

Christian Mind in the Emerging World

Christian Mind in the Emerging World:

*Faith Integration in Asian
Contexts and Global Perspectives*

Edited by

Peter Tze Ming Ng,
Wing Tai Leung,
and Vaughan King Tong Mak

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Christian Mind in the Emerging World:
Faith Integration in Asian Contexts and Global Perspectives

Edited by Peter Tze Ming Ng, Wing Tai Leung,
and Vaughan King Tong Mak

This book first published 2018

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2018 by Peter Tze Ming Ng, Wing Tai Leung,
Vaughan King Tong Mak and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without
the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-1649-0

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-1649-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Acknowledgements	xii
Introduction	xiii
Part One: The Christian Mind	
Chapter One.....	2
Looking Back and Looking Ahead: Major Contributors to Faith Integration in the Context of U.S. Christian Higher Education <i>Karen Longman</i>	
Chapter Two	23
Better Lovers: The Shape of Love in Christian Higher Education <i>Claudia Beversluis</i>	
Chapter Three	41
Education of Love and Humanity: Dialectics at Work between the Global and the Local in Chinese Context <i>Peter Tze Ming Ng</i>	
Chapter Four.....	68
Beyond Positive Psychology to Spiritual Well-Being: Integrating Faith in Teaching Psychology at the University <i>Grace Shangkuan Koo</i>	
Chapter Five	90
From Integration to Integrity: A Model for Teaching and Research in Australasian Contexts <i>Geoff and Elizabeth Beech</i>	

Part Two: The Emerging World

Chapter Six.....	114
Christian Higher Education in a Globalizing World: A Co-Creation Story <i>Wing Tai Leung</i>	
Chapter Seven.....	137
Mapping Christian Scholarship in a Pluralist Korean Society: Incorporating the Reformed Worldview with the “Missional” Vision <i>Kuk Won Shin</i>	
Chapter Eight.....	159
Climate Injustice as Manifested by Global Food Insecurity: A Christian Exposition and Call for Actions <i>Amos Tai, Edward Lai and Karen Lee</i>	
Chapter Nine.....	187
Encountering Technopoly with Chinese Traditional Five Cardinal Relationships <i>Kai Pak Chan</i>	
Chapter Ten	210
A Chinese NGO’s Faith-Based Vision for Families of Children with Disabilities: Impact of Chinese and American Learning Communities <i>Dennis Feaster, Bing Xu and Judith Vander Woude</i>	

Part Three: Academic Faith Integration

Science & Technology

Chapter Eleven	240
Science and Religion: What Kinds of Truth do They Seek? <i>Mike Brownutt</i>	
Chapter Twelve.....	268
Science and Faith: From Conflict to Integration in a Korean Context <i>John Choi</i>	

Business & Politics

Chapter Thirteen	288
The Purpose and Practice of Business for Christians in the Asian-Chinese Context	
<i>Albert Erisman</i>	

Chapter Fourteen	315
Birth of a Christian Salesman: Reflection on Academic Faith Integration in an Asian Context	
<i>Kam-Hon Lee</i>	

Chapter Fifteen	338
Being in but Not of the Powers: Contours of a Prophetic Witnessing Practice in Ancient Africa and Asia	
<i>Pak Nung Wong</i>	

Chapter Sixteen	365
Politics that Promotes Business-as-a-Calling: Historical and Comparative Studies	
<i>Paul Neal</i>	

Education

Chapter Seventeen	380
The Craft of Christian Higher Education	
<i>Susan Felch</i>	

Chapter Eighteen	401
Five Theses on Christian Educational Leadership	
<i>Albert Boerema</i>	

Chapter Nineteen	419
A Christian Perspective on the Issue of “Love” in the Psychology of M. Scott Peck: Can this be Applied in the Hong Kong Context?	
<i>Terry Lam</i>	

Religion & Theology

Chapter Twenty.....	450
Watson M. Hayes and the Indigenization of Theological Education in China <i>Alisa Ai-xia He</i>	
Chapter Twenty-One.....	475
Reformed Life Theology: Reviving the “Life” in Reformed Theology <i>Simon Baik</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Two	499
The Christian Association of the University of Hong Kong and Its Response to the Outside World (1953- 1993) <i>Max Hui-Bon-Hoa</i>	

Cultural Studies

Chapter Twenty-Three	528
Re-Integrating Christianity and System Theory <i>David Van Dyke and Benjamin Pyykkonen</i>	
Chapter Twenty-Four.....	544
Cinematic Identity: Examining the Intersection of Christianity and Culture in East and South East Asia through Film <i>Aaron Bohn.</i>	
Contributors.....	559

PREFACE

The title of this book “**Christian Mind in the Emerging World: Faith Integration in Asian Contexts from Global Perspectives**” is an ambitious endeavor. It is like one of those titles that a doctoral advisor would discourage for a dissertation. To combine the thoughts and findings of 30 scholars under this umbrella theme, first at a conference and then in a book, is a bold attempt. But is it worth trying?

