Quaker Higher Education QHE

A Publication of Friends Association for Higher Education

Volume 2: Issue 1 ***April 2008***

In This Issue of QHE . . .

Donn Weinholtz - Editor

The articles in this issue of *Quaker Higher Education* fall into three categories; governing Quaker colleges, being a Quaker philosopher, and implementing campus initiatives. **Douglas C. Bennett,** President and Professor of Politics at Earlham College, opens by analyzing the benefits and difficulties accompanying Quaker decision-making at Earlham. Doug's article builds on last fall's essay by Paul Lacey that explored Quaker decision-making's basic principles applied at the college level. Doug pushes deeper, raising important questions regarding the vexing impact of four variables; size, complexity, expertise and responsibility.

The tensions of being both a Quaker and a philosopher are addressed in three articles by **Laura Rediehs,** Associate Professor of Philosophy at St. Lawrence University, **Richard Miller**, Associate Professor of Philosophy at East Carolina University, and **Jeffrey Dudiak**, Associate Professor of Philosophy at The King's University College. These pieces grew out of the lively Quaker Philosophy Roundtable at last year's FAHE annual meeting. They set the stage for future *QHE* issues exploring Quaker perspectives within other academic disciplines.

The final two articles highlight initiatives undertaken by Quakers collaborating with colleagues at two universities located in New England. First, **Abigail Adams**, Associate Professor of Anthropology, and **Charles Button**, Assistant Professor of Geography, from Central Connecticut State University, report on their efforts to transform their university's sustainability practices. Then, **Mary Lee Morrison**, the Founding President and Director of Pax Educare, Inc., The Connecticut Peace Education Center, addresses lessons learned from developing a regional, *Women and Peacebuilding* conference held at the University of Hartford. Both of these articles identify strategies that may prove applicable at other campuses (perhaps your own.)

Quaker Higher Education is published on-line by FAHE each spring and fall. As always, if you would like to submit an article or letter for possible publication in *QHE*, you can contact me at:

Email: weinholtz@hartford.edu
Telephone: 860-768-4186.
Snail-mail:
Department of Educational Leadership, University of Hartford,
223 Auerbach Hall, Bloomfield Ave.,
West Hartford, CT 06117.

QUAKER GOVERNANCE OF QUAKER COLLEGES

Douglas C. Bennett

Since I arrived in 1997, there have been perhaps six occasions when the Earlham Board of Trustees had significant difficulty coming to unity.

On each occasion, the matter at hand was important and the Board had been prepared for the agenda item in advance. On each occasion, the Board deliberated with care, each person speaking constructively, no one dominating, and all listening attentively to one another. On each occasion, the clerk proposed a minute after about two hours that, at first, seemed to draw approval from those gathered. On each occasion, one member and then another asked to be recorded as standing aside, noting that the rest of the group seemed in substantial unity. But on each occasion, when a third or a fourth also asked to be recorded as standing aside (we are a Board of 24, with several honorary life trustees also participating at most meetings), the clerk withdrew the proposed minute. Generally he asked the group to return to the matter the next day, and after further deliberation, the Board did come to unity, always a different decision than the proposed minute of the day before, and a decision that everyone present agreed was superior.

This is Quaker governance at its very best: not only better decisions, but also deepening trust and respect for one another. On another college board, the decision of the day before would have been approved by an overwhelming vote, perhaps leaving some with misgivings. At Earlham, the Faculty as a whole makes decisions by Quaker business practice, as do its committees, most student organizations and other groups. (You can see our *Governance Manua*l at:http://www.earlham.edu/policies/governance/. In addition to key governance documents, the manual also includes a series of short essays on Quaker governance, most of them written by members of the Earlham community for various purposes over the past several decades.)

Consensus governance may well be the most unusual aspect of Earlham, and the one that seems, to many, most closely connected to our being a Quaker College. (Many Friends prefer to speak of unity rather than consensus, but in my experience, most Quaker organizations tend to talk of consensus governance.) I mostly want to celebrate our consensus governance, but also to note some confusions in the practice that arise among Quaker organizations like schools, retirement homes, social service agencies, and the like.

For Friends, Quaker business practice involves listening for the leadings of the Holy Spirit. Even at Earlham, we can hardly understand it this way, since many members of our community are not themselves Quakers and may not even believe in God. Nevertheless, we believe the process "can be effective in any group whose members share hopes and beliefs about their ability to engage in collective action for the common good." (That quotation is from Monteze Snyder et al., *Building Consensus: Conflict and Unity*, Earlham Press, 2001, a valuable handbook "for using consensus processes in workplaces, community organizations, schools, families and other social settings.")

