

## Is Academic Freedom a Mennonite Value? A Discussion Starter

By *Ted Grimsrud*

For over one hundred years, Mennonites in North America have been in the higher education business. As was no doubt inevitable, as time has passed, Mennonite colleges and seminaries have adopted many of the values and practices of their surrounding culture's higher education milieu. And yet, we still want to think of our "product" as in some sense distinctively Mennonite.

One area where these two communities (North American higher education and the Mennonite churches) perhaps most obviously have potential for being in tension is the area often referred to as "academic freedom." Should academics who work for Mennonite schools operate in terms of "academic freedom?" Partly because I teach in theology and partly because this question seems especially pointed in relation to theology (broadly defined to include biblical studies, ethics, and other related disciplines), I will focus on theology in this essay. I believe my reflections, though, could to a large extent apply to all disciplines in our Mennonite colleges and seminaries. What constraints, if any, should be placed on the freedom of expression in the classroom for Mennonite theologians? What about our publications? What place is there for censorship on the part of Mennonite institutions? How about self-censorship?

I address these issues from the perspective of one who has taught at a Mennonite college for nearly five years, and who for ten years before that pastored in three Mennonite congregations. I also address these issues as a person who did not grow up as a Mennonite, but rather grew up in the "Wild, Wild West" in a milieu strongly influenced by rugged frontier individualism. So, while I write out of lengthy experience in Mennonite institutions, I also write as one who does not have the

traditional Mennonite, community-first ethos in my bones.

However, individualist that I may be, I also write as one not fully comfortable with Enlightenment-centered rationales for individual rights and freedoms. I do not find the ideal of "academic freedom" that attractive when couched in terms of Enlightenment individualism. Or rather, in reflecting about the responsibilities of theologians who work at Mennonite institutions, I do not look at Enlightenment freedom as the main source of reasoning. At the same time, I need also to state that I have deep appreciation for how Enlightenment influences have fostered personal freedom in our culture.

As a Christian, though, I find it more helpful to place the issues of appropriate expression for theologians in the context of spiritual gifts. I believe that it is because of the gifts theologians have been given and have nurtured and are hired to exercise that open expression is something our schools should cultivate (more than because of the ideal of "academic freedom"). However, in practice open expression in a Mennonite college and "academic freedom" in a state university might not look noticeably different.

So, this is my central argument: Mennonite churches and colleges and seminaries must respect the giftedness of their theologians. They should expect those theologians to be honest and open in

... continued on page 4

### Toronto Mennonite Theological Centre

47 Queen's Park  
Crescent East  
Toronto, ON

M5S 2C3 Canada

t: 416-978-6078

f: 416-978-7821

e: [tmtc@chass.utoronto.ca](mailto:tmtc@chass.utoronto.ca)

w: [grebel.uwaterloo.ca/tmtc](http://grebel.uwaterloo.ca/tmtc)

### Anabaptist-Mennonite Scholars Network

Coordinator:

Jeremy Bergen

**Please return your corrected  
Scholar Information Form along  
with the annual membership fee.  
The Network depends on your  
continuing support.**

## A Loss of Confessional Nerve: Anabaptist Scholars Must Do Better

By J. Nelson Kraybill

Dorothy Yoder Nyce's article on "Disciplined Interreligious Dialogue" (*Network* 3/2, December, 2000, available at <http://grebel.uwaterloo.ca/amsn/2000Dec.pdf>) raises concern in me about the confessional stance of North American Anabaptist scholars as we witness in a culturally diverse world. As any follower of Jesus should do, Yoder Nyce seeks to engage in self-critique and to convey respect for dialogue partners of other world religions. But by seeming to abandon the conviction that something of singular and *universal* significance happened in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, she risks losing the heart of Christian faith. Anabaptist scholars must do better.

Yoder Nyce addresses issues with which I struggle, and many of my peers do the same. My generation has learned that to believe there is "salvation in no one else" than Jesus Christ (Acts 4:12) is awkward and even offensive in a post-modern environment—at least if missional activity grows out of that. A loss of confessional nerve profoundly limits the ability of the Mennonite Church (and many other Western Christians) to reach a suffering and broken world with the good news of Jesus Christ.

