

**Ministerial Training and (Post)Modernity:
We Speak about a paradigm shift, but are we only teasing?**

Institution Based Ministerial Training Creates Concrete (Post)Modern Experiences for Students

By
Rev Chip Anderson
Tappan, New York

Paper presented at the 1995 Annual Meeting of the
Evangelical Theological Society

November 16, 1995

**Ministerial Training and (Post)Modernity:
Institution Based Ministerial Training Creates Concrete (Post)Modern Experiences for Students[†]**
By Rev Chip Anderson, Tappan, New York

The future of the Evangelical church occupies a vast amount of analysis, discussion, and debate.¹ To talk about the future of the church, however, necessitates discussing its future leadership. To ignore the present status of ministerial training is to leave open the question of the church's future. Students enrolled in institutions of Christian Higher education represent the "coming generation of American Evangelicalism" and it will be "this generation of evangelical students" who will make up the future leadership of the church.² Although not dependent on it, the future of the church is enmeshed with the process of ministerial training. The ministerial training process will mold the next generation of church leadership; and the next generation of church leadership will effect the church's core beliefs and character. Thus, the process of ministerial training is a significant issue. In this paper I am concerned about the present state of ministerial training, whether it is good or bad for the church in America, whether it is adequate, and dare I suggest, worldly or biblical?³

Recently, a Director of Advancement said, "I am not here to say, 'what can our college do for the church; but look what God has done through us.'" The assumptions in such a comment are worth pondering. However, suffice it to say, boasting of what God has done through one's

[†] I would like to thank the Mountain Home Alliance Church in Mountain Home, ID, the Riverside Alliance Church in Monticello, MN, the Haverhill Alliance Church in Haverhill, MA, the Shanesville Alliance Church in Shanesville, PA, the Maxwell Memorial Tabernacle in Three Hills, Alberta, Canada, and the Tappan Alliance Church (NY) for providing my own church-life experience which has contributed to the development of this paper. I am also indebted to a number of Prairie Bible College (Three Hills, AB), Nyack College (NY) and Alliance Theological (NY) students and teaching colleagues, as well as, numerous Christian Higher Education Administrators and local church pastors who interacted with me on the ideas of this paper. Also, I am thankful for the contributions made by the Director of Bridgeport (CT) Area Youth Ministry, Mr. George Stowell, as well as my wife, Peggy, without whom none of the ideas in this paper would have surfaced. I acknowledge the support of these friends and colleagues, but, alas, I take full responsibility for the presentation, the conclusions, and the consequences of this essay.

institution is not reasonable justification for an institution's continued existence or legitimization of its programs. We should be asking, "Does our present process of ministerial training actually benefit the church?" Or, "Does it effect the future of the church positively or does it reinforce harmful assumptions, attitudes, and practices that will diminish the health of the church?" The answer to these questions is the subject of this essay.

Sociologists and theologians alike point out the many carriers of modernity through which (post)modern values and assumptions are reinforced (i.e., objectified and institutionalized).⁴ It has also been shown that such carriers have a devastating effect on the church and on the religious environment in general. Evangelicals can spot the dangers of modernity in public education or when someone opens an adult bookstore or within the Hollywood community. However, Evangelical educators do not see that their own assumptions and tactics drip with assumptions of (post)modernity.⁵ As Os Guinness says, we do not see our environment because we see *with* it. "That means we are influenced by ideas we do not notice and therefore are not aware of their effect on us. Or, if we see the effect, we find it difficult to discover the cause."⁶ We are naive to think that our decision-making process, tactics, managerial styles, and institutional structures in the Christian Education community are less carriers of modernity.

In this essay, I suggest that the present ministerial training process (i.e., institution-based) is too much a carrier of modernity to benefit the church; thus, necessitating a re-shaping of ministerial training in our (post)modern context.