Consensus decision making is much more than finding ourselves all inclined to vote the same way; it is a set of commitments to work together to construct shared understanding and agreement. These four bracing commitments are especially important.

- *Transparency*. We need to take care that all relevant information is made available to all who will participate in decision-making. This requires active habits of regular disclosure and information sharing.

- *Listening carefully*. We need to listen unusually carefully to one another. We gather in silence (or stillness) to prepare ourselves to listen carefully and to empty out distractions that may linger in our minds. And we leave moments of silence between spoken messages to allow each contribution to be fully comprehended.

- *Speaking constructively*. We need to speak constructively, not in opposition to one another, but constantly seeking to find and widen a firm ground of shared agreement. (This can be especially difficult in academic settings because of ingrained professional habits of criticism.)

- *Good clerking*. We need to put ourselves in the hands of a clerk who will help us find the best we collectively have to offer. Clerking is a mutual relationship: the clerk should trust that each participant will speak only when s/he can move the discussion forward, and the participants should trust the clerk's judgment in acknowledging speakers and in formulating and reformulating where we are in the deliberation.

At its best, consensus process can be seen as a collective exercise of reason: many minds working together to think through a complex or vexing problem. Perhaps this is why it can work so well at an academic institution. Where *Robert's Rules of Order* or other voting processes can become an exercise of power politics (majority wins! others lose!), consensus process encourages us to find solutions that win assent and legitimacy from everyone.

* * * * *

So what mars this celebration of Quaker decision-making?

In practice we recognize some potential drawbacks. It can be very slow in reaching a conclusion. It can be sabotaged by bad faith (which could undermine each of the commitments noted above) though we rarely experience this. It can work poorly where self-interest is engaged among some participants. It probably asks too much of human frailty to ask or expect some individuals to put aside their own self-interest in this process; better that such individuals recuse themselves. We recognize these practical difficulties, and yet we are still deeply attached to the idea of consensus decision-making. But none of these are the main difficulty, which is more conceptual than practical.

Grasping the conceptual difficulty requires focusing on these two questions: (1) Who is included in the group that reaches consensus, and how

do we justify this pattern of inclusion and exclusion? And (2) should we ever allow an individual to make an important decision, and if so, how do we justify that?

Our ways of thinking about Quaker decision-making processes arise from the monthly meeting for business. In this setting, we have clear answers to these two questions. Who is included in the group that reaches consensus? All members. Should we ever allow an individual to make an important decision? No. But are these the right answers in Quaker *organizations*?

It is one of the glories of Quakerism that we have created so many vital, effective, purposeful organizations: schools, colleges, retirement homes, hospitals and hospice services, and social service and advocacy organizations. We want these Quaker organizations to follow Quaker business practices. But if our standard model for such decision making arises from the monthly meeting for business, we risk (and I believe we regularly experience) recurring issues around the legitimacy of authority in Quaker organizations. I believe we have some conceptual work that needs to be done so that Quaker business practices can be adapted to the different circumstances of a Quaker organization.

Monthly meetings for business generally involve a few dozen people, and rarely more than 100. Many Quaker organizations (even if small) can be a good deal larger in terms of total people involved. Their functioning requires specialized roles (teachers and students, professionals or managers and support staff, boards of directors and paid staff, etc.). Those specialized roles sometimes involve valued expertise. And Quaker organizations often have specific missions that put them in regular engagement with those who are not members of the organization. There may be legal requirements that prescribe how the organization does its work. Put another way, the different circumstances of a Quaker organization (as against a Quaker meeting) involve size, complexity, expertise and responsibility. These differences make it difficult to adapt the standard model of Quaker decision-making to Quaker organizations.

Consider again the two questions. I'll use Earlham as a running example.

(1) Who is included in the group that reaches consensus, and how do we justify this pattern of inclusion and exclusion?

Although we often provide an opportunity for anyone in the community to voice his/her opinion to whoever is making a decision, no decisions at Earlham involve every member of the community: all 1500 persons, including faculty, students and staff. No one seriously argues we should make decisions in this way, though it is not uncommon to hear that someone doubts the legitimacy of a decision because "s/he was not involved."

Many of the decisions we make involve careful thinking (not just tallying of preferences) so it makes sense to focus the decision-making in a relatively small group of people to whom we entrust the responsibility to listen carefully and weigh thoughtfully.

At Earlham, our *Governance Manual* has a good deal of black letter text that specifies who makes which decisions. The pattern turns out to be quite complex. Most of the time there isn't much controversy about who's included and who's not. The Faculty make decisions about the curriculum, for example; the Board of Trustees gives final approval to the budget. These delineations of "whose decision is it to make? following what process?" generally arise from sensible thinking given the location of relevant expertise (e.g. The Faculty with regard to the curriculum) or bearing of responsibility (e.g. The Board with regard to the budget, in light of its ultimate fiduciary responsibilities).