It is no coincidence that the Anabaptist church is growing steadily in parts of the world where the church makes decisive and bold confession of the uniqueness of Jesus. Nor is it a coincidence that the Anabaptist church is stagnant or declining in the West where people like me are tempted to mute our Christological confession. We deeply want to be accepted and respected at the Society of Biblical Literature, at the university where we study/work, or at other professional, intellectual or ecumenical guilds where exclusive truth claims are viewed as suspect.

Outfitted with tools of sociological or anthropological analysis, we join the chorus critiquing inadequate mission efforts of others (or of predecessors in our own tradition). Yoder Nyce, for example, uses pejorative words and phrases to describe those who "claim our particular view of or relationship to God as universal":

"imperialistic . . . paternalism . . . holier than thou . . . trample another's insight and dreams . . . arrogant, evangelistic tactics."

But the New Testament church and Christians through the centuries have held that it was the

trinitarian God who chose to make self-disclosure in Jesus Christ the pivotal event of salvation history. Believing and proclaiming this conviction does in fact "negate" many other world views. We must "speak the truth in love," never use coercion, and be prepared to suffer.

Many Mennonites in the West grew up in settings where we had virtually no contact with other world religions. Privileged to travel and to live in other cultures as adults, or confronted with other world views in home communities rapidly becoming multi-religious, my generation has needed to deal with questions of inter-religious dialogue. Our recent encounter with world religions sometimes generates the illusion that Anabaptist Christians now are dealing with a new situation, requiring us to relativize our confessional statements about the singularity of Jesus Christ (or to limit the public face of our Jesus-commitment to peacemaking and ethics, which generally plays well in the guilds).

But the gospel of Jesus Christ was first spoken into a world that was just as diverse in religion and culture as our own. Early believers who met the risen Christ were aware of the scores of religious options in the Roman world. Yet a *historical* conviction propelled them with astounding energy into mission, as summarized by Paul in Philippians 2:5-11: Jesus Christ, though in the form of God, emptied himself, became obedient to death on a cross, and was exalted so that "every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Such assertions about the singularity of Christ are "a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles" (1 Cor. 1:23).

If Jesus' death and resurrection simply were one way to human reconciliation with God, there would have been no compelling reason for the terrible suffering of Golgotha. It would have been possible to "let this cup pass" from Jesus, because other less costly ways to restore humankind would have been available. Had early Christians been content to engage in mere polite comparison of religious perspectives with people of other world religions, there would have been no mission movement and no martyrs and no perceived threat to powers of the day. Such tepid confession would not have produced a Perpetua or a Dirk Willems or an Oscar Romero.

Salvation for the early church meant encounter with the risen Lord, confession of the sin of self-

. . . the gospel  
of Jesus  
Christ was  
first spoken  
into a world  
that was just  
as diverse in  
religion and  
culture as  
our own.

adjudicated spirituality, and uncompromised commitment to the Christ who someday will reign forever in a restored cosmos. Early believers called Jesus *kurios* (Lord), language that had both personal and world-historical dimensions. Worship and mission in the early church issued from a radical eschatology that arced from the resurrection of Jesus to the *parousia*. I find no hint of Jesus as Lord of history in Yoder Nyce's article or in her DMin project.

Although she refers to Jesus as "truly God and my key Mentor," Yoder Nyce rejects use of *only* language—when applied confessionally to Jesus—as "idolatry." This is a serious charge to lay against a central confession of the church, a charge that seems to deny both the trinity and the incarnation (unless we are to look for many incarnations in various religions).

The early church rejected a plethora of Mystery Religions that each promised an avenue to

God through a mentor, despite the fact that each religion must have had *some* redeeming elements. The result of the early church's confessional exclusivity was that millions experienced salvation in Christ. Apparently the early church found it possible both to proclaim the centrality of Jesus Christ and to relate to people of other faiths with love and respect.

What I sense in Yoder Nyce's writing is the heart of a person who cares for others, who has a love for those who have been wounded by imperialistic religion, who has good listening skills. I want to learn from her passion for dialogue. Her approach to interfaith dialogue may build bridges to people of other faiths, but in the end we must have something more life-transforming to carry across the bridge.

