IDEALS FOR A FLOURISHING UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

If any of you know of a university community that is characterized by the ideals I am about to describe, please give me a call. Maybe we can both apply for employment.

Few university communities, if any, measure up to the ideals I am about to describe. But, I believe they are ideals that university communities should aspire to, especially university communities that are committed to being Christ-centered.

Interspersed within my proposed set of ideals will be some horror stories, from my own experience, of some major problems that can occur when there is no campus-wide commitment to a given ideal.

Community Members Share a Common Educational Purpose (A set of "First Principles")

A fool-proof test of whether a university is actually operating on the basis of an agreed upon set of first principles is to examine what happens when the university attempts a comprehensive revision of its General Education program.

I have been involved in 5 such reviews of General Education during my career in Christian higher education, and the keys to success, or failure, are very clear to me. A comprehensive general education review, in contrast to the tinkering we often settle for, can be successful only if it is informed by a set of agreed upon "first principles."

I remember well one failed attempt to revise general education at a very strong CCCU school. The faculty were excellent. The major programs of study were very strong. But, the attempt to revise general education requirements deteriorated into departmental turf battles, because there were no agreed upon first principles to inform faculty-wide deliberations. As a result, the operative selfish questions were, "what is good for me, or, at most, for my academic department," or, "what will be best for attracting students to our academic major?" As a result, the faculty never got to the really important question,

"what will provide the best general education for all of our students in light of "Goals for the Student" that are a portion of a set of first principles?" The reason we never got to that all important question is that the faculty had never agreed upon a set of first principles that included a vision of the kind of student we wanted to graduate.

I have read with interest Huntington's statement on its "Philosophy of Education," and that statement has the potential to serve as a set of first principles, provided you actually go back to that statement every time you deliberate about your curriculum or co-curriculum. My experience suggests that too many such statements of a "Philosophy of Education" are intended only for the first few pages of a university catalog, or one page in the Faculty Handbook, and are then relegated to a bookshelf someplace.

You will have to answer the question as to whether you all have actually agreed to this "Philosophy of Education," and whether it actually comes into play when you make curricular or co-curricular decisions. If it is only "window-dressing" at this point in time, then I suggest that you begin to take it seriously, starting right now, as your statement of a "common educational purpose." And, if you do not presently take this statement seriously, and you wish to do so, let me take the liberty of suggesting a refinement or two for your consideration.

To your credit, your present "Philosophy of Education" does include some brief statements that fit what I have called "Goals for the Student," by which I mean those characteristics that you hope your students will have attained by the time they walk across the stage on graduation day. For example, in one of your "bullets" (my Mennonite friends prefer that I call them "pearls"), you refer to "habits of honest, clear, constructive, critical thought," and "an appreciation of beauty as expressed in nature and the arts." In my estimation, those are two great goals for your students, if you take them seriously.

But, may I make the meddlesome suggestion that you review the "Goals for the Student" that are presently somewhat "hidden away" in your "Philosophy of Education," and that you consider expanding the number of such goals, and articulating them with a bit more

specificity than you currently state. Let me illustrate this suggestion by noting a "Goal for the Student" that another CCCU school recently adopted (Northwestern College in Orange City, Iowa). I present this example not because I think you should embrace this goal (that is your business), but because it illustrates the level of specificity I have in mind. (and it is an example that will inform another ideal for a flourishing university community that I will be proposing) – "The student should value the diversity of the human family and seek opportunities for learning, growth, and transformation through intercultural relationships." Note carefully that this goal has cognitive, affective, and volitional components. It requires that students *learn* a great deal about other cultures and the "intercultural competencies" needed to effectively engage persons from other cultures. It requires that students develop a *deeply felt sense of empathy* for those who differ from them, enabling them to see things from the perspective of the other. And, it requires *actual engagement* with those steeped in other cultures. More about that later.

So, my first ideal for a flourishing university community is that community members share a common educational purpose that serves as a set of "first principles."

All Segments of the Community Collaborate With Each Other in Working to Foster the Shared Educational Purpose

Let me illustrate this ideal by dealing with the possibility, or not, of strong collaboration between the teaching faculty and the co-curricular staff.

