

## Integrating Faith and Learning in Higher Education

David S. Dockery

The integration of faith and learning is at the essence of authentic Christian higher education and should be wholeheartedly implemented across the campus and across the curriculum. This was once the goal of almost every college in America. It is no longer the case. Prior to the 19<sup>th</sup> century, every college started in this country—with the exception of the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Virginia—was a Christian based college committed to revealed truth. All of that changed with the rise of secularization and specialization, creating dualisms of every kind—a separation of head knowledge from heart knowledge, faith from learning, revealed truth from observed truth, and careers from vocation.

What happened was a loss of world view in the academy. There was a failure to see that every discipline and every specialization could be and should be approached from the vantage point of faith, the foundational building block for a Christian worldview. The separation of faith from learning and teaching was the first step toward creating the confused and disconnected approach to higher education, even in church-related institutions.<sup>1</sup>

A brief overview of Christian higher education will help us see the shifts and changes in purpose and focus across the years. Early Christian education

Dr. David Dockery is a Founding Fellow of the Research Institute of The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission. He is President of Union University in Jackson, Tennessee. Dr. Dockery presented this paper at the Fall meeting of the Fellows of the Research Institute on September 20, 2000.

emphasized catechetical purposes as foundational. Medieval universities (those developed between some general education for the elite. Of the 79 universities in Europe during this time it was Salerno that was best known for medicine, Bologna was best known for law, and Paris was best known for theology.

The Renaissance period emphasized the revival of Greek and Roman literature with the addition of newer subjects developed during the medieval period like arithmetic, geometry, and music. The Reformation and Post-Reformation period placed all aspects of education within the context of a Christian worldview. Higher education reached its zenith, building on what had gone before, in America. Early American colleges governed by trustees from related religious groups provided education within the context of faith and grounded in the pursuit of truth (*veritas*). Some of these schools included:

<u><i>Institution/Location</i></u>	<u><i>Date Founded</i></u>	<u><i>Denomination</i></u>
Harvard (Massachusetts)	1636	Congregational
William and Mary (Virginia)	1693	Anglican
Yale (Connecticut)	1701	Congregational
Princeton (New Jersey)	1746	New Light Presbyterian
Columbia (New York)	1754	Anglican
Brown (Rhode Island)	1765	Baptist
Rutgers (New Jersey)	1765	Dutch Reformed

Pennsylvania and Virginia were essentially the first secular institutions. The German model espousing research and academic freedom began to widely influence American Higher Education in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. Johns Hopkins,

founded in Maryland in 1867, was the first pure research institution in this country.

During the 19<sup>th</sup> Century state supported higher education began to flourish, following the University of Virginia model, which had separated the theological influence from the curriculum by abolishing the chair of divinity in its reorganization of 1779. The University of Michigan adopted a credit point system; Harvard introduced an elective curriculum, and majors and specializations followed as we moved into the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.<sup>2</sup>

The rise of enlightenment thought was a watershed in the history of western civilization, it was a time when the Christian consensus was broken by a radical secular spirit. The enlightenment philosophy stressed the primacy of nature, a high view of reason and a low view of sin, and an antisupernatural bias; and it encouraged revolt against a faith-affirming perspective of education.<sup>3</sup> Friedrich Schleiermacher's *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultural Despisers* severed faith from philosophy and morality. Faith was understood only in pietistic terms having no connection with matters of truth. Though Schleiermacher tried to save the Christian faith, in reality he separated it from the exploration of truth—even the Jesus of history and the study of the Bible was separated from the Christ of faith.<sup>4</sup>

Early twentieth century American education was impacted by this mindset in the Modernist-Fundamentalist controversies. Both groups in various ways tried to save “faith” through various pietistic approaches, on the one hand, you could

find the separatistic pietism of American fundamentalism, and on the other there was the pragmatic pietism of William James, the common faith civil religion of John Dewey, and the ahistorical experiential religion of Harry Emerson Fosdick. The result, however, was the divorce of faith from teaching and scholarship in universities across the country in the arts, the humanities, the sciences, the social sciences, and all other spheres, including the scholarly study of religion. There was during this time still a belief in objective truth in all fields, but the dominant perspective, with rare exceptions, maintained that faith had to be bracketed from this search for truth. The situation has changed even more drastically at the end of the twentieth century with the rise of postmodernism, which includes the loss of a belief in normative truth, and the influence of relativism in almost all spheres of knowledge.<sup>5</sup>

