinism, the doctrine of total depravity. Effie is able to see that Jeanie is bound by this doctrine and unable to see the goodness in others as a result of it. Though they part in peace, Effie is clearly hurt by Jeanie's choice of priorities: by her valuing her religious duties above Effie's life.

Effie's trial finds Jeanie composed and ready to do her duty. She "had already anticipated the line of conduct which she must adopt, with all its natural and necessary consequences . . ." (211). While Davie suffers with doubts as to the outcome of Jeanie's testimony, and the usually belligerent (and not particularly religious) crowd reacts to Effie's youth and beauty with "an universal murmur of compassion and sympathy" (216), Jeanie sits composed in the room where witnesses were sequestered during the trial. When Effie, at the bar of justice, is overcome by shame, "[a]ll marked and were moved by these changes, excepting one. It was old Deans, who . . . did nevertheless keep his eyes firmly fixed on the ground . . ." (216-17).

It was Jeanie and Davie, depicted by Scott as the staunchest and most faithfully religious of the Puritans present, who seemingly are unable to feel the compassion that Effie's demeanor excites in the crowd of onlookers, and even in the officials of the court. When Jeanie is called upon to give her testimony, to say the words that will either free her sister or send her to the gallows, she hesitates slightly, not because "she at any one instance entertained an idea of the possibility of prevarication—it was the natural hesitation to extinguish the last spark of hope that remained for her sister" (231).

The crowd, who normally would have been excited by the prospect of a hanging, groans in dismay, a groan that is followed by a deeper groan from Davie Deans who collapses to the floor. The staunch old Cameronian can no longer resist, at least for that moment, his human feelings. Jeanie however, remains unmoved: "Even in this moment of agony and general confusion, Jeanie did not lose that superiority, which a deep and firm mind assures to its possessor under the most trying circumstances" (231).

Jeanie, despite the encouragement of circumstances that moved even the rabble of Edinburgh, remains locked in the spiritual Tollbooth of her Calvinistic religion. Her humanity and compassion are as much a prisoner to her Presbyterian religion as Effie is a prisoner of the judicial system. Like Effie, who had refused the opportunity to flee from the Tollbooth during the Porteous riot, Jeanie refuses to flee the religious prison that has separated her from the natural love she has for her sister.

With only the slightest hesitation Jeanie speaks the words that she knows will condemn her innocent sister to a horrible death on the gallows. Even her father, the zealous Davie Deans, does not possess her strength of will. Jeanie has passed the ultimate test of her religion. She has failed, however, in her humanity.

Jeanie's subsequent journey to obtain a pardon for Effie, though ultimately successful in preserving Effie's life, does not change the fact of her failure to speak at the critical moment. In the course of her journey, Jeanie again encounters Robertson, whom she now discovers to be the son of an Anglican Rector, Mr. George Staunton. Robertson/Staunton tells Jeanie the story of his life of crime and of how Wilson had heroically enabled him to escape from the Tollbooth. Once again, Scott juxtaposes Wilson's "gallant and extraordinary deed" (327) with Jeanie's failure to rescue Effie.

Though the pardon that Jeanie wins from the hand of the Queen enables the physical release of Effie from the Tollbooth, neither she nor Robertson (Staunton) ever completely escape from its frightening power. Though they marry, assume different identities in which their crimes are unknown, are wealthy, and should be happy, they can never escape the bitterness of their former lives. Likewise, though they are no longer bound by the Calvinism of the Scottish Kirk, but are under the much less authoritarian Anglican creed, they seem unable to break free of the condemnation of their religion. Robertson is eventually murdered by their own bastard son, "the Whistler;" and Effie lives an inconsequential life on the fringes of high society. A strong Calvinist might assert that each had met the fate that Providence had predestined for them.

In *The Heart of Midlothian*, Walter Scott has created a powerful tale of sin and retribution, of mercy, deliverance, and judgment. Towering above all the individual characters in his novel stands the monumental edifice of the Tollbooth, the Heart of Midlothian, a powerful symbol of the Calvinistic Presbyterianism of the Scottish Kirk. As the prison held in its grasp the bodies of those who had committed crimes against the state, so the Calvinist Church held the hearts and minds of its members, compelling their obedience and condemning their failures. It is this "curse of legalism" as noted by Sanford Carpenter, that "has often obscured the Gospel of Grace throughout the progress of the centuries" (151).

Scott's *The Heart of Midlothian* stands as a scathing rebuke of the failure of Scottish Presbyterianism as a redemptive force in society. Instead, Calvinist doctrine stands condemned as one more example of the manipulation of religion as a tool to enslave the hearts and minds of humankind.

Works Cited

Barry, William. "John Calvin." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume III. New York: Appleton, 1908. Online Edition. Knight, K. 24 August 2005. New Advent. 7 Oct. 2005. **http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03195b.htm**

Carpenter, Sanford N. *The Reformation in Principle and Action.* Philadelphia, PA: Lutheran Publication Society, 1917.

Gardner, E. Clinton. "Justice in the Puritan Covenantal Tradition." *Journal of Law and Religion.* 6.1 (1988). 39-60. JSTOR. Carson-Newman College Library, Jefferson City, TN. 3 Sept. 2005. <http://www.jstor.org>.

Lamont, Claire. "Introduction." Scott, Walter. *The Heart of Midlothian.* New York: Oxford, 1982.

Magnusson, Magnus. *Scotland: the Story of a Nation.* New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2000. Newman, Albert Henry. Manual of Church History; Volume II: *Modern Church History (A.D. 1517-1932).* Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society, 1931.

NIV Study Bible: New International Version. Kenneth Barker, gen. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1985.

Reid, W. Stanford. "John Knox's Theology of Political Government." *Sixteenth Century Journal.* 19.4 (1988). 529-540. JSTOR. Carson-Newman College Library, Jefferson City, TN. 3 Sept. 2005. <http://www.jstor.org>.

Rose, Ben Lacy. *T.U.L.I.P: The Five Disputed Points of Calvinism*. Franklin, TN: Providence House, 1996.

Scott, Walter. *The Heart of Midlothian.* New York: Oxford, 1982.

Starkey, A. M. "Robert Wodrow and the History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland." *Church History.* 43.4 (1974). 488-98. JSTOR. Carson-Newman College Library, Jefferson City, TN. 3 Sept. 2005. <http://www.jstor.org>.

Steele, David N. and Curtis C. Thomas. *The Five Points of Calvinism: Defined, Defended, Documented*. Ed. J. Marcellus Kirk. International Library of Philosophy and Theology: Biblical and Theological Studies. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1963.

Walker, Williston. *A History of the Christian Church*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1959.

Wendel, Francois. *Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*. Trans. Philip Mairet. Durham, NC: Labyrinth, 1986.

A Faith—and an Education —for the Journey

Melodi B. Goff

On Monday, February 27, 2006, the Carson-Newman community welcomed Dr. Nancy Ammerman as the 2006 Maston Series lecturer. In the evening presentation, entitled "Journeys of Faith," Dr. Ammerman used the imagery of adult life as a journey on which we take a backpack of things from our childhood. Would religious upbringing be among the items packed? In exploring this question, Dr. Ammerman mentioned building faith communities through telling "our stories of faith," the trend (not really new) among young people to leave the religious upbringing of home, and the "limits of rationality" contrasted with other forms of "knowledge."

In response to a question, she suggested that the role of a liberal arts college is to provide a *safe* place for students to explore different ideas including their religious beliefs (emphasis mine). As these lectures are presented to the campus community to provoke and stimulate discussion, reflection, and analysis, two of these ideas—the college as a safe, comfortable and comforting environment, and limits of reason and other forms of "knowing"—will be explored in the context of a free-church Christian liberal arts college.

There is a growing trend in American society, including academe, to place a great deal of emphasis on religious experience or "spirituality" and an as-yet-minority movement in the natural sciences to set aside the traditional scientific approach to knowledge in favor of more "open-minded," less rigorous and less verifiable positions. A brief scan of the covers of recent editions of *Time*, *Newsweek*, *The New Republic*, and *People*, a quick glance at some recent news reports in any media format, or a minimal observation of the entertainment industry's offerings will bring this movement screaming to the attention of any current social-equivalent to Rip Van Winkle.

At the same time, studies indicate that college students are becoming less focused on their studies, spending more time immersed in the social aspect of college life (especially the digital social world of Facebook, MySpace, and the like). When faced with ideas that challenge their current positions or beliefs, or which make demands of their time

that they prefer to avoid, students find overwhelming support in the digital world populated by their peers—support that encourages them to ignore the difficulties, which, after all, are created by a temporary aspect of their lives (college). Mark Bauerlein calls this, "an acute peer consciousness, a sense of themselves as a distinct group," (B7). College is seen as a step: get the grades (by whatever means necessary), get the degree (however little learning it may actually reflect), and get a real life (meaning a highly-paid job which makes no demands beyond the 9-5 workday—unless one is going to be a professional athlete, where the workday is quite different and the demands almost entirely physical).

Such comments have been frequently made in the library, not uncommonly directed to library staff, and are quite likely repeated in many other places and to many other individuals on campus. And while the students become detached and disengaged from the academic life, colleges and universities are still expected to provide them with a top-notch education—without placing any "unnecessary" pressure on students—and to provide a completely safe yet satisfying social life for students. When a student becomes depressed and attempts (successfully or not) suicide, the institutions and individual faculty members may be considered, and at the least often feel, responsible.

On the surface, all of this would seem to support Dr. Ammerman's position: colleges need to become safer, cozier, more comfortable places, encouraging students (and faculty) to develop a stronger sense of community by telling their stories and bringing out to the "real" world that which today's students find on the internet. Academic institutions, it may seem, should be more open to other forms of "knowing," to place more value on the knowledge that students have (they are experts on popular culture and all the fine functioning of any imaginable electronic gadget or personal device), and to have them learn only what potential employment-related facts can be packaged in entertaining presentations of five-second sound bytes. After all, as Bauerlein notes, "the current crop of students is the most educated and affluent ever. Their enrollment rates in college surpass those of their baby-boomer parents and Generation X, and their purchasing power is so strong that it dominates the retail and entertainment sectors. . . . Students have grown up in a society of increasing prosperity and education levels. . . ." (B7). Doesn't this suggest that students are doing quite well for themselves? What more could be asked for?

Enduring significance and value: that is what is so keenly missing in the knowledge base of this generation of students. They are remarkably competent and knowledgeable about all kinds of trivia, some of it even quite useful (how many of us over the age of forty have required assistance from our children to figure out how to program the

DVD/VCR/Cable box . . . or how to make the confounded remote for said box actually work?), but lack the patience and the motivation to learn those things which can be grasped only through reflection and critical evaluation (including, quite importantly, critical self-evaluation). In the field of history, for example, "'Thinking historically' is one of those higher-order critical-thinking skills that educators favor, but how one can achieve it without first delving into the details of another time and place is a mystery. The facts are not an end in themselves, of course, but are a starting point for deeper understanding, and the ignorance of them is a fair gauge of deeper deficiencies" (Bauerlein B8). The same is true for other fields, and students' willful ignorance only feeds their natural tendency to believe their feelings and experiences are incomprehensibly unique from anything other generations may have encountered. A diploma from a college such as Carson-Newman should indicate that the bearer, having completed preliminary and structured study, is commencing a life of liberal education which "consist[s] in studying with proper care the great books which the greatest minds have left behind, a study in which the more experienced pupils assist the less experienced pupils, including the beginners," (Strauss 3).

Many attempts have been made to reach out to today's students, with academics taking an "if we can't beat 'em, join 'em" approach. In some cases, popular culture is used as a vehicle to introduce the students to ideas, themes, and concepts that are explored with greater depth and breadth in the traditional fields of liberal arts. Unfortunately, "all too often, the outcome is that important works are dumbed down to trivia, and the leap into serious study never happens. The middle ground between adolescent life and intellectual life is disappearing, leaving professors with ever more stark options," (Bauerlein B8).

Using Dr. Ammerman's imagery of life as a journey, today's college students have their backpacks loaded with snack foods and gadgets, but nothing that will provide them sustenance or shelter on the long journey ahead. Uncomfortable though it will be, a liberal arts education must—and can only—begin when the student realizes his pack is utterly deficient and starts the slow process of evaluation and repacking.

A fair question to ask at this point is, "Should we care?" Perhaps we should simply say an "amen" to the statement Bauerlein ascribes to "a distinguished professor of literature . . .'Look, I don't care if everybody stops reading literature. . . . Yeah, it's my bread and butter, but cultures change," (B8). What is the role of an academic institution in twenty-first century America? More specifically to Carson-Newman, what is, or should be, the role of a Christian liberal arts college? Should we worry about what, beyond job skills, our students are taking with

them on their life journeys? Should we create discomfort and raise difficult questions, especially since we must ourselves always be "aware that no present set of ideas is either complete or destined to be final," (Olive, "Baptist" 61)? As has already been asked in a morning faculty workshop, "Is there anything wrong with being 'touchy-feely'?"

To be perfectly blunt, yes. There is something very wrong with a liberal arts institution, including if not especially a Christian liberal arts institution, being cozy and touchy-feely, backing away from the unpleasantness of honestly critical and therefore potentially negative evaluations of students' academic performance, application of rational thought (or complete absence thereof), and/or social conduct. There is something frighteningly wrong with a liberal education that endorses, encourages, and/or becomes indistinguishable from our popular culture. In his essay "What is Liberal Education?" Leo Strauss notes that,

> Liberal education is the counterpoison to mass culture, to its inherent tendency to produce nothing but "specialists without spirit or vision and voluptuaries without heart." Liberal education is the ladder by which we try to ascend from mass democracy to democracy as originally meant. Liberal education is the necessary endeavor to found an aristocracy within democratic mass society. Liberal education reminds those members of a mass democracy who have ears to hear, of human greatness. (5)

No genuine liberal education can be safe or comfortable—neither for the individual learners, nor for the community that together they form. Robin Thomerson quite correctly warned, "You should not expect to agree with everything you hear or read in this place. You should expect to be challenged in your own beliefs" (81). Likewise, the college as a whole must embrace "the intellectual necessity of criticism. The academy that loses its ability to be critical of itself and its most assured results has ceased to be the academy. It has ceased being education and has become indoctrination" (Olive, "Baptist" 59).

"Counterpoison," "challenge," "critical"—these are not words of ease and security. Nor is a liberal education a path to popularity, fame, or fortune—it is just as likely to lead to the opposite. Thinking clearly, seeing through the façade and shallowness of mass culture, refusing to participate in the hierarchical games of that culture and striving to liberate from the bondage of ignorance all who will join in the quest for wisdom are actions generally not appreciated by the masses seeking comfort and security, nor the powerful seeking to maintain their power and importance. Friends outside the circle of academe may become few, for a liberal education, which consists in the constant intercourse

with the greatest minds, is a training in the highest form of modesty, not to say of humility. It is at the same time a training in boldness: it demands from us the complete break with the noise, the rush, the thoughtlessness, the cheapness of the Vanity Fair of the intellectuals as well as of their enemies (Strauss 8).

Of course, it is not just the nonacademic and secular world from which true students may find themselves estranged. Consider the following word of caution from Professor Ben Sloan:

> Perhaps one of the lessons that should be taught at a church-related school is recognition that sinister forces frequently operate under the cover and protection of institutions that avow the opposite. People who maintain a façade of respectability but who misappropriate funds, misrepresent the facts, and fail to take a stand to stop irresponsible rumors (or perhaps even start rumors themselves) may be present in any position in the community. (Sloan 13)

Is it worth it? Perhaps, in light of this rather gloomy and discomforting perspective on the value of a liberal education, the trend in higher education to move away from the liberal arts is not only understandable, but also preferable? Having rattled cages, shaken self-perceptions, disturbed ease, and disrupted pre-established "absolutes," what can a Christian liberal arts college offer to compensate for all that grief?

First and foremost, and again quoting Thomerson, each truly educated individual will "know how to think for [him or her]self—to determine from [his or her] own strength of mind and heart what is true and what is false. *[He or she] will not be enslaved by what others tell [him or her] is the truth*," (81; emphasis added). Additionally, Strauss notes that "Liberal education is liberation from vulgarity," and elaborates on the Greek term for vulgarity: *apeirokalia*—lack of experience in things beautiful. Those who have a liberal education experience things beautiful (8). Finally, there is the simple pleasure of learning, of stretching ones mind and sharing in the dialogue of a learning community, and the delight in encountering well-argued but opposing views ("the community of the greatest minds is rent by discord and even by various kinds of discord," Strauss 4). Though a bit extreme if read literally, Hugo of St. Victor captures the sentiment well: "Learn everything; you will afterwards discover that nothing is superfluous; limited knowledge affords no enjoyment [*coarctata scientia jucunda non est*]" (qtd. in Willman par. 17).

A liberal education, then, will be disquieting and difficult, but the rewards are lifelong, if not wholly realized in the immediate, or even

near, future. Such an education affords the learner true freedom of the mind—the only freedom which cannot be stolen. We have seen that the liberal arts present the learning community with challenges and contradictions in all areas, as observed, and those contradictory positions force the student to be ever more careful while seeking to discern for him or herself which of the arguments is most convincing. In attempting to make those evaluations, the temptation may arise, as Ammerman indicated in her lecture, to blur the lines between rational and irrational. After all, if the great minds of recorded history cannot agree—cannot not only not agree, but also completely and utterly disagree—perhaps all positions, contradictory though they be, are equally right. Maybe they are all equally wrong. Who knows? Why should we, who make no claim to greatness of mind, discern, or try to discern? What difference will it make, any way?

On the opposite end of the spectrum, there is the conservative reaction, the urge to declare unchanging certainties, absolutes that require no evaluation, foundational principles that are as unquestionable as the sum of two and two (base ten, of course). Yielding to this urge is to abandon the path of lifelong learning in the liberal arts tradition. What remains to consider is the growing tendency in this age to abandon the distinction between reason and intuition or instinct, to accord equal standing to both for all decisions and in any evaluative process.

In "Believing Whatever," Thomas de Zengotita explores the Who-knows-and-what-does-it-matter? syndrome. The de Zengotita article should be repeated in its entirety, but copyright restrictions and space limitations here make that . . . dare I say impossible? De Zengotita recounts a number of personal anecdotes and the results of informal polls that reflect the growing trend in our culture for "open-mindedness" to be equated with being willing to believe anything and everything is equally possible. Levitation, astrology, necromancy, and alien abduction are seen as possible because, after all, nobody really knows or understands anything for sure. It is all relative; or it is all a matter of perspective, or a question of superposition (let's leave the poor cat out of this, and if we need an example, use the unobserved tree in the forest).

The completely nonunderstood and unquestioned, but wholly relied upon, wonders of technology reinforce the perception that anything is possible. Choosing not to be gullible, choosing to cling to Western scientific skepticism, has become the equivalent of being arrogant and narrow-minded. De Zengotita sees as the cause of this decidedly anti-scientific approach the position that

> . . . beliefs are essentially choices. They are expressions of our freedom, interpretations that people (and cultures) construct out of

> an otherwise indeterminate experience. Why does this view of beliefs persist among us, even as right-wing fundamentalists move to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by this ethos? . . . When George W. Bush and Bill Frist say students should hear "both sides" in the debate of intelligent design versus evolution, they have the winds of postmodernism at their backs . . . we're the ones who've been problematizing and destabilizing such categories for the last 30 years. (B13)

So, the lines have been blurred for some time—perhaps, to a greater or lesser degree, categorical distinctions have always been blurred or blurry. Certainly some categories are more easily recognized than others, and some things are more easily classified than others. However, to Ammerman's note that the majority of humans have always relied more on instinct than reason, I say, "Yes, and look where that gets us!" It is the few who have dared stand against the comfortably unthinking majority, whether by openly challenging the contemporary culture or by working quietly apart from it, who have been the nexus of progress. The current trend of overemphasizing, possibly even glorifying, the nonrational aspect of human nature, this "spirituality" that is leaking (or flooding) into everything, is a destruction of boundaries that have allowed science to do what it has done. If we detract from—worse, retreat from!—science for the sake of "spirituality," we lose rationality.

This is not to say that science and reason are the sum total of what it means to be human. We are, for better or worse, more complex creatures than that. We must bear in mind that "the greatest minds to whom we ought to listen are by no means exclusively the greatest minds of the West" (Strauss 7), and there is in the Eastern tradition a useful emphasis on holistic understanding. Nevertheless, we should not lose sight of the fact that "While the other world religions emphasized mystery and intuition, Christianity alone embraced reason and logic as the primary guides to religious truth" and so, "Encouraged by the scholastics and embodied in the great medieval universities founded by the church, faith in the power of reason infused Western culture, stimulating the pursuit of science and the evolution of democratic theory and practice" (Stark B11).

In *Religion on the Brain*, Richard Monastersky reports on one area of scientific study that has recently become interested in the subject of (or, if you will, has recently become subjected to the influential popularity of) spirituality: neuroscience. The majority of neuroscientists understand that which we refer to as "the mind" as the result of a functioning brain. In his book *The Astonishing Hypothesis: the Scientific*

Search for the Soul, Francis Crick states quite clearly and simply: "your joys and your sorrows, your memories and your ambitions, your sense of personal identity and free will, are in fact no more than the behavior of a vast assembly of nerve cells and their associated molecules" (3).

This boldly stated summary of the purely physiological concept of the mind has ruffled many religious feathers, as the Platonic concept of an immortal soul has won out, in the viewpoint of the masses, over Hippocrates' physical explanation, "Men ought to know that from nothing else but the brain come joys, delights, laughter and sports, and sorrows, griefs, despondency, and lamentations" (par. 17), and become nearly inseparable from the Christian doctrine of resurrection (which holds not that we will not know death, but that Christ will resurrect us—we will be RE-created, we will be new creations. Certainly we will each, somehow, still be ourselves, yet we will be new).

However, a small group of scientists is openly challenging that concept. Quoting Mr. Patrick McNamara, assistant professor of neurology at the Boston University School of Medicine, Monastersky writes, "'It's absurd for someone to say that consciousness is nothing but a certain set of brain-activation patterns,' . . . He [McNamara] openly wonders whether consciousness has an immaterial aspect, perhaps related to what theologians have traditionally called the soul," (A15). One has to wonder how far of a leap is it from here to ghost-hunting, séances, levitation, reincarnation, or "body-snatching"?

