

## Academic Freedom: A View from the Public University

By Willi Braun

“All things are permitted . . .”

I thank Jeremy Bergen for his invitation to comment on the “academic freedom” debate, begun in the previous issue of *Network*. The position from which I speak is this: I am a Mennonite with some, though not exclusively, theological training, appointed to teach religion, specifically the history and literature of early Christianity, in a large public university. Though I teach religion, I hold my position neither because I am Mennonite, nor because I have some theological training (and interest), nor because I hold (or do not hold) a particular “worldview,” noting a prominent term in Elmer John Thiessen’s reflections, and one to which I will return. My job description is brief — I must teach the required load of courses on topics and issues largely of my choice; I must pursue a research program and demonstrate this pursuit through publication, though I am free to choose the topics that will occupy me and the theories and methods that will inform and direct my chase of the chosen topics; I must do some administrative work, though the specifics are negotiable and changeable. It contains neither written nor implied limits to my academic practices. I am not required to disclose my own philosophical, ideological, political or religious preferences (worldview), nor am I expected to discredit the preferences of my colleagues and stu-

dents. But neither am I required to be silent about my preferences nor am I censored or censured if I criticize the preferences of my colleagues and students. That is, within the very broad and imprecisely defined scope of what constitutes academic practice and intellectual responsibility and respectability, and within the equally fuzzy bounds of my expertise for which I am employed (and even beyond those bounds), “all things are permitted,” to use the Pauline freedom slogan. This freedom is cultivated by the university’s ethos of free inquiry and intellectual daring, habilitated by the value placed on novelty and experimentation, promoted by the university’s reward structure, and ultimately protected by the tenure system (which, admittedly, is a protection only for some, not all, academic staff).

“. . . but not all things are beneficial”

What’s wrong with the picture I have just sketched? In principle, nothing. In reality, however, it is an ideal that, while robustly operative at one level, is compromised at other levels. Many of the constraints are familiar to academics working in public universities. Funding formulas are creating an increasingly entrepreneurial university and my freedom to be an academic in the true sense of the term is constrained by the need to face off with the institutional mechanisms by which resources are controlled and distributed. The value of schol-

. . . continued on page 2

**Toronto Mennonite  
Theological Centre**

47 Queen’s Park  
Crescent East  
Toronto, ON  
M5S 2C3 Canada  
t: 416-978-6078  
f: 416-978-7821  
e: mennonite.centre@  
utoronto.ca

**Anabaptist-Mennonite  
Scholars Network**

<http://grebel.uwaterloo.ca/amsn/>

Coordinator:  
Jeremy Bergen

arship has shifted toward monetary terms and the reward systems in the universities place pressure on researchers/scholars to invest in pursuits that may be neither intellectually nor politically all that interesting or beneficial. More burden, as well, is placed on disciplinary academic units to link themselves to interest groups and sponsoring constituencies outside the university. While an increased “town and gown” symbiosis is to be welcomed in that it accentuates the university as an accountable service institution, a consequence of this beholdenness to special-interest constituencies is an erosion of the academic’s meta-critical function with respect to the multiple, often conflicting and contested interests in a heterogeneous society.

But these things are not what worry me the most. A far greater impediment to academic freedom actually meets me as a wolf in sheep’s clothing, that is, in a view of the public university and what constitutes academic inquiry that represents itself in a rhetoric that champions “freedom” and “pluralism,” in a view that says, “let a thousand worldviews bloom” in the garden of the academy, a view that is enchanted with the dubious notion of what the late Ernest Gellner called the “egalitarianism of all thought-systems.” In the pages of *Network* it is the view pleaded by John Elmer Thiessen in his review of Anthony Diekema’s *Academic Freedom and Christian Scholarship*, but widely current elsewhere as well — see, for example, George M. Marsden’s recent book, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship* (1998). If I may engage Thiessen in a dissenting conversation, typically this view is rationalized with an opportunistic appropriation of postmodernism, which, in the context of debates such as this, is understood as the basis for a “new epistemology” that has vanquished on old epistemology based on the “the assumption of objectivity” at the heart of the “myth” of the Enlightenment (quoting Thiessen). Modernism is dead, postmodernism rules and, so continues the logic, we are left with many and variegated “worldviews” that have an *a priori* equal claim to a platform in venues of critical thought — hardly a “freedom” that truly frees the academic *qua* academic, though it does give licence to be “free to be me.”