The **Asian contexts** have been a history of suffering: colonization, independence, and identity crises. Enlightened Asian minds find themselves in conflict between the ideal and the reality: Gandhi’s independence of India from the British, Sun Yat Sen’s revolution to prevent China’s disintegration by imperialistic powers; and Pramoedya Ananta Toer’s puzzling story where a young Indonesian enticed by modernization brought about by the Dutch came to become a second-class citizen in a Western dominated world. When can Asian countries and leaders learn to form a community with neighbors and the West in an inter-subjective relationship? Today Asia is still searching for quality leadership. The struggling stories of South Korea, the Philippines, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, Hong Kong and Taiwan followed the meandering journeys toward post-colonial independence and leadership. In other places, dictatorship is common, and people can only enjoy a limited degree of freedom of expression. Asia has been a land of rich natural resources with some regions now enjoying a better economy, but what about cultural depth and spiritual richness?

Globalization seems to promise diversity and multiple perspectives. However, we also witness a form of creative destruction in the general trend of Westernization in Asia, both in consumer products and in education. Is the post-Truman US-led globalization of world order falling apart under Brexit and the “American First” policy of Trump? Or is it going to be replaced by a back-door globalization through the Belt & Road initiative of China? Can economic ties be value-laden with the imposition of ‘democracy’ and ‘human right’? Or can it be value-free as pure economics? When can humanity seek unity in diversity in the shrinking world coined the “global village”?

Academia is supposed to be the engine of civilization to sort these dilemmas out. But can academia warn against pitfalls of gigantic scale

such as the 2008 Global Economic Tsunami or is it in fact the cause of them? From where has academia inherited the mandate that skill and knowledge should be the primary objectives for graduates today? Since when has academia turned into vocation training centers for professional development, or a sheer research laboratory? When did ‘case study’ become a primary method in pedagogy and research finding? When will academia dig deep into civilization and the root causes of cultural bankruptcy and renewal? While many of the Asian institutes of higher learning are patterned after the West in their pursuit of ranking and professionalization, is there an awakening to the need for cultural reflection, and the unique contribution that the East can make to the world?

Academic Faith Integration is a dangerous phrase. In the name of academic freedom we have edged out any dialogue on metaphysics. Academics are expected to be schizophrenic, in that they are supposed to keep their personal beliefs for private consumption. Academia is not a place for value-laden discourse. But is it possible to be value free? Is technology neutral? All human endeavors are culture making and they come with worldview orientations and value systems. Nothing is without biases. There is a need to enter into the deep-structure of a discipline, such as its philosophy and presuppositions, and ask questions there. However, seminaries and bible colleges in Asia have been busy contextualizing and indigenizing theology so as to be freed from the ‘original sin’ of imperialism of the past century. To them the Bible is a book and theology a domain of study. But we need to see the world through the lens of faith; more explicitly, what does the Bible have to say about creation and the world? Attempts at faith integration into academic disciplines have been sporadic and are still in an infancy period of development, partly because applying the Christian worldview on any academic discipline requires a systemic way to enter into its underlying principles and inherent logic, which is a rigorous and demanding exercise in Christian scholarship.

Admittedly, the **Christian mind** is important. Is it an other-worldly utopia that captures the mind of the poor as “opium of the people”? Is it to be confined to the spiritual realm and the religious order? Or is it a cultural mandate that actualizes co-creation with God and presence of the Kingdom to come? By Christian mind we do not intend to separate the human faculties. Knowing, doing, being, and becoming are all intertwined. One’s knowledge informs one’s doing and vice versa. A Christian framing of the world and the implied course of action is in dire need today. But thinking Christianly has become a rare encounter. When evangelistic giants like Billy Graham and his generation are passing away, we need

more than the lamentations of Mark Noll and David Wells of the wasteland of Christian thoughts. We believe in the continuation of the heritage of Christian thinkers like C. S. Lewis, G. K. Chesterton, Jacques Ellul, John Stott, Alvin Plantinga, and others to usher us into the future. It is with this spirit that this humble book can be a start.

These papers originated from an **international conference** hosted by Lumina College in Hong Kong during January 25-27, 2018. They embraced a rich mix of global scholars from the four corners of the world. They brought to us global perspectives on love and higher education, faith-integration experiences in the West, dialectics between global and local approaches, educational leadership, and crafting of Christian values into education. They helped us map our stands toward internationalization of higher education, Christian scholarship in a pluralist society, technopoly, global injustice, and attending to the weak. They encouraged us to put into practice the Christian framing of the world in the realms of business, psychology, science, student life, and film. We trust that there is a remnant not bowing to heathen gods and there is common grace among secular prophets. Human beings as an earthly species can find God's way to garden the Planet and to build it with Him into a new City.

Wing Tai Leung
Founding President
Lumina College
Hong Kong
March 1, 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present volume came out of an international conference hosted by Lumina College in Hong Kong during January 25-27, 2018. We wish to thank our six plenary speakers, Prof. Claudia Beversluis, Prof. Karen Longman, Prof. Albert Erisman, Prof. Grace Shangkuan Koo, Prof. Kuk Won Shin, and Dr. Kai Pak Chan. They anchored in call for papers and helped knitting together the theme and focus for the conference. Thanks are also due to the contributors who came from the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Australia, the Philippines, South Korea, China and Hong Kong. They are scholars and practitioners from various fields, ranging from natural sciences, engineering, technology, environmental sciences, psychology, to political sciences, education, management, communication and film-making, linguistics, arts and humanities, hence a rich mix of global scholars from the four corners of the world.