Openly questioning assumptions is, of course, at the heart of science. The problem here is not that the status quo of neuroscience is being rocked, but the rationale, methods, and motivation for and of the questioning. Among alarming indicators that something other than scientific inquiry is taking place are the ties between the scientists studying "spirituality" and the Intelligent Design movement. Monastersky reports on UCLA research professor of psychiatry Dr. Jeffery Schwartz, a self-described incendiary whose theories include a quantum mechanics explanation for a noncorporeal existence of consciousness. Attending a "secret conference" of the intelligent-design's movement leadership in—the coordinator of the "private meeting would not confirm that it was happening when contacted by the reporter, nor would he discuss who was attending" because the participants feared losing their jobs—Schwartz proclaimed "that his studies of the mind provide support for the idea that consciousness exists in nature, separate from human brains," (A18, inset). It should be noted that even among others interested in studying spirituality, Schwartz is seen as an extremist, and his Templeton grant proposal for studying his quantum mechanics theory was rejected because "it had to do with a lot of hocus-pocus" (Monastersky A18 inset).

Also quite disconcerting is the apparent lack of even basic logic concerning the "results" of some studies. Monastersky reports that some "research suggests frontal lobes show heightened activity during prayer and meditation, [which] indicated focuses attention" and therefore "religious experiences have a reality to the subjects. [Newberg says,] 'There is a biological correlate to them, so there is something that is physiologically happening" in the brain, (A16). Such a "finding" should have be fully anticipated—by definition, meditation and prayer are acts of focusing one's attention, and attention is a mental activity—i.e., something is happening in the brain.

That the center of focus is not physically present does not suggest that the focusing individual has somehow "gone" or "moved" somewhere—it merely demonstrates the individual's ability to concentrate in the absence of (or through the ignoring of) physical stimuli. In certain situations, when experiences have a reality to individuals that is not perceived by others, a mental illness is suspected. While I am not suggesting that religious experience is (necessarily) a mental illness, it seems that by blurring the lines between the rational and irrational, by forcing a dominating "spirituality" upon every aspect of life, we open the door to all kinds of "[w]ild fanaticism, dark superstition, and antinomian license [being] excused by appeal to the scriptures" or religious impulse/insight/revelation (Olive, "On Receiving" 16).

At this point, the questions are: "At a Christian college, shouldn't a spirituality and religious focus infuse everything and everyone? Don't we need to have a doctrine and practices to set us apart?" Being again perfectly blunt—no, to both. An academic institution that identifies with the free church movement "has no innate impulse to be religious. Indeed, much to the contrary, its sympathies lie with the free and the secular, that ultimate sectarianism that gladly embraces life free from religion," (Olive, "Baptist" 64).

As to the other question, "Christianity alone embraced reason and logic as the primary guides to religious truth. . . . Christianity was oriented to the future, while other major religions asserted the superiority of the past. At least in principle, if not always in fact, Christian doctrine could always be modified in the name of progress, as demonstrated by reason," (Stark B11). If we have any basic tenet, it is that everything is subject to review and revision, as dictated by reason and logic—including, of course, neuroscience, but not because there is a religious dogma to be defended.

Dr. Ammerman's imagery of life as a journey is so very appropriate, for "[l]iving faithfully in the Baptist academy is to understand life as a pilgrimage toward a future still outstanding, a future that never allows the adoption of the status quo in knowledge and values," (Olive,

"Baptist" 62). What, then, can we give our students to take along in their backpacks as they journey from here? First, I would suggest that the question is wrongly phrased: that which we can give the students is not so valuable as that which they can find here and choose for themselves. We can and must, if we wish to retain our integrity, provide here an atmosphere of genuine academic freedom and intellectual pursuit.

In such a setting, students can find the incorruptible freedom of thinking clearly for themselves, they can experience the beauty of great minds, and they can develop an appreciation for and expectation of cooperation within diversity. Of course, find, experience, and develop are all used here as verbs—the students who take action, who seek, struggle, and dare to dissent can leave here with an education that will prove invaluable on their life journeys. But we cannot force that education upon them. Anything we stuff into their packs that they have not themselves lifted will be a burden quickly shed.

Will our students take faith with them? Again, that is not something that we can guarantee, nor force upon anyone. Indoctrination in any religious tradition is a violation of the freedom to which we, as academics and as followers of Christ, must be unwaveringly committed. We can, through faithful living, share with them Christ's story of hope for a future we anticipate and the freedom we now have. We must also examine the contents of our own knapsacks while we go a-wandering the mountain tracks of a Christian liberal arts education, for experienced students no more need the baggage of religiosity, creedalism, and mindless compliance than do the novices. So, let us be faithful to rattle the cages of complacency and provoke rational dissent to the status quo. Set free of the triple bondage of comfortable ignorance, easy acquiescence, and unquestionable absolutes, the winner of a liberal arts education will happily take what is needed for life's journey.

Sources Cited

Ammerman, Nancy. "*Journeys of Faith." Maston Lecture.* Jefferson City, TN: Carson-Newman College, Feb. 27, 2006.

Bauerlein, Mark. "A Very Long Disengagement." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 52.18 (6 Jan. 2006): B6-B8.

Crick, Francis. *The Astonishing Hypothesis: the Scientific Search for the Soul*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.

De Zengotita, Thomas. “Believing Whatever.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 52.12 (11 Nov. 2005): B13-B14.

Hippocrates. *On the Sacred Disease*. Trans. Francis Adams. *The Internet Classics Archives*. http://classics.mit.edu/Hippocrates/sacred.html. 3 June 2006.

Monastersky, Richard. “Religion on the Brain.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 52.38 (26 May 2006): A14-A19.

Olive, Don H. “On Receiving a Love Letter from God.” *Faculty Studies* (1977): 16-19.

___. “The Practice of Baptist Higher Education.” *Carson-Newman Studies* 10.4 (2005): 59-65.

Sloan, Ben L. “Illusions.” *Faculty Studies* (1978): 8-13.

Stark, Rodney. “How Christianity (and Capitalism) Led to Science.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 52.15 (2 Dec. 2005): B11-B13.

Strauss, Leo. “What is Liberal Education?” *Liberalism: Ancient and Modern*. New York: Basic Books, 1968. 3-8.

Thomerson, Robin Bryson. “Liberal Arts Education: Strong Hearts, Strong Minds.” *Carson-Newman Studies* 10.4 (2005): 80-89.

Willman, Otto. “The Seven Liberal Arts.” *Catholic Encyclopedia.* http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01760a.htm 28 May 2006.

Roger Williams on Divine and Human Truth

Don H. Olive, Sr.

Many of the miseries of religion, active and passive, stem from the absolutist claim that devotees possess divine truth. Persecutions, inquisitions, tortures, pogroms, genocides, executions, murders, wars, slanders—all these are justified actions when one is "called of God," obeying the truth of divine command. Abraham's faith was measured out in his unhesitating willingness to sacrifice his son Isaac. On the other hand, Saul's failing in faith was seen in his disobedience to the command to utterly annihilate the Amalekites, a people who had offended Yahweh generations earlier.

Such miseries have continued into the Christian era in spite of the clear teachings of Jesus that his followers are to return good for evil, to withhold judgment, and to live with humble human truth until the consummation. The teachings of Jesus remind later followers that another way besides the way of divine truth absolutism that humanity does not possess. Human truth awaits the eschaton; and in the meantime humans, subject to error and correction, see through a glass darkly. Such an understanding is part and parcel of living by faith and not by sight. This humility of mind is as necessary to Christians, as is the humility of heart by which they conform to Christ.

This humility of mind is clearly exemplified in the thought of the great advocate of religious freedom, Roger Williams, founder of Providence and the Rhode Island Colony. Exiled by Puritans early on and beset by Quakers in later years, Williams contended mightily for human truth and against the arrogance and absolutism of those who claimed to possess divine truth. This essay will examine Williams' contentions against the heteronomous divine truth of the Augustinian tradition of the Puritans and against the autonomous divine truth of the Quakers.

Divine Truth as Outer Light

The "firebrand" of New England preached at Salem, but was often at odds with the Puritan establishment for his deep-seated commitment to freedom of conscience in matters of faith. No human agency, even the religious establishment, has divine truth. The conscience must not be coerced, for it is in the individual conscience that the truth of Christ resides, not in the Church. Williams claimed that "Christianity fell asleep in Constantine's bosom, and the laps and bosoms of those emperors professing the name of Christ. . . . The unknowing zeal of Constantine and other emperors did more hurt to Christ Jesus' crown and kingdom than the raging fury of the most bloody Neros" (Williams, *Bloudy*, 112).

John Cotton of Boston opposed Williams' position that violence against another for cause of conscience is antichrist. Cotton appealed to the authorities, concluding with citation of and recourse to the infamous change of heart had by St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, upon his adoption of the position that the Catholic Church is identified by its possession of divine truth. Catholicity requires one, divine truth. Cotton wrote:

> It is well known Augustine retracted this opinion of yours [Williams'], which in his younger times he held, but in after riper age reversed and refuted, as appears in the second book of his *Retractions*, chapter 5, and in his Epistles, 48, 50. And in his first book *Against Parmenianus*, chapter 7, he shows that if the Donatists were punished with death they were justly punished. And in his eleventh Tractate upon John, "They murder," says he, "souls, and themselves are afflicted in body. They put men to everlasting death, and yet they complain when themselves are put to suffer temporal death." [1]

---

[1]Footnote in Roger Williams, *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience*. Ed. Richard Groves. (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2001), n. 27, p. 26. "St. Augustine, Retractions," *The Fathers of the Church*, Vol. __, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1968) pp. 129ff; "St Augustine, Letters," Vol. I, *The Fathers of the Church*, Vol. __, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1951) pp. 213ff, 237ff; *Contra Epistolam Parmeniani*, lib. I, cap. 8, tom. 8x, 19; "St. Augustine, Tractates on the Gospel of John, 11-27," (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, (date?), (page?).

Williams' bold and courageous response to Augustine's endorsement of violence against the conscience of the heretic was emphatic. He appealed to the teachings of Christ, relegating Augustine and other Church Fathers who adopted violence against others in causes of conscience to the antichrist tradition. Williams charged that the Roman Catholic Church and possibly the Church of England, in claiming to possess divine truth, are Christ denying. Christians who promote violence against conscience are false Christians, and "that Antichrist is too hard for Christ at votes and numbers" (126). Roger Williams did not hesitate to contradict the broad Christian opinion and the testimony of the Fathers, as well, in denying that violence against conscience is ever justified.

Williams considered unsupportable the claim of Augustine that the Donatists "murdered souls." The Donatists, in the third and fourth centuries after Christ, held against the absolutist claims of divine truth made by the Catholic Church as codified by St. Augustine by 411 A. D. The Donatists claimed that all truth is found through human experience, so that even heretics may find truth through the experience of heresy itself. Truth is mediated through experience and comes piecemeal to the worthy and the unworthy. It never behooves believers nor is it justified to claim that truth is had once and for all.

Augustine, on the other hand, contended (and won in that contention) that divine truth is had by the Catholic Church and gives grounds for persecuting heretics, for they murder or wound the soul of the true believer, denying some aspect of divine truth as found in the Church. Williams wrote: "This rhetorical persuasion of human wisdom seems very reasonable in the eye of flesh and blood" (126). But, against this flesh and blood seeming, Williams arrayed five arguments.

First, Williams argued that according to 1 Cor. 8.9, not heretics only, but even true Christians in the exercise of their Christian liberty may be guilty of inadvertently destroying the souls for whom Christ died. In these cases of soul murder, it is absurd to contend, as did Augustine, that they all "ought to be hanged, burned, etc." (126). Williams' *reductio ad adsurdum* argument claimed that Augustine's position makes Christianity in its day-to-day exercise a religion of continual violence against all, believer and unbeliever alike. The possessor of divine truth can never cease from bloodletting.

Williams, second, pointed out the logical contradiction in the phrase "murdered souls," for a soul is taken to be eternal even by the Augustinian argument of killing the body to save the soul. According to Williams, since one cannot kill a soul, as one can a body, the argument of killing what can be killed in order to protect from murder what can-

not be murdered is incoherent. Even the Scripture notes that souls are not murdered; they are only infected or bewitched. Williams added for good measure that the Scripture notes that such souls "may again recover (1 Cor. 5; Gal. 5; 2 Tim. 2, etc.)," whereas the executed victims of violence surely do not. A permanent response to an impermanent condition is inequitable and unjust (126).

Third, Williams claimed, against Augustine's use of the state's sword to punish the heretic for soul-death or soul wounding, that violence against conscience denies Christ and his lordship over his own, the Church. The use of the sword denies that Christ's punishment of the heretic by the spiritual two-edged sword of his mouth (Rev. 1, 2) is sufficient. Williams' argument is that physical, emotional, or psychological violence against the heretic amounts to propping up a Christ who is so weak that he cannot take care of his own in either protection or punishment. Any justification of persecutory violence is true heresy.

Williams' fourth argument was based on the parable of the tares. Williams wrote: "Although no soul-killers, nor soul-grievers may be suffered in the spiritual state, or kingdom of Christ, the church; yet he has commanded that such should be suffered and permitted to be and live in the world, as I have proved on Matthew 13" (127). In the referenced passage, the parable of the tares, God instructed that the tares be left alone to grow among the wheat until the harvest, lest in pulling the tares the wheat be uprooted, as well.

Williams disputed Augustine's interpretation that, since the Church has divine truth, it is able to identify the tares at all points of the Church's existence as those who disagree with the divine truth. Upon identification they are to be destroyed. Williams' interpretation is that, since no one individual or group possesses divine truth in this life, only at the harvest, the end of the age, is absolute identification possible. Tares (heretics) are not upon human identification with human truth to suffer unchangeable consequences, for "otherwise thousands and millions of souls and bodies both must be murdered and cut off by civil combustions and bloody wars about religion" (127).

William's last argument is:

> The souls of all men in the world are either naturally dead in sin, or alive in Christ. If dead in sin, no man can kill them, no more than he can kill a dead man: nor is it a false teacher, or false religion, that can so much prevent the means of spiritual life as one of these two: either the force of a material sword, imprisoning the souls of men in a state or national religion, ministry, or worship, or, secondly, civil wars and combustions for religion's sake,

> whereby men are immediately cut off without any longer means of repentance. (127)

The use of violence to force men into or cut them out of religion is persecutory and prohibited to those who are Christ's. No justification for violence against the conscience exists.

Divine Truth as Inner Light

Williams' opposition to those who use violence in the cause of conscience was based in his denial of human possession of divine truth. His opposition to the Quakers was rooted in the same conviction. He viewed the Quakers' claim to an inner light as a claim to possess autonomous divine truth. Their emphasis upon the inner light or the direct leadership of the Holy Spirit within was lacking in spiritual and mental humility and was an affront to Williams.

In part, this affront stemmed from the scandal of nudity upon the part of some Quaker women. While the practice of public nudity was not the official position of Quakers, neither could Quaker officialdom condemn nudity against the claimed directive of the Holy Spirit to disrobe. Officially, the Quakers had no theoretical means of determining whether the claim of a directive for female nudity of "married and maidens" was true or not. In disputation with the Quakers, Williams contended that they erred in ascribing their convictions to God and acting shamelessly thereon. Nudity was but one notorious example of this grievous error.

All religious truth is human truth requiring that it be tried by reason, not mistaken for divine truth that stands above reason. Williams saw such a mistake as both dangerous and wrong. In *George Fox Digg'd Out of His Burrowes*, Williams advanced three arguments against this "demonic" claim, seeking to establish reason as the criterion by which all religious and secular conduct is to be judged.

First, Williams favorably contrasted reason to what he regarded as the coercive persuasion of sophistry and rhetoric. Reason leads humanity by means of free decisions, and therein is its morality and kinship to God, for God leads man not as a beast, but by "a reason when his understanding and judgment is satisfied . . ." (Williams, *George*, 126). To use anything other than rational judgment is to treat self and others as mere animals, only fit for "halter or bridle." Divine truth trumps reason and thus treats God's creation as merely a means to the ends had by those who claim to be the possessor of that truth.

Especially, in matters holy Williams opposed any sort of application of divine truth that impinged upon the believer's conscience. Even

judgments made about God must be mediated through reason, for otherwise the infinity of God overwhelms the finite thinkers and, conversely, destroys their ability to distinguish what is of God and what is of sin. Thus, the exercise of divinely given reason is necessary in truly knowing God and his will and in not mistaking self for either.

Williams wrote that reason "tells us, that except we suffer ourselves to be led as beasts by Satan (as the poor Quakers are) we must come to the use of means, or a mediate leading and teaching, and then what is become of these hellish fancies of only immediate teachings and inspirations?" (128). For Williams, only reason can lead one away from error. Only by the means of rationality, by means of choice freely made, does one counter the work of the Satan. Immediate, divine truth, that which denies the human truth of Christ, is in Williams' word, "hellish." It is idolatrous.

Second, Williams advanced reason as the means of human truth, the only truth, about God by making an appeal to the sinfulness and weakness of humanity. In his public disputation at Newport with the Quakers, John Stubs, John Burnet, and William Edmundson, Williams reminded them that the sinful heart of man "in them is darkness and no light" (130). Edmundson cried out, "Blasphemy, he speaks blasphemy." Williams explained, "I conceived he meant I called their immediate holy spirit which they pretend to, the arrantest juggler and cheater in the world: my heart was warm, and my tongue breaking silence . . ." (131).

Williams charged that Edmundson had mistaken him to be saying that the Holy Spirit was evil. Williams claimed that he only meant that "every man's own deceitful heart" was evil (131). Those who make truth immediate, who claim that they possess unconditioned divine truth, do not consider the flawed vessel in which that truth is contained. They forget their humanity. Only reason reminds them that they can well be mistaken, for all such vessels imperfectly apprehend truth. Thus, according to Williams, divine truth does not give one the privilege or right of speaking for God in correction or coercion of another's conscience.

For Williams, it is only reason that tells believers that they are weak and thus "if any man wants wisdom let him ask of God who gives to all men liberally and upbraids not. . . ." (127). Only by the use of reason can people move beyond knowledge to wisdom itself, for reason tells them that they need and require an asking of God. The more people know, the more disinclined they are to admit that knowledge is limited and conditioned by humanity. On the other hand, reason weighs the finite mind and finds that it is wisest when knowledge is confessed to be lacking.

The third and most developed argument for the centrality of reason in religious experience is set forth in Williams' repeated reminder to the Quakers to "try the spirits." The rational soul recognizes this scriptural admonition in three critical dimensions of religious judgment—(1) a universal "touchstone," (2) a touchstone determined by one's "own reason" or by "some testimony of unquestionable witnesses, satisfying my reason," and (3) "some heavenly inspired Scripture or writing which my reason tells me came from God" (127).

Williams did not spell out in detail what he meant by the first "universal" touchstone of truth. Seventeenth century thought, however, was filled with ideas of the universality of pure reason. The principles of noncontradiction, identity, and the excluded middle, as the conditions of thought in general, were widely considered to be necessary to thought and thus universal. It would be surprising if Williams was not referring to some such touchstone as these.

Williams claimed that the second touchstone by which the trial of putative religious knowledge is to be made comes from the rational exercise of mind. He noted that human thought alone determines this touchstone. If thinkers appeal to some more fundamental truth or revelation for validation, they fail, for these appeals are but to that which itself must be validated. For Williams, man does not possess immediate, self authenticating truth, even one single truth that is absolute, foundational, and above rational criticism.

Williams' lone alternative to one's own reason is the touchstone of "some testimony of unquestionable witnesses." (127). Of course, that such witnesses are "unquestionable" is determined only by an exercise of reason, or, as Williams put it, "satisfying my reason." Testimony is yet a human product. As such, it must be tried, even though the testimony is from the most brilliant and reliable of witnesses.

In the final analysis religious authority is limited to the author and finisher of faith. All other religious knowledge is mediate and must be seen as requiring validation. The arrogance of self validating truth is the lie of Satan and the source of all violence against conscience. The most venerable testimony must be weighed.

"Some heavenly inspired Scripture or writing which my reason tells me came from God" is the last of Williams' suggestions for the touchstone by which to try the spirits. But, even the heavenly inspired Scripture is subject to the human mind, for Williams. A confrontation with divinely inspired Scripture is no guarantee of divine truth. Even in contact with Scripture, the believer must request the gift of understanding from God and know that that understanding is but human.

Williams wrote: "It is clear that the pen-men and holy scribes of God's will unto us (in whom God did speak, and by whom he wrote

immediately and infallibly) those blessed chosen pens of his were not infallibly guided by an immediate Spirit in all that they said and did about this Scripture, as these poor dreamers [Quakers] say of themselves, and therefore must necessarily dash against the Holy Scriptures, and all holy means formerly used by the first Christians, yea and all rational means to pieces; for all that they say or do is the immediate Spirit, and Christ and God himself. . . " (128).

Williams affirmed that the "pen-men" in the hand of God miraculously wrote Scripture, immediately and infallibly. Williams, however, was also aware that people who receive infallible truth are too corrupted to possess that truth incorruptibly. Thus, he affirmed that even the writers of Scripture themselves could not speak infallibly about the miraculous writings that they wrote. Though instruments in the hand of God and vehicles for his truth, they confessed that the truth that they have to communicate is mediate. Quakers or others who claim to possess the truth will be dashed to pieces for their pretensions, for they are guilty of an overweening pride of possession that not even the apostles dared to claim.

Coming full circle, Williams' claimed need to try the spirits became the guiding intellectual light of his life. It lies close to the humility that drove Williams to the position of the freedom of conscience that he required for every rational being, for every cause of conscience. Neither state, nor government, nor Church, nor religion holds divine truth of God bare. Fundamentalism and creedalism are "hellish," not in the recognition of truth, but in their failure to recognize that all religious truth comes only after much rational effort and then is always held tentatively by corrupted and corruptible human beings. The surest truth of one's life may never be claimed to be God's truth. Such a claim is dishonest and demonic. Only God knows immediate truth; human truth is mediate truth. As such, the genuine Christian can never participate in or tolerate persecution in a cause of conscience.