Some controversies about inclusion and exclusion arise because someone may object that they should participate in making a decision because "it will affect them." Note that this argument that anyone potentially *affected by* a decision should be involved in *making* the decision could be used to justify the involvement of a great many people (if not everyone) in the making of every decision. And it flies in the face of the admonition that Quaker process may not work well where self-interest is involved. The controversy arises because the standard account of Quaker decision making process has virtually nothing to say about who should be involved in making a decision, and certainly says nothing that helps draw the lines of inclusion and exclusion. The default understanding is that "everyone" should be involved.

(2) Should we ever allow an individual to make an important decision, and if so, how do we justify that?

Many decisions at Earlham follow a compound process: a committee that includes faculty and students makes a recommendation to the President or to another officer of the college. In these situations, the ultimate decision will be made by the administrative officer based on considerations of expertise or responsibility, but the officer is charged to "consult broadly" before making the decision. The committee is the group charged with the consultative responsibility and will normally make its recommendation by consensus.

Nevertheless, should the officer make a different decision after receiving the recommendation, we often hear that "the President has overturned a consensus decision." The problem, again, is a not a lack of clarity in our governance documents. Rather, it is a lack in our standard understanding of Quaker decision-making that could ever justify any single individual making a decision or that could justify any further step ever following a consensus process.

In an important 1969 joint statement by the Faculty and the Board of Trustees there appear these two sentences: "Earlham is an open community within the context of a Quaker pattern of search for consensus. We realistically recognize the necessity for division of labor and for weighted allocations of responsibility." I quote these because the second sentence is remarkably wise, in my experience, among Quaker writings about decision making. And yet the document provides no elaboration. It provides no justification for the "realistic recognition" of either a "division of labor" or for "weighted allocations of responsibility" in making decisions. These are precisely what we need.

Every Quaker organization I know (schools, colleges, retirement homes, social service and advocacy organizations) frequently finds itself in governance wrangles. Just as the good exercise of Quaker business process (like the instances of the Earlham Board working to find unity with which I began) can strengthen bonds of trust and group cohesion, these wrangles about the legitimacy of decision-making can weaken trust and tear apart cohesion.

These wrangles arise, I believe, not because Quaker organizations do not seek to follow the broad understanding of consensus-seeking decision-making. They arise, rather, because the way Quakers articulate decision processes makes no provision for size, complexity, expertise or responsibility – all features of any serious organization. When a decision-making process is sensibly shaped around these, it is vulnerable to being attacked as illegitimate – to being attacked as unQuakerly.

Within Quaker organizations, consensus should be the process we use within groups when they are charged to participate in the decision making process, but the decision-making process is certain to be more complex than one in which every individual gathers together in a single group to make all decisions. Within Quaker organizations, the guiding principles for consensus decision-making should light our way: transparency, careful listening, constructive speaking. We should seek broad participation, engage in active consultation, and encourage care to be taken that every voice is heard.

In the celebration of and faithful adherence to Quaker business practice, we also need to find a way to enrich Quaker thinking about decision-making to adapt it to the circumstances of Quaker organizations: that is, to make a place for (and not by silence undercut) considerations of size, complexity, expertise and responsibility.

*** * * * * ***

Where Quakerism and Philosophy Meet: The Ethical Ideal of Respect?

Laura Rediehs

The Friends Association for Higher Education (FAHE) exists to provide "opportunities for fellowship among all who share Quaker ideals of higher education, whether on Quaker or non-Quaker campuses"<http://www.earlham.edu/~fahe/>. As a Quaker at a non-Quaker college, I have found the annual FAHE conferences immensely valuable in providing a context for me to periodically reconsider and re-calibrate my Quaker identity and my academic identity.

My academic field is philosophy, and over the years I have met other Quaker philosophers at FAHE conferences. I began to notice how important it was for me to check in with the other Quaker philosophers I knew at each conference, and I began to fantasize about the possibility of bringing all of us together for a discussion about whether and how we each try to integrate our Quakerness and our philosophical identities in our work and our lives, and so I finally proposed the Quaker Philosophy Roundtable as a session for the 2007 FAHE conference. I wrote to all of the Quaker philosophers I had met and asked them to participate, and as I learned of other Quaker philosophers, I invited them to come as well. I had

originally expected about eight of us to participate, but there were about thirty who attended.

At the Quaker Philosophy Roundtable discussion, we began with introductions grounded in two of our guiding queries: "How do you see your primary identity? Quaker? Philosopher? Quaker-Philosopher?" and, "Do you ever find your Quaker identity in conflict with your academic-philosophy identity?" Not everyone present was an academic philosopher, but all were interested in the possibilities inherent in connecting Quakerism and philosophy.