We are thankful to Cambridge Scholars Publishing, UK who accepted our proposal for publication even a few months before the conference. Our hearty thanks are also due to the work of Maria Shing who helped with the co-ordination, formatting and editing of the book manuscripts.

Last but not least, our sincere appreciation goes to the Lumina staff team for their logistic supports throughout the conference and all the follow up work leading to the publication of this volume. The wonderful team includes Joyce Chan, Ophelia Ng, Brian Hung, Patrick Chan, Elis Tang, and Ceciline Poon. Without their great help and support, this present volume would not come out so nice and so fine. Of course, we have to thank God too, for all His gracious blessings to Lumina College and bringing us all together as a team.

Peter Tze Ming Ng
Chief Editor
Senior Researcher
Lumina College
Hong Kong
May 21, 2018

INTRODUCTION

There are altogether 24 papers collected in this volume. They are written by scholars from the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Australia, the Philippines, South Korea, China and Hong Kong. These scholars are experts in various fields, covering natural sciences, engineering, technology, environmental sciences, psychology, political sciences, education, management, counselling, communication and film-making, linguistics, arts, philosophy, religion, theology and history. They are also well-experienced in inter-disciplinary research and cross-cultural studies. It is indeed exciting to have such a wonderful group of scholars involved in serious discussion of issues relating to faith-learning integration in Christian higher education today.

Most of the papers in this volume are concerned with faith-learning integration in higher education, such as science and religion, e.g. Mike Brownutt's paper on "Science and religion: what kinds of truth do they seek?" (Chapter 11), John Choi's paper on "Science and faith: from conflict to integration in a Korean context" (Chapter 12), and Amos Tai, Edward Lai and Karen Lee's paper on "Climatic injustice as manifested by global food insecurity: a Christian exposition and call for actions" (Chapter 8). Some papers are on faith and business, e.g. Albert Erisman's paper on "The purpose and practice of business for Christians in the Asian-Chinese context" (Chapter 13), Kam-hon Lee's paper on "Birth of a Christian salesman: reflections on academic faith integration in an Asian context" (Chapter 14), and Paul Neal's paper on "Politics that promotes business-as-a-calling: historical and comparative studies" (Chapter 16). Some are relating faith to political sciences and cultural studies, e.g. Pak Nung Wong's paper on "Being in but not of the powers: contours of a prophetic witnessing practice in ancient Africa and Asia" (Chapter 15), David Van Dyke and Benjamin Pyykkonen's paper on "Re-integrating Christianity and system theory" (Chapter 23), and Aaron Bohn's paper on "Cinematic identity: examining the intersection of Christianity and culture in East and South East Asia through films" (Chapter 24). Still, some papers are on faith and education, e.g. Susan Felch's paper on "The craft of Christian higher education" (Chapter 17), Albert Boerema's paper on "Five theses on Christian educational leadership" (Chapter 18), and Terry Lam's paper on "A Christian perspective on the issue of 'Love' in the

psychology of M. Scott Peck: can this be applied in the Hong Kong context?" (Chapter 19). There are also papers on the teaching and practice of Christian theology in the Asian contexts, such as Alisa Ai-xie He's "Watson M. Hayes and the indigenization of theological education in China" (Chapter 20), Simon Baik's "Reformed Life Theology: reviving the 'life' in Reformed Theology" (Chapter 21), and Max Hui-Bon-Hoa's discussion on "The Christian Association of the University of Hong Kong and its response to the outside world" (Chapter 22).

Besides these papers on faith and learning integration, there are others exploring the Christian mind in the development of the emerging world in a global context, bearing special relevance to the Asian context or where the scholars are located. Wing Tai Leung's preface and his paper, "Christian higher education in a globalizing world: a co-creation story" (Chapter 6), give an overview of the emerging world in a global context, and how Christian higher education has been adapting itself as a response, whereas Kuk Won Shin's paper, "Mapping Christian scholarship in a pluralist Korean society: incorporating the Reformed worldview with the 'missional' vision" (Chapter 7), elaborates more the challenges in South Korean context and discusses how the Reformed worldview can adapt itself to the emerging world. Kai Pak Chan's paper, "Encountering technology with Chinese traditional five cardinal relationships" (Chapter 9), draws our attention to the growing impact of technology, technocracy and technopoly on human culture today and tries to encounter it with resources from the Chinese traditional five cardinal relationships and related biblical teachings.

On the other hand, in one paper, "Looking back and looking ahead: major contributors to faith integration in the context of U.S. Christian higher education" (Chapter 1), Karen Longman traces the development of the understanding of faith-learning integration and Christian worldview in the American context in the past 50 years. Claudia Beversluis reports on how Calvin College has moved forward from the concern for faith-learning integration and Christian scholarship to the seeking of a new form of Christian mind – the pondering of "intellectual love", and of "becoming better lovers" in Christian higher education; hence, her ground-breaking paper on "Better lovers: the shape of love in Christian higher education" (Chapter 2). Having studied the history of Christian higher education in modern and Republican China, Peter Tze Ming Ng reports in his paper, "Education of love and humanity: dialectics at work between the global and the local in Chinese context" (Chapter 3), two Chinese cases and illustrates how Chinese Christians have understood and demonstrated their Christian minds in their contemporary Chinese

contexts. Hence, all these papers would help demonstrate how the Christian mind in the emerging world could be recognized and developed, be it in American, Asian or Chinese contexts.