Works Cited

Williams, Roger. *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience*. Classics of Religious Liberty 2. Ed. Richard Groves. Intro. Edwin Gaustad. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2001.

____. *George Fox Digg'd Out of His Burrowes*. Ed. J. Lewis Diman. Vol. V: *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams*. New York: Russell & Russell, Inc. 1963.

Flavors, Clashes, and Saying What Is Right about God

Doug Renalds

None of us knows how God acts or does not act in this world. That's why people sometimes disagree on matters of religion. Years ago I drove my mother to a fabric store in downtown Staunton, Virginia. We circled the crowded lot for a parking space. Third time around, a car backed out directly in front of Mom's fabric store. "The Lord was looking out for us," she remarked.

I wasn't so sure. "What about the first couple times around the lot?" With a shake of her gray hair and crinkle of her nose, the discussion was over. "God has His perfect timing."

But Mom didn't *know*. And though I disagreed with her, I didn't *know*. None of us does. We each have our varying interpretations of who God is and what God does. We might boldly proclaim what we believe to be true (we might be completely convinced), but none of us truly knows.

Sometimes folks get frustrated here because they feel the campus offers too many questions and not enough proclamations. "We know the truth! Let's proclaim it!" I understand that frustration. I wish it were that easy. But Christianity itself, as you have no doubt discovered by this point in your college career, offers many different flavors, interpretations, styles, and emphases.

My dad once shared an office with a woman who could travel to work by one of two equidistant routes: the interstate or the back roads. Daily she agonized, "Which way does God want me to go today?"

Dad was never torn up over questions like that, and yet I would consider him the most honest and faithful man I've ever known. That's what I mean by flavors. Here's another: the End Times. Did the household in which you grew up feature frequent conversations about the Rapture and 666? Many Christian households rarely discuss it, but plenty of you can find a Bible at your house with Daniel and Ezekiel tattered from intense use.

One final flavor and I'll move on. As a student myself here years ago, I took part in a hall prayer group with my friend Billy whose father was dying of cancer. One night Billy left the prayer group seething in

anger. A guy had detailed God's miraculous healing of a college van during a recent mission trip. "On I-75 across Jellico Mountain the van broke down. We all held hands and prayed . . ." Later that night Billy put his anger into words. "I pray my guts out for my father for eighteen months and get nothing . . . and you expect me to believe that God heals a *van*!"

With so many flavors of faith, it's difficult to identify broad connecting themes upon which we can all agree. Yet one common theme emerged from a class I taught a few years ago. "Picture yourself on a park bench," I said to the students, "and the Deity sits down beside you, offering to answer any question you have (even the most unsolvable mystery) in language which you could comprehend. One Great Question solved, free of charge. What question would you ask?" I was expecting something theologically speculative, such as the nature of scripture, why we suffer, or an insightful peek into the afterlife. But one student simply wrote, "Are You proud of me?"

Isn't that what most of us seek? We want to make God proud of us. Breezy liberals, decided fundamentalists, all of us do what we do because we're convinced it makes God proud of us. We arrive at different conclusions on how to worship, what to believe, and how to behave. Inconceivable as it might seem, five years ago this same motive compelled people to fly airplanes full of innocent people into buildings full of innocent people. Our many flavors of faith (and our disagreements over religion) boil down to our differing visions of what pleases God, or how to make God proud of us.

My Own Flavor: Learning from Eliphaz

My own faith flavor is best expressed near the conclusion of the book of Job. The Cliff Notes version of Job goes something like this. Job is good, enjoying a life of blessedness. But then he loses his possessions and children and suffers to such a degree that his wife suggests he curse God and die. Job says no. His friends (led by Eliphaz) counsel Job to confess his sin, but Job denies he's done anything wrong and maintains he has only worshipped God. While he doesn't curse God, Job does begin to question God. God's mighty response from the whirlwind provides us this human/deity exchange:

God: Were you around when I created the world?
Job: No.
God: All right then.
Job: (*Gulp!*).

Next, God verbally blasts Job's friends, and upon these words will I focus, italicizing for emphasis. "After the Lord had spoken these words to Job, the Lord said to Eliphaz the Temanite: 'My wrath is kindled against you and against your two friends, *for you have not spoken of Me what is right*, as your friend Job has.'" (Job 42:7)

First, let me come to the defense of Eliphaz. He was merely articulating the popular religion of his day. According to the religion of his day, it was not possible for a good man to be cursed. The Deuteronomic code (the written word for that day's faithful people of God) states it plainly. "If you obey God, you will be blessed; if you disobey God, you will be cursed." It's a clear formula. Job was suffering, so God must have cursed him for doing evil. It was right there in Eliphaz's version of the Bible. It must have been so.

And yet from the whirlwind, God said it wasn't so. ". . . *You have not spoken of me what is right. . . .*" Imagine his shock when Eliphaz heard these words. How could he be the one who wound up in trouble? He had quoted scripture. He had boldly spoken the truth. He had taken a stand for God. He had been faithful to the popular religion of his day. God had to be proud of him for that! Right? Imagine his shock as Eliphaz began to face the possibility that the religious formula he had faithfully followed all his life was not broad enough to encompass God.

We would do well to compare the plight of Eliphaz to our present context. I've heard contemporary Christians confidently proclaim "God caused the tsunami!" or "Katrina was God's punishment upon New Orleans." I've also heard God hates homosexuals . . . Muslims . . . or those who don't vote republican. But do we really know that? We don't even know if a good God provides us a parking space. How can we be so confident that God sends misery or perform acts that, if humans did them, would be considered evil? If you or I caused a tsunami, we would rightly stand accused of committing an act of colossal evil. I cannot imagine God getting behind such a project. It is possible, I suppose, for God to disobey God's own laws. But if that's the case, then let's pack up our logic, fold the tents on sense, and move to the land of absurdity.

I refuse to believe that God orchestrates evil. I will not speak of God in such a way, lest I commit the sin of Eliphaz. It took me almost four decades of life before I could articulate one of the primary flavors of my faith. Here goes. "As the source of all love, God is more big-hearted than I am. I will not believe anything—no matter who said it or where it is written—which makes God out to be more small-hearted than I am."

A Bighearted God

By bighearted, I believe that God desires to include, not exclude. I believe that love is God's essence, spirit, and lifeblood. Love is God's action, movement, chore, path, daily project, and comprehensive direction. Love is who God is and what God does. Love is God's noun and verb. Our job is to tap into it, absorbing it and passing it. And while love might sound like a cushy stroll through the softer side of Sears, we know that love equals pain and God is necessarily a sufferer.

At this point, I'm guessing that half of you receive these words as obvious. God is love; where's the news in that? And the other half of you is thinking, "Love is good, yes. I'm pro-love. And you actually had me until you mentioned the queers and the Muslims. . . ."

But, what about full and total love? What if we opened ourselves to the possibility of fully opening ourselves? Why can't love (full-tilt, all-out love) be our message? What if, instead of "Boycott Disney!" or "Women in Subjection!" we proposed this year to "Love Everyone?" Would that be taking a stand for God? Or must taking a stand for God always involve some limited form of love? "We'll love them, but . . ." Such a stand clearly articulates what we will *not* do.

It is time to break out the rib-spreaders and let our hearts grow big. It is time (it has always been time) for limitless love, for a message that clearly says, "Here is what I *will* do. I will love you." That's my stand for God.

A bighearted God is a God of mature, robust love. Personally, I think this point is quite obvious, until I look at what passes for popular religion, including the annual Santa Claus vs. Baby Jesus debates. This November, a friend tried to convince me how despondent God is over Christ being left out of Christmas. "How would *you* feel if it was *your* birthday, and everyone brought presents to *your* party, but no one mentioned or acknowledged *you*." Placed in such a position, I'll admit I might be bitter. But I sometimes exhibit the emotions of a middle schooler, and I need to lean upon a God who doesn't. I would suspect that the Source of All Love in the Universe might respond in a less adolescent way than me.

And as for me, I think the best way I can celebrate Christmas is to *celebrate Christmas*, not moan about everyone else who's not getting it. A God of robust love is worthy of our worship, whereas the God promoted in much of today's popular religion (peevish, juvenile, arbitrary, vindictive, punishing with hurricanes and tidal waves) is not worthy of our worship. Instead of a loving heavenly Father, God is thus depicted as a child abuser. I mean honestly. I can do a better job of parenting than that. Even I know not to drown my own children. Am I a

better parent than God? Of course not. Such a God we could not tolerate, let alone adore. But God is a perfect parent, fully worthy of our honest worship.

The Popular Religion of Our Day:
Three Quick Questions

By not questioning the popular religion of his time, Eliphaz spoke that which was incorrect about God. Briefly, let's look at our own popular religion's treatment of three contemporary issues.

First, the gay question. I don't claim to know the answer on this one. We can certainly find scriptural references that condemn homosexuality. However, before we confidently condemn gay people, let's remember that Eliphaz boldly "spoke the truth" from his own scripture (which became our scripture), and God chastised him for it.

Let's be careful not to speak what is incorrect of God. Does God reach out to the persecuted? The underdog? The fearful? The confused? The oppressed? These are apt descriptions of someone "in the closet," tormented inwardly and outwardly. The world is already full of Christians who will pile on abuse and condemnation. You will not find me among them, lest I follow the path of Eliphaz.

Second, the "Christian Worldview" question. From time to time I hear students suggest that the College should offer a uniform approach, clearly proclaiming the "One Truth" of Christianity.

We all wish it were that easy. "Give me that old time religion!" we long to bellow, "It's good enough for me!" Yet even if we wiped away the newfangled religion of our moderates, we would still find the old time religion splintered in disagreement. Earnest conservatives clash over key issues such as how God works in this world (Calvinism vs. free will). We clash over questions of The Holy Spirit's movement in worship. We clash over whether following Jesus means actually living the life of peacekeeping and pacifism that Jesus exhibited on earth.

These sorts of clashes and flavors have been around for at least twenty centuries, from the very inception of Christianity on earth. I often hear the passionate call for us to return to "the New Testament church." But let's face it, those folks fought like cats and dogs. Does the book of Acts read like theological harmony to you? Do the epistles of Paul and Peter? Friends, we *are* a New Testament church, still sorting out what we believe.

The cherished Baptist notions of Soul Liberty and Priesthood of the Believer were born out of European bloodshed over religious issues, and also out of the realization that opposing parties rested their arguments upon solid foundations. People on opposite sides each had

good reasons for disagreeing. We still do, which is why I can thoroughly respect someone with whom I thoroughly disagree. Clashes and flavors mark the history of Christianity, and if we are to speak sensibly about our own faith, we must candidly identify our own flavors.

I am amazed at speakers who confidently set forth the "Christian Worldview" or "Biblical Worldview" on practical issues such as finances, daycare, gender roles, and dating (even though Biblical marriages were arranged, taking place prior to the emergence of modern romantic courtship). Is it really that clear and easy to identify a Biblical Worldview? The Bible was not written like a rulebook or encyclopedia, even though that's what we often ask of it today. Certainly it contains rules, as in the Ten Commandments. But most of scripture is written as testimony (the gospel *according to* John, *according to* Matthew, etc.).

Doctrinal beliefs have been left up to us to hash out, usually through prolonged tension. Christianity was over 400 years old, for instance, before it sorted out the doctrine of the Trinity. Just as foggy are many areas of ethics (rules for behavior). Can we come to instant agreement on the Bible's position on slavery, consumption of alcohol, war, masturbation, economic systems, abortion, or drug use? We cannot return to the old days of "One Christian Truth" because those days never existed. Christianity was born in a world of conflicting ideas, a world that has grown no simpler in the last twenty centuries.

Question three: "Does God have a unique plan for your life?" In today's version of evangelical Christianity, this is a given, not a question. Still, consider for a moment the possibility that God does not have a unique plan for your life. Instead, God might have the same general plan for all our lives. We are to honor, love, and obey God. That's God's plan for our lives. As the book of Micah suggests, we are to "do justice, love kindness, and walk humbly with your God." Am I saying that God has no opinion on whether you become a nurse, marry Charles, or go with the twenty-year mortgage instead of the thirty? I don't know. How can I know? I'm merely asking you to regard the possibility.

In 1990, I considered buying a house. I phoned my dad, whose illness prevented him from traveling the six hours to see the house. "Dad," I said, "I've been praying about this, wondering if it's the right thing to do." My father's response changed my entire view. "Sometimes there isn't *a right thing* to do," he said, "but there are degrees of wisdom." How liberating it was to view the question from that framework. God isn't up there leading me to one particular house. My job isn't to read God's mind, but instead to make sound decisions based upon the wisdom and resources God has given me.

How liberating! How sane! Because honestly, can God be complimented by being placed in such a role? Imagine a father in a movie who insists his daughter become a lawyer and also demands that she marry Gerald Poindexter. Such a father would serve as the film's bad guy. We would rightly despise him. But at least he is *clear* about it. How much more despicable if he hid those demands behind the clouds, stringing her along, revealing just enough info to keep her dependent! A good parent does not seek that sort of dependence, but instead delights in the daughter's strength, industry, creativity, enjoyment, and production. Yet today's popular religion portrays God as concealing a specific "will for our lives," leading but not telling, playing hide-n-seek with our destinies. Am I the only one who thinks this is a warped view of God?

Perhaps I'm making too much out of this. What harm comes from believing that God has it all planned out, and that my job is to discern and walk in that plan? First, our prayers bog down in the self-centered task of discerning God's will for our lives. Second, we insult God by believing God is the manipulative bad parent in a movie. Third, the rest of us would be better served if our "search" time turned to "action" time. How many opportunities have swept by while we surveyed the skies and listened for That Voice? Engage the world. Where do your talents lie? What do you enjoy? What do you *want* to do? You are allowed to *want* to do something! Don't temper it with your superstitious qualifications ("If it's God's will . . .")! Are you talented in biology? Get out there and cure cancer! Stop wandering, muttering, "God hasn't made it clear what I should do with my life." God's not to blame.

Finally, the notion of God having a specific plan for our lives seems to me to be a modern fabrication, emerging only within a prosperous nation like our own. What is God's unique plan for a starving Ethiopian child? It's for that child to live, right? Basic needs, the bottom floor on Maslow's hierarchy. Yet we wrap ourselves in the tortured pursuit of our own life options, and flatter ourselves by attaching God's name to the process. "I just don't know what God wants me to do!"

For starters, perhaps God wants us to think of ourselves less often. In a speech this year at the national prayer breakfast, pop singer Bono claimed that "the poor" are mentioned 2100 times in Christian scripture. That number might be inflated (2100 nods in sixty-six books seems a little hard to believe), but how many times does scripture mention God having a plan for our lives? Once, maybe, wedged in the book of Jeremiah? And even there, the "plan" referred not to an individual, but the Hebrew people as a group. Nowhere do we have record of Jesus instructing us to figure out God's plan for our lives.

The notion of God having a unique plan for our lives is so deeply ingrained in the popular religion of our day that I honestly don't expect these words to budge you from that belief. But the next time you start to take the easy way out by saying, "God's telling me to break up with you," take a deep breath and say, "I'm breaking up with you." Similarly, try replacing "I feel led to" with "I *want* to . . ."

The three questions I've asked tonight obviously lead to other questions. For some of you, that's frustrating. You'd much rather that I give you something to believe in than ask about. "If you feared God," someone once told me, "you wouldn't ask so many questions." But that's not true. I ask these questions because I do fear God and want to honor God. The example of Eliphaz—plowing ahead indiscriminately, proclaiming "truths" which make God out to be more small-hearted than most of us are, or a worse parent than we are—teaches me to question popular religion, so that I might better honor God and say of God that which is right.

Of course my version of "right" may differ from yours or from that of a great many other earnest Christians. None of us knows how God acts or does not act in this world. We all have our flavors. My own hope rests in a bighearted God, not the God delivered to me by the masses. And inwardly, I certainly have questioned this position just as much as I have questioned popular religion. Upon what rational foundation do I stand? Is my belief in a bighearted God merely a *preference* for a bighearted God? I certainly don't think so. My *preference* is for a softhearted God who gives away free cars and long vacations. My *belief* is in a bighearted God, whom I can fully worship with my mind, heart, soul, and strength and about whom I can hopefully speak what is right.

The Liberal Arts

[2006 Liberal Arts Emphasis Week Address]

Joe Bill Sloan

Several years ago in times prior to the various *CSI* and *Law and Order* television series that are now available, the most popular TV crime show was a half hour drama called *Dragnet*. Every week Sgt. Joe Friday and his detective sidekick would arrive at the scene of a crime and begin their investigation. The actual crime was never shown to the audience and often the victim survived and would be available to provide information to the detectives. An excited victim or witness would begin talking very rapidly and giving a thorough account of the event only to be interrupted by Sgt. Friday who with his flat, impassive, deadpan style would admonish the person to provide "only the facts, please, just the facts."

Stating just the bare facts about a sometimes complex event might have been sufficient to help Sgt. Friday solve a crime every week in less than half an hour, but the "just the facts" approach does not work in education. Nevertheless, the "just the facts" methodology has invaded the American educational system. More and more of America's teachers are being forced to subscribe to a pedagogy that stresses memorization of facts, rote memory, rather than a learning process that enables students to develop critical reasoning and analytical skills. President Bush's No Child Left Behind Program is just the most recent example of a program that induces many teachers to teach to the standardized test and omit or dilute material that encourages the development of thinking skills.

And now that "just the facts" model is knocking at the doors of America's colleges and universities. Last year the U. S. Secretary of Education, Margaret Spellings, appointed an eighteen member Commission on the Future of Higher Education to determine if standardized testing should be expanded into colleges and universities as a means of proving that students are learning and to bring more accountability to higher education.

The reaction to this development has been mixed to say the least. The President of one of the nation's finest undergraduate liberal arts

colleges, Bard College in Maine, Leon Botstein, has warned "to subject colleges to uniform standards is to trivialize what goes on in higher education. Excellence comes in many unusual ways. You cannot apply the rules of high stakes testing in high schools to universities." Is Botstein's reaction just so much posturing?

After all, those of us who teach on the college level are often very resistant to change and we really don't like outsiders, especially the federal government, second-guessing what we do. But the real risk may be what Carson-Newman Sociology Professor Ray Dalton calls the McUniversity syndrome, that is, the McDonalding, the fast food approach to a college education. So, what is it that we do at a liberal arts college? What is it that makes the liberal arts tradition so important to a college like Carson-Newman?

When I enrolled as a freshman at Carson-Newman College a few years ago, I had no real idea what my major was going to be. My father had been a mathematics professor here for many years, and I seemed to have an aptitude for math; so, I enrolled in the freshman class that all math majors were expected to take. I did okay, so the next step was to take calculus. Well, instead of me taking calculus, calculus took me. I hated it! The tedium, the formulas, the mind-numbing problems, none of it made any sense to me. I asked myself, how could my father have spent almost thirty years of his life teaching this stuff? I eventually majored in Political Science but only after "wasting" fifteen academic hours taking math courses that I was convinced I would never use.

A few years later I was in graduate school and a part of the course requirement in my program included courses in Statistics and Research. I was in these classes with students who I knew from other classes I had taken. I knew they were bright and knew a lot about Constitutional Law, International Politics, and Political Theory. In fact, believe it or not, some of them were better students than I was. Virtually all of them, however, were struggling in Statistics and Research Design, while it seemed so easy to me.

How was it that out of a group of twenty people I was mastering the material so easily by comparison? I finally realized it was that math that I had wasted so much time taking as an undergraduate at Carson-Newman. The discipline required in those math classes was making the path of study for that graduate class so much easier for me than what many of my highly intelligent classmates were experiencing.

Now, this is perhaps a rather negative way to exalt the virtues of a liberal arts curriculum of which mathematics has always been a part, along with literature, history, philosophy, music, science, and many other academic disciplines. What does the liberal arts tradition mean? What is it that liberal arts colleges claim to provide?

Wabash College in Indiana has a Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts where efforts are ongoing to assess the content and impact of a liberal arts experience. By the way, two of our fine Carson-Newman professors are Wabash graduates—Dr. Jerry Wood in English and Dr. Mike Seale in Physics. At Wabash the focus is on such matters as critical thinking, scientific reasoning, writing and reading skills, openness to diversity/challenge, learning for self-understanding, and the development of a sense of responsibility.

Carson-Newman Religion professor, Carolyn Blevins, with whom I have team-taught an Honors course for twenty-six years describes liberal arts as

> stimulating the student to be exposed to ideas that stretch them as well as ideas with which they disagree. It is a search for meaning and personal values, and it leads them to know about and respect those with whom they disagree. Horizons are expanded and lifelong curiosity about ideas, society, and faith is developed.

Carson-Newman Philosophy Professor Brian Austin emphasizes that the liberal arts curriculum helps students "develop the tools for distinguishing between an idea that might really feed them and an idea that will make them feel good for only a moment." In other words, the tools for real growth, happiness, and strong convictions about issues are created and reinforced.

There are facts to be learned, even memorized, in any liberal arts curriculum, as there must be a foundation of knowledge before complicated issues can be studied and understood. But all too often, **only** facts are learned and important questions are never asked. So often the only question that seems to be on the mind of an American college student is, "is this going to be on the test?" Perhaps, that is because early educational experiences have created a mindset that certain kinds of questions are to be asked and certain kinds are **not** to be asked.

Students have been discouraged from using their imaginations and probing their own curiosities and ways of thinking. A liberal arts college should be a hotbed of discussion and open-ended intellectual inquiry about all aspects of life, ethics, morality, tolerance, and how we are to live together in an increasingly complex and violent world and still hold on to our humanity.

In recent years, many traditional liberal arts colleges have seen their core curriculum squeezed out by the expansion of professional programs such as business, engineering, and nursing. At Carson-Newman, the divisions or departments with the most rapidly increasing numbers of majors are Business, Education, and Nursing. At some col-

leges, these kinds of programs have diluted the influence of the liberal arts. That is not true here.

Along with the rigorous science and clinical classes required in Nursing at Carson-Newman are courses in areas such as ethics. The Business curriculum includes classes in ethics, statistics, and oral and written communication skills. The Education program here focuses on all areas of the liberal arts, especially language arts. No matter what your major is at Carson-Newman, liberal arts are at its core.