Different Quakers who are also philosophers offered different ways of responding to these queries. In my own life, I find both of these terms individually to be very meaningful and important to me. I also find that combining these terms reveals powerful resonances and creates serious dissonances, and both the resonances and dissonances help explain why I find a life as a Quaker and a philosopher to be so endlessly interesting.

Calling myself Quaker expresses my connection to a distinctive subculture I experience as *home*—a community that speaks a language I recognize as my own "native language." This is a community of seekers who perceive and experience their lives and the world in spiritual terms, and who have deeply internalized the habit of looking for "that of God" in everyone. In calling myself Quaker, I feel connected to a historical tradition and set of practices that I find tremendously inspiring.

Calling myself a philosopher connects me to a somewhat different world and set of traditions and practices. The word "philosophy" means "love of wisdom," and in Plato's *Republic*, Socrates at one point notes, only half-jokingly, that this means that philosophers are first of all *lovers*. His definition of wisdom is difficult to grasp. He can only explain it with images. Goodness is like the sun, he says, shining upon the earth giving light and warmth. Wisdom is a special kind of knowledge—of seeing not just what is, but also noticing how it is illuminated by the "sun" of goodness shining down on it all.

In my quest to live up to this ideal about what philosophy is: to be a *lover*—a lover of *wisdom*—to seek not just to know what is, but also to be sensitive to the play of the light of goodness upon the world, I feel a profound convergence between my Quaker identity and my philosopher identity.

But there are ways that these two worlds I inhabit do not always harmonize. There are a lot of academic philosophers today who scoff at idealistic notions of wisdom. Some people in academic philosophy today are very hostile towards religion. Some academic philosophers, in the name of intellectual rigor, can behave contemptuously towards students or colleagues. And so one aspect of my attraction towards thinking of myself as a Quaker philosopher is my desire to hold the world of academic philosophy to what I regard as Quakerly standards of openness and respect.

Just as Quakerism is non-creedal, academic philosophy today tends in its own way to be non-dogmatic—focused on teaching methods of critical inquiry instead of imparting a single "definitive" subject-matter, as such. And so it is not

inappropriate to hold philosophy to a high standard of openness: an openness that is not dismissive of religious thought or the idealistic quest for wisdom. And *dialectic* (a primary method characterizing philosophical inquiry), i.e., dialogue across different points of view in quest of greater understanding, needs to be grounded in principles of engaged respect for it to be effective. And so it is also not inappropriate to hold philosophy to high standards of respect. At the ideal level, the resonances between Quakerism and philosophy emerge again.

During the Quaker Philosophy Round-table, someone asked whether there were any specific philosophical teachings that Quaker philosophers would especially want to advocate. Would Quaker philosophers, for example, tend to argue against ethical relativism since Quakers tend to take ethics seriously? These questions sparked a lively debate. "Who gets to say what counts as moral absolutes?" someone asked. "As soon as one person defines a moral absolute, someone else will disagree with it."

I found myself stepping in with what felt like a radical suggestion: "What about a supreme principle of respect?" I asked. "Is that a moral absolute that Quakers, anyway, do tend to believe—that everyone is worthy of respect: that there is that of God within everyone?"

In the pause that followed, I added one more question, "And if so, is this something that Quaker philosophers are especially well-prepared to argue for in our wider culture today?" Here I was trying to connect back to another of the guiding queries of our discussion: "How do we, as Quaker philosophers, see ourselves as 'scholars for peace, justice, and sustainability'?" Do the concepts of peace, justice, and sustainability imply an absolute ethical standard at least of respect towards all other people and towards the natural world?

In reply, someone perceptively pointed out that a lot hinges on how one defines "respect," and I wholeheartedly agreed. While the group seemed hesitant to fully accept, much less endorse my suggestion (and I was not at all surprised or troubled about this), I also do not remember that anyone directly argued against my suggestion either.

In the Quaker world, Friends on the whole do take respect very seriously without much need for further definition. But this is very much not true in the wider world—a world that keeps encouraging people to draw enemy lines. And so the wider world may benefit from an explication of the concept of "respect" in non-religious language, and in fact this is one of my own current writing projects—I am working on a book about respect. I see this as a kind of exercise in translation, undertaken from my full identity as Quaker philosopher—using the tools of conceptual analysis from philosophy to help translate this widely held ethical view within Quakerism into more secular language.

Too many people today vastly misunderstand religious language, and there is a great need for skilled "translators." Philosophers tend to be well-trained in the skill of translation across conceptual systems—perhaps Quaker philosophers especially so because of how the faith of Quakers is grounded much more in experience than

in the particular linguistic clothing of creeds and other statements of belief. Because of this, Quakers tend to be well aware of the limits of language, and therefore also tend to develop the capacity to be flexible in their use of language.