I recently consulted at a CCCU school that had developed a good set of first educational principles that included a well articulated statement of "Learning Goals for the Student," and they sought advice on how to proceed with the implementation of these principles, with special consideration given to the possibility of creating a synergy between curricular and co-curricular programming. My advice was simple. Have the teaching faculty, who are responsible for the curriculum, deliberate about the implications of the learning goals for the curriculum, and have the co-curricular staff (those responsible for student development, spiritual formation, and athletics) deliberate about the implications

of these *same shared learning goals* for co-curricular programming. Then bring the two groups together to create a synergy wherein the curricular and co-curricular initiatives are wed in ways that complement and enrich each other.

Very few people on either side of the aisle thought much of my advice. In over-simplfied terms, many of the teaching faculty thought that learning is what takes place primarily inside the classroom (despite a considerable body of contrary empirical evidence), so co-curricular staff shouldn't be suggesting ways for such learning goals to be fostered outside the classroom. And, many co-curricular staff members, for reasons I cannot fathom to this very day, feared that this collaborative effort with teaching faculty would diminish their relative autonomy as providers of co-curricular services.

This was far from being the first time in my career that my advice for more collaboration between teaching faculty and co-curricular staff was ignored. A more concrete example of the lack of partnership between teaching faculty and co-curricular staff occurred when at one of the schools at which I served, I was asked to chair a Task Force to develop a set of recommendations relative to an emerging Service/Learning program. This college had a flourishing Student Volunteer Service Program, in which about 85% of the student body participated each year, including involvement with local hospices, soup kitchens, and other great social service organizations. Our Task Force had the audacity to suggest that this flourishing program could be made even better if students volunteering for a particular form of service were encouraged (maybe even required) to take courses in the college curriculum that were closely related to the service they were rendering. For example, wouldn't it be helpful if students involved with a local chapter of Amnesty International took a political science course in international relations?

The protest from the co-curricular staff was deafening: "students do not want to study about these things; they just want to become actively involved." What an insidious bifurcation. It created the strange irony that some students wanted to roll up their sleeves and work in soup kitchens, but were not encouraged to find out why there are soup kitchens in the first place.

My horror stories about the lack of partnership between the teaching faculty and co-curricular staff at CCCU schools are only the tip of the iceberg. In the course of my speaking or consulting at over 50 CCCU schools, I have found that it is not unusual for there to be great competition, even hostility at times, between teaching faculty and co-curricular staff, as they compete for institutional resources or that precious commodity of student time. When things are better, these two segments of the institutional community co-exist. But, I have found it to be rare for there to be active collaboration between the teaching faculty and the co-curricular staff. My logic for calling for such collaboration is impeccably simple: if the college has an agreed upon statement of educational purpose, then it is the task of the faculty to foster that purpose inside the classroom, and it is the task of the co-curricular staff to foster that very same educational purpose, in complementary ways, outside the classroom.

For a concrete example, let us go back to the learning goal of Northwestern College relative to intercultural relationships that had obvious cognitive, affective and volitional components. Students can learn about other cultures in the classroom. But, that may lead only to "head knowledge," as if a student is merely a disembodied intellect (or what Harvard minister Peter Gomes has called "a head on a stick"). Contrary to settling only for head knowledge, students will develop a deep sense of empathy for those who differ from them only if they actually engage those steeped in other cultures outside the context of the classroom. This learning goal begs for collaboration between teaching faculty and those co-curricular staff responsible for programming outside the classroom.

These reflections about the need for more collaboration between teaching faculty and co-curricular staff can be extended to all segments of the university community. Based on an agreed upon educational purpose, it is the responsibility of all segments of the university community, from the Board of Trustees to the Maintenance Staff, to be contributing to the realization of that educational purpose in light of their given responsibilities. But, all segments of the university community must be empowered to be able to make such a contribution to the educational purpose of the university. This leads me to my next ideal.