*J. Nelson Kraybill is President of Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary, Elkhart, IN.*

## Editorial

*By Jeremy Bergen*

There are two conversations represented in this issue of *Network*. J. Nelson Kraybill responds to Dorothy Yoder Nyce's proposal for interreligious dialogue. The question of "academic freedom" is considered in Ted Grimsrud's discussion starter, in two responses to his article, and in Elmer John Thiessen's review of recent book on academic freedom in Christian higher education and scholarship. Please send responses, either as articles or as a "letter-to-the-editor," on either topic.

There are several items to note regarding the structure and operation on the Network.

1. Starting with the next issue (October), I will email the newsletter to those members for whom I have email addresses (most likely as a message with a link to a PDF document on the website.) *Please make sure your correct email address is on your information form.* For those without email or those who prefer hard copy, the Network will continue to be produced in paper form and sent via post.

2. We are improving the Network website. Besides newsletters, it will feature an improved listing of scholars on the Network. If you've visited our site in the past year, you'll have noticed that this list had not been updated for some time. The main purpose of the redesign is to facilitate collaboration on projects. Thus, it is important that the box "Research Interests and Projects" on the information forms reflect *current* interests and

projects, including "half-baked" ones. In addition, the following fields will be listed on the web: name, title, organization, mailing address, email address, primary department. To help us put together a useful listing, please note the following when you return your form:

- Ensure the box "Publish this data (fields in italics) on Network website" is marked appropriately. The default is "no."
- You may wish to have an institutional address listed as mailing address.
- Fill out the email box. If this is left empty, you will continue to receive newsletters by regular mail.
- Update the "Current Research Interests & Projects" box.
- ***Please enclose your annual membership fee! And consider an additional donation to either the Network or TMTC. Thank you for your continued support.***

3. The Network is an initiative owned and managed by the Toronto Mennonite Theological Centre (TMTC), which is in turn owned and managed by Conrad Grebel College (CGC), Waterloo, Ont. All financial matters, including tax receipts for donations to the Network or to TMTC, are now handled by CGC but information forms and cheques should still be sent to TMTC. These institutional connections will contribute to the stability of the Network. The Institute of Mennonite Studies, Elkhart, Ind., is a co-sponsor. In recognition of these associations, the *Conrad Grebel Review* is offering subscriptions to Network members at a reduced rate (see enclosed flyer).

**continued from page 1 . . .**

the responsible expression of their gifts in teaching and scholarship.

As well, I believe that Mennonite churches and colleges should expect their theologians to be active members in the Mennonite Church. I believe that Mennonite theologians should understand their vocation as being one of service to the Mennonite Church (and as such, service to the broader Christian church and to the world).

However, this membership and this vocation should not be constraining factors. Rather, they are the precise factors that give theologians the responsibility to speak freely and forcefully, openly to articulate the fruits of our research. Like all members of the church, we are called boldly to speak the truth as we discern it. This may mean challenging, or it may mean reaffirming, old orthodoxies. It may mean resisting superficial fads, or it may mean pushing in new directions. That is, we are called to encourage our fellow Christ-followers toward maturity in faith.

When a person joins the Mennonite Church, that person vows to be part of the process within the church of giving and receiving counsel. Our responsibility is to make our contribution to the discernment of the body. We believe that the church is a living organism, made up of varieties of people with varieties of spiritual gifts—some teachers, some comforters, some prophets, some counselors, some artists, some artisans. The body is healthy only when those gifts are exercised. Pity the church that quenches the Spirit by ignoring the contributions of any of its gifted members.

When we understand theologians as gifted members of the church, we will see that our called-out work is not in tension with the church's mission but an essential part of it. Theologians are recognized as people with spiritual gifts in the areas of teaching and scholarship. We are not more important than other members with other gifts, but we do have an authentic role to play.

The Mennonite tradition is especially compatible with this notion of the place of theologians in the church. We rightly are skeptical of creating an elite hierarchy of "experts," where a few tell the many how to think. However, we also place a high priority on the on-going need for the church to be about its work of discerning the signs of the times, always applying the timeless truths of the gospel to particular places and issues. Theologians (broadly defined) have an important contribution to make in this on-going discernment process. For example, biblical scholars help us with the always necessary (and always evolving) work of biblical interpretation. Ethicists help us better

understand the issues at hand in our day and age. Doctrinal theologians help us, when necessary, to revise old and to construct new understandings of God and the biblical message that may be applied to these current issues. That is, the task of all different types of theologians is to be attentive to God's truth and to help the church grow in faithfulness to that truth.