From my Quaker identity, I find myself concerned about how radically people can misunderstand each other, how afraid they are to engage in real dialogue with each other, and how much they then can hurt each other by drawing enemy lines and writing each other off. From my philosophical identity, I want to teach the benefits and skills of engaging in dialogue across different points of view, often teaching these skills by using the analogy of translation. I tell my students that one of the advantages of studying philosophy is that it helps you to become multi-lingual within your native language. Even when others are not skilled in this kind of translation, if you are, you can help facilitate dialogue by honoring the other's use of language and taking on the burden of translation. In my writing, I try to find meaningful "translation" projects to take on in order to open up lines of communication between traditions of thought that might benefit from each other's influence.

There are, of course, other possibilities as well for how to integrate one's Quaker identity with one's academic identity. I am very glad to see other Quaker philosophers engaging these questions, and I hope that those in other academic disciplines might find it meaningful as well to consider how their Quaker identities are related to their academic interests and pursuits.

* * * * * *

Broadening Philosophy's Appeal

Richard Miller

Philosophers aren't used to being the center of attention these days. It is rare for new books by philosophers to get reviewed in any outlet that caters to the general reader, even those like the Atlantic or the New York Review of Books that aim at a well-educated audience. To write philosophy today is to write for fellow specialists. Even within philosophy epistemologists don't usually read papers published in ethics and ethicists don't read papers in metaphysics. So it was quite a surprise when our Philosopher's Roundtable drew over thirty academics few of whom were professional philosophers. What drew so many to come to hear what we might have to say?

Upon reflection I don't think I should have been surprised at all. A century ago, William James spoke of the inherent interest of philosophy to people of all kinds: "Let a controversy begin in a smoking-room anywhere, about free-will or God's omniscience, or good and evil, and see how every one in the place pricks up his ears. Philosophy's results concern us all most vitally." (Pragmatism p. 8) Great themes like the relationship between justice and equality, the existence and nature of God, the reality or the illusion of human freedom and the scope and limits of human knowledge will always draw.

Professional philosophers have gotten used to thinking of philosophy as something that is naturally and properly conducted among specialists in a language that only specialists can understand. This bothers me. The great philosophers of history did not write only for other philosophers, they sought

to address a much wider audience. Our retreat to the ivory tower strikes me as tragic not noble. When I raise this issue with most philosophers they seem untroubled by the fact that these days we speak and write only for each other. The usual response seems to be: the general public simply lacks the training, the patience and frankly the intelligence to follow the details of our arguments or to see how they ultimately connect with what they say they are interested in. For years I have listened to such responses and they continue to strike me as patronizing and false.

It would be one-sided to suggest that all is wrong with professional philosophy. In my opinion much is right about it too. The articles published in professional journals may be full of jargon and technical detail that make them inaccessible to the general reader, but they are also models of clarity and rigor for those of us whose training enables us to read them. Nevertheless, I continue to feel that most of the clarity and rigor is wasted in chasing down details that are too far removed from the perennial issues that should be philosophy's ultimate concern. In other words I have a sense that the discussions lose the forest for the trees. In the process of becoming specialists we have lost sight of the purpose of philosophy.

Going to FAHE provided me with a new opportunity. I could raise these concerns, as well as my suggestions for how to approach philosophical problems in a different way, and see if Quaker philosophers would be more open. What I found was that other Quaker philosophers do see philosophy as a discipline which should properly speak to a wider audience and are like me troubled by our inability to consistently address that audience. They do not take the elitist attitude that I find so distressing in other professional philosophers. In my talk I tried to share with them my analysis of why philosophy retreated to the ivory tower and how we could do philosophy in a more accessible, more relevant way.

I shared with them the inspiration I found in the work of the last great American pragmatist, C. I. Lewis. In Lewis' conceptualistic pragmatism I find a way of articulating the philosophical enterprise that preserves the clarity and rigor that professional philosophy has attained while at the same time keeping it closer to its roots in real human concerns. Lewis tried to convince philosophers that they should stop attempting to prove that their views about justice, knowledge, freedom etc. were the one and only necessarily correct and final word on the subject. Instead we should recognize that there are in fact many possible ways to think about justice, knowledge, beauty, truth, God, freedom and the soul. It simply makes no sense, he argues, to think that one concept is "correct" and the others are false or wrong. Concepts are tools. They are more or less useful but it makes no sense to call them true or false. To argue for one concept of justice is ultimately to try to persuade others to use our concept of justice, to think with it, to see the world with it. It is wrong-headed to try to refute another concept of justice. The other concept can't literally be false but it might not work very well. We should focus our attention on how concepts help us solve our problems. To argue for one theory of justice over another is to try to persuade others that we will live together

more harmoniously if we think of justice in this way rather than in that way.