I. The Ministerial Process and the (Post)Modern Trap

There is a vast amount of material analyzing and critiquing the affects of modernity on ministerial training. I am in agreement with those who conclude that the restoration of the church's theology

to its proper role and dimension is necessary to stem the tide of modernity within institutions of Christian Higher Education.⁷ However, simply recovering the theological (and classical) dimensions of ministerial education is not enough if the structures and process of institution-based ministerial training is not addressed and reshaped. We underestimate the power (post)modernity has for molding and shaping institution-based ministerial training. Thomas Oden observed that “there is a sense in which liberalism, neorthodoxy, and fundamentalism are all surprisingly more like each other than any of them is like orthodoxy in tone and spirit. For, although they all [have] different responses to modernity, they are all more deeply enmeshed in the spirit of modernity . . . on which Christianity must not bet all its chips.”⁸

One of the current Higher Education debates--Christian and secular alike--illustrates our situation. Educators debate the question, “how much theory/knowledge verses how much practical/skill?” Within Christian Higher Education, there is little doubt, given our cultural milieu, that the practical/skill area will widen and the theory/knowledge area will narrow. The tension and debate, however, is set up wrongly by the question. When we ask “how much skill vs. knowledge?” three assumptions are implied: First, the assumption that *the place* where ministerial training occurs is neutral, meaning, the (post)modern environment does not mold ministerial programs and student outcomes; second, the present institution-based structures are a given; and third, the present process of courses, curriculum, three-credits, semester-driven programs are the correct process.

The question could be re-asked another way, such as “where should the knowledge be taught?” Or, at least, “Does our paradigm mold students in such a way that is both relevant to the present church environment and will it produce ‘real church time’ leadership?” Asked this way, ministerial training is freed from the assumption that the present ministerial process and its

structures are non-negotiable, perhaps allowing for other non-negotiable concerns to arise and be considered.

Current ministerial training curriculum, program “revisions,” and development head in the wrong direction because it neglects the molding power of modernity on its own decision-making process and on the ministerial training process itself (and it assumes the continuance of institution-based training).

For the most part, modernism was identified favorably for its reinforcement of linear progress, absolute truths, the rational planning of social orders, and the standardization of knowledge and production. However, now “fragmentation, indeterminacy, and intense distrust of all universal or ‘totalizing’ discourses . . . are the hallmark of postmodern thought.”⁹ Thomas Oden calls postmodernists “hypermodernists,” those who push the assumptions of modernism, with its skepticism and contempt for moral authority.¹⁰

Truth is not an issue in postmodern thinking.¹¹ No longer is truth paragon, but now performativity is the central issue. No longer is the discovery of truth important, but what kind things and information work best. Everything in education--including Christian Education--is now tied ever more narrowly to the principle of performativity. Now, the question asked by teacher and student is no longer “Is it true?,” but “What use is it?” and “How much is it worth?”¹² This can be seen in the skills vs. knowledge debate already stemming from the so-called need to be relevant and practical.

Ironically, many of the Institutions of Christian Higher Education were founded to stem the tide of accommodation to more liberal, culture-driven institutions of ministerial training. They were developed deliberately to resist the cultural pressures of the emerging secular and modernizing climate.¹³ But now, resistance is at a low ebb; and accommodation is rising. James

D. Hunter points out that it is “superficial to simply to say that Evangelical theology as practiced by the coming generation is becoming more liberal. Yet the evidence is suggestive of a common trend, one in which the theological tradition is conforming in its own unique way to the cognitive and normative assumptions of modern culture.” That is why our problem is not just curricular in nature--its is significantly sociological because the structure of institution-based ministerial training infuses certain “cognitive and normative assumptions” that mold student development, worldview, and spirituality.

This is the (post)modern trap that Christian educators and ministerial candidates face. My contention is that our present process of campus-based ministerial training reinforces our (post)modern culture and attitudes, especially the attitudes which militate against biblical church-life, the work of the gospel, and are antithetical toward orthodox Christian beliefs.