Christian liberal arts colleges, however, face other challenges to the endurance of their liberal arts roots and the value of open-ended intellectual inquiry. Given the complex issues that permeate society these days and beg for study and analysis in college classrooms, how does a college remain true to liberal arts **and** true to its Christian identity? It is a challenge that all face now.

For some people in Christian life, the term **liberal** arts is threatening. The word liberal is to suggest freedom to think, freedom to discover. It has nothing to do with the divisive arguments between liberals and conservatives in the political and religious arenas. But some in those arenas are threatened by the idea that students should be free to think.

Archbishop Michael Miller, who is the secretary of the Vatican's Congregation for Catholic Education, warned in an address at the University of the Notre Dame last year that "Catholic colleges must be identifiably Catholic or face the possibility of evangelical pruning by the Vatican." Miller noted that the church might not spend its money to preserve those Catholic universities "if their Catholic identity has been compromised." Miller predicted a "purification" of the curriculum of these schools. In simpler terms, he means that the study of issues about which the church has strict theological positions would be stifled and cease to occur at Catholic colleges.

In Protestant higher education, some colleges with Christian roots have moved from their church-related tradition to preserve their autonomy, while others have succumbed to the restrictions that their church has required and limited the free flow of inquiry. Still others have been created for the express purpose of instilling in their students absolute dogmas about issues that have no place for debate or discussion. The real risk of this denominational control is that students will not be encouraged and taught **how** to think; instead, they will be instructed as to **what** to think to the exclusion of any other way of thinking.

Carson-Newman strives to hold fast to the liberal arts tradition and our Christian Baptist heritage. Christian liberal arts colleges, such as ours, must encourage and promote open inquiry that understands that no honest questions are out of bounds. Indeed, questions are the center-

piece of the Socratic method of teaching and learning. As Dr. Don Olive, Dean of the Humanities Division, reminded us in an essay he published last year, "truth always remains before us, tentatively teased out in the dialogue between thinkers." Those thinkers are not confined to teachers. The dialog he describes is between teachers **and** students and the penetrating questions come from both. Olive continues by emphasizing that thinkers understand that no current "set of ideas is either complete or destined to be final." The kind of learning that is inculcated in liberal arts is open to change and continues throughout one's life.

And yet there are those in Christian higher education that take the fundamentalist view that the educational goal of Christian liberal arts is to promote a so-called Christian worldview. That view compels the acceptance of an absolute creed; it closes the door to questions of any sort. Now, please do not misunderstand me. In matters of belief, morals, and ethics there are going to be and should be some personal absolutes that we as individuals should strive to achieve.

Our religion, our Christianity is devoutly held and lived by us as individuals. ***And it is not religion per se that is the threat to Christian liberal arts; it is fundamentalism.*** As America's premier sociologist of religion, Robert Bellah, said in a recent interview, "Fundamentalism in American education is an attempt to bring us full circle eighty years later to the days of the Scopes trial." He continued, "Fundamentalism doesn't pull you into society. It makes you part of a group that feels abused and alienated from society. It doesn't contribute to the civic network that a vital democracy needs." Nor does it contribute to the vitality of a true educational experience.

However, fundamentalism is not the only threat to a true liberal arts education. As Dr. Clark Measels, Dean of the Fine Arts Division, commented to me recently, we live in a world of extremes, caught between "the extremes of spiritualism and fanatical rationalism. A liberal arts institution like Carson-Newman attempts to help students understand multiple positions" on issues. People can become the captives of religious dogmatism, but also there is the danger of the opposite of extreme of rationalism devoid of faith.

In October of 2004, I had the opportunity to deliver the college's annual Founders Day Address. I would like to conclude this discussion about Christian liberal arts with some variation of the comments I made then.

When you are a student in a religion class at Carson-Newman College, you should be inspired to assess, reassess, and reassess again how you read and understand scripture. You should study a variety of theological perspectives and be knowledgeable about other faiths. That is a Christian liberal arts education.

When you are a student in a science class at Carson-Newman College, you will be invigorated by the studies of **scientific** theories about the tens of thousands of years within which the earth that we inhabit has developed. That is a liberal arts education in the best Christian tradition.

When you are a student in a philosophy, history, political science, psychology, and sociology class at Carson-Newman College, you will be challenged to acquire an understanding of differences between loyalty and devotion to country and its values as compared to blind loyalty to government and other social institutions regardless of their policies and actions. That kind of critical thinking is the cornerstone of Christian liberal arts.

Regardless of the field study—music, literature, art, business, health care, the preparation of teachers—for students to have experienced a robust exposure to all competing theories within the disciplines is the mission of a Christian liberal arts education.

John Stuart Mill used a simple metaphor to illustrate the fragility of maintaining openness in one's educational experience, the struggle of the "tender plant." Mill said, "The liberating arts, led by humble Christian seekers for truth, provide powerful nourishment for that tender plant." To borrow from Mill's best-known metaphor, education should embrace a "marketplace of ideas."

Often we experience our greatest growth as students when we are forced to confront our preconceived opinions about issues. We do not live in a world of certainty, but rather ours is a gray world and a complex world. Critical thinking, openness to new ideas and solutions to problems, and understanding of the ambiguities of life are strengths of character, not character flaws. And a mere surface tolerance for others different than we are is not enough; a genuine Christian liberals arts education produces not just a tolerant person but also an individual who accepts and embraces diversity and approaches problems with the **attitude** and the skills that are needed to live productively in the complicated day and age.

At Carson-Newman College our mission statement is vintage Christian liberal arts: open intellectual inquiry and the development of spiritual maturity. That is our uniqueness. When you graduate you will have a major and/or minor along with a liberal arts general education curriculum that will have exposed you to a wide range of academic disciplines, and a variety of ideas and viewpoints. And you will have had the opportunity to acquire the skills to be a life-long learner and adapt to a world that will be undergoing constant change and challenges.

What Do Children Need To Do Well?

Sharon T. Teets

Scan through a few months of any popular news or women's magazine for the last ten years, and there will certainly be articles that attempt to tell parents and teachers how to maximize cognitive development in the early childhood years. Recent advances in technology have allowed scientists to understand how brain development occurs, and in a typically American fashion, products have been designed and marketed, supposedly based on this research, to help stimulate brain development. Parents who are not already having their children listen to Mozart or watch Baby Einstein videos are encouraged to question whether or not they may be limiting their children's potential for cognitive development.

It is within this context that the Salzburg Seminar on Early Childhood Development focused on brain development in early childhood, asking the essential question: What do children need to do well? Twenty-nine countries were represented in the fifty-nine participants, some of whom were educators, pediatricians, employees of nongovernmental organizations, researchers, and public policy advocates. Many of the participants represented developing countries. So, it is not surprising that there were vast differences in opinion about what it takes to have children "do well."

Armed with the information about the differences in school readiness and academic achievement of children from low-income African-American, Hispanic, and Native American families, as compared to those from middle and upper income white families (Achievement in America), some representatives from the United States were convinced that preschool programs need to be made universally available with an emphasis upon school readiness skills. On the other hand, some representatives from the U. S., deeply committed to the notion of developmentally appropriate practice (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997), are convinced that the current emphasis upon standardized testing and the much more academic orientation in preschool and kindergarten classrooms is ultimately short-sighted and can create serious learning and motivational problems later on in the child's schooling experience.

Representatives from the United States are familiar with the depressing statistics about poverty and early childhood in the United States, and many question the commitment of the society to the future of its children (Condition of Education 2006). As reported in the Children's Defense Fund's State of America's Children 2005, one fourth of all young children live in families in which the income is less than $25,000 per year. After having seen a decrease in the number of children living in poverty during the decade of the 1990s, the numbers living in poverty have increased significantly in the last five years. Of particular concern is the number of children who are living in what is known as extreme poverty, an income of $7,610 for a family of three.

Contrary to popular stereotypes about families in poverty, the 70% of children in poverty are living in homes where at least one family member is employed. The income of a two-parent family being paid minimum wage is only $21,400. The consequences of inequalities in educational opportunities for the poor have been eloquently described by Jonathan Kozol in a series of best-selling books (1991, 1995, 2005), and The Education Trust presents achievement test data that shows that achievement gaps typically increase from the time of school entrance throughout the school years, rather than decrease as a result of educational experiences (Achievement in America).

Concerns of those from the United States seemed to pale, however, when a UNICEF representative presented the following information (Engle, 2005):

- Of 100 children born in 2005, ninety-five are born in developing countries.
- In developing countries, eight children will die before the age of five.
- Thirty-one children will be underweight (at a time when childhood obesity is becoming one of the greatest health problems in the U. S., as documented in Childhood Obesity).
- Ten children in developing countries will have some sort of disability or delay, and eleven children out of the ninety-five will repeat first grade.
- Thirty-five children out of the ninety-five will attend a preprimary school

The statistic on pre-primary school attendance seems relatively high compared to those who live in the United States, and especially in Tennessee, a state that has just experienced its first year of lottery-funded four-year-old programs for "at risk" children. Head Start, the only nationally funded, comprehensive education program for children

from low-income families, has generally served only 50% of the preschool children who are eligible for participation and only 3% of the infants and toddlers that were eligible for participation (Head Start Basics 2005). However, even though the participants in the Salzburg Seminar were well-informed about many statistics prior to coming to the seminar, the statistics were especially sobering when offered in person by Sheila Sisulu, Deputy Executive Director of the United Nations World Food Programme and former ambassador to the United States from South Africa: "Today 18,000 children will die. They will die in places like Bangladesh, Malawi, Guatemala, and Afghanistan. They will not grow up to become the teachers, farmers, doctors, or artists they could have been.

Their deaths have several things in common: their parents were poor and hungry; they were born malnourished, and the hunger that has marked generations of their families will claim their lives. Outside their family and community, no one is likely to notice their parting. They will not be seen on CNN or the BBC or ZDF. Tomorrow, another 18,000 children will die . . ." (Sisulu, 2005, p. 1). For the participants, who attended meetings in a castle in which sumptuous buffets were served for breakfast, lunch, and dinner, the numbers ticked away . . . 18,000 times eight days . . . 144,000 deaths of children just in the amount of time the participants had been discussing the issues surrounding the question, "What do children need to do well?"

Throughout the Salzburg Seminar discussions, various documents, statistics and positions were reviewed about what is known about what children need to "do well." With the glaring numbers of deaths of children, calling for the basic nutritional needs of children to be met, which includes access to micronutrients, such as iodine, that can prevent stunting, illnesses, and deaths, seemed obvious, although more difficult to achieve than to advocate (Sisulu, 2005). Other issues that are hampering children's ability to "do well" were discussed. Presentations focused on the adultification of children, with attention being given to the large number of child-headed households in developing countries where parents have been lost to AIDS and other illnesses (Richter, 2005), as well as the growing phenomenon of adultification of children in the United States (not to be confused with the Hurried Child Syndrome identified by David Elkind).

"Adultified" children in the United States are defined as those who are "prematurely exposed to adult knowledge and assume adult roles and responsibilities, primarily in their own need-based families" (Burton, 2005, p. 1.). Barbarin (2005) identified the lack of involvement as fathers as problematic in African-American families as well as families in developing countries. In short, at some points, the concerns about the

welfare of children seemed overwhelming--the quest for an answer to "What do children need to do well?" that could transcend cultures seemed to be hopeless.

In the search for common ground, The Convention of the Rights of the Child document was reviewed as a possible framework for formulating a cross-cultural policy statement on what children need to "do well." Among other things, the document advocates the following for all children:

1. The right to survival and development;
2. Education to develop the child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential;
3. The right to play;
4. The right to shared parenting;
5. Child care for working parents; and
6. Assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views, given weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child. (United Nations Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights)

Embarrassingly, the United States is one of the very few countries in the world that has not endorsed these very basic rights of the child.

Still another proposal for common use was based on extensive research in South Africa and other cultures. Rather than focus on specific needs, such as that of micronutrients, Linda Richter (2005) used Urie Bronfenbrenner's theory of human ecology to propose that three basic needs must be met to ensure that children "do well."

- At the family level, every child needs a consistent and responsive caregiver;
- At the community level, the caregiver and child must be part of a close social network that provides social and economic support; and
- At the community, state, and/or national levels, the child and caregiver must be part of a larger social network or institution that provides a sense of belonging.

By far, the most in-depth information that guided seminar participants was the summary of recent research on brain development and early childhood development published in *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development* by the National Research Council, Institute of Medicine (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). To illustrate the extent of research on early childhood discussed in the

text, chapter titles are listed: Rethinking Nature and Nurture, The Challenge of Studying Culture, Making Causal Connections, Acquiring Self-Regulation, Communicating and Learning, Making Friends and Getting Along with Peers, The Developing Brain, Nurturing Relationships, Family Resources, Growing up in Child Care, Neighborhood and Community, and Promoting Healthy Development Through Intervention. The title of the book, *From Neurons to Neighborhoods*, reflects the over-arching focus on the centrality of brain development, but the chapter titles provide the hint that all aspects of development, including social and emotional development, are also of critical importance to brain development. Some of the "facts" of brain development are that:

- During prenatal development, brain cells develop at the astounding rate of more than 250,000 per minute.
- By the 20th week of fetal life, billions of neurons, which are nerve cells that store and transmit information, have been created.
- At birth, the brain is nearly 30% of its adult weight, but by age two, it is approximately 70%.
- Brain development proceeds through the process of synaptogenesis, which results in connections between neurons.
- Neurons that do not receive environmental stimulation lose their synapses and undergo a process known as synaptic pruning.
- Although the brain begins specializing relatively early, the brain is also characterized by neural plasticity, which refers to the ability of different parts of the brain to take over tasks normally accomplished by some other part of the brain. During the first few years of life, the brain is characterized by greater plasticity than at any other time period.

These "facts" have led to great speculation about appropriate types of stimulation to ensure that synaptic connections continue to be made. The phrase "Fire it to wire it," refers to the need for stimulation in order to encourage the sophisticated system of communication required for the optimal functioning of the brain. Clearly, the role of nutrition is essential in the healthy development of the young brain. Beyond that, however, researchers are unwilling to clearly specify exactly what is needed for the brain to "do well" in early childhood. However, researchers and practitioners have summarized their findings in to ten core concepts that can guide policy and practice:

1. Human development is shaped by a dynamic and continuous interaction between biology and experience.
2. Culture influences every aspect of human development and is reflected in childrearing beliefs and practices designed to promote healthy adaptation.
3. The growth of self-regulation is a cornerstone of early childhood development that cuts across all domains of behavior.
4. Children are active participants in their own development, reflecting the intrinsic human drive to explore and master one's environment.
5. Human relationships, and the effects of relationships on relationships, are the building blocks of healthy development.
6. The broad range of individual differences among young children often makes it difficult to distinguish normal variations and maturational delays from transient disorders and persistent impairments.
7. The development of children unfolds along individual pathways whose trajectories are characterized by continuities and discontinuities, as well as by series of significant transitions.
8. Human development is shaped by the ongoing interplay among sources of vulnerability and sources of resilience.
9. The timing of early experiences can matter, but, more often than not, the developing children remains vulnerable to risks and open to protective influences throughout the early years of life and into adulthood.
10. The course of development can be altered in early childhood by effective interventions that change the balance between risk and protection, thereby shifting the odds in favor of more adaptive outcomes. (Shonoff, & Phillips, 2000, pp. 3-4)

In addition to these core concepts, the National Research Council also suggested four themes emerging from the review of literature: All children are born wired for feelings and ready to learn; early environments matter and nurturing relationships are essential; society is changing and the needs of young children are not being addressed; and interactions among early childhood science, policy, and practice are problematic and demand dramatic rethinking (Shonoff & Phillips, 2000, p. 4). Careful consideration of the ten core concepts and the four themes will provide clear directions both for policy and practice.

What seems to be striking about the core concepts and themes that researchers, educators, and medical practitioners have extracted from the literature, however, is that these seem like so much "common sense"—aren't these things that most everyone already knows? That

may be so, but considering the sobering statistics already reviewed, our actions do not reflect our "common sense."

As a participant in the Salzburg Seminar, it was very easy to become very discouraged, particularly given the severity of the world's problems relative to the needs of children. However, Joan Lombardi (2005), long an advocate for children, encouraged each participant to find his or her "sphere of influence." At the conference, participants were encouraged to think about the "take-aways"—the things that we would remember to guide our research, our practices, and our policy work. Given my own "sphere of influence" here at Carson-Newman, the following are "take-aways" to be shared with colleagues and students:

- Given that 95 out of 100 children born in 2005 were born in developing countries, residents of the United States *cannot* ignore the plight of children worldwide, if not for moral reasons, at least for practical ones. The consequences of inadequate development for the world's children are now and will continue to affect the world economy.
- Given that each individual can find his or her own "sphere of influence," every person needs to give careful consideration to what he or she can do to positively impact the lives of children—these may be the children in one's own family, in one's own community, or in the world. Although it is overwhelming to try to prevent the deaths of 18,000 children each day, UNICEF (as well as many other agencies) provides clear guidelines about how individuals may help. For example, a mere contribution of $1.20 can immunize a mother against tetanus or a donation of $2.40 can provide a "School in a Box" kit for one child. Sixty dollars can immunize 60 children against polio. Even if we have chosen other ways to help meet the needs of children, organizations like UNICEF and the Children's Defense Fund have well-developed web sites that provide a plethora of information that may be shared with students for research, advocacy, and/or service projects. The old adage of "Think globally—act locally," is not out of date, but given Carson-Newman's mission to "have a world-wide impact," students may need to be encouraged to think about their responsibilities at a global level as well.
- Even a cursory review of the core concepts outlined in *From Neurons to Neighborhoods* demonstrates that social and emotional development is critical for overall child development. The current fascination with focusing only on cognitive devel-

opment, and specifically on the use of standardized tests to measure cognitive development, is inconsistent with what medical and educational researchers know to be good practice. While performance on standardized tests may be a marker for predicting development, and while all children deserve to be well prepared to be successful on tests that are going to help determine their futures, focusing solely on performance on standardized tests for planning instruction has the potential for seriously limiting children's development in the areas of critical and creative thinking. Time spent in families and in schools on helping children to develop social competence, as well as academic skills, will ultimately serve the child well in areas of self-regulation and problem-solving.

- Early childhood programs, particularly for children from low-income families, have been demonstrated to be effective. Longitudinal data from the Perry Preschool Project clearly outlines the economic benefits of a well-planned early childhood educational experience. The Perry Preschool Program was developmentally appropriate, and longitudinal studies have demonstrated that the early education group, at age 40, has outperformed the control group on intellectual and language tests, as well as on measures of school achievement and completion. In addition, Perry Preschool participants were more likely to be more fully employed and involved in less crime than the control group participants. The economic benefits of high-quality, developmentally appropriate preschool programs have been estimated conservatively of providing a $4 return to every $1 invested—some more recent estimates suggest that a return of $17 is provided for every $1 invested. The chart below shows a projection of how educational funding is related to brain development (Perry Project Age 40 Results). Logically, greater funding in the years when brain development is occurring at the most rapid rate has the potential to yield greater results (Activist Info).
- Families are important to children. Although the structure of families has varied from culture to culture and from time to time, children benefit from a stable, caring family structure, and fathers are an important component of those families. Schools and other institutions that serve children need to focus on ways to support women and men in nurturing their children. Parenting is a challenge even in the most optimal situations, and those who serve children need to remember that we

will accomplish more by supporting parents, rather than criticizing them.

- Finally, education is a lifelong process by which an individual's potential for development is maximized—this means all aspects of development—physical, motor, language, cognitive, social, emotional, and moral development. While the early childhood period is one of the most important periods of development, the middle childhood and adolescent years are also important periods of development. The physical development of the brain continues throughout adolescence, and research indicates that many of the developmental characteristics of adolescents are a result of continuing brain development, particularly in the middle school years. The important point is that development continues across the entire lifespan, and although neural plasticity decreases after early childhood, there is always potential for maximizing potential. Throughout childhood and the adolescent years, adults assume the responsibility for arranging the conditions to maximize development. As individuals mature into adulthood, the responsibility for maximizing potential rests with the individual. Each individual must determine, as an adult, what he or she needs to "do well." However, as faculty members in a small, liberal arts college, our greatest contribution may be in helping our students think seriously about how to maximize their chances of "doing well" in a holistic, lifelong sense, rather than simply "doing well" for a course grade.

References

Activist Info. Domestic Action July 2004: Congress Must Fund Increased Enrollment in Early Head Start. www.results.org/website/article.asp?id=1073. (Retrieved June 1, 2006).

Achievement in America. The Education Trust. www2.edtrust.org/EdTrust/Product Catalog/PowerPoint.htm. (Retrieved June 1, 2006)

Barbarin, O. A. (2005, October). *Family life and early child development: Stumbles along the path from research to practice and policy*. Paper presented at the Salzburg Seminar on Early Childhood Development, Salzburg, Austria.

Bredekamp, S., & Copple, C. (Eds.). (1997). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs.* Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Burton, L.M. (2005, October). *Childhood adultification: A matter of risks and resilience.* Paper presented at the Salzburg Seminar on Early Childhood Development, Salzburg, Austria.

Childhood Obesity. American Obesity Association. http://www.obesity.org/subs/fastfacts/obesity_youth.shtml. (Retrieved June 1, 2006).

Condition of Education 2006. National Center for Education Statistics. http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/press/highlights.asp (Retrieved June 1, 2006).

Engle, P. L. (2005, October). What do children need to develop well? Paper presented at the Salzburg Seminar on Early Childhood Development, Salzburg, Austria.

Head Start Basics 2005. Children's Defense Fund. www.childrensdefense.org (Retrieved June 1, 2006).

Kozol, J. (1995). *Amazing grace: The lives of children and the conscience of a nation.* New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools.* New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America.* New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

Lombardi, J. (2005, October). *Creating policies which support successful early childhood development: Strategies for moving the agenda forward.* Paper presented at the Salzburg Seminar on Early Childhood Development.