As well as stressing persuasion over intellectual coercion Lewis also stressed creativity. Instead of thinking of philosophers as searchers looking for a fixed and immutable truth about justice or knowledge we should see our function as that of engineers designing new and improved intellectual tools for human beings to use in their lives under continually new and changing conditions. Fidelity to old ways of looking at problems is not necessarily a virtue. We should be on the lookout for new ways to think and philosophy at its best offers genuinely new and creative solutions to problems both old and new.

The reactions of the other Quaker philosophers to these ideas encouraged me. I had gotten used to very negative reactions from other philosophers. Some are dismissive because they see nothing wrong with the way philosophy is done in our ivory tower. Others find the idea of making philosophy accessible to the general reader naïve. The other Quaker philosophers were not dismissive. They took the problem and the suggested solution seriously and tried to examine it critically to see if it would stand up. We had a lively discussion of Lewis's ideas and what they mean for philosophy at this time. I welcome the opportunity to sharpen my own understanding by taking account of all the points that were raised there.

In the roundtable many of us shared what it meant to us to be both Quakers and philosophers. Some of the themes I had raised in my talk on pragmatism rose again in the roundtable. There was a general sense that we were opening a discussion that was potentially very rich, but for which there was far too little time to explore during this brief conference. Since then, several of us have remained in regular contact where we continue this and other philosophical discussions. I feel hopeful that something really valuable is beginning to emerge out of last summer's FAHE sessions, but that it is emerging slowly in fits and starts. Each of us is quite busy with typical academic duties in teaching, research and administration and so the time to continue these discussions is sometimes hard to find. Despite this, six months later the discussion has not died out, but rather deepens and becomes more meaningful.

*** * * * * ***

***Philoi sophias* [Friends of wisdom]: Quakerism and the Vocation to Philosophy**

Jeffrey Dudiak

As a lifelong Friend, and a philosopher by inclination and profession, and one who has long had, moreover, a sense that my Quakerism has been an integral, formative (if often tacit) influence upon the fact and the manner of my philosophizing, I find myself - at this awkward moment of mid-life crisis (taking stock of what I have done so far, and what is left to me to do, God willing, for the next quarter of a century) - seeking to more deliberately understand the relationship between my confession and my profession. I have, for a few years now, been moving into a stage where I am increasingly understanding myself and my calling to be that of a "Quaker philosopher" - without knowing quite what that would mean, and without a community of other Quakers in

philosophy with whom to work this out. Imagine my delight, then, when - as the pleasantest of interruptions to my largely solitary musings - I was invited by Laura Rediehs to participate in a "philosophers' roundtable" at FAHE. After forty(-six) years in the wilderness, was I crossing the Jordan at long last?

And a delight it was, as we scurried to expand the circle to accommodate a surprising number of Quakers teaching and otherwise engaged in philosophy, and others with sufficient interest in the philosophical enterprise to show up too. But even as we were introducing ourselves the question arose as to whether we think of ourselves as "Quaker philosophers", or, alternatively, "Quakers who are also philosophers," and while we had little time to explore this, my suspicion is that we would have been far from unanimous in our approaches to the question. Leave it to philosophers to fret over who they are even before the introductions are complete! And yet, delving into this would, I think, teach us a lot about how we conceive of both our religious commitments and philosophy itself. I seek here, therefore, to explore this issue a little - in only a preliminary and suggestive way, granted - as a question of existential importance to myself as I attempt to carve out my post-mid-life identity, but perhaps also one with implications both for other philosophers and for those of other disciplines and professions as well, since the question might structurally reverberate with the question as to whether we might better think ourselves Quaker psychologists, or Quaker biologists, or Quaker business-(wo)men, or even Quaker prison reformers, etc., or whether it is rather a matter of our being Quakers (who happen to be, additionally, or incidentally, or tangentially) engaged in some or other vocation.