This is not the place to pipe for a modernism vs. postmodernism tango, except to say that my view of the knowledge of Religious Studies — any disciplined and critical knowledge, for that

matter — and the means of producing this knowledge does not fit the simple epistemological options that Thiessen sets up. Admittedly, if by “modern” one means a foundational, ahistorical “universal human reason,” i.e., knowledge and knowing that is historically unsituated and unaware of the conditions in which knowledge is produced, I am not a modernist. If by “postmodern” one means the valorization of the “egalitarianism of all thought-systems,” of “whatever,” of “difference” and “other” or “non-closure” as self-legitimated transcendentals of sorts, then neither am I a postmodernist. Rather, in my rejection of essentialism or foundationalism or “closure,” I am postmodern; in my recouring to so-called Enlightenment regard for the possibility of conceptuality by conceptual labour — both examined, of course — I am a (corrigible) modernist. And as such, I am suspicious of any invocation of “postmodernism” where I sense that it is used either as a rhetorical device to place some taste, preference, practice, worldview or self-representation beyond criticism, or its incantation as a basis for an uninterrogatable admission of “whatever” into venues of critical thought. This is simply liberalism turned into compost for growing things that I find very frightening, not only because of what they bode for thought itself, but also because what they imply socially and politically.

I take the crucial issue to be not whether it is possible to think outside a worldview, nor to be questions over the academic’s freedom to hold and confess a worldview. Nobody denies these things. Rather, the crucial issue is how the academic in the public, plural-worldview university discharges her or his vocation and expertise as a critic of worldviews in the context of a pluralism of worldviews. (Let me here stress, parenthetically, that I use “criticism” in the old Greek sense, meaning the will and ability to distinguish and decide [*krinein*] between options on the basis of standards [*kriteria*] that are themselves the precipitates of a critical [*kritikos*] process that now, as in ancient Greek societies, is not esoteric [private, knowable only by a privileged few], but exoteric [public, knowable by anyone by means of intersubjective possibilities of reasoning].) My primary role is not to appreciate and applaud the colourful array of worldviews, though I do, but to place the making, maintenance, functions and effects of worldviews into the focal point of my academic practice. Taking the Christian

canon as an analogy: The academic puts the same probing and irreverent question to it that she would pose of *any* text or utterance. Who speaks here? That is, what person, group, or institution is responsible for the text whatever its putative author? Who is being addressed, and in what context? Through what system of symbols, signs or codes? What and whose interests are being served in the communication? What is the issue on which the speaker wants to persuade the audience? Who benefits or gains? Who, conversely, does not benefit? What is lost or gained? For such critical purposes, a pluralism-based, mix-and-match theoretical and methodological profligacy, a come-one-come-all ecumenical generosity with respect to “approaches,” or elemental worldview-derived presuppositions are, in the final analysis, not in my lexicon of scholarly or pedagogical virtues, much less marks of the display of academic freedom. Why not? “Without the experience of riding hell bent for leather on one’s presuppositions, one is allowed to feel that methods have really no consequences and no entailments. Since none of them is ever allowed to have any power, none of them is ever subjected to any interesting cost accounting” (Jonathan Z. Smith). In other words, in as much as the so-called “new epistemologies” are thought to subsume the academic’s freedom under the imperative of intellectual and confessional pluralism, they function as an abnegation of strong critical judgment, as corrosive of the very possibility of determined, disciplined, cost-counting intellection with respect to human, including religious, *arts de faire*. The postmodern privilege impedes the academic’s freedom to be a hell-bent for leather critic wherever such criticism is considered impolite, irreverent, or even imperialistic, or wherever scholarly arguments are reduced to the status of mere opinions that one either shares or rejects for equally “just because” reasons. During a recent stay in Pretoria, South Africa, I was ever amused by a clever urban billboard slogan that promoted the incorrigible posture of a popular talk-radio personality: “My opinions may change, but the fact that I’m right doesn’t.” It marvellously captures the combo of argumentative promiscuity, untestability and dogmatism that often presents itself behind the kind smile of pluralism in the academy.

“Whoever has ears to hear . . .”

Freedom of speech, that is, the freedom of the

academic to subject all “sacreds” and world-views, including her or his own, to no-holds-barred criticism, is a precious thing in its own right — which is why I so strongly want to defend it against certain “postmodern” freedoms. But freedom to speak is hardly a prize unless it is exercised in conditions in which the freedom to hear is equally prized and fostered. In this respect, I share and applaud Ted Grimsrud very gentle (subtextual) lament over the lack of welcome, perhaps even the squelching, of the theologian’s freedom in exercising the theologian’s “gift.” It is all too often the case in the classroom and in other academic contexts that the desire to be heard overrules the appetite to hear, to listen and muster the patience and care that critical judgment requires. Whatever the reasons — and surely they are many and complex — for the hearing difficulties I often encounter (in myself included), a cultivated deafness of mind constrains freedom in the pursuit of knowledge in subtle but powerful and usually overlooked ways.