Perry Project Age 40 Results: Long-Term Study of Adults who Received High-Quality Early Childhood Care and Education Shows Economic and Social Gains, Less Crime. High/Scope Educational Research Foundation. (Retrieved June 1, 2006).

Richter, L. (2005, October). *Community ecology: Supporting families for children.* Paper presented at the Salzburg Seminar on Early Childhood Development, Salzburg, Austria.

Shonkoff, J.P., & Phillips, D.A. (eds.). (2002). *From neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Sisulu, S. (2005, October). *Early childhood development: Linking new advances in research, theory, and practice*. Paper presented at the Salzburg Seminar on Early Childhood Development, Salzburg, Austria.

State of America's Children 2005. Children's Defense Fund. www.childrensdefense.org. (Retrieved June 1, 2006).

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Convention on the Rights of the Child. www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm. (Retrieved June 1, 2006).

Teaching Liberation Theology: A Multidisciplinary Approach

Carol Wilkerson, Don H. Olive, Sr.,
and Aaron Hedges

Abstract

In the fall semester of 2005, a faculty member in Spanish and a faculty member in philosophy collaborated to offer a cross-disciplinary course in Liberation Theology. The course was listed as a 400-level, senior course intended for advanced students in either of the two disciplines. The objectives of the course were for students and faculty to contribute individual expertise during an exploration of the various tenets of Liberation Theology, to examine cultural and linguistic nuances by comparing the text *Teología de la liberación* by Gustavo Gutiérrez and its English translation *A Theology of Liberation*, translated and edited by Sister Caridad Inda and John Eagleson, and to mature in personal faith over the course of the semester.

Background

During the summer of 2005, Dr. Don H. Olive, dean of the Division of Humanities at Carson-Newman College, and Dr. Carol Wilkerson, chair of the Department of Foreign Languages, discussed the possibilities of collaborating to teach a course on liberation theology for advanced students in philosophy and Spanish. After a lengthy search for appropriate readings in both Spanish and English, they selected the signature text *Teología de la liberación* by Gustavo Gutiérrez and its translation, *A Theology of Liberation.*

How the Course Was Conducted

One of the biggest concerns in planning the course was how to stage daily classes so that students from both disciplines could participate and faculty from both areas could contribute their individual expertise. It was decided that the Dr. Olive would begin most classes with a lecture in English to serve as a preview for the philosophy students

and an orientation for the Spanish students, who had limited backgrounds in theology and philosophy. A discussion in English followed each lecture. Summaries of each chapter and guiding questions were posted in Spanish on Web CT to help the Spanish students to comprehend the text, and students were encouraged to meet with the Spanish faculty member one afternoon per week for additional help. Both faculty members assisted students from both disciplines with ancillary materials and research projects.

In addition to discussions of six chapters of Gutiérrez' book, students analyzed one book of scripture and one song according to the tenets of liberation theology and they researched two topics related to liberation theology. Students presented their research to the class during oral presentations in English. However, Spanish students submitted their written reports in Spanish and philosophy students wrote in English. Students followed the same written procedures for the three tests, Spanish students writing in Spanish and philosophy students in English.

The class invited one guest lecturer, Dr. Douglass Sullivan-González of The University of Mississippi at Oxford, to speak about his experiences and research in liberation theology. Early in the semester the class viewed one feature-length film in English, *Romero* starring Raúl Julia, and at midterm a twenty minute documentary in Spanish, *Caminos de liberación,* produced by The University of Iowa as an Annenberg Project, with Spanish students and faculty serving as translators.

When appropriate Dr. Wilkerson and the Spanish students offered insight on cultural issues and linguistic nuances, often pointing out difficulties in translating from the Spanish to English and the translator's resolution. One notable example was the term *neighbor* in the parable of the Good Samaritan, and the Spanish plays on the words *prójimo, aproximarse,* and *próximo,* lost in translation. Some of the members of the class had lived and worshipped as children of missionaries in Argentina, Costa Rica, Cuba, Mexico, and Spain. They described for their classmates differences between Protestant and Roman Catholic churches in the Spanish- and English-speaking communities.

What Participants Learned

In written, end-of-course evaluations and during classroom discussion, students commented that they learned a lot about how Latin American churches function and why those churches are considered to be more politically active. Most stated that when beginning the course they did not know much about the Roman Catholic Church and that the

course gave them an overview of its contemporary history, as well as that of protestant or evangelical movements in Latin America.

Although all the Spanish students had completed prior coursework in Latin American culture and history, none had heard of liberation theology. Both the Spanish and the philosophy students said that the course gave them a better appreciation of the struggles of poor and indigenous peoples in Latin America. Students also said they were unaware of the role of the United States in the turmoil in Latin America, most notably the correspondence between Archbishop Romero and President Jimmy Carter.

Students also reported gaining a deeper understanding of philosophy and theology, though the philosophy students to a lesser degree. Both students and faculty said that their faith life was enriched by virtue of the discussion about topics outside their academic major and their church denomination. For example, although all students were practicing Christians, none was familiar with rituals of worship in the Roman Catholic Church. Prior to this course, students had not considered the application of the tenets of liberation theology to other issues, such as the African American Catholics, women's movements, and gay and lesbian rights movements.

The ideas of Gutiérrez also spurred (re)consideration of spiritual ideas and practices. His reference to both Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud in a work of theology was to many students unexpected, if not shocking. Students reported grappling with the idea that a Christian doctrine could be built upon the ideas of such proudly nonreligious men. However, by the end of the course, Gutiérrez' rationale was better understood. Indeed, one of the final exam questions required students to discuss the similarities and differences between liberation theology and the ideas of Marx.

Suggestions for Improving the Course

Although all students reported that they gained new insight into issues in Spanish and philosophy, they also stated that neither group was able to study its particular subject in as much detail as it could have in a regular, single-subject class. During class discussion at the end of the term, students said that depth of study in their particular field was sacrificed for breadth. The philosophy students commented that they did not approach Gutiérrez' theology as analytically or systematically as they could have because not all their Spanish classmates had the necessary background. Similarly, the Spanish students were not able to develop their speaking and listening skills, because the majority of classroom

discussion took place in English for the sake of the philosophy students.

When asked how to approach the course in the future, students suggested beginning the semester with lectures both in basic principles of theology and on contemporary Latin American history and culture. The students also recommended that they only meet as a combined group once per week. They proposed that during one class period per week the faculty member in philosophy give brief explanatory lectures for the selected chapter of the Gutiérrez text, following by joint discussion by the Spanish and philosophy students. For the rest of the week, the students suggested that they meet separately for more in-depth discussion in their respective academic field of study.

Future Multidisciplinary Courses

The feedback from the students in this course was invaluable in the planning of future multidisciplinary courses. At the beginning of the semester a total of eight Spanish students were enrolled. Before midterm, three had dropped, citing a lack of interest in the topic and not enough opportunities to speak Spanish. Of the five who completed the course, one reported loathing the topic and feeling that he had no say in what was taught. During multiple consultations with the Spanish faculty member, the student said that the only thing keeping him from dropping out was that the course was required for the major.

This sentiment came as a surprise to both faculty, who had advertised the topic and discussed it with students a year prior to its being offered. Other language faculty speculated that the unhappy student, as well as those who dropped the course, may not have been prepared for the amount of reading and its level of difficulty. Faculty suggested that students might feel more involved and be less likely to drop if faculty hosted planning meetings and invited eligible students to participate.

From discussion with Spanish students, it would appear that they want to spend significant amounts of class time speaking the target language. They are not likely to take advantage of resources offered outside of regular class time. For example, ancillary notes in Spanish posted on a web site were rarely, and only briefly, accessed; and students who came for help during office hours primarily asked for translations of words they could not find in their dictionaries. Therefore, when planning future multidisciplinary courses, it might be necessary to set aside a segment of the class time to go over issues of concerns unique to language students.

Conclusions

The experience of the faculty and students who participated in the fall semester liberation theology course taught at Carson-Newman College may serve as an example for other foreign language faculty desiring to offer special topics courses. This was the first time in the history of the college in which a language course was taught jointly with a nonlanguage faculty member and facilitated in English.

The faculty members are encouraged by the fact that students reported learning more than they expected about a new discipline outside their major, while at the same time exploring new topics in their field. Comments made in end-of-term evaluations offered valuable insight into ways that cross-disciplinary language courses might be taught in the future. Language faculty members will incorporate those suggestions as they plan their next multidisciplinary course to be taught jointly with a multilingual faculty, “Selected Readings of Nobel Prize Recipients.”

Journeys of Faith: Meeting the Challenges in Twenty-First Century America

[2006 T. B. Maston Lecture]

Nancy Ammerman

Leaders like T. B. Maston have always recognized that faith must constantly respond to the challenges of the times. Whether challenges of racism and segregation or challenges of war and peace, a faith that is too comfortable with things as they are is likely to prove inadequate.

In many ways, we are still coming to terms with the changes Maston helped to shape. The traditions that guided the lives of many of your parents and grandparents have been fundamentally altered, and new forms of faith are still emerging. As the eminent sociologist Robert Wuthnow has put it, we have shifted from a culture of dwelling to a culture of seeking (Wuthnow 1998). We have not left everything behind, but we are selective in what we put in the backpack for life's journey. And whether the faith of our childhood will be in that backpack is very much a question to be answered.

I want to explore tonight two of the most important reasons that we find ourselves asking those questions and suggest some of the ways in which faith traditions are—and are not—stepping up to the plate to help us find answers.

The first reason is the reality of diversity. If it ever was the case that a person could emerge from youth into adulthood under a single overarching sacred canopy, that is clearly not the case today. The U. S. remains a predominantly Christian country, but young adults today encounter compatriots from many corners of that Christian tradition, many of whom have only vague attachments to whatever tradition they may claim. About one in four young adults identifies as Catholic, but less than half of them attend even once a month.[1]

---

[1]These figures have been compiled from the General Social Survey, combining surveys from 1993-2002 and looking just at those who were 18-30 years old in their survey year (Center 2002).

Another one in four identifies as some sort of conservative Protestant, with an additional one in ten part of the various African American Protestant denominations. More of them attend regularly, but even here a substantial number of people who were raised in a tradition have little on-going connection to it today. One in six young adults identifies with one of the Mainline Protestant denominations, and again, less than half of them attend regularly. One in five young adults has no religious preference at all, but a quarter of them actually do show up at religious services occasionally.

All the nonChristian traditions together account for only 3% of young adults. But their psychological presence is far greater than those numbers would indicate. For one thing, they are not evenly distributed around the country, so there are pockets in the U. S. where Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, and others are present and visible in far greater proportions than in other places. For another thing, only about 37% of the young adult population is actively participating in a Christian tradition, and among them the range of beliefs and practices extends from traditionalist Catholics saying the Latin mass to hip evangelicals with praise bands to Afro-centric black Methodists and civic-minded Congregationalists meeting on New England town greens. Except, perhaps, for places like this, it's hard to find a critical mass of any given tradition in any given place. Between the 40% who are minimally- or nonparticipating Christians and the 20% who have no religious preference, a majority of the young adult population is at best nominally attached to any given tradition, and the rest are spread among a very wide diversity of groups.

But more than the sheer numbers, diversity is a *cultural reality*.[2] No one makes any assumptions about the religious identity of the people they meet on the street—unless those people provide some visible signal. And even if they do, American culture has taught us well. We know that no one has the right to impose his or her religion on someone else and that each of us is supposed to choose for ourselves from the vast array of religious and secular options available to us. Even people who come to the U. S. from places where religion is much more taken-for-granted quickly learn that in the U. S., religion is far from a given. They learn that people here believe in different gods or no god at all; they worship on Saturday and Sunday and five times a day. Some fast during Lent, others on Yom Kippur, and still others between sun-up

[2]I have elaborated on the challenges of modernity for religious life elsewhere (Ammerman 2000). Portions of this essay draw on material first published there, as well as from my 1997 Presidential address to the Association for the Sociology of Religion (Ammerman 1997).

and sun-down during Ramadan. Some ordain women to lead their religious communities, and others command them to be silent. The range of practice and belief is enormous, and it is not in distant lands, but all around us.

One of the results of this American pluralism is a tendency toward individualism in matters religious. The same forces of mobility and education and commerce that have brought diverse people together have also dislodged those people from traditional communities in the process. And in the dislodging people from communal loyalties, the modern individual has been created.[3] Our family and town and ancestral occupation do not first identify individuals. Rather, we are identified by occupations and places and even names that we have chosen for ourselves. Faith, in this individualist mode, is a private meaning system that seeks only "what is true for me."[4]

Recent studies of "baby boomers"—the now "aging" parents of today's youth—have demonstrated the degree to which these ideals of individualism and choice abound. Wade Clark Roof has documented the spiritual lives of the generation that came of age in the midst of that "question authority" era (Roof 1993). We have sought out our own paths—borrowing from eclectic religious sources, sometimes part of organized religion and sometimes not. Dean Hoge and his associates looked at a sample of boomers who began the 1960s inside organized religion as Presbyterian confirmands.

Interviewing them thirty years later, however, these researchers discovered that only about a quarter were still in Presbyterian churches. Many had left religious involvement for at least a time, and many others were in other religious traditions or outside the faith entirely.[5] Today 78% of Americans say that a person can be a good Christian or Jew without attending church or synagogue.[6] Each American likes to think

---

[3]Among the theorists who have made the links between modernity and individuality, see Coser (1991), Giddens (1991, and Simmel (1908 (1971)).

[4]Among those who have argued that modern religion is characterized by individualism, see Bellah (1963), Hammond (1992), and Parsons (1964).

[5]See especially chapter 3 in Hoge, et al. (1994).

[6]Reported in Roof & McKinney (Roof and McKinney 1987, 57).

she can chart her own independent course. If those are the parents, we have to wonder what, if anything, they have taught their children.

Diversity—and the individualism it seems to have spawned—has taken individuals increasingly outside traditional religious communities and into a vast religious (and secular) marketplace of ideas, each seemingly left to chart their own path (Marler and Roozen 1993).

American religious diversity is, however, by no means new.[7] It has been a fact of life on these shores ever since Europeans started sailing in. By the time our Revolution was won and our Constitution written, no single religious tradition was strong enough to claim that it ought to become the officially established one. There was already as much diversity on these shores as in the whole of the European continent and far more than in any one European society (Butler 1990). Sidney Mead argued that religious tolerance quickly became a pragmatic necessity here (Mead 1963, 106). From the beginning, this country has been an experiment in religious pluralism.

Before the nineteenth century was over, the experiment had further expanded. Constitutional freedom not only protected the initial broad array of faiths, but also enabled this country to give birth to dozens of new religious traditions, as well as becoming the immigrant home to dozens more. Nathan Hatch describes the first third of the nineteenth century in ways that evoke our own time. Having set loose the possibility of religious liberty, what followed was "a period of religious ferment, chaos, and originality unmatched in American history. Few traditional claims to religious authority could weather such a relentless beating. There were competing claims of old denominations and a host of new ones. Wandering prophets appeared dramatically, and supremely heterodox religious movements gained followings. People veered from one church to another. Religious competitors wrangled unceasingly. . ." (Hatch 1989, 64).

When we look at today's diversity, it stands in a long line of religious inventiveness and experimentation. And in spite of the fact that dozens of groups would argue that they and they alone have the true way to live, all that inventiveness has taken place with relatively little overt or violent religious conflict.[8]

---

[7]This summary of American religious history is drawn from chapter 8 of *Pillars of Faith: American Congregations and Their Partners* (Ammerman 2005).

[8]Demerath has compared the U. S. to fourteen other societies where the mix of religion and politics has sometimes been violent. He concludes that religious liberty is not what distinguishes the U. S., but

The implication for religious groups themselves was that they would have to learn to be one among many, depending on their own resources to recruit and hold onto their members—in effect to act like Baptists. The Protestant Reformation had introduced Europeans to some modest notion of religious pluralism, but only the "radical" reformers (Mennonites and Baptists and Brethren, for instance) argued for complete separation from state power that would leave all religious groups on an equal footing and force each to depend entirely on voluntary membership.

New religious traditions coming here have often complained that they have been "protestantized" as they have accommodated to American culture. Whatever else that has meant, they are right that they have been pushed to adopt a basic commitment to live peacefully alongside religious others.[9] While the resulting diversity surely poses challenges to communities of faith, we can also celebrate the relatively peaceful and civil results of these long-standing U. S. commitments.

Diversity, then, challenges us to make individual choices, and it challenges faith communities to live alongside others who do not share their faith. Neither individual faith nor faith communities can be taken for granted.

The second challenge I want to explore with you is the equally inescapable reality of skepticism. In earlier times, people often turned to their religions to explain the unexplainable in life: Where do babies come from? Why does the moon pass through phases? What makes the crops grow and the rains come? What happens to us when we die? In the earliest days, priests and shamans offered solutions and cures, rituals and explanations for things people had no other way of understanding. But beginning at least with the Enlightenment, experts located in and trained by universities began to displace the priests as dispensers of approved knowledge about life's mysteries. If we want to know why we are sick, we go to a doctor. If we want to know about the moon, we ask an astronomer or even an astronaut. If we want to know about crops, we consult an agricultural scientist—or perhaps an economist. If we want to understand the mysteries of the human mind, we go to the biology and psychology departments. In each case, the authority is "sci-

---

that disestablishment (unlinking state power from religious privilege) is a key to our relatively less violent history (Demerath III 2001).

[9]The Protestant influence can also be seen in the typical organizational form new immigrants have adopted, what Warner calls "de facto congregationalism" (Warner 1993).

ence," and within science there are ways of defending one's evidence and recognized credentials that allow one to claim expertise. In this "modern" way of thinking, it is not sufficient to say that "the Torah commands it" or that "the priest advises it." Rather, the scripture itself is subjected to historical, critical, archeological, and anthropological investigation. And the pastor himself must gain advanced training in psychology and management before his or her advice will be taken seriously.

Like diversity, skepticism is not new.[10] This struggle between science and religion has been going on for at least two centuries, and by the beginning of the twentieth century, two dominant modes of response had developed. One mode of response was the liberal path of adaptation. To survive in this skeptical world, liberal theologians sought to make religion believable to rational, scientifically attuned minds—a set of moral precepts, yes, but not claims of miracle or transcendence. The liberal project, at least for the last century, sought uniquely modern forms for religious faith and practice, updating old doctrine and ritual and leaving aside any claims to timeless truth.

The result for many youth today is that their religious upbringing has emphasized tolerance as much as competence in their own tradition, questioning as much as faith. It was as important to their churches that they know about and accept their Buddhist and Jewish neighbors as that they know their own tradition's history and teachings. Within Christianity, ecumenism emphasized common ground and discouraged particularity. The result for many young adults is a growing indifference to those particularities – we're really all the same aren't we?

Standing opposite this liberal project has been an equally adamant conservative one. Theorists and practitioners alike have claimed that for religion to survive the modern challenge, it would have to form relatively isolated, "sectarian" communities with strict rules, firm beliefs, and a strong collective identity. Dean Kelley (1977) advised Protestant churches a generation ago that growth would depend on "strictness." People wanted to have a clear sense of identity, he claimed, and that identity would come from unwavering beliefs, clear guidelines for behavior, and no doubts about the presence of God in the world. Various religious countercultures and sectarian groups would give up the illusion of dominating society and instead simply shore up the barriers necessary to keep out the forces that undermine certainty (Berger 1982,

[10]Malinowski (1948) makes this most clear, but it is the underlying premise of the historical accounts given by Freud (1869 (1961)) about the human psyche, and by Marx (1963) about human history.

20). Belief and practice can be produced and sustained in spite of modern challenges, conservatives argue; but they require creating religious enclaves in which those ideas and practices make sense and constant vigilance against the incursions of the world.[11]

The challenges of the modern world, then, have appeared to present two radically different alternatives to those who would continue to be religious: You can either teach your children to be good, tolerant, civil, liberals or you can teach them to be aggressively active in maintaining the boundaries between their faith and a hostile world.

I want to suggest, however, that neither the skepticism nor the diversity is perhaps quite what we have taken it to be—and our options may not be so "either/or" as the modernists and fundamentalists claimed they were.

I am proposing that our way forward may lie in a kind of strategy that says "yes, but" to the modern challenges we face.[12] The realities of the modern situation are still with us, but their limits are increasingly recognized. Skepticism and diversity are not likely to go away, but we are beginning to recognize that modern assumptions about our necessary choices may not be the whole story. There are all sorts of cracks and crevices in that presumably modern front, in which new forms of life are emerging, and old, unnoticed ones have been thriving all along.

This is not the place for an extended philosophical reflection on the limits of "rationality," but I do want to suggest the commonsense observation that human beings have begun to engage in some fairly serious questioning about just how far science can and should take us and whether there are other ways we can learn about the world.[13]

We are also recognizing that we have always depended on other ways of knowing, alongside our reasoned inquiry. We have always trusted tradition more than we ever admitted. Vast areas of our lives are

---

[11]Smith offers a contrary view, that cultural diversity creates just the right sort of context in which an adversarial religion can maintain its own identity by consistently highlighting what it is not (Smith 1998).

[12]I have elaborated this delineation of the "postmodern" alternative to modern "either/or" thinking elsewhere and draw from those articles in the account that follows (Ammerman 1997 ; Ammerman 2000).

[13]Smith argues that the actual contrast between "rational" science and "irrational" religion was never so dramatic as the antagonists claimed (Smith 2003).

still governed by rules that come to us through habit and advice that have never been tested in any scientist's laboratory. We also know that sometimes our knowledge and insight comes from sources we have a hard time explaining. Sometimes we call it a "gut feeling" or "intuition" or a "vision" or "wisdom," but we still know it is true. In these days when there seems to be a spirituality of everything from nature to business plans, the lines between “rational” and “not rational” have blurred considerably. Science is not about to disappear, but its domain has been shrunk.

Nor has the modern response to diversity resulted in the universalist melting pot that was predicted. While many forms of particularity have eroded, other signs of difference persist. Not only are immigrants learning to live trans-national lives (Levitt 2001) in which old traditions and ties remain strong as new ones are established, but even some members of liberal denominations are celebrating their distinctiveness and teaching newcomers their heritage (Ammerman 2005). While fundamentalist, high-boundary solutions seem to be maintaining their appeal, I remain convinced that they will never be the primary way modern people choose to live together.