Each Community Member Is Empowered to Exercise Her/His Gifts to the Maximum Possible Extent

One of the most destructive impediments to true community is when the space for decision-making is occupied by only one person or a small group of persons within the community, especially when such decisions are made behind closed doors without seeking adequate consultation with those who will be affected by the decision, or without adequate input from all community members who have expertise relative to the issue at hand. The pain I experienced as a result of that "command-and-control" model of leadership is described in chapter 14 of my book *Learning to Listen, Ready to Talk* (enough said about that). I also proposed (in chapter 10) an alternative model for leadership, inspired by the following insightful words from the pen of Parker Palmer

> Jesus exercises the only kind of leadership that can evoke authentic community—a leadership that risks failure (and even crucifixion) by making space for other people to act. When a leader takes up all the space and preempts all the action, he or she may make something happen, but the something is not community. Nor is it abundance, because the leader is only one person, and one person's resources invariably run out. But, when a leader is willing to trust the abundance that people have and can generate together, willing to take the risk of inviting people to share from that abundance, then and only then may true community emerge. (Palmer, *The Active life,* 1990, p. 138)

The severe limitation that emerges when just one person takes up all the space for action is that the initiatives taken are only as good as the gifts of that one person. When many persons in the community are involved in shaping and implementing a new initiative, there is potential for the initiative to be as good as the combined gifts of all these members of the community.

For me, this is a Christ-centered approach to leadership, since it is a deep response to Jesus' call for Christians to love others. Giving those who I supervise "room to move," empowering them to maximize the use of their creative abilities, and contributing to their own growth as persons in accordance with their particular

gifts is integral to my understanding of what it means for me to love those I supervise. Therefore, one of the signs of a flourishing Christian university community is that each community member has been empowered to exercise his/her gifts to the maximum extent possible. A corollary to this ideal is the following ideal.

The Contribution of Each Member of the Community is Valued as Just as Important as the Contribution of Every Other Member

I was saddened by the report I read of the following reaction of Tony Perkins, president of the Family Research Council to the recent Evangelical Climate Initiative that was developed under the leadership of the National Association of Evangelicals. He is reported to have said that such a focus on redeeming the natural environment is a "distraction" from the really important work that evangelicals should be doing relative to the issues of abortion and gay-marriage. Hasn't Perkins read the clear teaching of I Corinthians 12 regarding the work of the body of Christ? God's redemptive work on earth has multiple aspects. God calls Christians to be agents for redemption of all aspects of Creation, including the environment, and I Corinthians 12 teaches us that no one aspect of that redemptive work is more, or less, important that any other aspect.

In a Christian university setting, this means that the work of the president is no more, or less, important than the work of the Provost, or a faculty member, or a co-curricular staff member, or a clerk in the business office, or a member of the maintenance staff, or the person who serves meals in the cafeteria. The contribution of each member of the community is as important as the contribution of every other member.

Community Members Create a Productive Balance Between Promoting the Good in Their Areas of Responsibility and Promoting the Good of the Whole Community

I am very appreciative of those who have a passion for making things better in their particular areas of responsibilities. If a faculty member chairs an academic department, I want her to be committed to her department being the very best department it can possibly be. That is marvelous. But, there is a potential underside to such deep commitment that is destructive of community. Again, let me illustrate from my own experience.

When I served as a VPAA at one school, I often left meetings of our Academic Policies Committee (composed of all the academic department chairs) discouraged, because no matter what the agenda item, some department chairs could never get beyond the question "what is best for my department?" So few were willing to "look at the big picture." I waited, mostly in vain, to hear more statements like "the proposal we are considering is good for the school as a whole, even if there is no direct benefit to my department, so I will vote in favor for it." In a flourishing university community, community members work hard to create a productive balance between promoting the good in their areas of responsibility and promoting the good of the whole community.

Different Segments of the Community Go Beyond Co-Existence to Engagement

The current emphasis in many schools on racial and ethnic diversity and multiculturalism is to be applauded, in my estimation, provided it goes beyond a very anemic version that amounts to co-existence. The co-existence model is found in many school lunch rooms. The African-American students sit at one table. The Asian-American students sit at another table. The Latino students sit at a third table. And, the Caucasian students sit at the other tables. The stark weakness in this co-existence model is that whereas those at each table may be rightfully celebrating some of their unique cultural traditions, those at the other tables are not benefiting from exposure to cultural traditions other than their own.

In a flourishing university community, different segments of the community go beyond co-existence to active engagement with one another, so that each segment not only celebrates its own distinctiveness and perspectives, but also contributes to mutual learning by engagement with those who may have differing distinctives and perspectives. The basis for my proposing this engagement ideal is the considerable body of empirical evidence that one of the most powerful educative influences at any educational institution is "exposure to otherness."