Administrators, Development Officers, and Academic Deans rearrange, modify, and propose new programs and curricular changes in order to revive their campus-based educational ministry (whether this stems from a genuine concern for the church is irrelevant). Just like the contemporary church's bent for relevance, however, what is actually revived is a social and culturally bound form of “civil” religious education in which the main purpose of the programs are to be socially relevant. This state of affairs has very little to do with genuine concern for the church and is actually an outgrowth of the modernist spirit. In other words, the more contemporary Christian Higher Education becomes (or tries to become), the more it looks like the contemporary world; thus, the ministerial training process becomes “a prisoner of the very culture it is seeking” to change through their “prepared” ministerial students.¹⁴

The writer of the Proverbs said, “Can a man take fire in his bosom, and his clothes not be burned? Or can a man walk on hot coals, and his feet not be scorched” (Proverbs 6:27-28).

Similarly, Peter Berger reminds us that “He who sups with the devil [of modernity] had better have a long spoon.” By playing by (post)modern rules, we cannot expect to produce something other than (post)modern church leadership. Now mixing my metaphors, when we dine with the devil of (post)modernity, we play by the enemy’s rules. As Donald Bloesch once observed, rules “that are poison to any vital religious tradition claiming to represent the truth.”¹⁵

II. Institution-based “Concrete Social Experiences” Carry Modernity

Credit is given to institutions which address issues broader than curricular, academic concerns. The subject of “informal curriculum” now occupies much current discussion regarding Christian education in general and, as well, the purpose of Christian Higher Education. Informal curriculum is usually related to student-life matters, student groups and events, and teacher-student relationships. However, there is a more significant “informal curriculum” that informs *and forms* student assumptions and character. The structure that holds the institution together creates particular “concrete social experiences” for the ministerial candidate. This informal curriculum has probably a longer lasting and more impacting effect than student life and/or the academic curriculum.

(Post)Modernity is carried by concrete social experiences. Certain character traits and assumptions of modernity are carried through “concrete social experiences” which cause people to think in certain ways and reconstruct the habits of everyday life. Watches, time-clocks, democracy, MacDonaldis, the Mall, the cash machine, the computer, TV, the video (the list is endless)--all create “concrete social experiences” for interpreting the world. Capitalism has especially created a profound dependency on the structures inherent within a free democracy (e.g., free association, unrestricted travel, upward mobile education and business opportunities,

manufacturing, production--and consumption). Os Guinness reminds us that "Modernity is simply unprecedented in its power to remake human appetites, thinking processes, and values."¹⁶

What is significant for this discussion is that these carriers of modernity are catalysts for the process of secularization, that is putting a cleavage between the natural and the supernatural/religious. This has caused all levels of society to be more prone to think in naturalistic terms and "to subject all of life to a calculus of benefits--to assume that whatever is most efficient is most ethical."¹⁷ This implies that above all else "that the 'bottom up' causation of human designs and products has now decisively replaced the 'top down' causation of God and the supernatural."¹⁸ This is a vital, sociological observation that must be considered if one is concerned about ministerial training, and especially the future of the church.

The process of modernization that is currently being carried along by such major contributors as capitalism, technology, urbanization, and the mass media or telecommunications¹⁹ also impact institutions of Christian Higher Education because the structures of these institutions are dependent on these same "concrete social experiences."

Modernity and postmodern thinking is not carried simply in movements or through ideas, but, as Peter Berger says, "in concrete social experiences." Berger points out that such "formations of modernity" bring about mind-sets and habits which are unfavorable toward religion, encouraging *this-worldliness*. Likewise there are social experiences inherent in the structures of the institutions of Christian Higher Education that mold the process of ministerial training and, thus, mold the ministerial student's mind-set and habits.²⁰ There are at least four

aspects of institution-based ministerial training (i.e., the informal curriculum) that carry modernity and provide “concrete social experiences” for ministerial students.[§]

Institutional Survival. It is improbable that God would ever tell a Christian College or Seminary President, “I am finished with the school. Close the doors. Tell the trustees thank you and the students good bye.” And if God did, and if the President did, the school would be looking for a new president. Imagine a Development Officer suggesting, “I think God wants to close the doors of this institution.” Never would happen. There are simply too many forces that will not allow for them to close--at least, not without a fight. It is not part of our American psyche to fail. We are more apt to find ways to survive.