A much more promising response to diversity seems to be emerging among people who culturally bi-lingual—speaking a native, parochial language, while also speaking a common language shared with people they do not know.[14] We live in a world where people can be both rooted in particularistic ethnic and religious communities *and* more aware of the larger world and the choices that have brought them to their current practices. They are, to use Stephen Warner’s extremely helpful term, “elective parochials” (Warner 1988).

That term is useful because it recognizes two key realities. First, today’s religious commitments are by definition “elective.” The realities of choice are probably with us to stay. Nearly all religious communities recognize that the community of birth is not always the community of lifelong affiliation. It is no accident that religious people increasingly use the metaphor of “journey” to describe their faith. At the very least, geographic mobility is likely to precipitate the search for a new congregation, and in most instances even the person who remains within a given denomination will have more than one congregation from which to choose. Many commentators have come to refer to this reality as religious “shopping,” but it need not be a cost-benefit calculation. To choose is to make a commitment, however minimal, and to be on a journey implies conscious effort. These are not passive processes, but active engagement with traditions.

---

[14]This metaphor is borrowed from Brueggemann (1989).

And tradition is the other reality evoked by that "elective parochial" phrase. To be a parochial is to have a community, to go beyond one's presumed autonomy as an individual. We are neither as free and disconnected as the modernist story would have had it nor as utterly embedded in unchanging communities as our traditionalist forebears. We live in a world of chosen community.[15]

What I am suggesting is that *communities* of faith are in fact vitally important in supporting those who seek to live a life of faith, but the relationship between person and community is not one that can be taken for granted.[16] The American religious experiment has always meant that people have to invest voluntary resources in preserving and extending their own traditions. The Constitution guaranteed the right to gather into religious communities, but it did not guarantee that any given group would succeed in their efforts. Only the groups own voluntary energies could do that.

Faith communities that seek to build robust relationships that can sustain their youth and adults face exactly the challenges of diversity and skepticism and choice that we have been describing. Congregations cannot structure their work around assumptions that members will share common social religious histories. Even if they do, they cannot count on a stable and integrated communities and relationships to supply a store of conversation topics and common lore. Relationships outside the congregation—families, neighborhoods, common places of work or leisure or shopping—cannot be counted on to supplement and reinforce the community-building efforts of the congregation. The people who find their way into local congregations bring increasingly diverse life experiences out of which a community must be intentionally constructed.

The challenge of gathering a community of common religious practice is especially apparent to those who find themselves in the religious and cultural minority here. Immigrants for whom religion was a taken-for-granted part of the culture "back home," soon realize that they are going to have to organize if they want to maintain those traditions here (Warner and Wittner 1998). Across the country, we see thousands of new local gatherings—masjids, temples, and study groups—all taking on the tasks and forms of American congregational life, vol-

---

[15]Bender (1978) provides an excellent historical argument for the "both/and" character of modern community. It is both alien and impersonal and laced with dense webs of affiliation.

[16]This section on congregational community building draws on material from chapter 8 in *Pillars of Faith* (Ammerman 2005).

untarily forming the communities that they hope will teach their children the language, music, stories, and rituals of the tradition. These religious newcomers know that they have to be intentional and that they need the help of a community. They know that American culture will not help them teach their children to practice the faith (Warner 2002).

While there are many ways to respond to the challenge of sustaining faith in the midst of diversity, investment in the worship and religious education that is carried on in local congregations seems to me one of the most effective strategies. What I have discovered in recent research, however, is that some congregations invest much more heavily than others in the work of worship and spiritual life. The importance of gathering for worship is perhaps best recognized in the African American churches, and it shows up in very concrete ways. Services last longer than in most other traditions, multiple choirs contribute their time and talents, ushers and pastor's aid groups and others support and guide the church's experience. Many churches invite worshipers back for Sunday or Wednesday or Friday evening services that are filled with prayers, testimonies, and songs contributed by all the participants. These churches are also likely to expect both children and adults to attend Sunday school classes, with a cadre of adult teachers who spend significant time training and preparing and youth leaders who are apprenticed in the work.

If any tradition wishes to perpetuate a distinct spiritual way of life today, they cannot depend on institutions in the larger culture to help them. They need not become an oppositional counter-culture with high boundaries, but they will have to tend intentionally to building their own religious traditions.

Building those traditions means, most fundamentally, experiencing and telling stories of faith. This is what congregations do as they gather for worship. In hymns, scripture, sermon, sacrament, prayer, chant, bowing, kneeling, lighting candles and incense, wearing vestments, displaying art – the words and signs and symbols tell the story. As people listen and move and see and smell, they encounter a reality beyond themselves. The practices carried on by organized local communities of faith are the carriers of the transcendent spiritual experiences many modern seekers find absent elsewhere.

Strong communities of faith, of whatever sort, also need to encourage their members to talk with each other in terms that acknowledge and celebrate the particular spiritual presence they come together to celebrate. While such spiritual talk may come more naturally to a conservative or sectarian group, it is not impossible for others. Shared experiences in service projects or spiritual retreats may provide the stories members can tell each other and their children, but everyone needs the

social space in which to do it and the encouragement to risk spiritual forms of conversation.

Stories, then, provide us both with the common threads that allow us to make connections with each other and the unique identities that keep us anchored in the midst of our diversity. They can be told over and over, linking us to our past, while evolving with each new telling. Unlike doctrinal propositions, they do not have to go head-to-head with scientific and philosophical skepticism. They are at once accounts of what has happened and of what it means. Active, intentional story telling is the basis on which all communities have always been built, and that is no less true today when those communities are so fluid and fragile.

American society depends on the willingness of local communities to nurture relationships and traditions—to tell their stories—no less than it depends on the traditions to operate as tolerant parts of a plural whole. Both the voluntary investment and the stance of tolerance are essential to the relatively healthy diversity that has characterized American society.

Will faith be in the backpacks we take on our journeys? It just might, if it has been told and experienced in communities that are willing to celebrate their own unique identities. Will such a faith lead to fearful and defensive enclaves? It need not. In spite of the modern challenges of diversity and skepticism, we have ample evidence that a healthy religious commitment does not always lead to antagonism toward neighbors or the world. Is any of this easy? By no means. Communities that seek to isolate their youth often lose them, and communities that provide no roots can even more surely bid them farewell. The challenges of diversity and skepticism are real, but the opportunities for intentional community building are just as real for those who are willing to take up the challenge.

References

Ammerman, Nancy T. 1997. "Organized Religion in a Voluntaristic Society." *Sociology of Religion* 58:203-15.

—. 2000. "Conservative Jews within the Landscape of American Religion." Pp. 359-90 in *Jews in the Center: Conservative Synagogues and Their Members*, edited by Jack Wertheimer. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. 2005. *Pillars of Faith: American Congregations and Their Partners*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bellah, Robert N. 1963. "Religious Evolution." Pp. 20-50 in *Beyond Belief*. Boston: Beacon.

Bender, Thomas. 1978. *Community and Social Change in America*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Berger, Peter L. 1982. "From the Crisis of Religion to the Crisis of Secularity." Pp. 14-24 in *Religion and America*, edited by Mary Douglas and Steven Tipton. Boston: Beacon.

Brueggemann, Walter. 1989. "The Legitimacy of a Sectarian Hermeneutic: 2 Kings 18-19." Pp. 3-34 in *Education for Citizenship and Discipleship*, edited by Mary C Boys. New York: Pilgrim.

Butler, Jon. 1990. *Awash in a Sea of Faith*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Center, National Opinion Research. 2002. "GSSDIRS General Social Survey: 1972 - 2000 Cumulative Codebook." National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago.

Coser, Rose Laub. 1991. *In Defense of Modernity: Role Complexity and Individual Autonomy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Demerath III, N. J. 2001. *Crossing the Gods: World Religions and Worldly Politics*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Freud, Sigmund. 1869 (1961). *The Future of an Illusion*. New York: Norton.

Giddens, Anthony. 1991. Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hammond, Phillip E. 1992. *Religion and Personal Autonomy: The Third Disestablishment in America*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Hatch, Nathan G. 1989. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hoge, Dean R., Benton Johnson, and Donald A. Luidens. 1994. *Vanishing Boundaries: The Religion of Mainline Protestant Baby Boomers*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox.

Kelley, Dean M. 1977. *Why Conservative Churches are Growing*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Levitt, Peggy. 2001. *Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1948. *Magic, Science, and Religion*. New York: Free Press.

Marler, Penny Long, and David A. Roozen. 1993. "From Church Tradition to Consumer Choice: The Gallup Surveys of the Unchurched American." Pp. 253-77 in *Church and Denominational Growth*, edited by David A Roozen and C. Kirk Hadaway. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Marx, Karl. 1963. "Contribution to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right." Pp. 43-59 in *Karl Marx: Early Writings*, edited by T. B Bottomore. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mead, Sidney E. 1963. *The Lively Experiment.* New York: Harper & Row.

Parsons, Talcott. 1964. "Religion and Modern Industrial Society." Pp. 273-98 in *Religion, Culture, and Society*, edited by Louis Schneider. New York: Wiley.

Roof, Wade Clark. 1993. *A Generation of Seekers*. San Francisco, CA: Harper.

Roof, Wade Clark, and William McKinney. 1987. *American Mainline Religion*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Simmel, Georg. 1908 (1971). "Group Expansion and the Development of Individuality." Pp. 251-93 in *Georg Simmel on Individuality and Social Forms*, edited by Donald N Levine. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, Christian. 1998. *American Evangelicalism: Embattled and Thriving*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

— (Ed.). 2003. The Secular Revolution: Power, Interests, and Conflict in the Secularization of American Public Life. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Warner, R. Stephen. 1988. *New Wine in Old Wineskins*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

—. 1993. "Work in Progress toward a New Paradigm for the Sociological Study of Religion in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:1044-93.

—. 2002. "Growing Up Hindu in America: A Surprising Success Story." Chicago, IL: Youth and Religion Project, University of Illinois.

Warner, R. Stephen, and Judith G. Wittner. 1998. *Gatherings in Diaspora: Religious Communities and the New Immigration*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Wuthnow, Robert. 1998. *After Heaven: Spirituality in America since the 1950s*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Just Peacemaking Theory for International Cooperation in Preventing Terrorism

[2005 Carlyle Marney Lecture]

Glen H. Stassen

On September 12, the morning after 9-11, I lay in bed. Upset. I imagined myself in one of those planes when they were hijacked. I wanted to do something to prevent it. What could I do? I pictured myself gathering other strong men, and rushing the cockpit to prevent the terrorism. I went over my imagined scenario again and again; I needed to feel I could imagine some way to be empowered to prevent this terrorism. At that time, I did not know what passengers had done to stop that plane; we had not yet learned. But it turns out that what I imagined doing is exactly what those passengers had done on the plane that crashed in Pennsylvania and never got to the target the terrorists had intended.

I needed to imagine a scenario of empowerment; otherwise I felt totally powerless after the terrible attack of 9-11. How can we act effectively to prevent terrorism? How can we support action that deals with the causes of terrorism? We all need to imagine some way to be empowered to prevent it.

Pacifism and Just War Theory are not enough. They debate the question: is war justified? Jean Bethke Elshtain's book—*Just War and Terrorism*—focuses on only one question: is it justified to make war against terrorism? No other action is even discussed. As if the only dimension of creativity that the human animal could think of to solve problems is to pound on them.

But the strategy of making war on terrorists is not succeeding. Secretary Rumsfeld has said that more terrorists are being recruited than those his Defense Department is killing or capturing. This week a U. S. army general said the same thing: more Iraqis are being recruited to become terrorists than those the army is killing or capturing. The U. S. State Department reports that terrorist incidents worldwide have in-

creased each year since the Iraq War, and made a big jump upwards in 2005.

The Just Peacemaking Ethic to the Rescue

Just Peacemaking Theory[1] points to the practices that actually work to solve problems of injustice and get peace. Just Peacemaking Theory doesn't answer the question, is war justified? Instead it asks, "What practices work to make peace?" It gets at the causes of war and points to what works to prevent war and terrorism. So, twenty-three just war theorists and pacifists, who disagree on the question whether and when war is justified, worked together for four years and agreed unanimously on the new ethic of peace and war—on just peacemaking theory.

It was a remarkable process, these twenty-three experts in Christian ethics and in international relations, each with strong views that differ on many issues, working together for four years, and achieving unanimous consensus in their final meeting at the Carter Center in Atlanta. The book is the new, agreed paradigm for the ethics of peace and war. It is not simply a collection of articles; all twenty-three gave their approval to the whole book. I know of forty-five articles that have been published on the just peacemaking theory, and the number is growing. They are listed on my website, www.fuller.edu/sot/faculty.stassen. Christian ethicists are giving it support. The plenary session of the Society of Christian Ethics was devoted to just peacemaking theory. People are saying, "This is the ethic we have been needing for years—for centuries."

Just Peacemaking Theory (JPT) answers the question: What peacemaking practices fit Jesus' way, and work in the real world? I'm looking for what works to prevent terrorism. Just peacemaking works in the real world.

It does not put Jesus' way in an ideal realm, marginalized from what is obligatory in the real world. The Barmen Confession in 1934 (by Karl Barth and the Confessing Church) opposed the German-Christians, who limited Jesus to the inner life and gave their loyalty in the real world to the authoritarian Adolf Hitler. The Christian theologians and pastors who signed the Barmen Confession in opposition to Hitler and the Nazis said Jesus Christ is the one Lord. There is not

---

[1]Glen Stassen, ed. *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices to Abolish War* (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2004); Stassen, *Just Peacemaking: Transforming Initiatives for Justice and Peace* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992).

some other Lord; there is not some other sphere where we should not serve our one Lord. Just peacemaking theory shows how Jesus' way works by analogy in our world of complex international relations to fill out what it means to follow Jesus as Lord over all of life specifically where war is threatened and peacemaking can work to prevent it. So, to explain it, I will spell it out in the real world in more practical detail, more detail than you may have expected a Christian ethicist to do. I will show that just peacemaking is practical and realistic.

Jesus' Way in the Real World of Hate and Revolt against Roman Occupation

Jesus' context was the drive to make war against the Roman occupation, in the real world, like Palestinians making war against Israeli occupation now. When Jesus taught peacemaking, modeled it by speaking respectfully to a Roman Centurion, called on "this generation" to repent rather than placing the blame on the Romans, called for doing the practices that make for peace, and predicted war (Mark 13) and the destruction of the Temple because Jerusalem was not doing the practices that make for peace, he was talking about the need to repent and make peace in the real world.

The Sicarii or Zealots of Jesus' time said the Romans will leave only if we kill enough of them. Romans only understand violence. By contrast, Jesus wept over Jerusalem, and said: "Would that you knew the practices that make for peace." He saw revolt against Rome coming, and he called on his disciples not to participate in the revolt, but to flee to the hills. The disciples' strategy for overcoming the empire would be to love their enemies; it worked; they overcame the Roman Empire. And he predicted the Temple would be destroyed. He was right and the Zealots were wrong. The Zealots' strategy led to the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem, just as Jesus prophesied.

Jesus set his teachings in the context of the prophet Isaiah, and Israel. Both deal with the real world. We need a thicker Jesus, with attention to the concrete meaning of his teachings in his context and their meaning by analogy in our context, not a thin and vague Jesus.

So, I should show how Just Peacemaking Theory is grounded in Jesus' way, and also how it works in the world.

Matt. 6:19-33—Do not hoard, but invest your money in God's reign and God's justice.

Jesus taught in the Sermon on the Mount that we are to practice justice, especially with our money. Many people make the mistake of

saying Jesus did not confront the governing authorities, but merely allowed them to crucify him without putting up any opposition. They are making the mistake of thinking of the governing authorities only as Rome. But those who ruled daily life were the Jewish authorities who ruled the temple—the Sanhedrin, the high priests, the Pharisees, and the wealthy, as well as Herod.

David Gushee and I show in *Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in Contemporary Context*[2] that Jesus confronts the injustice of *the Jerusalem authorities* thirty-seven times in the Gospels. He was not confronting the *Roman* authorities because they did not rule the daily life and because he was urging peacemaking toward the Roman enemy and repentance for our own injustices. He was calling for repentance for the judgmentalism that was putting all the blame on Rome and would eventually boil up into a war of rebellion against Rome and bring the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, and the exile of Jews from Judah.

Instead, he said, take the log out of *your own* eye. Take responsibility for what you can correct in your own behavior. In those thirty-seven confrontations of the Jerusalem authorities, Jesus confronted four kinds of injustice: domination of the less powerful, exclusion of the outcasts, greedy oppression of the poor, and violence. He was calling the Jerusalem authorities to repent and practice justice. In doing so, he was faithful to the Old Testament, and especially to Isaiah, which he cited more frequently than anything else. Isaiah 32:16-17, says the effect of justice and righteousness will be peace.

Accordingly, the ethic of just peacemaking advocates two practices of justice: Sustainable Economic Development; and Human Rights, Religious Liberty, and Democracy. Both practices of justice work to prevent terrorism, because terrorists depend on arousing anger against injustice and on claiming that their violence is the only effective way to get justice. If governments can be prodded to do justice, then the people can be brought to see that their demands for justice are better served by pushing the government to do justice than by self-defeating and immoral terrorism. The point is to separate the people from the terrorists.

Recruiting Terrorists

International terrorist recruits tend to come from authoritarian autocracies such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt. But not all autocracies. Iraq before Saddam was defeated, Syria, and Iran have not produced terrorists who attack the United States, because the United States government

[2] (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), chapters 1 and 17.

has not been thought to support those autocracies. The United States should be nudging these autocracies like Saudi Arabia and Egypt in the direction of human rights and democracy. It should not be seen as the supporter of autocracies.

One expert writes: "In such societies, severe repression drives all politics underground, placing the moderate opposition at a disadvantage, and encouraging political extremism." Double-digit unemployment causes the educated but unemployed youth to grow increasingly angry and frustrated.

The United States is now seen by many as the supporter of the autocracies of Saudi Arabia and Egypt and of Israel dominating Palestine. That recruits terrorists. President Bush speaks in favor of just peacemaking ethics when he ways we should work in support of democracy. But *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices* says directly that we should not make war to force countries to shift to democracy. That can cause bitterness, divisiveness, and opposition; and it encourages the international system to favor war making.

Sustainable Economic Development

As *Just Peacemaking* points out, it is those who have developed some expectations and then see their own or their fellows' conditions dropping well below those expectations that tend to turn to violence. The terrorists do not come from absolute poverty; they come from people educated enough to have real expectations, but then experience increases in joblessness.

It is not poverty alone, but *deprivation relative to expectations* that is a significant factor in the turn to violence.[3] Some writers miss this point, contend that the poorest and least educated do not become international terrorists, and then conclude that economic development is not important for preventing terrorism.

Alan Krueger and Jitka Malecková study aggregate data carefully and conclude, rightly, that neither the poorest nor the least educated are likely to be terrorists. But they show that when Palestinian "college enrollment increased rapidly in the early 1980s, doubling between 1981 and 1985 . . . this remarkable rise in the education of the workforce coincided with a sharp increase in the unemployment rate for college graduates," and "the real daily wage of college graduates fell by around

[3] *Just Peacemaking: Ten Practices*, 112; see also Audrey Kurth Cronin, "Sources of Contemporary Terrorism," in Cronin, Audrey, and James Ludes, ed., *Attacking Terrorism: Elements of a Grand Strategy* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University: 2004), 25.

30%, while the real wage of those with 12 years of schooling held steady and the real wage of those with 11 or fewer years of schooling increased slightly," then frustrated and angry Palestinians turned to the *intifada* of 1988. And when "the Israeli occupation of the territories and lack of an effective capital market or banking system . . . prevented the labor markets in the West Bank and Gaza Strip from equilibrating," the *intifada* of 2000 broke out.[4]

This fits the relative deprivation hypothesis: dramatic increase in educational attainment plus the promise of the Oslo Accords caused rising expectations; but the economic expectations as well as expectations for political justice were dashed by Israel's interlacing Palestine with checkpoints, closures, and curfews, and the *intifadas* broke out. The suicide bombers were disproportionately college graduates. Krueger and Malecková's data show similar disproportion of above-average education and less rewarding economies among Jewish, Hezbollah, and Palestinian terrorists (132-33, 35, 37, 141).

Krueger and Malecková themselves do not consider the relative deprivation hypothesis, and hence they point out only the increased education without reaching the conclusion that the data suggest: increased education correlates with increased expectations; when these expectations are dashed, it causes anger and frustration. They do point out that deprivation of civil liberties correlates significantly with increased terrorism, which fits the authoritarianism hypothesis that I argue above.

Peter Hansen, Commissioner-General of United Nations Relief, Jean Ziegler, a Swiss sociologist and United Nations special envoy for the United Nations Human Rights Commission Agency, and the U. S. Agency for International Development have each issued reports that in 2002, with the Israeli closures unemployment increased to 80% in parts of the occupied territories of Palestine and the level of absolute poverty rose disastrously, with some 70% of the population living on less than $2 per person per day. Levels of acute malnutrition reached 25%, hitting women and children the hardest. This drastic drop in basic economic sustenance against a background of past higher expectations correlates with intense suicide bombings in that period.

We can support the One Campaign of Bread for the World (www.bread.org), support the Millennium Challenge to cut world poverty in half by 2015. President Bush said last week the U. S. would support it. That is American values. Christian values: Come to the aid

---

[4]Alan Krueger and Jitka Malecková, "Education, Poverty and Terrorism: Is There a Causal Connection?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 17/4 (Fall 2003), 128-9.

of the needy. Work for the Common Good. Will he and Congress back this up by providing the money?

But the U. S. is now the lowest per capita donor to economic aid for developing countries, except for Italy, and has been for years. ("For years"—It was not first caused by president Bush.) Such giving undermines our American and our Christian values.

So, two of the practices of just peacemaking—Sustainable Economic Justice; and Human Rights and Religious Liberty and Democracy—work to prevent terrorism, because terrorists depend on arousing anger against injustice and on claiming that their violence is the only effective way to get justice.