*Willi Braun is associate professor of Religion in the department of Comparative Literature, Religion, and Film Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton. willi.braun@ualberta.ca*

## Reply to “Is Academic Freedom a Mennonite Value?”

*[This response was originally written to be published alongside Ted Grimsrud’s “discussion starter.” That article, in Network 4/1 (May 2001), is available at <http://grebel.uwaterloo.ca/amsn/2001May.pdf>]*

*By Duane Friesen*

I am grateful to be included in this discussion. For what it is worth, here are a few of my comments.

1. I am unsure of the central focus of Ted’s essay. It seems to me that the essay shifts from a discussion at the beginning of academic freedom in the context of a college/university to the end where it focuses on the role (exercise of gifts) of the theologian in the church. I think we need to address these two different topics in somewhat different ways. I do not understand a college to be a church, and thus understand my role somewhat differently in these two institutional con-

texts.

2. The question, for example, of academic freedom in the college setting encompasses a broader context than the question of the role of the theologian in the church. I think more broadly, for example, of my colleagues who are philosophers, scientists, artists, historians, etc. Academic freedom in this context means the protection of inquiry (at Bethel College, for instance, it means a tenure system) even if such inquiry and the results of that inquiry violates tradition, established dogma, or even the Bible.

Galileo did not have academic freedom, so he was put under house arrest by the church, because what he saw at the end of his telescope and how he interpreted that violated established dogma. I am grateful for colleges and universities (differentiated from the church) where such values are protected. This is one of the values that the Enlightenment has passed on to us. Thus I have problems with Ted's fourth paragraph. ("I do not find the ideal of 'academic freedom' that attractive when couched in terms of Enlightenment individualism. . . I do not look at Enlightenment freedom as the main source of reasoning. . .") It is a mistake to treat the "Enlightenment" as a monolith that is primarily negative. Like any cultural phenomenon, we need to be discriminating. Though I recognize that the Enlightenment is a particular cultural construct, and its claims about universal reason are exaggerated, I also believe the Enlightenment has also been a positive force in liberating in-

quiry from the control of dogma and tradition.

Also, I do not equate unqualified "freedom of expression in the classroom" necessarily with academic freedom (as Ted seems to do in paragraph two). How I exercise my speech as a teacher in a classroom setting is an ethically complex issue that requires me to respect the beliefs and values of my students who may disagree with what I believe to be "true."

3. I also believe that academic freedom in the most basic sense (the power of truth to persuade rather than the "truth of power," where coercive pressure is applied to inquiry to manipulate or control) is fundamentally consistent with an ethic of nonviolent persuasive love (manifest by Jesus in the cross). In an inquiry (or conversation) where we pursue with others what is "true," what moves us forward is consent, the inner conviction that we "know" something that "compels" us to believe that something is true. This is a social process, one where we are constantly testing what we know with others, because of a profound humility - that we could be mistaken, that our own knowledge maybe distorted and partial. When the scientific community is working well, this is how they do it. I have profound admiration and respect for that model.

Thanks, Ted, for engaging this important issue.

*Duane Friesen is professor of Bible and Religion at Bethel College, North Newton, KS.  
dfriesen@bethelks.edu*

---

## Editorial

This issue is the lengthiest Network newsletter so far and reflects two lively discussions, several calls-for-papers, job openings and other announcements. Once again, I encourage you to respond to any of the articles in this issue and to suggest new topics for these pages.

Sincere thanks to all those who paid their annual membership dues since the last newsletter. The Network is financed by these dues.

I had hoped to launch a redesigned website with this issue. However, rather than launch a version with bugs, I will send out email notification shortly to announce that it is up and running. The website will allow members to update their profiles on-line and run searches on selected fields of the database.

Many of you are reading this issue directly from the web or have printed it from the web. To all those who gave email addresses on the Scholar Information Forms, a short note was sent informing you that the latest issue had been published to the website. I trust that this way of distributing the newsletter is acceptable to you. Please let me know if your email address changes. If you are not able to read the newsletter online (e.g. cannot download Adobe Acrobat Reader) or prefer to receive hard copies, we will continue to print and mail the newsletter by regular post. The more newsletters distributed electronically, the lower our printing and postage costs which allows us to redirect those resources into website development.

*Jeremy Bergen*  
mennonite.centre@utoronto.ca

## Interreligious Dialogue, continued . . .

Dorothy Yoder Nyce's article, "Disciplined Interreligious Dialogue" appeared in *Network* 3/2, December 2000. J. Nelson Kraybill's response appeared in *Network* 4/1, May 2001. Both issues are available at: <http://grebel.uwaterloo.ca/amsn/>

### Be Followers, not just Proclaimers

*By Mitchell Brown*

J. Nelson Kraybill's critique of Dorothy Yoder Nyce's article troubles me in two areas. First, his simple equation of growth with "decisive and bold confession" ignores the fact that idolatry at least since the episode of the golden calf has always proven to be more popular (might one say more universalizing?) than the less obvious service of the true God. Perhaps the more muted witness of the West is a result of harsh experience: we have seen what a bold stress on the universal and unique Jesus has done over the centuries to those "stubborn" ones (mostly Jews) who just don't get it; millions of lives sacrificed on the alter of this universal Jesus. There has to be another way to articulate the centrality of Jesus: universalism plain doesn't work.