I believe the central tension we face today, then, is best seen in terms of the church's openness to understanding its mission in the framework of the centrality of on-going discernment and dynamic engagement with a changing world. When the church understands its work in this creative way, it will welcome the contributions of all its members, each exercising one's gifts in service of the discerning work of the church. These needed contributions include the work of our theologians. If the church, instead, takes on the task of simply defending past orthodoxies and protecting its social status, then it will stifle many of its gifted members—not only theologians.

I am suggesting that we seek to understand our calling as Mennonite academics as part of the work of the church, done within the circle of church life. I resist the kinds of separation that appear to be, on the one hand, seeking to protect the church from the academy, or, on the other hand, seeking to protect the academy from the church.

Our ecclesiology has, at its best, understood that we all are responsible to share in the work of discernment. All voices within the fellowship must be heard. The church must not censor or squelch those within the fellowship (including theologians) who raise questions and suggest new directions. At the same time, all within the fellowship (including theologians) are called to do their work in service of the work God is doing through the community of faith, not as autonomous individuals.

Today, as always, the Mennonite Church (the Christian church in general) faces the enormously difficult and important task of embodying and articulating a living gospel that speaks to the people of our day. As near as I can tell, our schools have been doing a terrific job in training young people for this task (even if many in the Mennonite Church seem not to appreciate this).

However, we face a major challenge. We need always to be attentive to our language, to find ways to articulate a living faith. Perhaps this task now takes on a new urgency for Mennonites, traditionally inarticulate about faith convictions, more comfortable with lived-out faith than with talked-about faith. However, as the support sys-

I resist the kinds of separation that appear to be, on the one hand, seeking to protect the church from the academy, or, on the other hand, seeking to protect the academy from the church.

tems of the old ethos of Mennonite communities wither, one wonders if the faith convictions might also wither if they cannot find better articulation. Too easily, even at our schools, we settle for the jargons of other traditions (maybe most notably, the jargon of rigid, doctrine-centered evangelicalism on the one hand, and the jargon of pop humanism on the other hand).

The work of articulating a living faith, using language that is meaningful and authentic in the present while also faithful to the message of the Bible, is precisely what Mennonite theologians are called to. We are being irresponsible if we shrink from this work. Many in the church may not welcome it, may even try to squelch it. Our calling, I believe, is to press on anyhow. Not in the name of academic freedom so much as simply as a responsible exercising of the gifts God has given us and that the Spirit empowers us freely and courageously to use, for the sake of the church.

*Ted Grimsrud is Assistant Professor of Theology and Peace Studies at Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg, VA.*

Third, I am wondering what expectations Ted would propose to be appropriate for faculty members of a Mennonite institution. What commitments regarding the core values should one abide by? I would think this would include a sympathetic presentation of or orientation to the core values. What guidelines might one consider concerning those areas just outside the "core," those which are embraced by significant members of the constituency but are of a more controversial nature? At what point, for example, should one remove oneself from the institution if one cannot sympathetically endorse some of the core values?

Fourth, it would be helpful to suggest, at least in general, a process by which disagreements regarding the core values and/or controversial matters and the behavior of a given faculty member might be addressed. Who might be part of this? Is there a way to apply the tradition of Matthew 18 and "giving and receiving counsel" in a structure appropriate to this context? What kind of protection should a faculty member be given during such a process? How private should it be?

*Doug Miller is Associate Professor of Biblical and Religious Studies at Tabor College, Hillsboro, KS.*

## Responses to "Is Academic Freedom a Mennonite Value?"

*Doug Miller*

First, I agree very much with the general orientation which Ted is promoting, that those who claim a Mennonite/Anabaptist heritage (and others who claim the Christian church, for that matter) should center their approach in terms of the integrity of the individual gifts in the body—particularly the more academic gifts, in this case—and how those need to be free to function for the health of the whole as opposed to simply the Enlightenment value of academic freedom.

Second, the piece lacks specifics around which one might rally, or which one might correct, add to, etc. What are the "core values" that provide some boundary lines for what is and is not acceptable at a Mennonite institution? How specifically are these different from Enlightenment values? While each institution would work these out for themselves, it would be helpful to have some working examples.