Following World War II a rapid expansion of higher education has taken place all across America. As we enter the 21st Century there are approximately 3,600 institutions of higher learning: 2,000 public and 1,600 private. Many of the public institutions are community colleges. Others are large research universities. Of the 1,600 private institutions almost 800 maintain some church relationship (about 400 mainline; a little less than 300 Roman Catholic; and few more than 100 Evangelical). Among these 800 schools we can identify four different types:

1. The Private College

—independent in its operation

- few Christian commitments
- Faculty and students (with some or many board members) probably unrelated to the Christian heritage of the college
- approach to education generally as diverse and pluralistic as most public institutions

2) The Bible College

- Preparation for Church Related Vocation
- Generally study only Christian material
- Undergraduate seminary

3) The Church-Related College

- Acknowledgement of Christian heritage
- Sees itself as an academic partner with its sponsoring denomination with many faculty, students, and board members coming from that tradition
- Approach to education—two generally unrelated spheres:
  - a) Campus ministry and chapel programs
  - b) Academic curriculum and program
- Caring context for education

4) The Christian Liberal Arts College

- Strong cultural ties with sponsoring denomination/constituency
- Faculty and students conscious of denominational/constituency ties
- Board has strong tie to denomination/constituency

- Provides opportunity for examination of subject matter from a faith perspective
- Grace-filled context for education
- Approach to education grounded in Christian world and life view
- Education as a learning community—one sphere characterized by the integration of faith and learning and faith and living.

Now we find ourselves at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. What approach to education can we/should we expect from colleges that continue to relate to the Southern Baptist Convention. Baptist education now boasts over 40 colleges or universities of higher learning. In the pluralistic world in which we find ourselves can we expect/should we expect an explicit Christian mission to be maintained? Can the “one-sphere” approach to the integration of faith and learning be articulated and practiced or is the “two-sphere” church-related model a better strategy?<sup>6</sup> I am contending in this paper that the integration of faith and learning is at the essence of authentic Christian (Baptist) higher education and should be wholeheartedly implemented across the campus and across the curriculum.

In thinking about Christian higher education we cannot rapidly leap over the foundational issues. We need carefully and intentionally to think about the importance of integrating faith and learning as the essential issue for defining Christian higher education.<sup>7</sup>

## I. The Foundation of Christian Higher Education

We begin building our thinking on this vital subject by affirming the love for God and the love for study, the importance of devotion and the importance of instruction, the place of spirituality and the place of scholarship, the priority of affirming and passing on the tradition and the significance of honest intellectual inquiry. These matters are in tension, but not in contradiction – and if rightly understood they can be seen as connectives, bound together, not matters of exclusivity. We begin with a faith commitment that informs all learning, which also shapes expectations for living.

Some of our friends in academia regard such a notion as a medieval remnant at best or in the words of Kris Kristofferson, “a walking contradiction, partly truth and partly fiction.” Yet in this decade, among an increasingly large number of intellectuals there has arisen a deep suspicion of today’s thoroughly secularized academy, so that there is indeed a renewed appreciation for and openness to what George Marsden calls “the outrageous idea of Christian scholarship.”<sup>8</sup> As Mark Schwenn of Valparaiso University has suggested, it is time to acknowledge that the thorough secularization of the academy is at the least unfruitful. There is even a renewed interest in many places in the relationship of the church to higher education, or as our Catholic friends put it, “*ex corde ecclesiae*.”<sup>9</sup> John J. Piderit, president of Loyola University in Chicago, has called for “the university to be at the heart of the church,” which for us means a

purposeful commitment to being both Baptist *and* evangelical, evangelical *and* Baptist.<sup>10</sup> Thus, the time seems right and ripe to join this conversation to think afresh, about these ideas.