My second difference with Kraybill comes with his assertion that if Jesus is not unique then there is no reason for suffering discipleship. Really? There are martyrs in all religious traditions. Jews and Muslims have died faithfully for God without the intervening witness of Jesus. Similarly, Lawrence Hart tells the story of the death song of Cheyenne chief White Antelope ("The Earth is a Song Made Visible," p.75 in *Creation and the Environment*, ed. Calvin Redekop.) One need not have Kraybill's traditional Christology to be willing to die for God. The only alternative to such a traditional faith is not a "mere polite comparison of religious perspectives." Faithful witness does not require the universal and unique Christ.

The key to our witness must simply be following Jesus. Jesus wants us to do what he did. If there are people who will do the same in the name of others (Torah, the Prophet, Buddha), who are we to denigrate their witness? Jesus wants followers on the way of peace not just proclaimers of his name (Matt.25:31-46). To limit the power of God to just one way is a mistake with tragic consequences. Do we really be-

lieve that the God who "can raise children for Abraham from these stones," (Matt.3:9) is limited to just one path to salvation?

I have found God through Jesus Christ. Yet I believe that others can follow God along other paths. What will determine acceptable discipleship will not be some theological concept (universalism, uniqueness) but how one lives. Jesus wanted disciples, people willing to live peacefully amidst the violence of this world. Such peaceful witness is the kingdom of God. Jesus proclaimed not himself but this kingdom and I believe that he would accept all who would seek that kingdom.

*Mitchell Brown is pastor of Evanston Mennonite Church, Evanston, Illinois.  
mcb9476@ameritech.net*

### 2000 Years of History Makes a Difference

*By Daniel Leichty*

Substantial areas of content must be addressed in Nelson Kraybill's response to Dorothy Yoder Nyce's article. Kraybill claims that it would be "losing the heart of the Christian faith," were we to hold certain of our truths as dialogically tentative rather than as "singular and universal." Kraybill acknowledges the cultural context of religious pluralism, but rejects the dialogical position (expressed with profound and unusual spiritual depth by Dorothy Yoder Nyce) in favor of his reading of the missionary example of the early Christians, who, he claims, also lived in a religiously and culturally diverse world. He suggests that these early Christians were propelled by their "historical conviction" to proclaim their one Truth as universal, ipso facto we must imitate the example. He also claims the "tepid" dialogical stance would not sustain martyrs for the faith.

Simple equations between the contemporary situation and that of the first Christians on the

basis of a supposed religious and cultural pluralism shared by each is not justified. Even granting all other things equal (which I do not) the early Christians had one very major component lacking in their environment compared to ours, and that is 2000 years of Christian history. This places us in a completely different situation than the early Christians. Christianity has a (relative) established meaning everywhere but the most remotely isolated places on earth. Therefore, when we come proclaiming our Anabaptist-Mennonite Christian truth, we are very often trying to redefine meanings and assumptions already present. Much as we might yearn for a *tabula rasa*, so that we could get it right this time, that is not the historical circumstances within which we live. This alone is drastically different than the situation in the first century of the common era. We live on this side of those two millennia, and to suppose that we ought to be, or even could be, motivated by the same (scorching? boiling? torrid? searing? what?) "historical conviction" as the early Christians is itself an ahistorical view.

Likewise, the claim that a dialogical stance would not sustain martyrs of the faith is a total non sequitur. People have been martyred through the ages for all sorts of conflicting ideas and convictions. We most certainly are not the better for every one of them. There is good psychological and historical evidence (writing here on the eve of the McVeigh execution) that it is easier to line up willing martyrs behind causes that are simply base and brutal chauvinism than behind causes in which the inherent human value and rights of others are respected. The "true believer" is not, after all, really someone most of us admire very much. The dialogical stance is confessionally critical, but hardly evidence of a "loss of nerve." It takes at least as much spiritual fortitude and strength of faith to maintain a dialogical stance, positively embracing partiality as our human condition, as it does to soldier on confessionally (as if) in full assurance that one has possession of unalloyed universal truth.