And my call for engagement with those who differ from you goes far beyond categories of race and ethnicity. As I have already suggested, it includes teaching faculty engaging co-curricular staff. It also includes those faculty teaching in disciplines typically classified as "liberal arts" disciplines engaging faculty teaching primarily in what may be considered "professional studies." It includes those faculty and staff who consider themselves to be more "conservative" theologically actually engaging those they consider to be more "liberal" theologically. All segments of the university community ought to be engaging one another. Rather than sniping at one another, ignoring one another, or merely co-existing with one another. This leads me to my final ideal, the one toward which my whole career has converged.

Community Members Engage One Another by Listening and Talking

I trust that by now you have detected a certain logical progression in my ideals. A flourishing university community has an agreed upon educational purpose, with each segment of the community contributing to the realization of that purpose by being empowered to exercise their particular gifts in ways that enhance not only their particular area of responsibility but also the good of the whole community, with each contribution valued as much as any other contribution, and with each segment of the community engaging one another for the purpose of learning from one another. But, I now want to focus on what I believe is the most effective and loving mode of engagement, that of orchestrating "respectful conversations."

The most significant obstacle to the ideal I am now proposing is a perverted view of "niceness." According to this perverted view it is not "nice" to publicly express disagreements. As a teenage Christian, I was not socialized well into how to disagree agreeably, because the very idea of disagreement was suspect. We were led to believe that whatever Pastor Omar said about the interpretation of any biblical passage was "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," so we young people had just better "listen up."

In stark contrast to this shutting down of space for disagreement, let me read what one Christian university has said about disagreement: "The University must accept disagreement and controversy as a normal and healthy part of its life as a university, rather than viewing them as a threat to be avoided by silence on controversial topics." This is a marvelous statement. Do you know where that university is located? In Huntington, Indiana. This is a direct quote from your own Philosophy of Education.

Has your entire university community embraced that ideal, not just in theory, but, more importantly, in practice? If not, may I presumptuously suggest that you delete that statement from your Philosophy of Education, for the only thing worse than having no Philosophy of Education is having a Philosophy of Education that you ignore.

For the remainder of my presentation this morning, let me assume that your university community has indeed embraced, at least in theory, if not yet fully in practice, this statement from your written Philosophy of Education. Allow me, then, to make two modest suggestions for how you can "put legs" on this stated commitment.

Create Venues for Faculty and Staff to Listen to and Talk to One Another About Institutional Issues

What are the institutional issues with which you struggle? I don't know Huntington University well. But, I have been around the block enough times to know that there are two perennial issues with which most Christian colleges and universities struggle.

First, what is the relationship between studies in the liberal arts and professional studies? Have faculty on both sides of that aisle at Huntington University adequately listened to and talked to each other about this perennial tension? Is it conceivable that as a result of listening and talking to one another, you might forge a view of both liberal arts studies and professional studies that will enable each area of study enrich and complement the other? Who knows where such a conversation might lead? One cannot predict beforehand the results of a genuine, respectful conversation.

Secondly, what are the boundaries for theological disagreement at Huntington University? I would argue that you need to expect uniformity of theological belief relative to your university's *Statement of Faith* that is included in your Application for Faculty Appointment. But, as I read your *Statement of Faith,* I see much room for legitimate theological disagreement relative to many theological issues, such as the nature of the sacraments, the nature of the end times, and the nature of God's sovereignty. Have you created a space for robust conversation about such theological disagreements without resorting to the unhelpful labels of "conservative" and "liberal?" Such labels are unhelpful because if you ask ten different faculty members what these two contentious words mean, you may get ten different answers. And, besides, resorting to such simplistic labeling too easily becomes a way to summarily dismiss the theological views of others without actually talking to them about your differences. Who knows where such conversations about theological differences may lead. One cannot predict beforehand the results of a genuine, respectful conversation.

Design College-Wide Venues for Faculty, Staff, and Students to Listen to and Talk to One Another About Important Contemporary Issues

Where is the best place on your campus to host conversations on important contemporary issues? The first answer that comes to mind is the classroom. But, with all due respect to the teaching faculty, I believe that to limit conversations on important issues to classroom is short sighted, primarily because many of the most important questions facing humanity

at this time do not fit neatly into the departmental sub-divisions of knowledge that typically characterize the college curriculum. These pressing questions are often interdisciplinary in nature. Consider, for example, the following questions, all of which I think are important (but, you can decide on your own slate of important contemporary issues)

- What is an appropriate role, if any, for religion in doing politics?
- How can human beings be agents for peace and reconciliation between persons and groups in conflict?
- What is the meaning of "justice" and how can human being play a redemptive role in the political process toward fostering justice, especially for the poor and marginalized of the world?
- How can human beings be agents for the flourishing of the natural creation, by wise stewardship of natural resources and concern for a healthy physical and ecological environment?

