



Colleges and Universities of the Anglican Communion

The 2013 Dr Rowan Williams Annual CUAC Lecture
Lady Doak College, Madurai, India
November 11, 2013

TransAnglican Identities and Christian University Education

Sathianathan Clarke
Bishop Sundo Kim Chair for World Christianity
Wesley Theological Seminary Washington D. C., U. S. A.

Chairperson and respected guests,

Let me start with a word of thanks. First, I thank Canon James Callaway, General Secretary of CUAC (Colleges and Universities of the Anglican Communion), for inviting me to present this esteemed lecture. Second, I am grateful to Dr. Mercy Pushpalatha, Principal, Lady Doak College, for hosting me with much care and grace. And, third, I thank my friend, Reverend Dr. V. M. Spurgeon, Chaplain and Professor, Madras Christian College, for warmly, even if exaggeratingly, introducing me this morning.

It is a great honor to deliver the second Dr Rowan Williams Annual CUAC Lecture at Lady Doak College in Madurai, India. It is a special privilege and indeed humbling to follow Archbishop Williams, who gave the inaugural lecture in Canterbury, UK, on September 28, 2012. He spoke as the most representative figure of the Anglican Communion and he lectured from the historical center of its traditional authority. I speak as a representative of a united Church somewhat at the margins of the Communion. However, I speak from a location that represents the growing majority of the Church, which has moved from the north and west in previous centuries to the south and the east in the twenty-first century. Here the church is alive, Christianity is growing, and the kingdom of God is drawing close in fresh and amazing ways.

In this lecture I will deal with the matter of Christian identity in the twenty-first century from my post-denominational locus and from the perspective of my disciplinary field of World Christianity. I am an ordained presbyter of the Church of South India and a professor in the emerging discipline of World Christianity. In order to open up reflective possibilities to reimagine the mission of Christian university education in Anglican-related and Anglican-founded institutions of higher education, I offer two interpretations of our global twenty-first century context and suggest what challenges they present for the education mission of the Church.

Parsing the basics of Christian Identity

Let me begin by elaborating upon how I think about Christian identity. The universe is dynamic and our world is continuously changing. Any science teacher will attest to such a basic truth. But there are also natural laws that direct patterns within this complex and fluctuating process. Human beings as part of creation are also swimming in such a sea of change. There is a human need to

manage such confounding change that one personally experiences in the body and mind; collectively encounters in cultural and social relationships; and communally (as a species) lives through as members of the created order. Human identity, I suggest, is a way of expressing our consistent search for stability, meaning, and purpose as we navigate the constantly changing world. It is a conceptual platform for grounding the self in a world of baffling change.

Following this line of argument, I propose that *Christian identity is a way of naming and framing our beliefs and practices that make for stability, meaning, and purpose as we live in this world by submitting to the pattern and directive of Jesus Christ.* To put this in theological language, Christ centers and frames the Christian individual and community's search for faith (which gifts stability), love (which offers meaning), and hope (which instills purpose) in a dynamic, complex and complicated world. But there is a cost to this commitment to sift human identity formation through the sieve of Jesus Christ. The enigmatic truth is that one can only find Christian identity by losing one's identity in the person of Jesus in order to enjoin the work that Christ undertakes to bring life to the dying world. The fulfillment of our human life lies in the promise of seeking the fullness of life for all God's creation. Ironically, Christian identity grounds you in the way of Jesus even as it dissolves you into the world for the sake of abundant life. Finding self and losing self are entwined in Christian identity. Jesus says, "Those who find their life will lose it, and those who lose their life for my sake will find it." (Matthew 10: 39) Finding life for the Christian self involves losing life for the sake of God's purpose of life in all its fullness. Archbishop Justin Welby reminded the 10th World Council of Churches General Assembly in Busan, Korea, earlier this month that this is also true of institutions. In an address on November 1, 2013, which I was privileged to attend, he said, "Only institutions that are willing to lose their lives for the sake of the good news, the gospel, and for Christ, will find the life God offers."¹

Finding "the life that God offers" for Christian institutions also requires losing life for the sake of Christ. This paradox of finding one's self by divesting one's self into the things that make for abundant life for all is the crux of Christian identity. Jesus came for the sake of the life of the world. Christians too find their identity in being grounded in Christ and dispersed for his sake into the kingdom of God. Christian identity thus lives out of the creative tension between stability and serviceability. On the one hand, Christians are grounded in Jesus Christ which is the source of personal and collective stability, meaning, and purpose. On the other hand, Christians are unsettled for the life of the world through self-giving service, which adds value to the purposes of God.