Alonzo McDonald writes: “Whenever immortality becomes the central objective of an organization, its demise is inevitable. Concern for the self-perpetuation of the institution and the preservation of the status quo is the greatest idol that any institution will face.”²¹ When faced with institutional mortality management finds every way possible to maintain rather than die.

Much of current restructuring, curriculum development, and “right-sizing” is due to institutional survival (even if such decision-making stems from a genuine concern for student development). And because the ultimate reason to help foster student enrollment and retention, as well as to raised funds, is to keep the institution solvent and the ministry moving forward, institutions can take on idolatrous qualities. What feeds this idol is not a serious reflection on

[§] The areas of “pluralism” and “pluralization” have been left out of this draft. Nevertheless, “pluralism” itself creates many negative formation experiences for students, not only in our culture, but also from the “pluralistic” environment that is inherent in modern institution-based ministerial training institutions (e.g., degree choices, emphases, specialization, multiple choices of assignments, chapels, courses, etc.) We have neglected any serious analysis on how this pluralistic environment “forms” ministerial students. We are naive to think that the environment of pluralism and the process of pluralization (both within and without institutions of Christian Higher Education) have no damaging effect on both the ministerial training process and our ministerial candidates. We have been uncritical of this adoption of our culture. See Peter Berger’s books, *A Far Glory: The Quest for Faith in an Age of Credulity* (Free Press, 92) for an exposition of how pluralism forms character.

God or His word, but an analysis of cultural trends--and how the school can change so people will come and give. It is our culture that determines the direction, curriculum, and “feel” of our institutions of Christian higher learning. This leads to an informal curriculum which reinforces modern assumptions of “bottom up” causation and naturalistic thinking.

Dependent on Modernity. Institutions of Christian Higher Education are largely dependent on the structures of both modernity and its number one carrier, democracy/capitalism. The very structures of our world--technology, democratic freedom, mass communication, free enterprise, educational advancement, tax laws, etc.--empower our institutions. We convince ourselves that it is our religion (*our faith*) rather than the culture that gives us the power to carry on our educational ministries. However, as David Wells reminds us, “this is an illusion.” Whatever power Christian Educators may have is culturally derived, hence it is borrowed. “And borrowed power can be withdrawn as easily as it has been conferred.”²²

Not only are our institutions in a large degree dependent on the world, our methods (e.g., management styles, bureaucratic structure, policy implementations, etc.) are not neutral. The way in which we conduct educational business and the way in which the bureaucratic structure comes to decisions convey a trust in methodology dripping with capitalistic and democratic assumptions. Thus the institutions “carry” the postmodern assumption that life is “a calculus of benefits,” reinforcing naturalistic thinking about how ministry works and church life works. Business as usual makes such public values and assumptions seem axiomatic, thus welcoming a naturalistic and materialistic approach to everyday life.²³

Consumer-Oriented. A Christian college enrollment manager (note the term) replied to some faculty who opposed a certain advertisement for the school: “I am not here to get you [teachers] to come to our school; I am here to convince potential students to come to our

school.” The commercialization of our ministerial training programs is not neutral. We fail to realize that the techniques we borrow from our culture are not neutral; they are laden with ideological baggage from our culture.²⁴ Three modern values are carried through our marketing (and retention) strategies, and create definite modern “social experiences” for students.