What is at stake here, and why might some of us, at least, be hesitant to claim the term "Quaker philosopher"? There are indeed reasons to be wary. First, there is the rightful fear of the arrogance of thinking oneself a (self-appointed, no less) representative of a movement, representing Quakers in the philosophical world, or speaking "as a philosopher" to one's fellow Quakers, as if claiming this descriptor conferred some status. And there is the related concern of whether the adjective "Quaker" attached to something like "philosopher" does not imply an official title, a formal approval from the body thereby invoked, in the manner that "Catholic theologian" means more than a Catholic who is a theologian, but a theologian vetted and approved by Catholicism. If that is the meaning, then none of us should make this claim, because "Quakerism" (even if there were an unified society who could speak for "Quakerism" per se), as a "religious" society, is not in a position to certify any "philosophy" (in the technical sense) over another (just as Quakerism would be wise not to officially advocate for one school of psychology over another, or one political party over another). Another part of the apprehension around adopting the title, this time more from the side of philosophy than Quakerism, is that as specifically "Quaker" philosophers we then become, or are perceived to become, parochial and prejudiced in our approach to philosophy, which is particularly troubling where there is an expectation of neutrality, as is clearly the case for many schools of philosophy. We must not

allow our religious conclusions to function as a starting point for our philosophical reflections; rather we must first, as philosophers, examine these assertions themselves by recourse to some or other non-sectarian standards. Even for those like myself, who are convinced that the Enlightenment's "prejudice against prejudice" (in H. G. Gadamer's phrase) is precisely that, and who do not feel the need to philosophically exorcise the particular but to engage it, do not hope to translate this incredulity towards theoretical neutrality into an alibi for uncritical assertion. As "philosophers" we hope to proceed on an equal footing with our professional colleagues, without any claims to special access to the truth, even if we feel at liberty to proceed confessionally in our meetings.

And yet, for me at least, and perhaps for others for whom the relationship between faith and philosophizing is non-incidental, the term Quaker philosopher - if solely for the purposes of self-understanding, and not as the adoption of a title - retains a certain descriptive force. Quakerism is not simply one among a number of aspects that together define us, one that we foreground at certain times but that falls away behind the horizon when we are engaged in others, but is a root qualification, one in terms of which we have been (re)constituted as the people we are, and that therefore radically rather than incidentally affects (or even effects) all of our other engagements. The question, it seems to me, suggested by the terminological distinction in question here, is whether or not one's Quakerism comprehensively impacts upon one's vocation, such that the vocational activity could not be the activity that it is if the Quakerism of the practitioner were lacking. This is clearly not a claim that one must be a Quaker to engage in philosophy, or that the results achieved would be restricted to Quakers, but that our Quakerism is non-incidental to both the what and the how of our engagement in it. Philosophy is, on this model, undertaken a specialized calling within the more general task shared by us all: to "translate" our Quaker spirituality into our worldly activities, or "to bring our Quakerism to life."

But what more precisely is this relationship between Quakerism and philosophy that tempts me to adopt "Quaker philosopher" as a descriptor? By this I do not mean that Quakerism becomes the focus, or the subject matter, of philosophizing (though this would not be excluded), in the manner that a "Quaker historian" (qua historian of Quakerism) studies the history of the Quakers, but without necessarily being a Quaker. Nor do I mean by this that we begin by allowing Quaker presuppositions to either govern the choice of subject matter or delimit, doctrinally or ethically, the possible outcomes of our work, for instance, that we would be attracted to and promote certain philosophers who say things that seem to us to resonate with Quaker teachings and experience, or that we would attempt to make a philosophical case for pacifism (although neither of these would be excluded either). Rather, I think it would mean something closer to taking up the task of philosophizing in a Quakerly manner, being a Quaker in our whole person even while engaged fully in the philosophical task (while "being a whole man to" philosophy, as J. J. Gurney might put it), such that who we

are cannot but thoroughgoingly affect both what we do, and how we do it. A "Quaker philosopher" here would then be one who philosophizes in a Friendly manner, rather than one who is concerned with a particular disciplinary focus. Quakerism here would qualify our philosophizing adverbially.

Without pretending to, or seeking, any status official or otherwise thereby, with I hope seemly humility, and while welcoming dissent, *for myself* the term "Quaker philosopher" (over against the "less integrated" Quaker who is a philosopher) signals a vocation in philosophy motivated and framed by commitments that are self-consciously Quaker, or ,again, deliberately engaging in philosophy in a Quakerly manner, such that philosophizing itself becomes a way in which we expresses the love of God and neighbor that our Quakerism (in its various forms and diverse articulations) is itself an attempt to faithfully embody. Or, to adopt and adapt a phrase from the Jewish philosopher Emmanuel Levinas, a Quaker philosopher recognizes that before it is the love of wisdom, philosophy is "the wisdom of love in the service of love," and the Quaker philosopher (on the model I am suggesting here) brings the Quaker sensibilities that frame his or her approach to philosophy into his or her vocation as its very heart.

*** * * * ***

Sustaining Campus Environmental Sustainability Efforts: Lessons Learned and Insights Shared

Abigail Adams
&
Charles Button

We are two faculty members currently serving at a public metropolitan teaching university in the Northeast. We would like to share our experience as members of our university's first sustainability committee. We hope that our thoughts will help others in their efforts to move their institutions of higher learning towards better environmental steward-ship and leadership.