A word on method: "passionate balance" that is preferentially compassionate

You may have already noticed that in invoking the somewhat paradoxical constituents of Christian identity I have embraced the Anglican practice of not being unnerved by opposites. Locating binaries, paying attention to them, and coming to a mediatory truth by bringing them into critical engagement is a strength within the Anglican philosophical tradition. The Anglican Communion has consistently celebrated the *via media* (middle way). Historically, this referred to its origins, which carved out conciliation between Reformed Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. Theologically, this has also led to the pathway of mediatory truth. Such mediation of truth must be distinguished from those relativistic exercises of postmodern philosophers and theologians, those who Paul Avis identifies as "irresponsible eclectic, freelance pundits."² Instead the Anglican theological tradition entails a kind of sorting-through of the many perspectives in order to adopt a middle

way that is affirmed with joy and devotion and enacted with love and dedication to Christ for the life of the world. In a book by that very title Alan Bartlett makes a sustained argument for rearticulating the Anglican tradition as “passionate balance” in which “the truth of God is not the monopoly of any of the ‘tribes’ within Anglicanism.”³ Rather it is worked out in dialogue among God’s tribes spread out across the world through inspiration from *Scripture*, instruction from *tradition*, and clarity of *reason*.

In finding a role for the mission of university education I consciously strive for such “passionate balance.” However, such passionate balance in our twenty-first century needs to be enriched by a method of thinking and acting that is also *preferentially compassionate*. This was the way of Jesus Christ. He came to bring good news to the poor; release for the captive, healing for the blind, deaf, and lame; and freedom for those oppressed by the religious, political, and economic system (Luke 4: 18, 19) . This is where the losing of self in Christ presses toward seeking and giving life to those who struggle for existence in our world. This preferentially compassionate stance is what I suggest comprises the transAnglican trajectory. It slouches passionate balance toward preferential compassion for those who struggle in contemporary valleys of death to enhance the life of the world in accordance with God’s vision for all of creation.

From my brief reflection on identity and keeping the Anglican method of passionate balance and transAnglican method of preferential compassion as resources let me outline two facets of our contemporary global situation that impact Christian identity and then reflect on what challenges each of these present for the mission of university education today.

The TransAnglican context and the challenge of balancing the past and present for God’s compassionate future

The first thing to note is that Christian identity models have undergone substantial changes. In the last decades there has been a shift from thinking of identity as a *single essence* to gradually realizing that identity is constructed by a sense of “double belonging.” Let me use the example of my own family to illustrate such an evolution in our understanding of Christian identity.

For the last 150 years my forbears served the Anglican Church. Dependent upon a paradigm of *single-essence identity* until the independence of India in mid-twentieth century, they seemed to share an assumption that Christian and Anglican was a singular frame through which they could live out their life of faith in and witness to Jesus Christ. My ancestors served the Anglican Church in India. My great-great grandfather (W. T. Sathianadhan, 1830-1892) and great grandfather (W. D. Clarke) were long-time priests of the Anglican Church and my grandfather (S. Sathianathan Clarke, 1894-1952) was a Canon of the Anglican Church. The Englishness of their Christian identity was expressed in their lifestyle, their last names, and their worship pattern. A story was handed down that Reverend W. D. Clarke was so proud of his Anglican (which means English) roots that he preferred to use his initials to hide his Indian middle name. His full name was William Devapiriyam Clarke. My father recalled that when W. D. Clarke was asked what his full name was as a youth, he would reply “Willy Dicky Clarke”! The single essence model of Christian identity believed that there was one way in which one ought to be Christian and that this way was captured by the English who also happened to be our colonizers. Single-essence identity models lend themselves to rigorous and uncomplicated replication of a unitary self.