First, by reducing students to consumers, making their relationship to the institution dependent on competition (e.g., asking the question, “Why should someone choose our school over an other school?”), we risk shrinking human life (i.e., the student) down to purely economic determination. Second, commercialization endangers ministerial training because it can be stripped of all values except the ones that can make the sale. And third, in a postmodern environment where words are replaced by image, the commercialization of ministerial training underestimates the power that its image-based approach has on creating “concrete social experiences” for potential ministerial students. The commercialization of ministerial programs hits hardest because we are convincing ministerial candidates that image is primary, words are secondary; that audience is sovereign, not the message. Thus, the institutions “carry” modern assumptions about human life, values, and image, for which the students will assume is primary for carrying on church life.

Institutionally Shaped Spirituality and Church-life. Institutions of Christian Higher Education are rightly concerned about character and spiritual formation. In fact some programs have some curricular and student-life activities that monitor such formation. However, it is institutionally shaped--not ecclesiastically shaped. It is *the* institution that shapes Christian character and spirituality because much of its structure actually replaces church-life. Spirituality is shaped through educational requirement, not Christian obedience. It is shaped through program, not relationship. It is shaped through a church-less environment.

In *God in the Wasteland*, David Wells reveals that a significant number of seminary students did not find the church very helpful in developing their spiritual life.²⁵ This situation is reinforced by the institutions creating and replacing the church through its campus environment (e.g., chapel programs, small groups, prayer groups, ladies groups, men groups, ministry teams, etc.). The future of the church is somewhat dependent on the “shape” of its leadership; and the new generation of leaders will have an institutionally shaped spiritual life which is not dependent on church-life. And since student retention is an ever present issue, the institutions cannot avoid the commercialization factor even in such noble ideas as character and spiritual formation.

III. Unavoidable Consequences: The Shape of Things to Come

David Wells has shown that seminary students have characteristics of self-centeredness. Forty percent agree that realizing their own potential is just as important as putting others before themselves. Students are oriented toward self-fulfillment, self-expression, and personal freedom. These attitudes are often addressed through chapel programs, counseling, and mentor/discipleship student-life relationships. Some have noted that faculty need to take more of a mentor relationship with students. David Schroeder, president of Nyack College, points out: “As academicians, entrusted with the spiritual maturing of the next generation of Christian leaders, we must learn to present a more biblically based model of Christian discipleship and godliness and provide a way of striving toward such spiritual maturity.”²⁶

The problem lays not in our attempt at discipleship and student mentoring, but in wrongly assuming that *the place* where mentoring is done is neutral. David Schroeder indicated this in the same essay: “Today’s classes of Christian students in higher education represent a significant portion of the success of the next generation of Christians in carrying forward the work of the

kingdom of God and the Great Commission. Their success will largely depend on the willingness of today's Christian faculty members to become spiritual mentors.”²⁷

Such student dispositions toward self-fulfillment and self-centeredness are probably reinforced rather than challenged by the present institution-based process of ministerial training. The structures of our present institution-based ministerial training creates significant “concrete social experiences” for our future church leadership. Thus, we inherit (post)modern-shaped ministerial students into our programs and such (post)modern attributes are reinforced through everything from recruitment practices, retention policies, pluralistic nature of course offerings, the emphasis on “student need,” the fragmentation which occurs through the curriculum, and the institution's structure and survival. As one person put it, “The new approach is more practical, experimental, inductive, rooted in relationships with models and mentors, short term (like field trips, seminars, and retreats), interactive, hands-on, product-oriented, issue driven, and customized (offering options that fit individual needs).”²⁸

The “concrete social experience” of the student is a (post)modern experience because the process of ministerial training bears the likeness of our (post)modern world. Thus our ministerial candidates are shaped to be naturalistic in their thinking, trusting in technology, to emphasis methodology over theology, and to regard image over truth and management over character. This is, as the old adage has it, the shape of things to come.