If one is looking for a brief review of how Christian thoughts on academic faith integration in higher education have developed and enlightened today's discussion from a global perspective, the papers outlined below are highly recommended. First, as reported earlier, Karen Longman offers a concise historical overview on five major "fingerprints" that had shaped the thinking about faith-learning integration in the US context:

- 1) Arthur F. Holmes (1987): *The Idea of a Christian College*;
- 2) William Hasker (1992): "Faith-Learning Integration: An Overview" in *Christian Scholar's Review* 11(3), 234-248;
- 3) Richard T. Hughes and William B. Adrian (1997): *Models for Christian Higher Education: Strategies for Success in the Twenty-first Century*;
- 4) Todd Ream and Perry Glanzer (2013): *The Idea of a Christian College: A Re-examination for Today's University*; and
- 5) Calvin College professors, notably James K.A. Smith with his trilogy: *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation* (2009), *Imagining the Kingdom: How Worship Works* (2013), and *You Are What You Love: The Spiritual Power of Habit* (2016).

These are good references for the study of faith-learning integration in the U.S. context. As we know, Christian higher education has been undergoing great changes in the U.S. context in the past 50 years, especially when it was moving into the 21st century. For instance, in the book, *The Idea of a Christian College: A Re-examination for Today's University*, Todd Ream and Perry Glanzer (2013) reported that the conception of faith-learning integration had changed drastically since the publication of Holmes' *The Idea of a Christian College* (1987). Ream and Glanzer offered a timely call for a "re-do" or an update of the goals and distinctives of Christian higher education in three areas. First, they urged Christian higher education to place greater emphasis on the role of worship and the Church as having a "rightful place" in ordering the lives of students. They believed that "to be fully human and to live in right relationship with God" are essential elements for Christian higher education today. Second, in asking the question "what does it mean to be human?", they asserted that rather than focusing primarily on the cognitive

domain, Christian higher education should exemplify “what it means for God to lay claim over all domains of our existence – our minds, our bodies, and our emotions, as well as what it means in specific divine and social relationships”. Third, when considering seriously the move from “traditional college model” with undergraduate, liberal arts education orientations to “today’s university model” with more broadened curricular, international concerns and graduate programs offerings, Ream and Glanzer called for a more drastic shift in the understanding of faith-learning integration.

Regarding the issue as to how the Christian mind works, James K.A. Smith, a Calvin professor sought also to answer the question: “what does it mean to be human?”. Smith argued against Descartes’ assertion that human beings were fundamentally “thinking things”. He preferred seeing human beings as one that is “more imaginative, practice-oriented, and centered in the worship life of the church”. Rather than keeping the term “integration”, Smith declared his preference for the term “correlation” and called for another form of theological engagement with the world. For Smith, human beings are not only thinkers who act out of what they know, but also “lovers” who act out what they love and desire. Christian higher education should then become “a platform for shaping the loves and desires of students through formative practices, which can become constructive habits... As a result, our academic work becomes part of an education that is wholistic, resulting in action that is motivated by what we love and how we imagine that God wants the world to be”.

Claudia Beversluis’s “Better lovers: the shape of love in Christian higher education” (Chapter 2), is the second paper in this volume to be recommended. It builds on Beversluis’s own experience of higher education at Calvin College and she proposes that love is “our purpose, our method, and our primary outcome for Christian higher education”. For Beversluis’, love is not merely an emotion, subjective feeling, but also an orientation (of life) and a way of being human in the world. Love does not end in intellectual thinking only, it is also passion and commitment, which changes our whole life. Recalling her experience of teaching a course on “Developing a Christian Mind” (DCM), she reiterated that “Live a lover’s life. Be defined by loving. Build your identity around loving and be known for it”. This is precisely how the Christian mind could be recognized and developed in our emerging world today.

Grace Shangkuan Koo, a professor from the University of Philippines, has contributed some great ideas for our discussion. Her paper, “Beyond positive psychology to spiritual well-being: integrating faith in teaching psychology at the university” (Chapter 4), demonstrates not only how one

could overcome the limitations and correct the false promises of positive psychology, but also how one can move beyond it to attain real joy and “wholeness” in spiritual well-being, hence the true meaning of becoming human and the all-inclusiveness of the Christian mind. The “wholeness” in spiritual well-being is indeed what the Christian mind should give attention to; and her “perspectival approach” demonstrates one best way of integrating faith with psychology in Christian higher education. Peter Tze Ming Ng’s paper, “Education of love and humanity: dialectics at work between the global and the local in Chinese context” (Chapter 3), represents another attempt, enquiring into Chinese Christian’s understanding of what is meant to be human and how Chinese Christians attempted to extend their Christian minds and to demonstrate the Christian concepts of love, humanity and wholeness in higher education in the Chinese context.