Fuelled by a spirit of nationalism this model gradually began to give way to a more expansive one. The awareness that one is both Christian and Indian led to an acknowledgment that Christian identity involved a “*double belonging*.” My father (Sundar Clarke, 1927-2010) was the bridge between the Anglican Church and the Church of South India (CSI). Christian identity was both belonging to Christ and belonging to India. It is noteworthy that the CSI, a united Church that organically brought together the Anglicans, Congregationalists, Presbyterians and Reformed Church of America, was inaugurated on September 27, 1947, a mere month and a half after Indian independence from the British. While confirmed as an Anglican, my father was ordained into the CSI. Later, in October 1974, he was consecrated as a CSI Bishop in the Diocese of Madras. Although a vocal supporter and key contributor to the building up of the CSI, my father always reflected with gratitude on his early Anglican roots, while also shaping “the Indian Church to be Indian.”⁴ This model of identity as “double belonging” moved away from the idea of replication of a fixed essence to a more interactive and inter-relational one. Historical, cultural, political, and social contexts both form Christian identity and offer it a locus to exert its agency to enhance life in the world.

Even such “double belonging” however is an insufficient model to think through Christian identity in our globalized world. The present and our future calls for a much more spacious model for thinking of identity. I suggest today’s globalized context calls for a *multiple hyphenated* understanding of Christian identity. A hyphen, as you know, is a sign represented by a short connecting line, which attaches one component of one’s identity strongly and organically with another. For example, to claim I have a multiple hyphenated identity I might express I am an Indian-American-Christian-ecological-liberation-theologian-priest. Many traditions come together to form a multiply-formed and diversely-committed Christian in our twenty-first century context. Let me continue with my own example. I was born into and formed within the CSI. Being baptized into this ecumenical Church in 1957, I was ordained as a CSI presbyter by my father in 1985. After serving the CSI as a presbyter and theological educator for decades, from 2005 my mission location has moved to the United States of America. Although a full-time theological professor in a Methodist seminary, I serve as a licensed priest for the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Washington in the District of Columbia. Taking stock of this complex blessedness I can claim that my Christian identity is multiply hyphenated to many cultural contexts, national interests, and church families. Having a robust strain of Anglican blood, I have been born anew into and nourished by the waters of post-Anglican ecumenism, only to willingly fall sideways to serve as a transnational Anglican mission pastor in the Episcopal Church while teaching World Christianity in a United Methodist Seminary. My prediction is that such multiply-formed and diversely-committed Christian identities will continue to forge a post-denominational global community. Many in our own denominations have a cumulative spirituality, are comfortable with a wide assortment of religious affirmations, and live out a frightening array of commitments as they engage with the world as Christians. The question is what is the role of Christian universities in such multiply-formed and diversely-committed community of teachers and learners?

I think there are three challenges that Christian educationalists will need to think about to cater to the needs of such multiple-hyphenated identities. First, Christian universities and colleges need to promote a spirit of critical appropriation when it comes to what is handed down as the past. If educational institutions do not equip students to discern and sort out the past they will eject it as irrelevant and redundant. Heritage must not be a burden placed on youth; it must be passed down with a sense of delight and an attitude of affection. Yet what is handed down lies in the custody

of the receptors and will always be recast before being lived into and further passed down. Christian educational institutions thus must encourage an ethos where Christians can critically reflect upon and thoughtfully appropriate the heritage that comes from denominational history and doctrinal narratives within a multitude of possible types of stability, meaning, and purpose that are offered as the Christian way. Reflecting upon my own time in college in Madras (now Chennai), India, I recall a certain disconnect in some Christian teachers in the 1970s. These were teachers who had a wonderfully compelling and infectiously critical perspective on the discipline that they taught in college, be it science, philosophy, or literature. They lucidly analyzed the subject matter that they had inherited from the west and yet critically dismantled many parts of it to offer us just what would be necessary and relevant for our context. The method of critical appropriation was subtly transferred even while the subject matter was imparted in the classroom. However, these same critical appropriators of their teaching subject matter would breath fire down on you if you dared to criticize their cherished Christian doctrine, rite, or practice that was handed down to them. Educational institutions need to also bring embedded ideas about the relationship between God, human beings, and the world into such critical discourse. Enabling critical assessments of our heritage is an ethos that needs to be cultivated as an institutional culture and must include what we bring from our past to nourish our Christian identity.