You may respond by saying that you do address some of these questions in your curriculum. For example, you may talk about the appropriate role for religion in doing politics on POLI SCI 333. But, how about the preponderance of your students who do not take POLI SCI 333? And how about your entire faculty, none of whom, I am guessing, take POLI SCI 333 (other than the teacher, in a manner of speaking)? Questions such as these are simply too important to be limited to conversations that take place within selected courses in your curriculum. I recommend that you consider the possibility of creating college-wide venues for conversation about such important questions.

To put more legs on this suggestion, let me make a concrete procedural proposal for your consideration. Gather a small Planning Committee, with equal representation from your faculty and co-curricular staff, to annually design a colloquium outside the classroom that will enable your entire college community to discuss some important contemporary issue. In light of the upcoming presidential election, one appropriate topic for next Fall might be "The Role of Religion in Politics" (it would be almost criminal, in my estimation, for

that topic to be discussed only within Religion and/or Political Science classes). But, whatever the chosen topic for a given academic year, the conversations outside of class should be jointly orchestrated by faculty and co-curricular staff working in partnership (as per one of my earlier proposed ideals)

Lest you think my proposal for such a campus-wide conversation is pie-in-the sky thinking, let me share with you an actual example where this has been done with distinction. Based on the thought of Gerald Graff, Gordon College has implemented an annual Gordon College Symposium, coordinated by the Center for Christian Studies, which I used to direct.

In the spring semester each year at Gordon (since 1998), a week is devoted to this symposium, including evening programming all week and one full day (for which all classes are cancelled). An interdisciplinary symposium theme is announced each fall (e.g., Who is my Neighbor?; The Coming of Global Christianity; Money and Possessions). Students are then turned loose to design symposium sessions that they judge to be pertinent to the given theme. The designs have included lecture type presentations (with students at the lectern and some faculty sitting in the student chairs), poetry readings, a panel of students from a given class dealing with an interdisciplinary issue related to the course material for that class, musical compositions, art exhibits, and other venues as varied as the imaginations of students (including a pig roast on the quad one year).

This annual event has featured as many as 70 student initiated projects over the one week period, with conversations about the materials presented expected as part of each design. Total student attendance for the week has exceeded 3000, for a student body of about 1500 (mostly on a voluntary basis, although some required chapel credits could be obtained for a limited number of events). The total cost for this week of events is minimal, since it typically involves no outside speakers. It is a co-curricular vehicle for students to take more responsibility for their own learning, and for making students, co-curricular staff, and faculty equal co-participants in the educational process.

It is important for me to note an important shift in the design of the Gordon College Symposium over its 10+ years of being offered. Whereas the first few symposia had outside speakers, and the workshops were designed and offered almost exclusively by faculty and co-curricular staff, our Symposium really took off in terms of student interest and participation when we moved to workshops being almost exclusively student-initiated (so much so, that we couldn't even fit in any outside speakers). It amazed us that so many students accepted the challenge of taking more responsibility for initiating their own learning, when they were given the opportunity to do so.

I am convinced that with a bit of imagination, the faculty, co-curricular staff, and students at Huntington University can develop similar low-cost initiatives that enable you to create college-wide welcoming places for respectful conversation outside of the classroom.

But, there is an extremely important issue that you must first address, as pointed to in my final, and, possibly, most important ideal

The University Has Created a Safe Space for Conversation

 You can create a huge theoretical space for conversations at Huntington University, by means of structures such as forums for university conversations outside the classroom, or more faculty/staff conversations. But, few will come to talk if you have not created a "safe" space. A theoretical huge space for disagreement and conversations about disagreements at Huntington University will shrink down to no space, or an unsafe space, which amounts to the same thing, if community members do not aspire to live out certain virtues, which I have called "pre-conditions for respectful conversation." Allow me to close my presentation by enumerating such pre-conditions.