*Jeff Gundy*

I found Ted's essay to be well-written, thoughtful, balanced, and persuasive. I like his recasting of the issues away from "academic freedom" in the Enlightenment sense and toward what Ted calls "expression of gifts," although I think he is a bit too eager to dismiss the genuine value of the Enlightenment spirit of free inquiry and discussion.

I have sometimes made a kind of similar argument about creative writing, trying to get beyond the tired dualism of individual and community, which has often been used to champion either "artistic freedom" or the need for "accountability." Sometimes artistic freedom simply means the airing of grievances; too often, accountability and discipline have been code words for the powerful within a community trying to protect themselves against criticism. But this dualism overstates differences and understates the essential role of "marginal" figures in any healthy community. After all, as a writer I'm a part of my community (of several, in fact) and everything that I do is colored, though I hope not narrowly determined, by my experience in community. Of-

ten those who critique some communal traditions provide a crucial service in the constant renewal that a healthy church requires.

No community will prosper if it represses or drives away its most gifted and even eccentric members, or allows itself to be defined by a narrow and inflexible power structure. At the same time, of course, some stability and continuity are required. The rub typically comes when certain segments of community seek to define its borders in ways that exclude others, or to define various tests for "true" membership. Does the believer's church consist of all those who want to belong to it? Or does some part of the church have the right to exclude others they find insufficiently orthodox?

Our answers to these questions are, I suspect, often determined by whether we are in the "in" group or the "out" one. Within our church colleges, it is crucial that we transmit the Anabaptist story, in as much of its full complexity as we can manage, and that we both celebrate and critique the inevitably imperfect human dimensions of that story. To do so will require, I think, hiring the best and most committed faculty we can find, and then encouraging them to work as boldly and fearlessly as possible.

Ted is right to emphasize the need to be constantly re-thinking and deepening our understanding of theological and ethical and other issues, and the necessary place of those trained in the disciplines (and committed to the church) in that work.

*Jeff Gundy is Professor of English at Bluffton College, Bluffton, OH.*

---

### **Some Reflections on Academic Freedom and Christian Scholarship. Anthony J. Diekema. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).**

*By Elmer John Thiessen*

Let me begin boldly. I believe many Christian (and Mennonite) professors and scholars have accepted a secular ideal of academic freedom, resulting in a secular approach to teaching and scholarship, all of which are a betrayal of their Christian (and Mennonite faith). This is not the place to provide the evidence, but it is available! Anthony Diekema, past president of Calvin College, provides a corrective to this unfortunate statistic in the book under consideration.

Academic freedom is under threat in today's institutions of higher learning. Diekema is therefore to be commended for devoting a central chapter of the book to exploring such current threats as political correctness, ideological imperialism, intolerance of religious perspectives on secular campuses, and the resulting "chilling effect" and self-censorship that result from the prevalence of such threats (ch. 3).

But how about Christian institutions of higher learning? Diekema boldly explores two characteristics of Christian colleges and universities that might seem to militate against academic freedom. Against those who maintain that the Christian starting point of teaching and research at such institutions makes academic freedom impossible, Diekema argues that all thinking occurs within the context of a worldview (ch. 4). The assumption of objectivity that we have inherited from the Enlightenment is a myth. Indeed, the standard ideal of academic freedom which still rests on this myth is in desperate need of revision in the light of the new epistemology that is now generally acknowledged, thanks in part to the arguments of postmodernism. Starting with a Christian worldview, rather than being a hindrance to academic freedom, can in fact be an aid to research and the discovery of new knowledge.

A second possible challenge to academic freedom arises from the relation between a Christian college and the church or its supporting constituency. Here again Diekema argues for the possibility of a healthy relationship and describes ways to maintain this (ch.5). He also describes several controversies at Calvin College which threatened to destroy academic freedom (ch.3). Diekema's account of how he handled these cases is instructive and further serves to underscore the central point of the book - a Christian college can and should support academic freedom, though properly qualified to acknowledge the inescapability of worldview commitments.