As James Burtchaell in *The Dying of the Light* has so accurately and insightfully recognized, being a faithful Christian college or university will involve much more than mere piety. As a brief survey indicated earlier, history shows that a commitment to piety alone will not sustain the high ideal of a Christian higher education.<sup>11</sup> The Christian intellectual tradition calls for rigorous Christian thinking, in all areas as historically exemplified in Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Aquinas, Bernard of Clairveaux, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Edwards, Sayers, and Lewis, as well as many other contemporary thinkers. We need to understand the central place a school or department of Christian studies must play in a Christian college in carrying on this tradition by offering courses required of all students in both biblical studies and the various areas of Christian thought. Such courses are not merely exercises in spiritual devotion or professional preparation, as important as these may be, but they provide the framework for serious intellectual wrestling with literary, philosophical, scientific, technological, and worldview issues.

This provides the beginning framework for the uni[ty] in a Christian university. This framework refers to the constitutive belief that the world proceeded from a Creator by intelligent design and in that sense is a unified framework. While this framework doesn't pretend to answer every question, it

nevertheless begins where Scripture begins. “In the beginning God...” (Gen. 1:1), and with the confession of the Apostles’ Creed: “I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.” This constitutive belief informs the entire curriculum about the beginning point of a Christian worldview over against rival metaphysical and epistemological views. The affirmation of God as creator is as significant for a Christian world and life view as is the tenet of God as redeemer. As Abraham Kuyper maintained, “the dominating principle of Christian truth is not soteriological but rather cosmological” (i.e., the sovereignty of the triune God over the whole cosmos, in all spheres and kingdoms, visible and invisible).<sup>12</sup> Such an initial reference point avoids the error of a spiritualized gnosticism on one hand and a pure materialistic metaphysic on the other. This premise forms the foundation for our affirmation that all truth is God’s truth, which refers to truth that is both revealed *and* discovered. Thus we respond on the one hand with grateful wonder at what has been made known to us and on the other with exerted effort to discover what has not been clearly manifested. In such exploration we dare not misconstrue our previously stated premise so as to wrongly deduce that all scholarship or all research even if carried out by Christians is necessarily God’s truth. No! What we gladly affirm is the Christian intellectual tradition which recognizes that all scholarship, all invention, all discovery, all exploration—which is truth—is God’s truth.<sup>13</sup>

Certainly this important premise, similar to the exclusive claim that salvation is found only in Christ, is controversial, even counter cultural in today’s

world. Thus part of the mission of Christian institutions must be a quest for unity, a unified understanding of knowledge. Such exploration involves finding ways of seeing and knowing what sometimes, in a mysterious and yet undiscovered sense, is already there. As Johannes Kepler, the man famous for discovering that the orbits of the planets are not circles but ellipses, said, “the chief aim of all investigations of the external world should be to discover the harmony imposed on it by God.”<sup>14</sup>

Christian scholars in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, like Johannes Kepler in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, have the privilege of being sustained by this conviction and the responsibility to pass on the Christian intellectual tradition as it informs and impacts all the various disciplines. We believe such a responsibility to teach, inform, and communicate these traditions is possible because all human beings, everywhere and at all times, are made in the image of God. We believe this universality of humankind makes possible both teaching and learning. Contrary to trends in today’s higher education world, a Christian worldview contends that a species-centered discourse should not be replaced by an ethnos-centered discourse, which is characteristic of most postmodernism and lies at the root of what is often called multiculturalism.<sup>15</sup>

Because we can think, relate, and communicate in understandable ways, since we are created in the image of God, we can creatively teach, learn, explore, and carry on research. Teaching must be prioritized at Christian colleges and universities. Yet, we want to maintain that there is a complementary place for

teaching *and* scholarship. Scholarship, in the Christian intellectual tradition, rightly understood, is not contrary to genuine Christian piety. As Charles Colson says, “True Christianity goes beyond John 3:16—beyond private faith and personal salvation.”<sup>16</sup> Nor should scholarship necessarily be seen as a threat to faithful teaching for the Christian intellectual tradition provides a foundation for new discovery and creative teaching, as well as the framework for passing on the unified truth essential to the advancement of Christianity.