The first is humility -- the conviction that as a finite, fallible human being, I do not fully understand Truth as God knows it, and I can therefore learn from conversation with others, Christians or non-Christians, who disagree with me.

Such humility distinguishes between capital T "Truth" and lower case t "truth," with Truth referring to the actual nature of things, and truth referring to the partial glimpse that a finite, fallible human being can grasp of the Truth. At the same time that I believe there is Truth, I don't believe I typically have direct, unmediated access to that Truth. At best, I can aspire to grasp a partial glimpse, for an aspect of the human condition is that "we see through a glass darkly" (I Corinthians 13:12). It is my experience that such humility is in short supply in the intellectual community. As David Claerbault has dared to propose: "There is something about being intelligent that seems to breed a sense of superiority" [Claerbault 2004, p. 165].

Such humility is not compromise. In respectful conversations, I will seek to express my *commitment* to certain "truths" with clarity. At the same time, I must be characterized by *openness* to the possibility that I am all wrongheaded about some of my present beliefs and need correction from others. In the process of give-and-take with those who disagree with me, I will try to present a persuasive case for the truth of my beliefs. But I must be open to the possibility that any aspect of my partial understanding of the Truth needs refinement.

Another way of saying this is that scholars working out of a Christian faith perspective must embrace both poles of a rare combination pointed to by Ian Barbour in his definition of "religious maturity": *"It is by no means easy to hold beliefs for which you would be willing to die, and yet to remain open to new insights; but it is precisely such a combination of commitment and inquiry that constitutes religious maturity."* The combination of commitment and openness is a rare combination. Openness to the beliefs of others without commitment to your own beliefs too easily leads to sheer relativism. Commitment without openness too easily leads to fanaticism, even terrorism (as C. S. Lewis has observed, to which recent world events tragically testify, "Those who are readiest to die for a cause may easily become those who are readiest to kill for it"). One of the most pressing needs in our world today is for all human beings, including scholars, to embrace, and hold in tension, both commitment and openness.

The commitment pole of that rare combination of commitment and openness also points to the need for the virtue of courage – the boldness to accept risks associated with honest advocacy of one's position. Individual courage requires the strength to freely speak one's convictions even when one's opinions may be unpopular. Institutional courage requires that a college create safe spaces for faculty and administrators to freely disagree about important issues, within the framework of the college's *Statement of Faith,*, even if the college's supporting constituency is unhappy about that.

Another precondition is patience -- the hope that through ongoing respectful conversations, greater understanding will gradually emerge as a gift.

Chris K. Huebner beautifully captures the essence of such patience in his observations about the "nonviolent epistemology" of the late, distinguished Mennonite theologian John Howard Yoder. Huebner suggests that "theology operates according to a violent logic of speed whenever it is unwilling to risk the possibility that truthfulness is the outcome of ongoing, timeful, 'open conversation'" [Huebner 2004, p. 67]. In contrast "Yoder's nonviolent epistemology…assumes that truthfulness is an utterly contingent gift that can only be given and received and that it emerges at the site of vulnerable interchange with the other" [Huebner 2004, p. 66]. We must overcome our propensity to want quick answers to complex questions. Patience and humility need to be further complemented by love.

Love—that enduring disposition of caring deeply for other persons, which includes providing a welcoming space for them to freely express their points of view.

As I Corinthians 13:2 states, "If I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing." Jesus Christ has called all Christians to love others. My commitment to orchestrating respectful conversation with others is my deep-rooted response to that call.

And, of course, Jesus taught that the primary tell-tale sign of a community being "Christ-centered" is that the members of the community demonstrate love for one another: "By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another" (John 13:35).

If members of the Huntington University community make a common commitment to aspire to be characterized by these virtues when you engage those with whom you disagree, then the theoretical huge space for disagreement that my concrete proposal can create will indeed be a safe space in actual practice, opening up the possibility of orchestrating numerous respectful conversations that would facilitate your learning from those with whom you disagree.

Well, I wouldn't blame you if have decided that my collection of ideals doesn't describe any earthly place; it only describes what heaven will be like some day. But, although we will never create heaven on this earth, I believe that we as Christians are called to be partners with God in creating intimations of the fullness of God's eventual fully realized Kingdom, much like a morning sunrise is an intimation of the coming full noonday sun. So, it is my prayer that as a Huntington University community, you will, by the grace of God, aspire to these ideals for a true Christ-centered community.