Geoff and Elizabeth Beech, the couple from Australia contributed another insightful paper entitled: “From integration to integrity: a model for teaching and research in Australasian contexts” (Chapter 5). They are searching for a new model of integration which goes beyond mere integration of faith and learning, by adding upon it the biblical concept of faithfulness. The proposal of “integral model” is an attempt to reclaim in Christian worldview a proper place for God with His ownership and purposes for the world. The word “integral” has the same Latin root as “integrity”, hence giving more significant insights for a new approach to academic faith integration.

There are still a few models and perspectives discussed in this humble volume. Wing Tai Leung’s paper, “Christian higher education in a globalizing world: a co-creation story” (Chapter 6) provides another enlightening understanding of the impact of globalization on Christian higher education in this emerging world. Having explored the social landscape shaped by machine culture, Leung reports four models of internationalization as possible responses of Christian higher education to the globalizing world. Of the four models, namely: “Internal”, “External”, “Digital Network”, and “Co-creation” models, Leung strongly recommends the Co-creation Model which, as he says, is biblically-based and is “patterned after God’s co-creating through mediation”. Whereas James Smith has proposed the term “correlation” as a new form of theological engagement with the emerging world, Leung suggests “co-creation” as an alternative model for Christian higher education reaching out to the global world. The co-creation model goes beyond simply collaborating with overseas schools and includes also “cultural

dialogue, partnering, and indigenous contextualization. Faith and learning integration would be done in multiple perspectives and cultures”.

As an illustration of how the co-creation model of internationalization does work, Leung introduces Lumina College in Hong Kong as a case in point, which has the vision of approaching Christian higher education in three dimensions (“the three Cs”). First, the principle of **Coherency** places emphasis on worldviews and value systems. It starts from the belief that the world is God’s world, both in creation and redemption. “God’s world” is the foundation of our Christian worldview and is the starting point for any possible integration of faith and learning. Second, the principle of **Creativity** reminds us that we are co-creators with God, and not just stewards taking care of the Garden or the Earth. We are also called to create culture, to plow the land, to collaborate with God in continuous creation. Third, the principle of **Commitment** is relational. It is our commitment to love God and love our neighbors. Hence, education and commitment involve the whole person; we care for and serve others as our Father is a loving father, and love demands the commitment of the whole person.

The three “Cs” are of great significance to our discussion of the Christian mind and Christian scholarship in Christian higher education today. What is underlying the three “Cs” is the belief in “God”. The God-factor is what makes the Christian mind or Christian scholarship “Christian”. It is not truly Christian worldview if we cannot declare that the world is God’s world; and there is not any real faith-learning integration if we cannot claim a place for God. The God-factor is the core of, or the key element for the development of our Christian worldview; and it is the foundation for any possible integration of faith and learning. Hence, we are reminded that “Christian higher education is a battlefield among conflicting worldviews... We need to provide a coherency in understanding God’s created world”; “Culture making is the best expression of the Christian worldview and a praxis of coherency. To be human is to create culture, to co-create with God”; “Commitment to share our lives, our resources, our talents, and our destinies with others is the ultimate goal of Christian higher education. We need to be committed to God and through this commitment love others and God’s creation”.

Again, Christian mind is not confined to the cognitive domain, neither is it just “more imaginative, practice-oriented”, coming merely out of one’s subjective, emotional feelings. “Culture making” points to one’s co-creation with God which is not only biblically-based, but also demands whole-person commitments from those who are co-creating with God.

Also, if commitment is relational, Ream and Glanzer (2013) have rightly stated that “to be fully human and to live in right relationship with God” are essential elements for Christian higher education today. And the introduction of the biblical concept of “faithfulness”, underscored by Geoff and Elizabeth Beech, is highly relevant as it denotes not only the essential nature of our relationship to God, but also how it can outgrow to realize our integration of faith with learning.

Regarding the question as to what is meant to be human, it is both foundational and essential to uphold a wholistic view. In Leung’s preface, he declares: “By Christian mind we do not intend to separate the human faculties. Knowing, doing, being, and becoming are all intertwined”. And his call for passion and commitment in Christian higher education connotes also the whole person’s involvement. It reaffirms that “Education is more than knowledge and skill... Education is for making choices, value formation, personhood and community building, and social action”. This is similar to what Claudia Beversluis has stated when she quotes from Plantinga who says: “Loving God intellectually means taking an interest not only in God... in the peculiarities of God, but also in the works of God”; she adds by saying: “Intellectual love must lead us out into the lives and habits of other human beings in order to do them some good”. When love is expressed as passion and commitment, it does not end in intellectual thinking only, it demands actions, to do people some good. In short, to be human involves the whole person – mind, heart, and hands (interestingly, this is also what Karen Longman has concluded in her paper), and when we are talking about the Christian mind, we should be mindful that “our knowing, doing, being, and becoming are all intertwined”.