Turkish and Russian Antiterrorism Compared

Russia has wrestled with terrorism by an ethnic-minority, Muslim Chechens in southern Russian seeking independence from Russia. Russia chose a scorched-earth military approach. The result: enormous devastation, and no end to terrorism.

Turkey had an analogous and very serious problem with rebellion and terrorism by an ethnic-minority, Muslims led by the PKK (*Partiya Karkeren Kurdistan*), seeking independence from Turkey. It had killed more than 30,000 persons since its beginning in 1984.

But, then, Turkey changed its approach to deal with causes of Kurdish terrorism. Turkey stopped widespread military attacks. Instead, they arrested terrorists when they could find them, as a police action; and focused on sustainable economic development. Between 1983, and 1992, the Kurdish areas received twice as much investment per capita as any other region. They worked on health and education for the Kurdish area.

They also worked on human rights and democracy: They gave Kurdish tribal structures recognition and enlisted them in the struggle for economic development, community development, and political representation, instead of trying to suppress them as they had before. Kurds have gained more representation in the Turkish parliament than their proportion of the population.

Work with Emerging Cooperative Forces in the International System

Why did they make this change? Because of Turkey's drive to be accepted as a member of the European Union. The European Union told them they needed to work on human rights, democracy, and eco-

nomic development for the Kurds, if they are to be accepted as a member of the EU. This is another practice of just peacemaking: “Work with emerging cooperative forces in the international system.”

When Jesus teaches "love your enemies," he is commenting on the teaching in Leviticus 19:17-18—"Love your neighbor as yourselves." The question in Jesus' day, and in ours, is "who is my neighbor?" Who is to be included in the community of neighbors? Jesus said that God gives sunshine and rain to God's enemies as well as friends, so we are to include even our enemies in the community of neighbors. How do we do that in relation to other countries in a time of terrorist threat?

We need to “Work with emerging cooperative forces in the international system.” We can see how that worked when the European Union prodded Turkey to focus on doing justice for Kurds. It also worked in arresting Ocalan, the leader of the PKK terrorism campaign. He was hiding in Assyria, so that the Turkish government could not capture him. But other countries in the international system pressured Syria not to give him asylum, and they expelled him. He fled, but Italy arrested him and extradited him to Turkey. The Turkish government imprisoned him and said it would seek the death penalty.

Practice Cooperative Conflict Resolution

But another teaching of Jesus is that when we have anger against our brother, we are commanded to go to the brother and make peace (Matthew 5:21-26). Accordingly, another practice of just peacemaking is "Practice cooperative conflict resolution." And that is what Turkey did: they talked with Ocalan. In conflict resolution, you ask if there is some interest your enemy has that you can affirm, while you reject what you must reject, such as the violence of terrorism. They asked Ocalan: "Is there some interest you have that we can affirm?" He said, "I'd really rather live. Can we avoid the death penalty?" They said, "We'd really rather that the people of Turkey live. Can you call off the terrorism?" He said, "It's a deal."

So, now, the Kurdish terrorism against Turkey is almost all finished. However, as president Bush and prime minister Tony Blair were meeting in London, Nov. 20, 2003, terrorists attacked the London-based HSBC bank and the British consulate. Twenty-six people were killed, including British Consul Roger Short. Five days previously, two Jewish synagogues in Istanbul were bombed, killing twenty-three. This is not Kurdish terrorism against the Turkish government. It is Al Quaeda-type terrorism against the British and U. S. governments for their attacks against Muslim nations and for their support of Israel's occupation of Palestine and against Israel for that occupation.

Strengthen the United Nations and International Efforts for Cooperation and Human Rights

Along with the just peacemaking practice of working with emerging cooperative forces in the international system, there is the parallel practice of Strengthening the United Nations and international efforts for cooperation and human rights. It works: the more nations are involved in international networks and in organizations of the United Nations within their own countries, the less often they make war. This is an empirical conclusion of political science research.

The converse is shown in the shift in the first decade of the 21st century. The George W. Bush administration shifted to bypassing the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations inspection process in making war in Iraq, in opposing the United Nations, and in withdrawing from eight international treaties. And it declared three wars: against terrorism, against Afghanistan, and against Iraq. And threatened war against Iran. I do not know any other U. S. administration that has declared so many wars in one administration.

Here are the introductory paragraphs from the long-range strategy of the largest U. S. grassroots peace organization, Peace Action (www.peace-action.org). How much truth do you see in them? It's not about being in favor of president Bush or not; he won't run again. It's about learning and correcting in the next administration, whether Democratic or Republican. Some may find the words too pointed, but the words are meant to point out the corrections that Peace Action believes the next administration needs to take:

> The present U. S. policy of go-it-alone unilateral domination rather than international cooperation not only alienates the United States from other nations, but erodes our own security. Making war on Iraq before the international inspections were finished, when they had found no weapons of mass destruction, and against the advice of almost all other nations, caused international resentment and fueled the anger that recruits terrorists. Closing out other nations from bids for Iraqi reconstruction intensified the international hostility. Arguing that prisoners in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantanamo were not subject to the protections of international law left the prisoners vulnerable to abuse and the United States subject to international and Muslim criticism and hostility. Rejecting repeated warnings from the International Red Cross of prisoner abuse allowed the abuse to become an international scandal. Ignoring warnings of the international inspectors that 350 tons of very high explosives stored in Al Qa Qaa needed guarding allowed these

high explosives to fall into the hands of terrorists for use against U. S. forces, Iraqi police, and future targets elsewhere.

Making war unilaterally has caused most other nations to avoid assisting in Iraq and led others to withdraw. Continuing U. S. military dominance has caused many Iraqis to resist the U.S. presence as a foreign occupation. Combined with weakness in opposing injustice to Palestinians, this unilateral domination has convinced many Arabs and Muslims that the United States is making war against them.

Withdrawing from six international treaties designed to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction—the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, inspections for the Biological Weapons Treaty, the Chemical Weapons Treaty, and the Nuclear Fissile materials Treaty, the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, the Landmines Treaty, and also from the International Criminal Court and the Kyoto Accords—has further turned other nations against the United States. And it has undermined international efforts to prevent weapons of mass destruction from proliferating into the hands of terrorists.

Terrorist groups exist in something like eighty nations. The only way to combat them effectively is by international cooperation. But international cooperation requires that the United States be internationally cooperative.

The United States is founded on the principle of checks and balances. A lack of checks and balances leads to abuse of power and injustice by the powerful. U. S. military and economic power is huge. If the U. S. fails to listen to other nations, to support international treaties that restrain unilateral actions, other nations see it as a bully, as arrogant, as a dominator—and this increases the anger that leads to terrorism. The U. S. needs to support international treaties that restrain all nations from proliferating and maintaining weapons of mass destruction.

The policy of go-it-alone unilateral domination enervates the international cooperation needed to prevent terrorism, exacerbates the anger that recruits terrorists, and erodes the restraints against the spread of weapons of mass destruction. This undermines our real security. The United States can contribute to world peace and security much more effectively by working in tandem with international networks and treaties for human rights and freedom from weapons of mass destruction. A nation's security, like an individual's, requires respectful engagement with a larger world.

Matt 26:52—"Put up your sword; those who take up the sword by the sword will die."

Jesus' teaching about putting up our weapons correlates with two additional practices of just peacemaking. One practice is to *reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade.* The other practice is to *take independent initiatives to reduce the threat*. Even prior to the long process of negotiating a treaty, a country like the United States can take an action such as presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy did—halting testing of nuclear weapons and inviting the Soviet Union to do the same, for a specified period of time. That led to the Test Ban Treaty that has halted test exploding of nuclear weapons above ground ever since 1963.

Presidents George H. W. Bush (the father) and Gorbachev both took very significant reciprocating initiatives that reduced nuclear weapons on both sides by about half. A nation can lead by taking initiatives and inviting reciprocation, and thus achieve significant reductions in offensive weapons and significant increases in safety and security. The "Roadmap for Peace" presses Israel and Palestine to take peacemaking initiatives toward each other, such as withdrawing from occupied and ceasing terrorist suicide bombing attacks.

Many fear that terrorists could attack the United States with biological weapons.[5] Were terrorists to introduce a fatal virus into an airplane flying from London or Paris to New York (it would not be detected by the x-ray machines), passengers could transmit the infection to their different destination-cities for a week before their symptoms appeared; and the disease might spread further as doctors took another week to diagnose it. Recently, several flights from France and England to the United States were cancelled because of suspicion that they were about to be used for exactly that kind of biological threat.

Fortunately, a Biological Weapons Treaty that makes these weapons illegal has been signed by almost every nation. Though its verification procedures are not yet in place, the negotiations to develop them since 1995, have produced widespread international agreement. This enacts the just peacemaking practices, *work with emerging cooperative forces in the international system,* and *strengthen the United Nations and international efforts for cooperation and human rights.* The practice to *reduce offensive weapons and weapons trade* also applies to biological weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. "The United States has a profound interest in preventing other countries from

---

[5]See the *Washington Quarterly* reader on terrorism, Alexander T. J. Lennon, ed., *The Battle for Hearts and Minds* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003), 73, 79, 91, 153, etc.

testing nuclear arms and stopping rogue regimes and terrorists from acquiring biological weapons." The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Biological Weapons Convention "would advance these important goals. If the United States rejects the restraints these agreements impose or declines to negotiate improvements, how can it ask others to embrace them?"[6] Yet "in the summer of 2001, the United States shocked its peers when it rejected" the agreement establishing verification procedures for biological weapons, an action that reflects the George W. Bush administration's unilateralist course in international policy.[7]

Verification of the Biological Weapons Treaty would include annual declarations by nations describing their programs and factories that could be used to produce biological weapons, random visits to declared facilities, and short-notice inspections of suspected facilities. Clearly this would be useful in preventing many likely sources of bioweapons for terrorists.

By mid-2001, a consensus text was emerging, and on July 23, 2001, the twenty-fourth negotiating session convened. Delegates expected their efforts would soon result in a final text. During the first three days, more than fifty nations spoke in favor of promptly completing the negotiations. Then U. S. Ambassador Donald Mahley brought the entire process to an end: "The United States has concluded that the current approach to a protocol to the Biological Weapons Convention . . . is not, in our view, capable of . . . strengthening confidence in compliance with the Biological Weapons Convention. . . . We will therefore be unable to support the current text, even with changes."

Later in 2001, "the United States tried at the last minute to terminate protocol negotiations completely, throwing the meeting into disorder and leaving no option but to suspend the conference until November 2002." The U.S. earned disappointment, criticism, and anger from the world community for blocking enforceable inspections of sites where terrorists might develop, purchase, or steal biological weapons for their own use.

---

[6]*Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 69, 285-6; and Arnold Howitt and Robyn Pangi, eds., *Countering Terrorism: Dimensions of Preparedness* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003), chapter 5.

[7]Mark Wheelis, Malcolm Dando, and Catherine Auer, "Back to Bioweapons?" *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 59:1 (January/February, 2003), 40-47. Further quotations in the text are from this article.

When the attack on September 11, 2001, demonstrated the urgent threat of terrorism, the U. S. representative this time did not try to block annual study meetings or to block the proposal that they might try again for adoption of the treaty in 2006. At the time of this lecture, we do not know whether the United States will support a revised treaty, but just peacemaking urges reducing bioweapons and working with cooperative forces in the international community.

The George W. Bush administration rejected not only verification of biological weapons, but also the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, the Kyoto anti-global-warming treaty, the International Criminal Court, international restraints on unilaterally making preemptive war, and the treaty banning land mines. It, also, disengaged from international efforts for peacemaking between Israel and Palestine, and peacemaking with North Korea.

The United States once enjoyed a high favorability rating in most of the nations of the world for its support for human rights, democracy, cooperation, and peace. But the recent Pew Global Survey of many other nations shows the rating of president Bush in those nations to have dropped to all-time lows, and the rating of the United States also to have dropped, although not as low as the president's. Favorability ratings in Arab nations are 4%. Those nations show extensive anger against president Bush for his perceived support of oppressive policies against Palestine and perceived wars against Muslim nations—Afghanistan, Iraq, Palestine, and Iran. This produces an atmosphere that supports some to become terrorists.

Terrorist networks are in something like eighty nations. The U. S. army cannot go to all those nations and attack the terrorists. Just peacemaking says counter-terrorism requires the cooperation of many nations. But to persuade them to cooperate, the United States itself needs a cooperative foreign policy.

Encourage Grass-Roots Peacemaking Groups

Jesus created a community of disciples, and formed cell groups of disciples in different villages.[8] The corresponding practice of just peacemaking is to encourage grass-roots peacemaking groups and voluntary associations (and church peacemaker groups). Alone, we have very little power, and we lack the information and networks that we need in order to have an effective and informed just peacemaking influence. So, it is crucial to find a group to join. I wrote a book for what

[8]N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1996), 276, 295ff.

used to be called the Brotherhood Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, laying out the practices that work to form a small group in churches with a mission to an inward journey of prayer and study, and an outward journey of peacemaking advocacy.

The book helped found many such peacemaker groups in churches. It sold well—through several printings and a second edition. But it is now out of print. Its basic practices can be found on the website of Every Church a Peace Church (www.ecapc.org). That website can also link you to other peacemaking networks, including the peace fellowships of numerous Christian denominations. So, my final word is: do not feel alone and disempowered; join a group, join a network. Be informed. Be effective. Follow Jesus in practical and informed ways.

Alumni Reflections

2005-06 Distinguished Alumnus Response

Ralph H. Elliot (‘49)

The Carson-Newman experience for me and for my wife was the opening of the doors to the future—doors with an undiminished hope. I came to Carson-Newman just out of the service in WWII, where I had been a rifleman in the infantry. I needed the school at that time. When I came here, I discovered it was more than the school itself that was important for me. The ethos of both the community and the College, in some ways one and the same, nourished me.

My wife and I lived in a small attic apartment in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Farris, and we had the nurturing support of the neighbor across the street Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Owens, who became known as our Tennessee parents. There are so many things I could say in the eight or ten minutes, which is about as long as these people have spent introducing everyone, so I can take a few minutes longer. But I’m really the debtor to certain faculty members, a couple of whom have already been mentioned here tonight.

When I came to the College, I had all the answers. After all, I had grown up in the eight-point record system. I attended BYPU (Baptist Young Peoples Union), and I learned my parts. I gave them back even in the BTU (Baptist Training Union), when we became that. In the process I was fortunate, because immediately there was mandated to me a touch of humility that caused me to realize that questions often are far more important than answers. And it happened because, by happenstance, I fell into the hands of Janie Swann Huggins and her English classes.

There, as I learned about metaphor and figures of speech and literary approaches to things, I learned that words somehow become the index to life. It was really in that class that I learned to read not just literature generally, but to read the Bible. And it was there that I began to understand how tragic it is when the words that are used to articulate someone’s theology or experience are so concretized that they become more important than the experience itself. And, so, I began, because of

Miss Janie, to grapple with the questions. And, as I grappled with those questions, I learned something about the ambiguity of faith—that you're always on the quest. I learned that an old Spanish proverb is correct—the one who thinks he or she has arrived has not yet begun. The questions continued, again, and again, and again.

As I began to learn to ask the questions, I discovered that sometimes the humility of the questions is far more important than the arrogance of the answer. And, so, I learned a tool with which I was to approach life. I was motivated to ask those questions and to search them out, to grapple with them, and to live with them, even when there were no answers.

As to motivation, we had in those days that horrible (I've forgotten what you call it) kind of notebook paper on which you had to have the professors lectures on one side and your research on the other. I'd done a good job, but called me in one day and said, "Ralph, I want to talk to you. This is a terrible paper." I said, "Miss Janie I thought I did a really good job." She said, "Well, you did, but you can do a whole lot better." Miss Janie and I were friends for life. As a matter of fact, long after the bump in the Genesis road, I came back here to Dandridge, TN, and conducted Janie Swann Huggins' funeral.

It was in Miss Janie's class that my real intellectual life began. But, then, J. C. Brashear taught me how important history is. It was he who helped me to understand that somehow every tomorrow is born in yesterday. And that it is so important to understand the ethos, ethic, and culture out of which something came, because only in doing that can you determine not only what was, what is, and what needs to be. Only then can you build bridges from the past to tomorrow. And it was there under his tutelage that I learned somehow to read institutional history as a key to the present.

Everywhere I have been, whether it was to a church or to an educational institution, the first thing I did in every instance was to sit down and read something of the history of that place, usually reading trustee minutes. In Rochester, NY, I read Dean's thesis on the history of the church that I was serving as interim. That became the key to my ministry. For example, when I went to Albany, NY, I happened to end up in a historical church. It was a church where great personages had roamed forth for ages, since the early 1800's—Charles Evans Hughes was superintendent in that church, and Major Rathbone, Lincoln's bodyguard, when he was assassinated (must not have been a good bodyguard) was a member of that church. Ira Harris, a Senator during Lincoln's time and important in the Lincoln administration, was a member of that church.

I discovered when I got there that there was some kind of feeling in the community about that church. It was located in downtown Albany, the state capitol, only a few doors from that capital building. By that time there was a great diversity in the community—economic, educational, you name it—but somehow the feeling was amongst those who were not in the upper strata, that Emmanuel was not the place for them. I began to search why, because I knew that our ministry needed to be a wider, more inclusive ministry than that.

One day I was contemplating the little metal numbers on the end of every pew in the sanctuary, and I began reading the history. I discovered in those early days, the church members owned the pews. They rented from the church space on which to rest the pew. Roaming around in the basement of the church one day, I discovered that pew #98 had been sold three times, and each new owner had made a $25 profit!

I also discovered that if you were not wealthy or prestigious enough to own a pew, you had to sit in the balcony. And all those many, many, many years later, that feeling was still in the community—there were pew folks and there were balcony folks. By beginning the understanding of the history and the ethos of that place, there was a new flowering in the life of that church and in the life of that community. I'm eternally grateful for what I learned in the history class at Carson-Newman, for that kind of understanding.

I must, if I may, comment about one other person that David has already mentioned, Dr. Carl Bahner. I'm not a scientist at all. My mind isn't made that way. But, how important he was in my life—a man of science, a man of religion, and a man of faith. It was there that I learned that religion and science are not enemies, but rather friends on the journey toward truth. I think it's so sad today, that we have the same argument going on that reoccurs every 25, 30, 50 years—call it Genesis, call it evolution, call it what you will—it's the same argument.

We live in an age when so many scientists are people of faith. For example, Francis Collins, Director of the National Human Genome Research Institute for the National Institutes of Health, outstanding Christian layman, who on public television and in public lectures says he is a Christian who believes that the Christian life and following Jesus Christ is what one does everyday, not just on Sunday in church. There's a great hunger in the field of science today, especially among physicists.

I had the wonderful experience, when I lived in Chicago, of becoming the friend of Dr. Yoichiro Nambu, former Director of the Ferme Physics Laboratory at the University of Chicago. Dr Nambu was the co-author of the String Theory, if you are a physicist or a scientist.

Even though he was a Buddhist by background, we have had many conversations. I was always impressed with the sense of awe, the sense of mystery, the sense of wonder, and the sense of the holy which he felt as he grappled with God's universe. What we are doing in creating this gap between religion and science, is driving away many of the most deeply believing people, some who believe far more deeply and experience far more deeply that sense of awe and wonder and mystery, that sense of the holy, than do many of these people who say they are preaching the word from the pulpit Sunday after Sunday after Sunday.

I could go on and on. I'm so grateful for not only these who helped me to understand history and questions, but also those who saw the wisdom in realizing that there needs be no separation between those who describe processes that took place and those who try to grapple with why they took place. I just wish everybody could know that Charles Darwin grappled with the question of God all his life. In the second edition of *The Origin of Species*, he wrote in his own handwriting, about a grander view of life, with its several powers breathed by the Creator.

Well, there's so much you have to leave out in that eight minutes, which are gone, I suppose. I could talk about the Philomatheans; I could talk about the Debating Society. I was telling somebody at the table, our debating team once was in Hickory, NC. One of the teams, we had a men's and women's team, was from the Naval Academy. Here came the Naval cadets all dressed up in their Navy blues, so handsome. The first thing that happened when the Navy team walked in and the debate began was that one of our female debaters fainted. But, as I recall, we won the debate.

The student socialization that took place at Carson-Newman, the political science, the literary activities—all of those make interesting stories. But what I want to say is how much this recognition means to me and my family tonight. I am sorry they could not be here. Actually, all four of us started out. One daughter, two weeks ago, ended up with a knee replacement, and couldn't come. Last Friday night, our second daughter called; she was in the hospital. On the way down here yesterday, my wife had a temperature of 102.4 degrees. I checked into the hotel and checked in at the hospital in Morristown. I had the feeling that somebody was still handling things that handled them in 1961!

But what I started to say was that I used to come to Carson-Newman quite often. I came once and spoke on Scholarship Day. I came another time for some kind of convocation. I came another time and led a religious focus week at the same time that Harley Fite would not allow a black player from Berea College to play football. So, do you want to know what the students talked about all week long in focus

week? On Thursday, Harley Fite called me in and said, "Ralph, we're really disappointed in you. Last year we had Carlyle Marney for focus week, and it was awful. It just tore up the campus. But we knew we could have confidence in you; but all you've done is talk about race all week long." I said, "Dr. Fite, I didn't introduce the question of race to this campus. You did."

Well, all of us are aware of what happened—that bump in the road called Genesis in 1961. It sort of ended my relationship with Carson-Newman, because the administration at that time made it clear to certain faculty members that an end was the way it needed to be. I did make another attempt, I think it was in the early 1980s, when Cordell Maddox was president. I was invited to speak in chapel. But, then, stuff was in the *Baptist and Reflector* for the next month or two. I said to Virginia, "It's hopeless, let's forget it."

But, dear friends, this means so much to me and to my family. There are two high honors in my life. One happened to me that didn't make it in the little write up in the booklet. I am the only Christian that has ever been awarded an honorary degree, an honorary doctorate, by Hebrew College in Massachusetts, for the work that I've done between Christians and Jews and for helping a theological seminary and a Jewish graduate college and rabbi training institution move to the same campus where they are now doing co-work. That means a lot to me.