A Christian university, in common with any other institution of higher learning, must surely subordinate all other endeavors to the improvement of the mind in pursuit of truth.<sup>17</sup> Yet a focus on the mind, the mastery of content, though primary, is not enough. We believe that character and competency development are equally important. Furthermore, we think the pursuit of truth is best undertaken within a community of learning that also attends to the moral, spiritual, and social development of its students following the pattern of Jesus who himself increased “in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men” (Luke 2:52).

The moral and spiritual virtues have vital cognitive significance and hence strengthen both teaching and learning. Thus we believe that humility strengthens and arrogance hampers the learning process. Not only humility, but faith, love, gratitude and other virtues are essential for a full orbbed approach to Christian higher education. Bernard of Clairveaux best combines the intellectual with the moral and spiritual with his famous statement:

Some seek knowledge for  
The sake of knowledge:  
That is curiosity;  
Others seek knowledge so that  
They themselves may be known:  
That is vanity;  
But there are still others  
Who seek knowledge in  
Order to serve and edify others:  
And that is charity.

Certainly this makes a difference in how we relate to colleagues, students, and other scholars and even how we interact with and evaluate their ideas. The unity of knowledge, shaped by love, is informing and foundational for all scholarship, teaching and learning. From this foundation comes our commitment to faith *and* learning, to both knowledge *and* virtue, throughout the educational process.

## II. The Purpose of Christian Higher Education

Christian higher education has an opportunity at this unique time in history to step forward as a leader in the larger field of higher education to prepare students to enter the changing world of the 21st century. In order to answer this call we must prioritize our commitment to the words of Jesus called the Great Commandment (Matthew 22:36-40). Here we are told to love God with our hearts, our minds, our souls—and to love others completely. Jesus' words refer to a wholehearted devotion to God with every aspect of our being, from whatever

angle we choose to consider it—emotionally, volitionally, or cognitively. This kind of “love for God will then result in obedience to all He has commanded.<sup>18</sup> These words of Jesus serve as the foundational framework for us to carry out our mission to our changing postmodern world.

The purpose of Christian institutions is to educate students so they will be prepared for the vocation to which God has called them, enabled and equipped with the competencies necessary to think Christianly and to perform skillfully in the world, equipped to be servant leaders who impact the world as change agents based on a full orbed Christian world and life view. Thus we are called to be Great Commandment schools.

The first and greatest commandment makes it plain that we are to love God with our minds. As T. S. Eliot so appropriately expressed:

The purpose of a Christian education would not be merely to make men and women pious Christians: a system which aimed too rigidly at this end alone would become only obscurantist. A Christian education must primarily teach people to be able to think in Christian categories.<sup>19</sup>

Thus we want to love God with heart, soul and our minds as well. Learning to think Christianly impacts our homes, our businesses, our health care agencies, our schools, our social structures, our recreation, and, yes, our churches too. For to love God with our minds means that we think differently about the way we live and love, the way we worship and serve, the way we work to earn our livelihood, the way we learn and teach.

As we prepare to enter the 21st Century we need more than just new and novel ideas and enhanced programs; we need distinctively Christian thinking, the kind of tough minded thinking that results in distinctly different action. To achieve this end we need to hear afresh the significance of Jesus' words for us. For as T. S. Eliot said so appropriately: to love God with our minds suggests, "to be able to think in Christian categories."<sup>20</sup> This means being able to define and hold to a world and life view grounded in the truth of God's revelation to us. It means seeing life and learning from a Christian vantage point; it means thinking with the mind of Christ. This involves the whole of our human personality. Our mind is to be renewed, our emotions purified, our conscience kept clear, and our will surrendered to God's will. Applying the Great Commandment entails all that we know of ourselves being committed to all that we know of God.<sup>21</sup> For our goal is not just the teaching of certain subject matter. No. It is both broader and more basic than that.