Second, universities and colleges need to couple creativity in encountering and relating with the present even as they encourage the skills of critical appropriation of the past. This is where we need to keep abreast of the change in identity formation paradigms. In a single-essence identity model one can think that the object of education is to produce clones indoctrinated into a universal and ahistorical Christianity. However, living out of multiple associations, affirmations, and commitments calls for creative skills. Education must help one deal with new and real questions in a complex and complicated world of difference and dynamism. The following three questions are important in our contemporary philosophy of education in our world as we encounter and engage the present: How does one integrate multiple spiritual affections that come from various locations? How does one adapt to the diverse mission commitments in our complex, confounding, and dynamic world? How does one effect these various communities of difference based on their divergent needs and resources? None of these have standard answers. Creative skills to sort out the inner self, to sift varying contexts, to reconfigure old and new sources, and to find a wholesome Christian vocation in such a complex world are what twenty-first century youth learners need from Christian providers of Higher Education.

Third, Christian universities and colleges need to link critical appropriation of the past with creative readings of the present for the compassionate practice of adding value to life as envisioned by God. Christian colleges and universities connect passionate faith, critical and creative knowledge, and compassionate living in our twenty-first century world. There is a dialogue concerning whether Christian education endeavors are governed by the mandate of *the Great Commission* (Matthew 28: 19f: “Go therefore and make disciples all nations...”) or *the Great Commandment* (Matthew 22: 37-39: “You shall love the Lord your God... [and] you shall love your neighbor as yourself.”) I do not wish to enter this debate in this lecture. I do know, however, that being faithful to learning in Christian higher education institutions involves formation for living with Christ for the purposes of God; and this implies nurturing living rather than mere believing. David S. Dockery conveys this point succinctly: “Being Great Commandment institutions means more than the integration of faith and learning; it involves the integration of faith and living.”⁵

It is important to remind ourselves that the mission of education is not attaining success in the world but finding and losing oneself sufficiently and productively to enhance the life of the world by pursuing the way of Jesus. As already mentioned this involves preferential compassion for the poor, the oppressed, the sick, and the unfree. In a fascinating study of missionary education in late colonial India between 1860 and 1920, Hayden J. A. Bellenoit reminds us that such focus on life-style education has a long history. “For most of these [missionary] educationists,” he surmises, “it did not matter much whether pupils absorbed the doctrine of Bible lessons. What was paramount was that they put them into practice.”⁶ Critical appropriation of the inherited tradition linked with creative encountering and engaging with present reality is placed in the service of living compassionately with Christ and for the life of the world.

The context of multi-religious convergence and the challenge of cultivating an educational ethos that balances the “scandal of divine particularity” with a “surplus of divine plenitude.”⁷

The second facet of Christian identity in our global context points to the fact that all identity formation takes place in a multi-religious world that mutually informs and transforms each other. The over-and-against identity assertions of Christianity may be a thing of the past. Of course, many continue to sneak it into the twenty-first century. But such covert models that assume that religions are in conflict with Christianity remain unhelpful to authentic human interrelationships and profess a testimony against the love of Jesus Christ. Enclaves of separate living based on religious identity cannot be successfully preserved in our world of rapid and easy movement of bodies of people, ideas, and commodities. But Christian leaders both of the Church and educational institutions have been slack and reticent to admit this mammoth shift. Let me take the example of India. Thomas Thangaraj, who lived and taught in Madurai for many years, talks about this formation of a Christian religious identity in difference from and defiance of a Hindu one. “The Hindu-Christian difference, in particular,” he states, “is often seen in a matrix of over-and-againstness. Hindus are viewed as potential enemies and not as fellow pilgrims on our journey towards the Divine.”⁸ Such an oppositional model is counterproductive to peaceful living in our world that has both persons and ideas moving more easily and eagerly across towns, cities, states, and nations. De-territorialization in the twenty-first century is a reversal of the colonial mission strategy of marking boundaries around territories to ensure that the Anglican, Presbyterian, and Methodist missions are confined within specific geographical spaces. Mission personnel and missionized converts were placed within preordained and restrictive social and physical locales in previous centuries. These boundaries have been erased in a new global context of intense many-sided flows and exchanges between various peoples with their own distinct cultural, religious, and cultural worldviews. Christian higher education institutions need to reflect a theology that advances the fruitful exchange of secular and sacred ideas and practices of all God’s children that have providentially make their way into our province of teaching and learning.