But, this is the second high honor. In many ways it is for me and for my family a return to our roots. I've been a long way since Carson-Newman. I've never been apologetic about my experience here or about my experience at Southern Seminary, as far as that goes. I am thankful those roots produced along the way some new fruits.

I no longer read a Bible that reads from Genesis to Revelation. I read from Exodus to Revelation!—I am being facetious. But this is a coming home. Because of what happened in the early 60s when our girls were so small, they didn't know what was going on. They did know, however, that somebody didn't like their daddy; and to this day, they have found it difficult to like Baptist preachers.

This event has in many ways been a new birth experience in their lives. I'm so sorry they couldn't be here tonight, but I'm really thankful to all of you. Thank you for rebuilding the bridges. Let us remember that bridges always lead to somewhere. They don't just look to where we've been. They look to where we might go. May God make that the case for you and for me, as we walk together from this point onward. Thank you so very much.

2005-2006 R. R. Turner Spirit of College Award Response

Ann A. Jones ('61)

First of all, I am in awe and humbled by the presentation of the *R. R. Turner Spirit of the College Award* that was recently revealed to me. I am grateful to the Alumni Association for the "vision" to develop this special award to recognize faculty and staff for many years to come. I knew from being a part of the Alumni Association, as faculty representative, that there was a strong desire for this special award in the name of Dr. R. R. Turner.

Dr. Turner was "Carson-Newman" in every way possible that represented the tradition of this school which is "Truth, Beauty, and Goodness," as imprinted on the seal of the college. He loved this college as a student, faculty member, and Professor Emeritus. He never knew a stranger, and everyone knew and loved Dr. Turner. He loved Carson-Newman, and I observed carefully his "walk in life" when I was a student here and later as a faculty member. The special traits he possessed were contagious for anyone who knew him.

I came to Carson-Newman in 1957, as a student desiring to further my education in music. My parents applied late to Carson-Newman. My pastor at Central Baptist in Johnson City, Dr. James Cox, kept urging my parents on to make this educational step for me. Finally, when I arrived at Carson-Newman, there was literally "no room in the inn."

Three of us girls could not stay in the dorms because they were completely filled. In those days no one lived off campus. We were immediately placed in the home of Dr. and Mrs. Harley Fite. I cannot tell you how much fun that was for a semester until we could be placed in a dorm. Dr. and Mrs. Fite and I really became good friends after that experience, and it was Dr. Fite that presented me with my first contract in 1967. I taught two full years for Dr. Teague prior to 1967, while he was working on his doctorate.

My experience as a student at Carson-Newman was outstanding. I received an excellent education that prepared me for the premiere music school in the country: Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana. Not only did I grow as a person, but also I grew in the appreciation of a true liberal arts education in a Christian environment. Today, I continue to champion the "liberal arts" concept for our school and its student.

As a faculty member, the superlatives are so enormous it would take too many minutes to express what this college has meant to me. I am indebted to my husband who has accompanied me through the years as a vocalist and supported me in every endeavor of my teaching career. I guess I have been away from home more than at home because of my professional activities through the years with my involvement as International President of Delta Omicron International Music Fraternity and related National offices. He has supported all of these important avenues in my life.

My colleagues with their individual creativity and personalities have helped me to be a better faculty member each day. I have learned something from every one of them. And, if you teach long enough here, you will see former students such as Angela Holder teach along with you.

Dr. Ball, our previous Dean, always encouraged me on; and he began my journey as a choral conductor. Of course, I had a secret desire to be a conductor; but Dr. Ball caused it to happen for me and asked me to be conductor of the Women Singers here at Carson-Newman. This has been an enjoyable experience along with teaching voice.

Dr. Measels has been extremely helpful to me since becoming Dean of Fine Arts, and we are always having good conversations about the future of the Music Department.

As a faculty member, I have spent a great deal of time on committees outside of teaching. Committee work helps you to grow as a faculty member because you have an opportunity to make a difference in the internal structure and future of the college.

My special enjoyment was being a part of the Alumni Association of the College, representing the faculty. This experience was enlightening to observe. I was privileged to listen to the excitement of our alumni, how they feel about the college, and where they hope the college will continue to grow in its ideals and new visions for tomorrow.

The Alumni Association has been directly involved in recruiting new students, beautification of the campus, and reaching out to other alums in giving to the college for its future programs.

I love to teach and interact with the students. The students have changed from decade to decade in their religious and educational background. This keeps faculty members on their toes and challenges them from day to day in working with the individual student. We weep with them when they are sad and rejoice when they had a rewarding day. Each year I look forward to see individual students grow in their religious experience, education, and development of leadership and responsibility skills from their experience at Carson-Newman.

I owe a great deal to Carson-Newman because it has given me my skills for life as a faculty member, and I continue to grow through this experience.

Once again, thank you for bestowing this prestigious award on me, the "*R. R. Turner Spirit of the College Award*."

****

Remarks at Founders Day

October 18, 2005

T. Maxfield Bahner ('54)

Growing up near the Northwest corner of the Carson-Newman campus was my good fortune. We moved to Jefferson City when I was four. In a sense the Carson-Newman family reared me, until I left to go to the Baptist Seminary in Louisville in January, 1954.

The world in which I grew up was in many ways much more simple than ours is today. When I was old enough, in a five or ten minute walk in any direction, I could be out in the country. I enjoyed walking in the fields of East Tennessee and the trails in the Smoky Mountains. It was a safe place to walk and to camp. Jefferson City was a safe place in which to grow up. We rarely locked the doors of our house. The biggest dangers we faced were drowning in Cherokee Lake or an occasional rattlesnake or copperhead.

When, in the fall of 1950, I entered Carson-Newman as a freshman I had not learned nearly as much as I thought I had. I was oblivious to the fact that I was greener than green, wetter than wet. Little did I realize that I was entering experiences that would change my life in most wonderful ways.

As I sat regularly in chapel, I saw the college seal emblazoned in gold on the dark blue curtains of the stage in Old Henderson Auditorium. That seal bore three words: "Truth, Beauty, Goodness." This morning I want to talk principally about the first of those words, TRUTH, and how some things I learned here about Truth have influenced my thinking over the years. I will talk briefly about the last two words, "beauty" and "goodness" toward the end of these remarks.

It began to dawn on me, slowly at first, that the campus was suffused with the exciting atmosphere of learning. From professors like Dr. Russell Bradley Jones who taught Bible, Dean Arlie Cate who

taught philosophy, Dr. W. W. Bass who taught English, Dr. Joe Chapman who taught biology, I began to learn the importance of a vigorous, informed, reflective search for truth. Knowledge provides stepping-stones towards that elusive goal.

I learned that acquiring knowledge is hard work. Learning is only incidentally related to academic examinations. The fundamental purpose for learning is to acquire knowledge in the various disciplines of a liberal arts education such history, English literature, math that will be important foundations as we continue to learn. Broad knowledge is an essential prerequisite to the search for truth. We might think of knowledge as building materials for our thinking. We acquire knowledge throughout our lives. And acquiring knowledge is, for me, still hard work.

In this Carson-Newman community, I began to learn that there are differences in truth. "Faith truth" is not the same as scientific truth. Scientific truth is not the same as the truth of music, poetry, or literature such as novels, short stories, essays, and the like.

Faith truth cannot be taught like history or language or the sciences. There is no standardized examination to measure faith truth, nor is there any way to reliably test faith truth to see whether or not it is correct. Witness the incredible variety of faith truth among the inhabitants of the world: Muslims, Buddhists, Hindu, animists, and many others. Even within Christianity there are many different understandings of faith truth.

Faith truth comes from our subjective experiences with the mystery of the Creator and creation. Here, I hope, you will learn a lot about the idea of the Holy and how that idea relates to the mystery of our existence. To the Hebrew people, our spiritual forbearers, the name used for the Creator was so holy it was expressed only by the consonants YHWH. Today we do not know how they pronounced it.

Faith truth cannot be quantified in any empirical way. "Faith" as the writer of Hebrews observed, "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."[1]

It was a "faith truth" adopted by the Church that the planet earth was the center of the universe, and all else revolved around the earth as the center. Galileo, in his study of the heavens, concluded that this was not the reality. He found that the planet earth and the other planets in our small system revolved around the sun. The Church said he was wrong. It tried him and imprisoned him for this until he recanted and said that the Church was right, even though, clearly, the Church was not right. What Galileo had observed in his studies was correct. Noth-

[1]Hebrews 11.1

ing the Church did changed the scientific truth that our earth is in a solar system rotating with other planets around the sun.

This is not to say that faith is not real, but that we must be very careful with faith truth. We may believe something to be true, and learn later that we were not correct. Vital faith cannot be static. Lively faith grows, broadens, deepens and strengthens as we grow in knowledge and in experience.

A static intellectual life would be pretty pallid. A static life of the mind is not what I think our Creator intended. We can grow in faith as we can grow in knowledge. We can grow whatever our circumstances. Dietrich Bonhoeffer grew in his faith even when imprisoned by the Nazis as his letters reveal. Nelson Mandela grew as a person in his faith during his lengthy imprisonment by South Africa, and came out of those experiences to lead his country as President.

My ideas about faith changed significantly while I was a student here. I can remember sitting in Dean Cate's class in the philosophy of religion and struggling with ideas that did not fit within the comfortable mental patterns of my youth. Dean Cate did not suffer fools gladly, and could, in his inimitable way, mop the floor with my feeble attempts to intelligently discuss the material we were studying or debate the new ideas I was exposed to. From Dean Cate and my father, Carl Tabb Bahner, who taught chemistry here for many years, I also learned the importance of healthy skepticism as we test ideas in our search for truth. Critical thinking is fundamental to life as well as to our search for truth.

Do not cringe from debating ideas! Debate is an important part of our learning. I practice law—particularly trial law. My adversaries and the courts regularly test my propositions in debate. In our firm, we debate issues, and out of this comes a better grasp of what we think is correct. I want younger lawyers in our firm, as well as my peers, to disagree with me, to debate ideas with me, and I sometimes change my mind as a result of these debates.

Just as in biology, my teachers, Dr. Chapman, Prof. Dickinson and Prof. Wolcott challenged me, they helped me to grow beyond the meager limits of the intellectual world in which I lived and thought when I first became a student here. They taught me to see science as a remarkable discipline that has the potential to bring a cornucopia of new ideas that can change the world for the better. Biology today is a far different and more exciting discipline than when I was a student here.

Dr. Jones taught me to read the Bible more thoughtfully and reflectively than when I came. He taught me, among other things, to think about how different parts of the Bible give us new perspectives. He taught me not to be afraid to ask questions. Thus, I learned to differentiate between the creation story in the first chapter of Genesis from the

other, and perhaps earlier, story in the second chapter of Genesis, and wonder where, for instance, the wives for Cain and Abel came from. He taught me to consider the different names used for God in the Old Testament. I learned first hand what Paul observed in the 13th Chapter of First Corinthians when he said, "When I was a child I thought as a child, . . . " and I had been thinking as a child. The Carson-Newman community of faculty and students helped me grow beyond that.

With faith truth we must be careful never to think we have "arrived," that we understand it all, that we have the final answer with nothing more to learn. It is dangerous to stop thinking too soon. We are created with a capacity for tremendous growth. The God we know through Jesus Christ is greater than our conceiving or defining. We must therefore be very careful with faith truth, recognizing that we hold truth in the earthen vessels of minds limited by our humanity and by our time in space and history.

This also informs the way we treat the faith of others, whether we agree with them or not. Forced conformity stifles faith. Faith truth is fundamentally personal. In matters of faith I may relate to you my experience or give you my opinion, but I cannot go beyond that. Faith truth is fundamentally personal. Having said this I want to emphasize that faith is real. Faith truth is crucial. We stake our lives on our faith.

I learned this repeatedly in Carson-Newman Volunteer Band, which met one night a week in the home of my parents. The members of Volunteer Band were persons who thought they might well spend their lives on a foreign mission field. I began to sit in the Volunteer Band meetings before I became a freshman. I listened to many including Webb and Betty Carroll and others talk of their experiences and their dreams. Fulfilling their calling and dreams the Carrolls went as missionaries to Uganda.

A few years ago my wife and I were in Africa having dinner with the wife of the head of the Africa Inland Mission. I asked her whether she knew Webb and Betty Carroll. Her face lighted up. She knew the Carrolls well. She told me that Webb Carroll was one of the few people who could talk with Idi Amin, a fearsome and bloody ruler of Uganda. She related a story about Webb's going on a trip and his car being stopped by some armed men. Among them was a man brandishing a weapon who was the leader of a brutal armed group. He stuck his head into the car. The man asked Webb if he was the person who had led his sister to a Christian faith. Webb thought this would be the end and that he would be killed right there. But, with tears in his eyes, this man asked Webb why he had not come to tell him about Jesus.

That faith is real is attested to again and again in history by Christian martyrs who have died for their faith and who are legion. We must

recognize that each had a sturdy faith that was personal and thus unique as is ours. There are saints galore even today.

This tension between faith and reason has a very long history. During the 13th Century, for example, a sect called Avenaists, believed faith and reason were not compatible. The angelic doctor, Thomas Aquinas, thought one could prove the existence of God through reason, the Uncaused Cause, the Unmoved Mover. While I disagree with Aquinas and think that we cannot reason ourselves to God, I do agree that reason and faith are not incompatible.

"Scientific truth" is different from "faith truth." Scientific truth can be tested and can be communicated in an empirical way. Scientific truth can be duplicated. Unlike faith truth, scientific truth is subject to scrutiny and testing.

In the first commandment in the Genesis record, God commanded that human kind should multiply and subdue the earth.[2] The implications of this commandment are breathtaking. Human kind is to reproduce. We are created with a purpose of reproducing and replenishing the race.

The second part of that first commandment is that we are to subdue the earth—to get a handle on God's creation, to understand it. We are just beginning to understand God's creation. Think how human kind's understanding of creation has grown since the earliest persons lived. The understanding of the people who left silhouettes of their hands and the exquisitely fluid drawings of animals on the walls of the caves at Lescaux was a tiny fraction of what you today have the tools to understand.

We, who call ourselves Christian, should not fear science. From my teachers in biology, chemistry and physics I learned, among other things, that there is no disconnect between real science and genuine faith. I have watched with amazement and disappointment the development of the creationist and intelligent design movements whose leaders want us to think these are science. They are faith based, but are not science. Creationists discard or ignore hard scientific evidence. Creationism has morphed into what is known as "intelligent design." It stretches my credulity that a thinking person can in this age believe the world was created in 4,004 BC in seven literal days, or that Noah's ark contained dinosaurs. The scientific evidence is that this is not the way creation occurred.

While we have the freedom to believe what we want to believe, whether it is true or not, as Galileo's experience with the Catholic

---

[2]Genesis 1.22

Church demonstrated, the "faith truth" the Church taught that the earth was the center of the universe was not correct.

The writer of the Eighth Psalm said:

> When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him? And the son of man, that thou visitist him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou has put all things under his feet. . . . Oh Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!

I think of some of the changes in my lifetime which science has made possible—transportation, communication, medicine, and agriculture. Think of the changes in your own lifetime. Probably few if any of us would fail to take advantage of the benefits scientific knowledge provide, whether listening to radio, talking on a cell phone, or turning to the healing sciences for help with illness or deformity.

The voyages of scientific discovery are still going on. We cannot imagine what we do not know and what we have not learned yet to do. God's creation is vaster, more complex than we can imagine. In our investigation and experimentation we are in the process of carrying out this first commandment as we learn to understand more about God's creation. The antiquity of this planet astounds us – not just thousands of years but thousands of millions of years! The spaces of God's creation stretch our minds that cannot really comprehend their volumes. Ask yourself whether there are limitations on these spaces or not—and if there are limitations, or are not, what is outside or beyond?

The capacity of the mind to learn and then to probe beyond what is already known demonstrates the power God has given us to carry out his intention. The geologist and the paleontologist look back at God's creation. They find rock without fossils. They find rock with fossils. They find fossils from obviously different time periods. They ask questions about how various species of life have come into being and how they have become extinct. They ask questions about how various life forms have come to be what they are today.

Astronomers, mathematicians and physicists look far beyond the horizons of the earth to chart the heavens, the actions of celestial bodies and study what those may indicate about other parts of God's creation we have yet to discover. What they are learning and what they are posing as working hypotheses are breathtaking.

These ideas about truth are directly related to you in your time at Carson-Newman College and for the rest of your lives. In all the disci-

plines taught here I learned the crucial importance of being aware, aware of the world around me, aware of the ideas of other people, aware of the changes that are happening—to look at the far horizon and not to limit myself to that with which I am familiar.

You live in a world vastly different from the world fifty years ago. You live in a world that is knit together more tightly than we appreciate. Young people today in India, China, Africa, South America, Russia, are working hard to learn. They are dedicated and disciplined. They know that to change their worlds—to have a better quality of life—they must excel. These are the people with whom you are going to compete.

Already many high tech jobs are being exported from American shores because communication makes it possible. In these distant places are people who are more skilled and more productive. Even legal research and patent writing are being exported to India. This competition is accelerating at high speed. To keep up, to compete, you're going to have to have the drive, the dedication, the discipline to master difficult subjects—math and all the sciences, history, language—Spanish, German, Chinese, Japanese, and, yes, English! If you fail, our society will lose its strength.

You must learn to work through difficulties, to postpone self-gratification apart from the satisfaction of knowing that you have taken advantage of every opportunity to have a valid education and to excel. Realize that you are just beginning. You will have to continue to educate and reeducate yourself as long as you live. Dean Cate, to whom I referred earlier, was studying Sanskrit when he died. My father spent his last day studying, and, at age ninety-three, had several new experiments laid out. Read Thomas Friedman, "The World is Flat."[3] This will get your juices going!

From my experiences at Carson-Newman College I also learned about "beauty" and about "goodness," the other two words in the Carson-Newman seal. I learned more about the beauty of music. One time I was sitting in the dim recesses of the old Henderson Hall, as Percy Granger played the piano, and was enthralled by the pure beauty of the sound of the notes. This experience led me to find other beauty, such as the slow, patient passages in Beethoven's Fifth Piano Concerto—the Emperor. I also learned the delights of jazz—the music of John Coltrane, Thelonious Monk and Bill Evans, to name some. I learned about beauty in art and in nature. Most of all, I learned about the beauty in the lives of people all around me—professors, fellow students, the people with whom I worked, and my neighbors.

---

[3]Friedman, Thomas L., "The World is Flat," New York: Farrar Strauss and Giroux, 2005.

In the Carson-Newman community I also learned about "goodness"—the self-giving generosity of people who in their lives reflect the Christian understanding of agape. I learned also the place of honor in goodness—the uncompromising ethic of truthfulness and integrity. Time does not permit me to explore these ideas with you further.

I challenge you to remember that Carson-Newman College was founded by people with a dream that the mission of our Maker and of his Christ can be furthered by persons whose minds are cultivated in the liberal arts in a place where He is honored and glorified by our search for the truths in store for us. Remember that Jesus came for us to know the truth so that the truth can make us free.

You have the privilege and, yes, the luxury of a college education. Probably you will never have this opportunity again. It is a once in a lifetime experience. Most people in the world will never have such a chance. Make the most of it! Take advantage of this privilege.

Then, as W. H. Auden observed in his poem—we will be "able to approach the future as a friend, without a wardrobe of excuses."[4] So be it!

[4]Auden, W. H., "Another Time," Poem "In Memory of Sigmund Freud."

Contributors

Nancy Ammerman—Professor of Sociology and Director of Graduate Programs, Boston University; Ph.D., Yale University.

T. Maxfield Bahner—Board of Trustees; B.S., Carson-Newman College, 1954; B.D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; J.D., The Law School, University of Virginia.

Mary Virginia Ball—Professor of Biology, 1985; B.S., Trinity University; M.S., Ph.D., Texas A & M University.

James Lewis Baumgardner—Professor of History, 1964; B.A., Carson-Newman College; M.A., Ph.D., University of Tennessee Knoxville.

James E. Collins II—Associate Professor of Psychology, 1990; B.A., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; M.S., Ph.D., University of Georgia.

Shannon Carpenter Collins—Assistant Professor of English, 2003; B.A., M.A., University of South Alabama; Ph.D., University of Tennessee Knoxville.

David E. Crutchley—Professor of Religion, 2004; B.L., L.L.B., University of Rhodesia, M.Div., Ph.D., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Ralph H. Elliott—Carson-Newman College Graduate, 1949: Retired, Provost of the Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York and Interim President, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, MA: A.B., Carson-Newman College; B.D., Th.D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

David N. Goff—B.A., Carson-Newman College, 1988: Adjunct Professor in English; B.A., M.A.T., Carson-Newman College.

Melodi B. Goff—Assistant Professor of Library Services, Serials and Systems Librarian, 2004; B.A., Carson-Newman College; L.I.S., University of Pittsburgh.

Aaron E. Hedges—B.A., Carson-Newman College, 2006: Tullahoma, Tennessee.

Ann Anthony Jones—Associate Professor of Music, 1967; B.S., Carson-Newman College; M.M., Indiana University.

Thomas Braden Milligan, Jr.—Professor of Music, 1978; B.A., B.M., Carson-Newman College; M.A., Ph.D., University of Rochester.

Don H. Olive, Sr.—Professor of Philosophy, Dean of Humanities, 1975; B.A., East Texas Baptist College; B.D., Th.D., Ph.D., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary; Ph.D., Tulane University.

Doug Renalds—Director Bonner Scholars and the Freshman Year Experience; B.A., Carson-Newman College; M.T.S., Duke Divinity School.

Joe William Sloan—Associate Professor of Political Science, Chair of Department, Associate Provost, 1969: B.A., Carson-Newman College; M.A., University of Tennessee Knoxville; Further Study: University of Tennessee Knoxville.

Glen H. Stassen—Lewis Smedes Professor of Christian Ethics at Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA: B.A., University of Virginia; B.D., Union Theological Seminary; Ph.D., Duke University.

Sharon T. Teets—Professor of Education, 1980; B.S., West Virginia University; M.S., University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Ph.D., University of Texas at Austin.

Carol Jo Wilkerson—Associate Professor of Spanish, Chair of Foreign Language Department, 2000; B.A. College of Charleston; M.H.S., Auburn University; Ph.D., University of Georgia.