In recent days David Damrosch, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University in New York City, has penned a sane and sound analysis of the specific challenges facing higher education at the conclusion of the 20th Century. His work entitled, *We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University*, proposes several reforms meant to alter the culture of American academic life.<sup>22</sup> He recognizes the changes that have been brought about in higher education with the rise and expansion of disciplines. Yet he proposes that the problem we face is not necessarily increasing academic specialization, it is the

lack of interrelatedness between the disciplines. This unwillingness to relate disciplines to one another has resulted in a fragmentation of knowledge. The fragmentation of knowledge should alarm all committed to Christian higher education, for it strikes at the foundation of our purpose.

Damrosch calls for an interdisciplinary community approach to teaching and research, simultaneously generalizing *and* specializing. He discourages the isolationism of the academy and urges that the university reshape itself by working in concert even across established field boundaries. He rightly recognizes that disciplinary fragmentation dates only from decisions made a century ago when the modern American university assumed its current form. Damrosch's suggestions are noble and helpful, but shortsighted. They fail to address the most important aspect of the problem, which is not specialization, but a specialization brought on by a fragmentation of knowledge. This has resulted in a false dichotomy between the life of the mind and the life of faith. It is here that Christian institutions seeking to put into practice the implications of the Great Commandment can enter this important conversation.

I would suggest that loving God with our minds—thinking Christianly—points us to a unity of knowledge, a seamless whole because all true knowledge flows from the One Creator to His one creation. Thus specific bodies of knowledge relate to each other not just because scholars work together in community, not just because interdisciplinary work broadens our knowledge, but because all truth is God's truth, composing a single universe of knowledge.

For Christian colleges and universities to become truly Great Commandment institutions does **not** mean that we will blur disciplinary boundaries—not at all! It means that we will take our varying, and at times seemingly conflicting, approaches and traditions, and seek to interpret and explain our subject matter under the Lordship of the Creator God, the revealer of all Truth. If we can learn to integrate faith thoroughly with our various disciplines, drawing on the long Christian tradition to do so, we can restore coherence to learning.

Then will education not only mean the passing on of content to our students, but it will also mean the shaping of character, and it will move toward the development and construction of a convictional world and life view by which we can see, learn, and interpret the world from the vantage point of God’s revelation to us. We must therefore seek to build Christian institutions where men and women can be introduced to an understanding and appreciation of God, His creation and grace, and humanity’s place of privilege and responsibility in God’s world.

It might be helpful to realize that the goal of Christian education, rightly understood for the past two thousand years, has been this integration of faith and knowledge. The starting point for this integration has rested on the foundation of the words of Jesus’ Great Commandment and the wisdom literature of the Hebrew Scriptures, which reminds us that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge, wisdom, and understanding (Proverbs 1:7; Psalm 111:10; Job 28:28).

Thus, the beginning point for thinking, learning, and teaching is our reverence before God the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth.

The search for knowledge, the quest for truth—phrases so familiar as to be clichés in education—must not be uttered carelessly. For when we speak of such from the Christian perspective we speak of God who is omniscience, God who is Truth. From this foundation has followed a legacy of those committed to a passion for learning based on the supposition that all truth is God’s truth. Thus, as Christians related together in a learning community, we all as faculty, students, staff, and administrators are to seek to take every thought captive to Christ and love God with all our minds.<sup>23</sup>

### III. The Goal of Christian Higher Education

“What then is the goal of Christian higher education?” we might ask. Aren’t others providing similar educational preparation? The answer is *yes and no*. Yes they are providing similar programs, but the uniqueness of a thoroughgoing Christian approach to higher education is its commitment not only to content, but to value-added education, to character development, competencies, and a Christian world view that challenges the predominant secular way of seeing life and work. So what must we do?

First, following Chuck Colson’s exhortation, we must train the mind by inculcating truth and developing graduates who will go out and infiltrate the world with what some call a “backyard apologetic.”<sup>24</sup>

We need professors, staff, and students who are competent in their profession, caring in their relationships, but who also confess and, if necessary, contend for the truth of God that is foundational for life and living.

Those involved in Christian higher education must be intentional about integrating faith and learning in every discipline—not as a cliché, or public relations watchword, but as a foundational reality. We must be intentional about a commitment to truth, for by Him and for Him are all things held together.