The *Christianity over-and-against other religions* model is deeply informed by a deficient theology. It focuses completely on “the scandal of particularity,” which lifts up the “Jesus only” means of truth and “Christians alone” election for salvation. Thus, it is so Christ-confined that it fails to take seriously the Orthodox Christian affirmation of the Trinity. “Passionate balance” brings back the other pole in Christian theology by reclaiming the fullness of the Trinity, which I am referring to as the “surplus of divine plenitude.” I use the term “plenitude” to capture the abundance of mystery and the copiousness of love that is generated by the three persons of the Trinity. It

communicates the inexhaustible riches hidden in the fullness of God that spills over from Jesus to the Abba God and God as Holy Spirit. Rowan Williams, in a recent essay published in July 2013, makes a convincing argument that highlights the mystery built into God which one becomes aware of in interreligious dialogue. Such dialogue he suggests “is one of the many means that God gives us to sink more deeply into the infinity of God’s work, presence, and purpose.”⁹ There is some similarity between the idea of “infinity of God’s work, presence, and purpose” that Williams emphasizes within God’s inexhaustible abundance and my own contention of the surplus that is contained within the inter-being and inter-action of the Trinity.

The context of our twenty-first century has already led us into such a world of intimate cultural and religious interrelationship that “actually brings us up against the sheer mystery of the God with whom we *all* [as multi-religious neighbors] have to do.”¹⁰ Hybridity rather than purity through separation calls for a more complex and yet true model for interreligious engagement committed to both passionate commitment to Jesus Christ and compassionate journeying with our pilgrims under a spacious Trinity. On the one hand, we need to attest faithfully and joyously to the claim of “the particularity of Jesus” in a world of many religious figures of revelation. This is no doubt a kind of scandal to the world of many religious communities. On the other, we also need to accept humbly and lovingly that our God is a Trinity that posits Jesus alongside the Creator (God the Father) and the Sustainer (God the Holy Spirit). This “more-than-only-Jesus” way of thinking allows for spaciousness of love and grace in God. This, no doubt, is somewhat scandalous to the exclusive Christian.

“Passionate balance” of the “scandal of particularity” (Jesus only) with “the surplus divine plenitude” (Father and Spirit also) however needs to be linked with preferential compassion. What might compassion look like when we embrace the religious other with a preference in Christian colleges and universities? In a world that only knows how to take care of the welfare of one’s own family, caste, and religious community, let me offer three challenges as we work out a passionate balance between the claim of particularity and the surplus of plenitude, with a stance toward preferential compassion in our educational settings.

First, in the context of multi-faith convergence colleges and universities need to become domains that foster the exchange of *common grace*. Often the Church does not have access to public arenas and thus it mainly promotes a grace that is not universal. It lives with a tacit model of over-and-againstness: our grace offered by Christ against your religious works that are devoid of God’s grace. Colleges and universities often are filled with people from different religious faiths. Sometimes they take the easy way out by privatizing religious belief and practice. Thus, each student or teacher professes faith as an individual and hardly allows the grace that pervades them to overflow and permeate the community around them. Another way pursued by Christian institutions is to parochialize grace. Christians gather in clusters or cells on multi-faith campuses to affirm and celebrate Christian grace as a religious tribe. They meet in Christian enclaves to thank God for uncommon grace mediated by Christ that has reached them alone as a special blessing.