While strong from a practical and illustrative point of view, I found Diekema disappointing in terms of his theoretical treatment of academic freedom. He does little to overcome the continuing confusion over defining academic freedom. To define personal academic freedom in terms of a "cluster of rights, needed by the professors to attain truth, to teach truth, and to publish truth to the fullest extent of their intellectual powers," is inadequate as it fails to make a distinction between truth and the human search for truth (85). To define institutional academic freedom in terms of protection "from undue influence and meddling by political authorities, pressure groups, or

Diekema suggests that all faculty, . . . should sign a “Socratic Covenant” upon appointment, a covenant which defines both the privileges and the responsibilities of being a scholar/teacher at a Christian institution which upholds the ideal of academic freedom.

any other entity that wields power in society,” begs the prior question as to what counts as undue influence (86). And what about the inescapability of worldview commitments, which should be an essential part of a revised ideal of academic freedom? Diekema, in my opinion, has provided some of the groundwork for a more defensible notion of “committed and hence limited academic freedom” but unfortunately he does not follow through. I realize that this is no small task, and is perhaps better left to philosophers!

As one might expect from an administrator, the central chapter of this book is devoted to proposals for policy development regarding academic freedom at a Christian college (ch. 5). There are many good suggestions here. For example, Diekema suggests that all faculty, especially at colleges and universities which embrace a Christian worldview, should sign a “Socratic Covenant” upon appointment, a covenant which defines both the privileges and the responsibilities of being a scholar/teacher at a Christian institution which upholds the ideal of academic freedom. This covenant includes a commitment to “voluntarily revoke my scholarly privileges and resign from my post as a faculty member,” when the “pursuit of truth is no longer the purpose of my life or the Christian worldview that I now profess changes in ways which may no longer comport with the stated mission” of the college (103). I believe that the acceptance of such a professional responsibility on the part of faculty members would do much by way of eliminating the need to engage in the difficult process of firing someone because of incompatible commitments between institutions and individuals at Christian colleges and universities.

There are, however, some puzzling applications in Diekema’s work which I believe are rooted in the theoretical weaknesses I have already identified. While defending a strong relationship between a Christian college and its supporting constituency, Diekema criticizes the 1990 papal directive, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, for trying to restore a Christian identity to Catholic universities (116, 119). Surely he would also criticize Calvin College if it strayed too far from its Reformed roots. He further cites the Charles Curran case in the 1980s as a violation of academic freedom (23, 34). Curran was barred from teaching theology at the Catholic University of America because of his unorthodox ethical views. But, it would seem that Diekema’s own policy statements would call for Curran to voluntarily resign, given his failure to endorse orthodox Catholic doctrine. Again, I believe that in order to address these applications more adequately,

Diekema needs to define more carefully the relationship between commitment and academic freedom.

Here it needs to be stressed that Christian scholars are not unique in starting with a worldview commitment. Nor are professors teaching at Mennonite colleges and universities unique in having their academic freedom limited because their institutions are related to a church constituency. Secular institutions of higher education too are supported by a constituency, and such support invariably comes with strings attached—note the increasing pressures faced by our universities from government, industry and society at large. And secular academics too begin with their own worldview commitments. In fact, it would be very revealing to require of all scholars that their worldview commitments be made explicit.

The reigning paradigm of academic freedom tends to view religious colleges and universities as inferior because they do not have the requisite freedom in the pursuit of truth. For example the 1940 statement of academic freedom, formulated by the American Association of University Professors, added a “limitations clause” for religious colleges and universities, requiring that limitations to academic freedom should be explicitly spelled out. This clause has not been without controversy, and in a 1970 “Interpretive Comment” even this concession to religious colleges and universities was no longer endorsed, i.e. there should be *full* academic freedom at all institutions of higher learning. But there is no such a thing as “full” academic freedom at any academic institution. The original limitations clause should apply to all colleges and universities. Once the ideal of academic freedom is revised to take into account the new epistemology that is highlighted by Diekema and that is now generally recognized in academia, then religious scholars, and religious colleges and universities, will stand on equal footing with their secular counterparts in terms of intellectual respectability.

*Elmer John Thiessen teaches philosophy at Medicine Hat College, Medicine Hat, AB, and is presently on sabbatical researching the ethics of proselytizing as a Research Reader at the Centre for the Study of Religion, University of Toronto. For a more detailed treatment of academic freedom, see Ch. 5 of his forthcoming book, In Defense of Religious Schools and Colleges, McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2001. This article draws on a review of Diekema’s book as found in the Journal of Education and Christian Belief, published in England.*

## new books

**William P. Brown**, *God and the Imagination: A Primer to Reading the Psalms in an Age of Pluralism*. 2000 J.J. Thiessen Lectures. (CMBC Publications, 2001).