Recently, the present author was asked to review an article for a journal of Christian higher education in North America. The article is a research report of the impact factors affecting the openness to Christianity among Chinese graduate students who attended a Christian university in the United States of America. While American scholars have been seeking new visions for faith-learning integration, launching their quests for *The Soul of American University*, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship*, or asking whether there is a place for God in Christian higher education, or even their university students are getting a coherent education (Marsden, G. 1994 & 1997; Ng, 2018; Lewis, H. 2006), it is quite interesting to read a research study which reports that Chinese students have found great significant values of seeking faith-learning integration, and of upholding Christian worldviews in American

universities today. What do these Chinese graduate students find in American culture today? How do they understand the concepts of “Christian worldview” or “faith-learning integration” from American universities? Coming from a non-Christian, communist country of China, these Chinese students however are eager to find and treasure much of the Christian roots in American culture, notably the followings: the belief in God as a key to Christian worldview; the relevance of biblical faith to life; and the concern for whole person education in Christian colleges. Would they be what we are hoping to find in Christian higher education today too? It is also interesting to know that their openness to Christianity comes more directly and strongly from factors in the relational-cultural dimension of Christian education. In short, what is significant here is a suggestion of an alternative way of looking at Christian higher education from possibly a different angle, and it is indeed challenging us to re-consider our visions of faith-learning integration and our Christian worldview, and to re-discover the distinctive marks (or *telos*) of Christian higher education for our emerging world today.

Peter Tze Ming Ng
Chief Editor and
Senior Researcher
Lumina College
Hong Kong
May 21, 2018

References

- Hasker, R. William. (1992). “Faith-Learning Integration: An Overview” in *Christian Scholar’s Review* 11(3). 234-248.
- Holmes, Arthur F. (1987). *The Idea of a Christian College*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Hughes, Richard T. and William B. Adrian. (1997). *Models for Christian Higher Education: Strategies for Success in the Twenty-first Century*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Lewis, Harry. (2006). *Excellence without a Soul: How a Great University Forgot Education*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Marsden, George. (1994). *The Soul of the American University: From Established Protestantism to Established Nonbelief*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- . (1997). *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ng, Peter Tze Ming. (2018). “Re-imagining Christian Higher Education in China Today,” in *Journal of Christian Higher Education (USA)*, 17(4), July-September issue, 185-197.
- Ream, Todd and Perry Glanzer. (2013). *The Idea of a Christian College: A Re-examination for Today’s University*, Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books.
- Smith, James K.A. (2009). *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- . (2013). *Imagining the Kingdom: How Worship Works*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- . (2016). *You Are What You Love: The Spiritual Power of Habit*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Brazos Press.

PART ONE

THE CHRISTIAN MIND

CHAPTER ONE

LOOKING BACK AND LOOKING AHEAD: MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS TO FAITH INTEGRATION IN THE CONTEXT OF U.S. CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

KAREN A. LONGMAN

Abstract

Those who invest their time and talents on the campuses of Christian colleges and universities believe an educational approach that takes seriously both “the life of the mind” and “the life of the spirit” produces transformative benefits for the students who attend. One of the key distinctives of these campuses is the oft-quoted commitment to the integration of faith and learning. Yet that simple term has been understood in many ways, some related to discipline-specific factors and others related to distinctives of major theological traditions. This chapter advocates that it is important for Christian higher education to articulate a clear and compelling *telos* for the work being done by faculty and co-curricular leaders across these campuses. After presenting a brief discussion of how the concept of faith integration has been defined and applied on Christian campuses, the chapter introduces five influential sources—beginning with the scholarly contributions of Dr. Arthur F. Holmes (Wheaton College, Illinois, USA) that have shaped the understanding and application of the term within the context of U.S. Christian higher education over the past five decades. The author, who served as Vice President for Professional Development and Research at the Washington, D.C.-based Council for Christian Colleges & Universities for nearly 20 years, also references an ongoing discussion regarding whether the concept of “integration” (i.e., two distinct entities coming together) is

the most appropriate and helpful way to frame future discussions and programming related to this important topic.

Introduction

The foundational concept of “faith integration” or “the integration of faith and learning” is one of the distinguishing characteristics of Christian higher education worldwide. Yet attempting to fully understand what this concept means, and how such integration can be lived out by Christian academics, has been an ongoing discussion for decades. In fact, scholars and practitioners who love Christ—and seek to follow him in heart, mind, and spirit—can always be thinking more deeply about faith integration, and *living into* the richness of this concept both personally and collectively within institutions of Christian higher education. The multi-layered dimensions of academic faith integration can be captured through the use of a metaphor offered by theologian Leon Morris in his commentary on the Gospel of John. Morris described this fourth Gospel as “a pool in which a child may wade and an elephant can swim”. (Morris, 1995, p. 3). The same could be said for the topic of faith integration, given the variety of perspectives on what these two words (“faith integration”) actually mean and look like... within disciplines, across disciplines, within and across theological traditions, and distinctively present in both the curricular offerings as well as in the co-curricular side of a Christian institution.

One way to think about this matter of faith integration is to ask: “What makes Christian higher education distinctive?” Within the US context, parents might logically wonder why they should willingly pay the higher cost of a private education, rather than sending their sons or daughters to a prestigious publicly supported institution? Responding thoughtfully to that question requires an understanding and appreciation of the *telos*, or the ultimate purpose of a postsecondary education that is distinctively Christian. As an observer of Christian higher education for many years, I sometimes encourage institutional leaders to think about that question in another way by asking: “What are the characteristics of the ‘exemplary graduate’ you think would best represent the outcomes you are working toward in all of your students?” If and when our Christian faith fully informed the entire educational enterprise, what would distinguish the alumni that our institutions produce?