Science and health care programs must be seen from a Christian vantage point. Science is measuring what is; it is observed truth. But observed truth need not conflict with revealed truth. They are complementary. We could really have no science without recognizing that God has created an orderly universe. If it's not orderly, nothing applies. For as Abraham Kuyper, the great Dutch thinker and statesman, said in his Stone Lectures given at Princeton in 1898:

God created the world and cares for His entire creation, and by His saving grace He brings regeneration and justification to His own, but by His common grace He sustains the creation He has made and He calls us to be participants in that common grace, to be agents of it C as He cares about its expression in every single aspect of life.<sup>25</sup>

Such a world view is also at the root of mathematics, which is foundational to business, accounting, and economics. This does not mean there is a Christian mathematics or that there are Christian multiplication tables. No, what is affirmed

is that there is Christian truth and order at the root that makes it possible to make mathematical calculations.

A Christian world view shapes our view of education, pedagogy, and the social sciences, for all must answer the question: what is it that motivates humans? This is at the root when we talk about the nature of men and women. There are several implications of these truths.

First, faculty and students at Christian colleges and universities should be better teachers and learners because our motivation for learning is different. We want to learn more about God and His world, His purpose and His activities as they impact our areas of focus. The purpose of learning is different. It is shaped by values different than just wanting to get a good job, as important as that is.

Second, education that integrates faith and learning, that establishes and shapes a Christian worldview, can help restore the loss of morality and loss of accountability. It can help us be better people, better citizens, better employees. It gives us standards and ideals to which we can aim in order to be better people, because it is an education concerned not only with content, but character. Then we can know what is right and do what is right. So a Christian world view not only impacts and shapes the mind, but the will as well.

Education shaped by a Christian world view can better prepare someone for his or her vocation. This is not vocational education, but it helps each of us see that our own unique vocation is a calling from God, a holy thing from God.

The goal is to enable men and women to be prepared for their chosen vocation in such a way that they can be salt and light in the marketplace. The goal of these programs is to help students become servant leaders and change agents in our world. The goal is to help us be prepared for work and to see it from God's perspective in a way that will bring glory to Him—preparation for vocation—not just job training or careers, but work, calling, *vocatio*.

### A Concluding Word

Learning shaped and formed by faith results in living that is shaped and formed by faith. The integration of faith and learning forms the foundation of Christian higher education and shapes its purpose and goal. Some would see faith and learning as contradictions that cannot exist together. Others would suggest they are two separate spheres that do not connect. Still others, in some postmodern way, might try to commingle what they still perceive to be contradictions. On the other hand, we maintain boldly that faith and learning *must* be held together. Without the marriage of these essentials there is no authentic Christian (Baptist) higher education. The church must again reconnect with the university so a new generation can learn to think Christianly in order to impact the world for good with the truth of the gospel.<sup>26</sup>

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> This disconnection has been ably documented by George Marsden, *The Soul of the American University* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); and James T. Burtchaell, *The Dying of the Light: The Disengagement of Colleges and Universities from their Christian Churches* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). Burtchaell sadly acknowledged that the story of the disengagement of the schools from their denominations and constituencies is in fact “more melancholy than the author expected.” (p. xi); also Mark R. Schwenn, *Exiles from Eden: Religion and the American Vocation in America* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981).

<sup>2</sup> See Robert Rue Parsonage, *Church Related Higher Education* (Valley Forge: Judson, 1978); Bernard Ramm, *The Christian College in the Twentieth Century* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963); Arthur Holmes, *The Idea of a Christian College* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975); Douglas Sloan, *Faith and Knowledge: Mainline Protestantism and American Higher Education* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994); Charles D. Johnson, *Higher Education of Southern Baptists* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 1955).

<sup>3</sup> See Colin Gunton, *Enlightenment and Alienation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), pp. 111-52; also Thomas C. Oden, *After Modernity... What? Agenda for Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990).

<sup>4</sup> See Schleiermacher’s posthumously published *Leben Jesu* (1864).

<sup>5</sup> See the insightful discussions in Charles Colson and Nancy Pearcey, *How Now Shall We Live?* (Wheaton: Tyndale, 1999).