**Leo Driedger**, *Mennonites in the Global Village*. (University of Toronto Press, 2000).

**Leo Driedger and Shiva Halli**, eds., *Race and Racism*. (McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000).

**Leo Driedger and Shiva Halli**, eds., *Immigrant Canada..* (University of Toronto Press, 2000).

**Nancy R. Heisey**, *Origen the Egyptian: A Literary and Historical Consideration of the Egyptian Background in Origen's Writings on Martyrdom*. (Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa, 2000).

**Alle Hoekema**, *Dutch Mennonite Mission in Indonesia: Historical Essays*. (Institute of Mennonite Studies [IMS]).

**Kenneth J. Nafziger and Marlene Kropf**, *Singing: A Mennonite Voice*. (Herald Press, 2001).

**T.D. Regehr**, *Peace, Order & Good Government: Mennonites and Politics in Canada*. 1999 J.J. Thiessen Lectures. (CMBC Publications, 2000).

**A. James Reimer**, *Mennonites and Classical Theology: Dogmatic Foundations for Christian Ethics*. (Pandora Press; Herald Press, 2001).

**Cynthia Sampson and John Paul Lederach**, eds., *From The Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*. Oxford University Press, 2001.

**Wilbert Shenk**, *By Faith They Went Out: Mennonite Missions, 1850-1999*. (IMS).

**Willard M. Swartley and Perry B. Yoder**, eds., *The Meaning of Peace: Biblical Studies*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (IMS).

**Willard M. Swartley**, ed., *Violence Renounced: René Girard, Biblical Studies and Peacemaking*. (Herald Press; Pandora Press US).

**Gordon Zerbe**, ed., *Reclaiming the Old Testament: Essays in Honour of Waldemar Janzen* (CMBC Publications, 2001).

To order books published by the Institute of Mennonite Studies, phone 219 296-6239 or email [bngingerich@ambs.edu](mailto:bngingerich@ambs.edu).

**Vision: A Journal for Church and Theology**, Vol. 2 No. 1 (Spring 2001), theme: Communion published by Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary and Canadian Mennonite Bible College. The theme of this second issue is Communion. Editors: Mary H. Schertz and Gordon Zerbe. To subscribe, contact AMBS, 219 296-6274, or [kfehr@ambs.edu](mailto:kfehr@ambs.edu); or CMBC, 204 487-3300 or [gzerbe@cmu.edu](mailto:gzerbe@cmu.edu). Web: [www.MennoVision.org](http://www.MennoVision.org).

## announcements

Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary (AMBS) and Goshen College are seeking a **professor of youth ministry** for a full-time position shared between the institutions. The primary responsibility is to help develop and to teach in a comprehensive undergraduate/graduate youth ministry program at Goshen College and AMBS. This person should have a demonstrated passion for and a track record of effectiveness in working with youth and young adults, a vision for youth ministry that fits the Anabaptist-Mennonite tradition, and an advanced degree in an appropriate field (e.g., practical theology) or current candidacy in such a degree program.

AMBS is seeking a **professor of pastoral care**, a full-time position beginning February 1, 2002. This person will teach in the areas of pastoral care, pastoral counseling and spiritual formation; and administer the spiritual formation program at AMBS. Qualifications include effectiveness in working with at least one of the fields of pastoral care, pastoral counseling and spiritual formation; and an advanced degree in an appropriate field or current candidacy in a degree program.

Send letter of application, curriculum vitae, and three reference letters to Dr. Loren L. Johns, Dean, AMBS, 3003 Benham Avenue, Elkhart, IN 46517, or [ljohns@ambs.edu](mailto:ljohns@ambs.edu). For further information see [www.ambs.edu/jobpostings/](http://www.ambs.edu/jobpostings/)

A Believers Church Conference, "Assessing the Theological Legacy of John Howard Yoder," is being planned for **March 7-9, 2002**, at Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary, Elkhart, Ind.

**Available: Nancy R. Heisey, *Origen the Egyptian*. (Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa, 2000).**

Useful insights for study of African theology and early Christianity.

**Order from Nancy R. Heisey, [heiseyn@emu.edu](mailto:heiseyn@emu.edu)**

**(US \$10, including postage)**