What is the purpose of all this martyr talk lately anyway? Around campus there is an observable rise recently among Christian conservatives in this appeal to think about martyrdom as a crown of conviction. Teenage kids on skateboards with Walkmans hanging out of their ears are challenged to think about "what beliefs you would die for." This no doubt raises the dramatic

element in their appeal, but little more than that. I remember myself being challenged more than once as a youngster in vacation Bible school with images of 'communists' invading the country and giving each person one shot to answer, "Believer or not?" knowing that to answer yes meant immediate dispatch with a gun or decapitation. Looking back on this with adult eyes, I really resent that this kind of drama was perpetrated on us youngsters by adults who should have known better. I would step in with no uncertain terms were I to find this in any religious program to which I was sending my own child. I am not convinced that the current appeal to "martyrs' faith" is on any higher level of discernment than that to which I was subjected back then. Who can say with any assurance or grounding in reality what ideas, if any, they would willingly die for? Most people who answer that question at all really mean what they would be willing to kill for, not die for. Whatever dying may occur comes as a tragic and unintended side effect of the killing.

I am fast concluding that this fascination with martyrdom is, above all else, a conservative Christian version of the modernist notion that authenticity can only be realized in the crucible of extreme crisis. I find Michael Andre Bernstein's arguments against this notion quite persuasive (*Foregone Conclusions: Against Apocalyptic History*. Berkeley: U of California Press, 1994) and I have come to see "What would you die for?" as a pseudo-question, intended to disguise other agenda. I am much more interested in what we can live for and how we can help to create a positive future for our children and grandchildren in this world. In this regard, I feel strongly that Yoder Nyce's proposal deserves a much more nuanced and considered response than Kraybill has given.

*Daniel Liechty is a member of the graduate faculty at the School of Social Work, Illinois State University. dliecht@ilstu.edu*

## We Must Talk about What Threatens Us

By Dorothy Yoder Nyce

1. I am amazed to be faulted for “loss of confessional nerve” when of my fourteen points about dialogue, seven included confessional statements about God and four about Jesus. A reader of Kraybill’s piece, who does not return to mine, learns little about my utterly profound belief in God (via Jesus, scripture, mentors, and experience).

2. Kraybill saw me as a caring person with good listening skills. To overlook (or not value?) the Theocentric core of another is a pattern that I have noticed among others who stress Christology at God’s expense (in my judgment). Such replacement of God (valid as Jesus is for a Christian) is an example of what I mean by idolatry. Will Mennonite scholars openly dialogue about what threatens us?

3. I have neither “muted” nor “abandoned” Jesus’ unique or universally available gift to humanity through his life, death and resurrection. Nor do I diminish people of other living faiths their space to claim unique understandings into the God of all nations. What I know about faith or the trinity is relative in that my knowing has limits, but I certainly deny neither the trinity nor the incarnation. For Kraybill to “seemingly” question my Christian integrity is a stance he chose to make public. How Jesus received Others and how he called/calls us as followers to live out God’s Kingdom/Way includes *disciplined* peacemaking, ethics and dialogue, none of which I would expect to be “tepid” or “mere polite comparison.”

4. I support effective efforts toward enabling God’s mission and presume that all involved will wish to learn from inadequate efforts. Not knowing how much of my DMin thesis Kraybill has read, I ask an initial question: Does Christian dispute of whether God *or* Jesus is “Lord of history” or our “life-transforming” Center enable or distract our witness among people of other living faiths? [I have never met Nelson Kraybill. We might start a conversation around Herbert Anderson’s “Seeing the Other Whole,” *Mission Studies*, xiv, 1/2, 1997]

Dorothy Yoder Nyce, D.Min., lives in Goshen, IN. [jdynyce@bnin.net](mailto:jdynyce@bnin.net)

## Humbleness is Response to Christ’s Uniqueness

By Anne Garber Kompaoré

After reading the article by Dorothy Yoder Nyce, Nelson Kraybill’s response, and Daniel Liechty’s response to Kraybill, I would like to contribute a few of my thoughts.

One hundred years ago, Christianity was the primary and overwhelmingly dominant religion of North America. Recently I saw a grade school certificate of my great grandfather’s, issued by the province of Ontario, with the Ten commandments inscribed upon it. I grew up saying the Lord’s prayer in public school everyday. Over the years, our North American society has become more pluralistic. We are challenged to completely rethink our historical Christian roots. We are called to be more sensitive and to provide freedom for other religions. Our generation has many more religious choices than was available a couple of generations ago. My own spiritual walk reflects my encounters with those choices; first of all the challenge of atheism, then the challenge of the divinity of Christ from a Muslim friend, and finally being confronted with the fact that one can consider Jesus divine, but along with other divinities; this challenge came from a Rosicrucian friend. Through all of these reflections, I have made my own decision to call Jesus my Lord and Saviour, to take the Bible as my sole authority as I shape my theology and Christian living practices. This also includes the Apostle Paul’s claim (later quoted by Menno Simons) in 1 Corinthians 3:11 that no other foundation can be laid than that which was laid by Jesus Christ.