<sup>6</sup> See Larry Lyon and Michael Beaty, “Integration, Secularization, and the Two-spheres View at Religious Colleges: Comparing Baylor University with the University of Notre Dame and Georgetown College” *Christian Scholar’s Review* 29 (Fall 1999) 73-112.

<sup>7</sup> This discussion continues the conversation about the character and future of Christian higher education taking place in many sectors. Much of this essay is built on themes found in *The Future of Christian Higher Education*, edited by David S. Dockery and David P. Gushee (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999). See also Richard T. Hughes and William B. Adrian, *Models for Christian Education* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997). The contemporary discussion can be traced to John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982 [1873]); See James W. Sire’s exposition of Newman’s key ideas in *Habits of the Mind: Intellectual Life as a Christian Calling* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000).

<sup>8</sup> See George Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); also see the conversation between George Marsden and Charles Taylor on this matter in *A Catholic Modernity?*, edited by James L. Heft (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

<sup>9</sup> See Mark Schwenn, “A Christian University: Defining the Difference,” *First Things* 93 (May, 1999):25-31. This essay borrows from, builds on, and challenges some of the key ideas in Schwenn’s article.

<sup>10</sup> See John J. Piderit, “The University at the Heart of the Church,” *First Things* 94 (June/July, 1999):22-25.

<sup>11</sup> See Burtchaell, *The Dying of the Light*.

<sup>12</sup> See Abraham Kuyper, “The Stone Lectures,” Princeton University, 1898; also see William A. Dembski, *The Design Inference* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

<sup>13</sup> See Arthur Holmes, *All Truth is God’s Truth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).

<sup>14</sup> Cited in Colson and Pearcey, *How Now Shall We Live?* 51, 425.

<sup>15</sup> See David S. Dockery, editor, *The Challenge of Postmodernism: An Evangelical Engagement* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996).

<sup>16</sup> See Colson, *How Now Shall We Live?*

- <sup>17</sup> See Mark A. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995); and Harry Blamires, *The Post Christian Mind: Exposing its Destructive Agenda* (Ann Arbor: Servant, 1999).
- <sup>18</sup> See Craig Blomberg, *Matthew*, New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 335.
- <sup>19</sup> T. S. Eliott, *Christianity and Culture* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1940), 22.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid; see W. David Beck, ed. *Opening the American Mind: The Integration of Biblical Truth in the Curriculum of the University* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991).
- <sup>21</sup> John R. W. Stott, *The Contemporary Christian* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992), 114-26.
- <sup>22</sup> David Damrosch, *We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995); also see Mortimer J. Adler, *Reforming Education: The Opening of the American Mind* (New York: McMillan, 1997).
- <sup>23</sup> See D. Bruce Lockerbie, *A Passion for Learning* (Chicago: Moody, 1994); also J. P. Moreland, *Love Your God with All Your Mind* (Colorado Springs: NavPress 1997); and Os Guinness, *Fit Bodies, Fat Minds: Why Evangelicals Don't Think and What to do About It* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994).
- <sup>24</sup> Charles Colson, "Backyard Apologetics," *Touchstone* (November/December, 1999), 41-45.
- <sup>25</sup> Kuyper, "Stone Lectures." See Peter S. Heslam, *Creating A Christian Worldview* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).
- <sup>26</sup> Baptist education in particular must be concerned with connecting the institutions to the churches, not as two different spheres; but as a partnership to create a "one sphere" learning community to advance the purpose and high calling of integrating faith and learning in higher education. See various explications of Baptist higher education beginning with Francis Wayland in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, *Thoughts on the Present Collegiate system in the United States*; J. P. Greene, "Why Education by Baptist Schools" in J. M. Frost, *Baptists Why and Why Not*, edited by Timothy and Denise George (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996); A. T. Robertson, "Baptist Colleges Are Essential" in *The Best of A. T. Robertson*, compiled by David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996); Carl F. H. Henry, "Baptists and Higher Education" in *Baptists Why and Why Not Revisited*, edited by Timothy George and Richard Land (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1997); James T. Draper, "A Vision for a Christian Baptist University," in *The Future of Christian Higher Education*, edited by David S. Dockery and David P. Gushee (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999) 17-24.