Because this concept of academic faith integration is so foundational to the educational enterprise of Christian colleges, each issue of the academic journal that I co-edit, titled *Christian Higher Education: An International Journal of Research, Theory, and Practice*, features at least one article in a special section with the heading “Academic Faith Integration.” The goal of this section is to inform and support both faculty and co-curricular leaders and practitioners across Christian higher education in taking an integrative approach to their work and making these campuses more distinctively Christ-centered. Dr. Paul Kaak of Azusa Pacific University (California, USA), who serves as the journal’s Faith Integration Section Editor, pointed out in the article that launched this series that large questions remain to be answered, such as: “*Whose* faith should be integrated?” And “*how*” integrated must something be to be deemed “true integration?” and “How do we keep faith integration authentic, rather than perfunctory, with our students?” Both *defining* faith integration and *putting this concept into practice* have challenges. For the purposes of reviewing articles for this particular journal, Kaak has chosen to define academic faith integration this way:

Academic faith integration is the work carried out by Christian faculty members when they meaningfully bring the scholarship of their discipline or professional practice and the scholarship representing insights and perspectives from Christian faith into dialogue with each other, applying that dialogue and its results to their research, the courses they teach, and their discipline-related products resulting in disciplinary perspectives that are uniquely informed by faith and/or faith perspectives that are uniquely informed by the discipline or profession. (Kaak 2016, p. 162)

Understanding the “Why” or *Telos* of Christian Higher Education

In focusing on the topic of “Major Contributors to Faith Integration in the Context of U.S. Christian Higher Education,” this chapter presents a historical overview of the contributions of several key scholars whose work has shaped the thinking about faith integration on Christ-centered campuses in North America. In particular, I will briefly trace the development of thought regarding the integration of faith and learning within the context of the Washington, D.C.-based Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU), formerly known as the Christian College Coalition. Founded in 1976, the CCCU currently serves 180+

institutions (30 of which are located in 18 countries outside of North America); in turn, these institutions educate about 520,000 students per year, and cumulatively report having 3.5 million alumni around the world. According to the CCCU website (www.cccu.org), the institutions of the CCCU share three primary educational commitments: First, these postsecondary institutions integrate biblical truth not just into “spiritual” aspects of the institution but throughout the academic enterprise; second, these campuses are committed to the moral and spiritual formation of students; and third, all CCCU institutions are committed to graduating students who make a difference for the common good as redemptive voices in the world. (See <https://www.cccu.org/about/>)

One of the “giants” among the group of influential thought leaders who have contributed significantly to sharpening the distinctiveness of faith integration across CCCU campuses is Arthur F. Holmes. This distinguished scholar spent over 40 years as a faculty member at Wheaton College (IL), one of the oldest and most prestigious Christian colleges in USA. The opening chapter of his book, *The Idea of a Christian College*, includes a challenge that Christian educators need to be thinking bigger and bolder about this enterprise we are involved in. Holmes makes the statement: “... by and large we have not dreamed large enough dreams” (Holmes, 1987, p. 11), as we consider “why” of what we do... the potential impact of Christian colleges and universities on the students who attend and on this increasingly dysfunctional world in which we find ourselves today.

Having a compelling “Why” clearly gives meaning to life and resonates with people, as evidenced by a TED Talk by Simon Sinek (2009) on this topic that has been viewed almost 38 million times (see: https://www.ted.com/talks/simon_sinek_how_great_leaders_inspire_action), and a related best-selling book titled “*Start with Why*.” Sinek presents the concept of the Golden Circle that has the “Why” in the middle, the “How” as the next concentric circle, and the “What” as the outermost circle. Most organizations, Sinek argues, start with “What” and never figure out their “Why.” In contrast, it is encouraging to affirm that the mission and potential contributions of Christian higher education have a very compelling “Why” that undergirds the work of faculty, staff, students, and alumni. This “Why” relates to the opportunity of higher education—whether reaching students at the undergraduate level (in four to six years) or at the graduate level—to shape lives during a period that educator Sharon Daloz Parks has described as “*The Critical Years*” (1989) that provide a foundation for how the remainder of life is lived. Just so, those

who invest their time and talents on the campuses of Christian colleges and universities believe an educational approach that takes seriously both “the life of the mind” and “the life of the spirit” produces transformative benefits for the individual students who attend; the alumni of these institutions also contribute to the “common good” of our communities, our countries, and to God’s Kingdom work in our world.

It should be noted that most of the students who attend CCCU institutions take their faith seriously and are eager to grow spiritually, hence their decision to choose to apply to a Christian institution. In fact, a major research project that was conducted for the CCCU several years ago found that a single question on a survey instrument best determined whether or not an “inquirer” would actually enroll and attend a Christian college. That question was: “Do you attend either a service or event at church more than once a week?” Those inquirers who had a vitality to their faith and desired to live and learn in community with other believers were much more likely to decide in favor of attending a Christian education.