Therefore, I agree wholeheartedly with Kraybill’s position that the claim of the uniqueness of Christ is essential to Christian faith as defined by the New Testament. This does not keep us from respecting those of other faiths and identifying points of commonality (such as monothesis of Christianity, Islam, and Judaism), nor does it keep us from appreciating values found in other faiths. We still have a lot to learn about how to live in harmony with those who think differently than we do. There are also still many countries in this world which do not tolerate religious plurality. This includes countries which will not allow Christianity, and will persecute and kill those who decide, on their own volition, to fol-

low the Jesus way.

The position of the uniqueness of Christ allows us to be bold in our claim, but it does not give us license to arrogance. In fact, the scriptures constantly preach humbleness. On the other hand, the mistakes of previous missionaries do not negate the importance of evangelism. (And by the way, being human, current and future missionaries will continue to find new mistakes to make! I know! I am a missionary.). So let us, as a church, not change our foundational beliefs! Let us rather consider how we can be better ambassadors for Christ in our changing world.

A note about martyrs. In Daniel Liechty's response I sense a dismissive attitude of those who speak of being ready to die for their faith. This makes me sad. Many Christian and Anabaptist martyrs over the ages really did not want to die for their faith. They died not because they refused to dialogue, but because their opponents refused to dialogue with them and accept them with their faith commitment. I do not know much about martyrdom for "causes that are base and brutal chauvinism" but I do know this world is a better world when people stand up for truly noble convictions and are willing to suffer for them. One prime example that no one but the most prejudiced WASP can deny, is the life and

death of Martin Luther King. Many churches throughout the world were born and are being born TODAY in an atmosphere of persecution. Martyrdom is not so much a mark of authenticity, it is a mark of conviction to one's cause. How do we reach out to our brothers and sisters around the world who are suffering immensely, because they know in their heart that Jesus Christ is the only way to God, and they are so convinced that they are willing to suffer and to die? What is it that convinces them so? Should we counsel them to forget the Christian faith if it causes too many problems? Or to have a secret faith? I would like people involved in interreligious dialogue, to talk with these people also, and to learn from them.

"Jews demand miraculous signs and Greeks look for wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified: a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles, but to those whom God has called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."—1Cor. 1:22-24 (NIV)

*Anne Garber Kompaoré serves with the Commission on Overseas Mission of the General Conference Mennonite Church in Burkina Faso, West Africa.* Anne\_Kompaore@sil.org

## calls for papers

Goshen College and Conrad Grebel College invite you to "**Mennonite/s Writing: An International Conference**", at Goshen College, October 24-27, 2002.

Call for papers: We welcome proposals for 20-minute presentations: on poetry, fiction, drama and creative nonfiction; on theoretical issues, single authors or writings, or sets of related writings.

Although we expect that most papers will concern currently active, published Mennonite writers, we also welcome papers on film and popular writing and on earlier Mennonite literature, including journals, diaries, autobiographies and oral literature. Papers dealing with Amish and Hutterite writings and experience will also be considered.

Since 2002 is the 40th anniversary of Rudy Wiebe's *Peace Shall Destroy Many*, which stands at the beginning of the remarkable production of Mennonite literature since 1962, we hope to have one session of papers on that novel in particular and second session on Wiebe's other writings.

The one-page (c. 250 word) proposal should be accompanied by a long biographical paragraph or a one-page academic vita. Deadline: **April 1, 2002**

People in the U.S. may send proposals to Ervin Beck, Goshen College, Goshen, IN 46526; fax 219-535-7293; email: ervinb@goshen.edu; in Canada, to Hildi Froese Tiessen, Conrad Grebel College, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G6; fax 519-885-0014; email: htiessen@uwaterloo.ca

*The Conrad Grebel Review* is planning a special issue for Spring 2002 on the theme, "**Responding to Terrorism: Does Nonviolence Work?**" We seek scholarly papers and reflective essays that present thoughtful and provocative analyses and ideas in response to the terrorist attacks of September 11 and the ongoing international military reply to those events. Submissions might be on such topics as: philosophical reflections on just war theory; nonviolent activism; non-military responses to terrorism; challenges to peace theology; terrorism and human security; educating children about peace in a world of violence; peace movements and terrorism, for instance.

*The Conrad Grebel Review* is an interdisciplinary journal with an international readership published three times a year by Conrad Grebel University College at the University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario. Each issue normally contains scholarly articles, responses to articles, reflections, creative writing, and book reviews. Recent issues have been on such themes as Religion and Science, Pluralism and Diversity, and Theologies of Service.

To send submissions or make inquiries, please contact Dr. Marlene Epp, Editor, *The Conrad Grebel Review*, Conrad Grebel University College, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, N2L 3G6, (519) 885-0220 x257, mgepp@uwaterloo.ca. Deadlines for initial drafts or proposals to submit is **January 31, 2002**.

new  
books

**Mark Baker.** *Recovering the Scandal of the Cross: Atonement in New Testament & Contemporary Contexts.* Co-author with Joel B. Green. Inter-Varsity Press, 2000.