IV. Reshaping the Paradigm: Creating “Church-Centered Social Experiences”

Herbert Schlossberg, in *Idols for Destruction* wrote: “A society conscious of its place in history is seldom content merely to note the changing circumstances with no attempt to evaluate their meaning.”²⁹ Likewise institutions of Christian Higher Education need to note “the changing

circumstances” of our (post)modern environment and understand the significance of it for ministerial training. Creating a different “formation” model means shifting from an institution-based model to another one--to a church-based model. Such a shift takes place at two levels: One a framework (or philosophical level) which has in mind the curricular standards; the other, is a venue change, which has in mind a non-campus-based “formation experience.”

An Apologetic Framework

In order to create a different paradigm for Ministerial Training, a shift must be made away from a sequestered, fragmented program toward a more apologetic model which reinforces continuity through a holistic church-life based experience. The goal of any “new” approach must be to create significant “social experiences” that will mold the ministerial student’s thoughts and habits to be less (post)modern and more biblical. A tri-dimensional approach where the goals of the program incorporate an ecclesiastical dimension, a kingdom-theological dimension, and a sociological dimension.

An Ecclesiastical Dimension. Ministerial training should seek to be more church-life centered than institution-based (to be discussed next). The “concrete social experiences” of the student should be shaped by his or her experience amid normal, everyday church life. In this case, it is not so much that the pastor is mentor, but a local church is mentor. Students entering present ministerial training do not necessarily have a church-life background, nor a positive (nor a biblically developed) ecclesiology. The curriculum base should have as a goal the development of an ecclesiology which would be informed (i.e., formed) through formal study and church-life experience. The academic emphasis needs to be on the nature of the church, as well as, the church’s role “in the world.”

A Kingdom-Theological Dimension. The “experience” of the ministerial candidate should be informed by a centralizing component. In order to shake the fragmented experiences of life, the Kingdom of God should be a central feature throughout the academic and student-life aspects of the training. A grasp of the nature of the Kingdom would permit the student to grapple with the rule and reign of God. The nature and implications of the Kingdom of God will help the student to develop a Biblical worldview for challenging (post)modernity. The Kingdom meets the challenge of modernity’s conception of time, privatization, pluralism, self-centeredness, anti-authority, image/anachronistic-based thinking, etc. The pursuit of theological knowledge and exegetical skill should also continue to be a strong feature throughout ministerial training.

A Sociological Dimension. The student should be vastly aware of the world surrounding himself or herself, as well as, the church. The study of the sociology of knowledge (as well as basic sociology) will enable the student to understand “the world” and how it ticks and how he or she relates to it. The sociological dimension provides a “knowledge” for explaining and evaluating the student’s own “social experiences.”

The student should also have an understanding of the relationship between church-life and the public-life. Curricular and student life experiences should be shaped by concrete experiences where church-life and public-life intersect. A church-based model will provide a “real time” experience to help the student to develop a worldview that is less private-sphere oriented. Another goal of such a model program should be the development of a church philosophy of the public, common good.

A Congregation-Based Paradigm

In order to create a different “formational experience” for ministerial students, a different base or milieu is needed. I have demonstrated that the “formational experiences” of institution-based

ministerial training reinforces (post)modern assumptions which create patterns of thought and everyday habits that are not necessarily beneficial to the church. Institutions which originally formed “to stem the tide of accommodation to more liberal, culture-driven ministerial training” and were first designed to “resist the cultural pressures of the emerging secular and modernizing climate,” can carry the same mantle by creating a congregation-based ministerial program built around the life of the church.

“We have reached a philosophical watershed,” concluded a M.J. Murdock Charitable Trust study of Theological Education. “A Church-based, rather than an academic, university research/scholarly-based” institution will best prepare church leaders for the coming century.³⁰ Any new paradigm for Ministerial training ought to be built on a constant church reality where relationships are created within the context of a worshipping community. Both students and faculty need to be in “real time” church life.