Five “Fingerprints” That Have Shaped Faith-Learning Integration in the U.S. Context

I approach this chapter by drawing from over 30 years of professional investment in the work of Christian higher education; nearly 20 of which involved serving as the vice president for professional development and research of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU), previously called the Christian College Coalition. The board of directors that guided the organization in the 1980s and 1990s prioritized that the CCCU should emphasize the Christian faith distinctives of its member campuses and avoid duplication of services that other organizations were offering; the timing was right for the CCCU to focus intentionally on the task of faith integration as the field was developing. During my years at the Coalition/Council, I coordinated the delivery of over 100 faculty development workshops—most of which were four or five days in length—on a variety of disciplinary topics such as “Christianity and Psychology” and “The Bible in Literature,” as well as numerous interdisciplinary workshops and conferences of 20-120 faculty around a variety of integrative topics. Somewhat surprisingly, we obtained some fairly large grants through the U.S. government—for example, from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

(FIPSE). These funds came in response to well-argued proposals for timely projects to strengthen this group of private colleges and universities; notably, then as now, all of the member institutions were fully accredited, representing a legitimate part of what we call the “mosaic” of U.S. higher education.

In the early years that followed the CCCU’s founding in 1976, there was a period of emphasizing the term “faith, learning, and *living*”—trying to move the dialogue beyond exclusive attention to the *cognitive domain* in ways that sought a faith-filled perspective on all of life. Given the tendency of faculty to be critical thinkers, there was also a degree of challenge even to the concept of “integration,” which seems to convey two *completely* separate sets of knowledge that need to be melded into one. Over the years, a variety of visual images were proposed to counteract this image of tension between two polar opposites that attract or repel—secular knowledge versus biblical truth; “Athens” versus “Jerusalem”. One image that was criticized portrayed “integration” as the frosting (i.e., faith) on a cake, meaning that the frosting was primarily an add-on to the substance of the cake itself. In contrast, some suggested that the composition of a *marble cake* better illustrated the legitimate enterprise of infusing faith seamlessly throughout the entire cake, with no external “frosting”. I recall one early CCCU conference when Dr. Susan VanZanten, now of Seattle Pacific University in Washington state, proposed the image of a soccer ball—recognizing the reality of the “ball” itself (the field of knowledge), but visualizing the insertion of scriptural truths through a hole that allows the air to enter and breathe life into the ball to fulfill its intended purposes.

Returning to the depiction by Leon Morris about the Gospel of John being “a pool in which a child may wade and an elephant can swim” (Morris 1995, p. 3), some have viewed the task of integration as being a relatively simple enterprise. For example, it is not uncommon for faculty to have the impression that their classroom evaluations of integrating faith into their teaching will improve if they begin each class period with prayer. At the deep end of the pool, faculty committees responsible for promotion and tenure recommendations attempt to identify ways in which faith integration effectively contributes to excellent teaching and/or scholarship. Yet, establishing explicit criteria and benchmarks regarding what qualifies as acceptably substantive faith integration—particularly across disciplines and with varying priorities across institutions in terms of teaching, service, and research priorities—is often a daunting task for all involved. That lack of clarity can be especially disconcerting for faculty who have had little or

no theological or philosophical training, yet feel expected to undergird their professional work with insights from both foundational fields.

Because faculty typically feel the right to “own” their classroom and scholarly agenda, being “expected” by the administration to integrate faith and learning, and to document that integration in tangible ways, can feel like yet another hurdle or a burdensome duty. Too often, regrettably, faculty feel insecure, unsupported, and lacking clarity about exactly what “the bar” looks like. One senior scholar who has been a thoughtful contributor to the task of faith integration over the years expressed this cautionary note: “My sense is that we’ve wrung a lot of the *joy* and *wonder* out of so-called faith/learning integration as we have gotten caught up in various ‘correctnesses’ (by which he meant politically correct or theologically correct perspectives)”. If this observation is accurate, we should be troubled. Ideally, faculty would find delight in seeing the natural linkages between our Christian faith with all academic disciplines and with all of life. And hopefully our students, who are often paying “top dollar” to attend a Christian college or university, would also find joy in seeing the connections between their faith and all of life and learning.

Conceptions of faith learning integration, in all its various discipline-specific forms and across the various theological streams, have evolved over the past five decades. Today’s incoming students, along with the newer faculty with fresh doctoral degrees, come from an increasingly challenging cultural context that has been transformed by the influence of technology. A 2017 report issued by the Public Religion Research Institute summarized the trends: “The American religious landscape is undergoing a dramatic transformation” (Jones and Cox, 2017, p. 7) in which the fastest growing faith-related shift is among those who are “religiously unaffiliated” or what sociologists refer to as “religious nones.” Additionally, a recent report on Generation Z (ages 13 to 18) in the United States issued by the Barna Group and Impact 360 documented that 57% of young people in this age group used screen media four or more hours per day; only 42% believed that the Bible is mostly or totally accurate; and 51% reported their highest goal in life to be happiness, with happiness most often defined by financial wealth.

Given these trends and many others, rethinking what faith integration can and should involve in order to serve today’s incoming new faculty and students well, it is important to remember that the pedagogical approaches that are engaging for today’s undergraduates are somewhat different than the approaches that may have been effective over past decades. Still, it is helpful to be aware of the building blocks that have contributed to the