**Mark Baker.** *¿Dios de ira o Dios de amor?* Buenos Aires: Ediciones Kairos, 2000.

**Tim Geddert.** *Mark.* Believers Church Bible Commentary Series. Herald Press, 2001.

**C. Norman Kraus, ed.** *To Continue the Dialogue: Biblical Interpretation and Homosexuality.* Pandora Press US, 2001.

**Markus von Martens.** *Amisch alli Daag: from het i funktion?* [Piety in Action? The Imitation of Christ as Expressed by the Amish] Lund: Arcus, 2001.



**The Conrad Grebel Review**  
An interdisciplinary journal published by  
Conrad Grebel University College

Fall 2001: Special issue on Theologies of Service, incl. papers by Mary T. Malone, Lydia Harder and Alix Lozano from the conference "Women Doing Theology: Envisioning an Inclusive Theology of Service," and articles by Gerald Schlabach and Judy Zimmerman Herr and Robert Herr. Poetry by Di Brandt.

Winter 2002: First annual Bechtel Lectures in Anabaptist Mennonite Studies: Terry Martin, "The Russian Mennonite Encounter with the Soviet State, 1917-1955"; Gordon D. Kaufman, "My Life and My Theological Reflection: Two Central Themes"

**Special Network member's rate:** Canada: \$24/year; \$18 (student);  
US: \$18/year; \$15 (student)

<http://grebel.uwaterloo.ca/cgreview/> 519-885-0220 ext.242  
[cgreview@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:cgreview@uwaterloo.ca)

**Elmer John Thiessen.** *In Defence of Religious Schools and Colleges.* McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.

calls for  
papers

**TMTC Graduate Student Conference - November 21-22, 2002** "**Issues in the Future of Anabaptist-Mennonite Scholarship.**" The Toronto Mennonite Theological Centre invites all graduate students and recently graduated students in the area of religion to submit an abstract on the above theme. The aim of the conference is to provide an opportunity for future scholars to offer, before their peers, papers and presentations that contribute to Anabaptist-Mennonite scholarship. The conference will be divided into two parts, the first consisting of papers on the theme of the conference, and the second of panel discussions on the topic "Integrity of Faith and Scholarship". The *Conrad Grebel Review* has expressed interest in publishing the proceedings from the conference. To further encourage students to participate, there will be a travel bursary for those individuals giving papers or presenting in the panel discussions. All submissions will be chosen anonymously. Abstracts should not be longer than 500 words and be clearly marked whether they are for the paper or panel section of the conference. If abstracts are being submitted by snail mail, they should be accompanied by a cover letter identifying name, address, and abstract title. Do not put your name or your university affiliation on the abstract. The deadline for receiving abstracts is **February 28, 2002**. For snail mail, submit abstracts to: TMTC Graduate Student Conference; 47 Queen's Park Cres. East; Toronto, ON M5S 2C3  
For email, submit abstracts to: [mennonite.centre@utoronto.ca](mailto:mennonite.centre@utoronto.ca) Please identify the email as an abstract submission in the subject line.  
For more information, contact Jeremy Bergen at [TMTC:mennonite.centre@utoronto.ca](mailto:TMTC:mennonite.centre@utoronto.ca)

Messiah College and the Sider Institute for Anabaptist, Pietist and Wesleyan Studies invite paper, panel and workshop proposals for possible presentation at the ecumenical conference, "**(Re)Connecting Spirituality and Social Justice: Christian Visions, Christian Realities,**" to be held at Messiah College, Grantham, Pa., May 30-June 1, 2002. This conference will provide the opportunity for scholars and other interested persons to engage in conversations on the relationship between "Christian spirituality" and "social justice." Papers, workshops and/or panels could explore topics such as: praying for social justice; social justice and Christian liturgy (including hymnody); the spiritual practices of Christian activists; insights from particular Christian traditions; lessons from the civil rights movement; feminist spirituality and the activist tradition; learning from Henri Nouwen and Thomas Merton; spiritual direction and social justice; theologies of spirituality and social justice; lessons from the Hebrew prophetic tradition, etc. Of course, proposals exploring other themes and topics are also welcome.  
Send 1-2 page proposals, including title, by **November 10, 2001**, to David Weaver-Zercher, Sider Institute for Anabaptist, Pietist and Wesleyan Studies, P.O. Box 4033, Messiah College, Grantham, Pennsylvania 17027; or e-mail proposals to [dzercher@messiah.edu](mailto:dzercher@messiah.edu). For more information, including the full conference schedule and registration details which will be available online by January 15, 2002, visit [www.messiah.edu/siderinstitute/](http://www.messiah.edu/siderinstitute/) (click on "News & Events").