Faculty should be involved with the leadership aspects of church-life.³¹ Students, whose patterns of thought are being formed academically by faculty, should see that leadership *in action in the church*. Academic excellence should be complemented (not supplemented) by skill in applying that knowledge in real-church life. “The involvement of [faculty] as a church person with a continuing assignment and responsibilities in a congregation is essential”³² for creating a church-centered “formational experience” for the student (and dare I say, for the faculty as well). Plus, the vested interest of the faculty would *not* be the institution, but the church--and students would benefit from *that* “formation experience” (or at least the by-products of *the faculty member's* formation experience).

Church-life should not just be build *into* a program--it should *be the program*. Church-life should be the one binding “concrete social experience” for the ministerial student in the training

process. (The details of such a process should entail developing experiences at various levels of responsibility to a church throughout the student's training.)

IV. Conclusion: Future Leadership Who Rise Above A Dying Culture

Time, lack of finances, and the inability to keep up with modernity will eventually, at least, diminish, or at the most, destroy the present structures of Christian Higher Education. The evaluations we can make about our moment in time, should not merely be a observation of the event of (post)modernity or the recitations of facts, trends, and statistics.³³ We need, rather, to be able to understand "our time" and work toward a positive future for the Church. The endeavor to change the paradigm from an institution-based ministerial process to a church-based one must be ardently undertaken and must have support from Institutions of Christian Higher Education, as well as, from their supporting constituencies (e.g., denominational structures, faculty members, Churches, present church leadership, and Christian Higher Education accrediting agencies).

Reinhold Niebuhr pointed out:

The prophetic movement in Hebraic religion offers an interesting confirmation of the thesis that a genuine faith in transcendence is the power which lifts religion above its culture and emancipates it from sharing the fate of dying cultures.

Christian Higher Education, if it wishes to remain faithful to the "prophetic movement of the Hebrews," needs to reshape its ministerial training in order to "lift" the future leadership of the church above our (post)modern culture so the church will not share in the fate of this dying culture.

¹ The central issues are being grappled with by such notable scholars like David Wells, Mark Noll, Thomas Oden, Os Guinness, Robert Wuthnow, Alister McGrath, as well as, by such practitioners like Leith Anderson, George Barna, Charles Kraft, Lyle Schaller, Peter Wagner.

² James Davison Hunter, *Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1987) 12.

³ I do not enter this discussion as an enemy of the present ministerial training process, but as a friend. As a student, a Bible College professor, and as a pastor I have benefited from its process, its institutions, and continue to benefit from its scholarship. However, my first devotion is not to Christian Higher Education, but to its own end--the benefit of the church.

⁴ Peter Berger, *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion* (Anchor Books, 1967) and *The Homeless Mind: Modernization and Consciousness* (Vintage Books, 1973) and *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge* (Anchor Books, 1966); David Wells, *No Place for Truth, Or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology?* (Eerdmans, 1993) and *God in the Wasteland: The Reality of Truth in a World of Fading Dreams* (Eerdmans, 1994); Thomas Oden, *Two Worlds: Notes on the Death of Modernity in American and Russia* (IVP, 1992) and *After Modernity . . . What?* (Zondervan, 1990) and *Requiem: A Lament in Three Movements* (Abington Press, 1995) and Oden's article on Higher Christian Education in *No God But God: Breaking with the Idols of Our Age* (editors Os Guinness and John Seel, Moody, 1993).

⁵ This observation was made by Michael Horton: "Evangelicals can see secularism when their neighbor wants to open an adult bookstore on the corner, but not when their own beliefs, assumptions, and tactics are dripping with secular attitudes and convictions" (Michael Horton, *Beyond Cultural Wars: Is America a Mission Field Or a Battlefield?* (Chicago: Moody, Press, 1994) 75).

⁶ Herbert Schlossberg, *Idols for Destruction: Christian Faith and Its Confrontation with American Society* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1983) 7.

⁷ Examples are, David Wells' two volumes, *No Place for Truth* and *God in the Wasteland*; Thomas Oden, *Requiem, After Modernity . . . What?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990)

⁸ Thomas Oden, *After Modernity . . . What?* 66.