I believe that the multi-religious convergence of the twenty-first century calls for a bolder step of acknowledging common grace that we have with all other faith and no-faith traditions on our campuses even as we respectfully share the received grace that Christians have been gifted in Jesus Christ. Such an acceptance of common grace hidden within the surplus of divine plenitude honors and learns from the mysterious knowledge given by God to all God’s children. The words of Norman

Klassen and Jens Zimmerman put this well: “In the context of university education, Christians need first to recognize all that we have in common with non-Christians. Through the university, Christians have often been *recipients* of common grace—of ideas and practices that arise through teaching and research that makes everyone’s life better. What is more, this grace regularly comes to people from non-Christians.”¹¹ The free circulation of common grace on Christian campuses honors the surplus of divinity scattered all over the human family. It sets up an atmosphere of respectful dialogue with the collective expectation of blessed surprise.

Second, in a context of multi-faith convergence *common works* of preferential compassion have a better chance of succeeding in bringing about life as envisioned by God. This is surely true in many contexts where Christians are a minority and cannot effect the wellbeing of the poor and the oppressed on a large scale. If one takes the example of Asia, where the Christian population is in single digits, a banding together of different religious and non-religious communities are essential to impact poverty alleviation, literacy betterment, and social and climate change policies. Here passionate balance of theology alone may not be sufficiently equipped to stimulate and sustain the common work of serving those who are struggling for the life that God envisions for all human beings. Such life desired by God involves at the least the following: first, a life of freedom of every human being in a world of physical hunger and religious persecution; second, a life of peace in a world of violence perpetuated by racism, casteism, and sexism; and third, a life of justice in a world of growing disparity and dehumanization. For this purpose, “passionate balance” needs to be interwoven with preferential compassion. TransAnglicanism is thus faithful to the way of Christ, the compassionate one.

The practice of preferential compassion across the world in the footsteps of Jesus Christ turns our inter-religious attention to the poor, marginalized, and othered. We might justify this focus for preferential compassion by qualifying Bartlett’s general proposition concerning where we may find Christ. Rather than only universally asserting that Christ “finds a home and voice amongst widely differing people”¹² we also specifically affirm that Christ finds a special place amongst those who are noticeably displaced. Christian colleges and universities privilege a variety of local sub-communities to their multi-faith constituency. The poor, widows, beaten down women, marginalized Dalits, exploited Adivasis/indigenous peoples, the physically and mentally challenged, vulnerable migrants, and sexual minorities are such out-of-place sub-communities are collectives for preferential compassion. One can even say that this stance toward the poor, the oppressed, and the marginalized is the way of Jesus that Christians offer in the mutual gifting of truth within a multi-religious context.

Seeking Christ and finding Christ as well as finding self and losing self for Christian educational institutions involves entering into such humanly-displaced yet God embraced-collectives for the purpose of bringing life as envisioned by God. Christian educational mission is inter-religiously com-passionate. It joins education communities in the passion of Christ, which is associated with the suffering and humiliated one. Christian colleges and universities are domains of multi-faith communities that prepare students and teachers to infiltrate the poor and oppressed to find an abode of freedom, peace, and justice through the compassion manifest in Jesus Christ. It is an educational domain where the bonds of multi-faith affections will be yoked with the bondage of the afflicted for the wellbeing of God’s world that Christ came to love and make whole.

Third, Christian colleges and universities in the context of multi-faith convergence must also aim at becoming restorers of a cosmo-centered life envisioned by God. Our earth is also damaged and hurting in the twenty-first century. This again is something that churches have ignored in an anthropocentric worldview that thinks of God's mission as only confined to the salvation of human beings. Educational institutions deal with a much larger subject matter that analyzes the whole multiverse of the created order, from life in the minutest cell to life in the whole solar system. God's eye is on the whole of the created order, which joins all human beings in groaning for healing. Because education deals with both the simplicity and the entirety of the created order, colleges and universities can help the church to both understand our kinship with nature and develop ways to restore creation to some semblance of harmony for the preservation of humanity and the wellbeing of all of creation. Peter Bardaglio and Andrea Putnam encourage educational institutions to teach the world about becoming "boldly sustainable". Let me quote them in full:

"Colleges and universities can only thrive if society and the biosphere are healthy. Any institution that is so short sighted as to pursue its ends without taking into account the interests of the larger community or ecosystem in which it is enmeshed will not achieve sustainable success. In the end, it will find itself forced, one way or another, to deal with the fact that its future is linked to that of the larger web of social and ecological relations."¹³

This is clearly already taking place in Lady Doak College in Madurai where the faculty and students are working toward creating an eco-sustainable college campus. The conscious planting and caring for trees, the ban on pre-packed juices and sodas, the thoughtful measures taken toward paper reduction, and the deliberate use of natural material for all advertising on the campus is turning this educational institution into a witness that Christian communities care for God's created order.

Conclusion

As I conclude this lecture let me leave you with a hope for the Christian mission of education that emanates from this reflection. I envision Christian colleges and universities as an in-between experimental space. They exist between the limited confines of the kinship of family (kin-dom of survival for life) and the expansive possibilities of cosmic kinship (kingdom of God's abundance for life). These education domains seek to exist courageously, dangerously, and imaginatively by connecting multiply-formed and diversely-committed Christian identities rooted in Christ with multi-religious identifications with the humanly-displaced yet God-embraced collectives for the purpose of bringing life in a dying world. Slouched toward preferential compassion toward the oppressed and marginalized these educational provinces are committed to learning for living. In this critical and creative location common grace of the spacious God is celebrated, common work for restoring life is shared, and care for the ravaged cosmos is undertaken. Christian education mission may not make everyone Christian but colleges and universities will be directed toward equipping young men and women in our global twenty-first century context to best serve their respective life enhancing vocations. I concur with Dockery when he states, "Education shaped by a Christian worldview can better prepare someone for his or her vocation. This is not mere career preparation, but it helps each of us see that our own unique vocation is a calling from God, a holy thing from God."¹⁴ May our Christian colleges and universities be just such hopeful and hope-filled experimental spaces!

1

<https://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/assembly/2013-busan/messages-to-the-assembly/greetings-delivered-by-the-archbishop-of-canterbury-at-wcc-busan> (accessed November 5, 2013)

² As Avis opines, “Anglican theologians need faith in their tradition to prevent them becoming irresponsibly eclectic, freelance pundits, but instead to practice what Karl Rahner called ‘theology in the bosom of the Church.’” Paul Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism: Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology* (London: T & T Clark, 2008), p. 6.

³ Alan Bartlett, *A Passionate Balance: The Anglican Tradition* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2007), p. 16.

⁴ Sundar Clarke, *Let The Indian Church Be Indian* (Madras: CLS Books, 1980)

⁵ David S. Dockery, *Renewing Minds: Serving Church and Society through Christian Higher Education* (Nashville, TN: B & H Academic, 2008), p. 15.

⁶ Hayden J. A. Bellenoit, *Missionary Education and Empire in Late Colonial India, 1860 – 1920* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), p. 88.

⁷ These categories were refined through discussions with Clare Amos over the “Ecumenical Conversations” at the World Council of Churches General Assembly (October 30 to November 8, 2013) in Busan, Korea.

⁸ Thomas Thangaraj, “Accepting the Religious Other: An Ongoing Journey” in *Faces of The Other*, ed. Hand Ucko (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 2005), p. 40.

⁹ Rowan Williams, “Dialogue is a Means of ‘God-Given Discovery’” in *Current Dialogue*, 54 (July 2013): 7.

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Norman Klassen and Jens Zimmermann, *The Passionate Intellect: Incarnational Humanism and Future of University Education* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006), p. 172. Emphasis in text.

¹² Bartlett, *A Passionate Balance*.

¹³ Peter Bardaglio and Andrea Putnam, *Boldly Sustainable: Hope and Opportunity for Higher*

Education in an Age of Climate Change
(Washington D. C: NACUBO, 2009), p. 174.

¹⁴ **David S. Dockery, *Renewing Minds*, p. 15.**