## job openings

Eastern Mennonite University (EMU) announces a **full-time, continuing faculty position in philosophy and theology** for fall 2002. Ph.D (or equivalent) or ABD in philosophy or related discipline. Expertise in the intersection between philosophy and theology and in social and political thought especially desirable. Seeking a candidate to teach in our newly expanded Philosophy and Theology major. The major seeks to integrate philosophical and theological thought, with a special concern for supporting the EMU mission of preparing students to answer Christ's call to a life of nonviolence, witness, service, and peacebuilding. Primary teaching assignment focusing on the philosophy component of the major, including history of philosophy, contemporary philosophy, critical thinking, philosophy of science, ethics, and social philosophy.

EMU announces a **full-time, continuing faculty position in world religions/missions** for fall 2002. Ph.D (or equivalent) or ABD in religions/missions/anthropology. Expertise in cross-cultural and two-thirds world issues required. Seeking a candidate with commitment to Anabaptist Mennonite theological and missiological perspectives, with significant cross-cultural ministry/scholarly experience. Previous teaching experience desirable. Teaching assignment will include the core course in world religions for all Bible and Religion majors and other missions/religion/anthropology courses. Must be willing to teach additional Bible and Religion courses within the general education curriculum.

For both EMU positions: Student advising, university service and ongoing scholarship expected. Salary and rank determined by education and experience. EMU uses an extended contract system. Send letter of application, curriculum vitae, transcripts (unofficial acceptable) and three references to Marie S. Morris, Undergraduate Academic Dean, Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg, VA 22802 or email to [ug-dean@emu.edu](mailto:ug-dean@emu.edu); [www.emu.edu](http://www.emu.edu) Reviews begin November 30, 2001. EMU reserves the right to fill the position at any time or keep the position open. AAEO employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

The Department of Biblical and Religious Studies at Messiah College invites applications for a **full-time tenure track position in theology**. Area of expertise is open (e.g., systematic theology, moral/spiritual theology, or other areas of theological reflection). Opening in Fall 2002. Qualifications: Earned doctorate in theology and the ability to teach theology courses effectively to undergraduate students. Founded in 1909 by the Brethren in Christ Church, Messiah College embraces the mission of educating women and men toward maturity of intellect, character, and Christian faith in preparation for lives of service, leadership, and reconciliation in church and society. For more information about Messiah College, see the school's profile at [www.messiah.edu](http://www.messiah.edu). Applicants should send a letter of interest, curriculum vitae, and three professional letters of reference to Dr. David Weaver-Zercher, Chair, Department of Biblical and Religious Studies, Messiah College, One College Avenue, P. O. Box 4141, Grantham, PA 17027. Review of applications will begin November 15, 2001, and will continue until the position is filled. For more information, e-mail [DZercher@messiah.edu](mailto:DZercher@messiah.edu); phone: 717-691-6013; fax: 717-796-5373. Messiah College does not discriminate on the basis of gender, race, color, disability, or national or ethnic origin.

Canadian Mennonite University is currently seeking to hire **two positions selected from the following Arts and Humanities**: philosophy, history, sociology, geography, mathematics, and political studies. CMU is also looking for **two music positions** with specializations in church music and ethnomusicology plus some combination of the following: choral, composition, music theory, and music education. These are all tenure track positions and will begin September 2002. Contact Harry Huebner, Academic Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Canadian Mennonite University, 500 Shaftesbury Blvd., Winnipeg, MB R3P 2N2; ph. 204-487-3300; email [hhuebner@cmu.ca](mailto:hhuebner@cmu.ca)

## conferences

**Association of Anabaptist Missiologists** meets **January 26, 2002** in conjunction with the Council of International Ministries gathering in Chicago. Features will include: Guest speaker, Samuel Escobar (professor of missions at Eastern Baptist Seminary and current president of the American Society of Missiologists); the "unveiling" of a new bibliography on Anabaptism and Missions (over 4,000 titles); a proposal for discussion about the need for an anthology of writings on missions from an Anabaptist perspective; and a banquet celebrating the life-long contributions of several prominent Anabaptist/Mennonite mission scholars and administrators. For information contact James Krabill at [JamesRK@mbm.org](mailto:JamesRK@mbm.org)

A Believers Church Conference "**Assessing the Theological Legacy of John Howard Yoder**" will be held at the University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana on **March 7-9, 2002**. Over 30 papers will be presented. Plenary speakers include Mark Thiessen Nation, John Paul Lederach, Gayle Gerber Koontz, Miroslav Volf and Stanley Hauerwas. For more information contact Karl Koop, Institute of Mennonite Studies, 3003 Benham Ave., Elkhart IN 46517-1999; [kkoop@ambs.edu](mailto:kkoop@ambs.edu)