⁹ Gene Edward Veith, *Postmodern Times: A Christian Guide to Contemporary Thought and Culture* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books) 42.

¹⁰ *Postmodern Times* 41

¹¹ *Postmodern Thought* 57.

¹² *Ibid.*; Steven Connor quoting Jean-Francois Lyotard in *Postmodern Culture: An Introduction to Theories of the Contemporary* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989) 32-33.

¹³ Christian Higher Education, sociologically, became the antagonist by making a "deliberate effort to reassert and defend the boundaries of the historic faith" (Hunter, *Coming Generation* 20). Hunter observed that in response to secular advancement, "Bible institutions and colleges emerged with the expressed intention of training ministers, missionaries, and lay people in [the] defense and extension of the central doctrines of the Christian faith" [James Davison Hunter, *American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandary of Modernity* (NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1983) 31].

¹⁴ Horton 74-75; Stanford sociologist David Gress says of the modern church growth philosophy that "[t]his phenomenon has nothing to do with genuine religion and is but another outgrowth of the modernist spirit . . ." (quoted by Horton).

¹⁵ Donald Bloesch, *The Evangelical Renaissance* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1973) 35.

¹⁶ *Wasteland* 29.

¹⁷ *Wasteland* 8.

¹⁸ Guinness, *Dining with the Devil: The Megachurch Movement Flirts with Modernity* (Baker, 1993) 41.

¹⁹ Wells, *Wasteland* 7-9.

²⁰ Guinness, *Dining with the Devil* 69.

²¹ In *No God But God* (Moody, 93) 137.

²² *Wasteland* 26.

²³ See Wells, *Wasteland* 10; also interesting to note Frederick Mark Gedicks' definition of "civil religion": "Faintly Protestant platitudes which reaffirm the religious base of American culture despite being largely devoid of theological significance."

²⁴ Okholm, personal notes from his paper presented at the 1992 Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society.

²⁵ *Wasteland* 194.

²⁶ David Schroeder, "Faculty as Mentors: Making Disciples on Campus" in *Alliance Academic Review* (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, Inc, 1995) 76.

²⁷ David Schroeder 76.

²⁸ Leith Anderson, lecture, "Facing the Future," Evangelical Press Association Convention, St. Paul MN, 12 May 1993.

²⁹ Herbert Schlossberg, *Idols* 4.

³⁰ "A 21st Century Seminary Faculty Model: A Review of the Graduate Theological Education in the Pacific Northwest," The M.J. Murdock Charitable Trust, *Faculty Dialogue* 23 (Winter, 1995) 9-22; "The purpose of the review: To discover what churches need in a pastor and the type of pastor seminaries produce (the output)."

³¹ There needs to be a *real* correspondence between an instructor's class-room experience and his/her church-life experience. This is an area often overlooked in assigning courses--scholastic competence is usually a criteria for assigning courses/topics. even at the expense of broader, equally valid criteria regarding church-life experience of the instructor. The dissonance between faculty-course and faculty-church-life is transferred to students--the class and the course in its totality is a "formation experience" for the ministerial student, which includes the student's experience *with* the instructor. Examples: A course on Pauline Theology offered under the rubric, "Paul as Pastor," taught by someone (a lady) who has not been a pastor, nor whose spouse has been a pastor (and in a denomination that, by policy, does not ordain women for pastoral roles); or, courses in ministerial topics, Christian Education or Theology where the instructor has been either absent from church ministry for a long length of time (five years?) or has never actually had significant church-life ministry "formation;" or, preaching courses being taught by those who have no recent experience in the "weekly" experience of preparing sermons amid other pastoral duties. These examples and observations are not about "women in ministry" nor about whether helpful insight can (or cannot) come from those not directly involved in church-life leadership. The issue is the dissonance found in the training experience.

³² "A 21st Century Seminary Faculty Model."

³³ Schlossberg 4.