As faculty at a large, public and non-Quaker institution, we suspect our parameters may match those of many FAHE members! In short, Central Connecticut State University (CCSU) is not an ivory tower, an island separate from the rhythms of the "real" world; our campus is much more of a town plaza where the larger community's roads arrive and people gather from the worlds of commerce, learning, family and government.

Both of the authors serve on our campus's Presidential Advisory Com-mittee on Environmental Sustain-ability ("Sustainability Committee") and the Climate Action Coalition (CAC). One of us co-chairs the Sustainability Committee and the other is the founder and Co-Chair of the CAC. We have spoken in several venues, including the Senate of the local private university chaired by the Friend who edits this journal. One of us is a member of a Friends meeting; one of us is neither a member nor an attender at this date, but considers himself to be like-minded.

We would like to share the process our campus underwent in the past two years concerning environmental sustainability, as well as some counsel from our experience, the top four "best practices" points that we hope will support you in your sustainability efforts at your campus. In doing so, we would like to address deeper issues that directly concern Friends testimonies of simplicity, equality, community, integrity and peacemaking.

CCSU's current attention to environmental sustainability began in Fall 2006. CCSU President Jack Miller convened his Presidential Advisory Committee on Environmental Sustainability, and a group of faculty and students created the CCSU Climate Action Coalition. The Advisory Committee on Environmental Sustainability was charged with creating an institutional plan to ensure that our university model sustainability in all aspects of its functioning. The CAC took on the mission of educating and motivating governmental officials, university and civic leaders, and all citizens to eliminate human contributions to the global climate change crisis.

The Sustainability Committee found that the university, at the start of our process, was "ahead" in some areas and "behind" in others. For example, CCSU already had a state-of-the-art co-generating Energy Center on campus, a very progressive hazardous material program and a computer support department that meticulously re-cycled used computers (big steps ahead!). Yet, we lacked the ability to support recycling for people in their offices, classes and residence halls (a big step back).

Our first step was to hire an environmental sustainability consulting firm to perform a Sustainability Baseline Audit. The purpose of this audit was to gather data and information on CCSU's current sustainability initiatives and identify areas for improvement. The consultants conducted the Sustainability Audit for the following categories: Energy use and conservation (including GHG and other emissions), Solid Waste Reduction and Recycling, Water Use and Conservation, Purchasing, Hazardous Waste, Building Design, Property Maintenance, Landscaping and Pesticides, Transportation and Food Service Operations.

The audit served us as we developed an Institutional Sustainability Plan to ensure that environmental sustainability becomes central to the University culture. We also used the audit to develop a Solid Waste and Recycling Management program, which we implemented immediately, as well as a comprehensive Energy Conservation program. The audit, the two programs and the Institutional Sustainability Plan are all available at our campus's sustainability website: (www.ccsu.edu/ccsusustainability/). A presentation about the process of our Sustainability Committee is available at (www.ccsu.edu/facsenate/Agendas/SustainabilityPresentation%20to%20Fac%20Senate%20final%2010-8-07.ppt).

While the Committee on Environmental Sustainability was developing an Institutional Sustainability Plan, the Climate Action Coalition was working on a January 2008 Inaugural Global Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change Symposium: Raising

Awareness and Promoting Change (www.ccsu.edu/ccsuclimate). This event, held on CCSU's campus, coordinated with simultaneous teach-in efforts at more than 1800 venues across America. The CCSU Symposium was the largest in the nation, and nearly 1000 students, faculty, and citizens from throughout New England came to engage political, business, civic, and academic leaders in discussions about environmental sustainability.

During this time, members from both the Sustainability Committee and the CAC advised President Miller to sign on as a charter member of the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment, in which our institution joins others in establishing a date and a plan to achieve climate neutrality (http://www.presidentsclimatecommitment.org/).

Our Sustainability Committee met the deadline and charge set for us last December (2007). We are now constituted as a permanent Sustainability Council. The CAC evolved into the Global Environmental Sustainability Coalition, and is now planning our April 2009 Symposium.

Our counsel to you as we review the past two years: First, make sure that your Facilities division shares ownership and credit for campus sustainability campaigns. This step is both utilitarian and principled. The Facilities staff are those who directly implement many of the sustainability measures. They must do so while meeting budget, labor and quality standards. We found that CCSU's Facilities director, who served as co-chair of the President's Advisory Committee on Environmental Sustainability, had been CCSU's unofficial "Sustainability Coordinator" for years. Energy and water conservation is nothing new to facilities departments. What sometimes is new are measures that go beyond cost recovery, but we found the facilities staff were very open to the fullest sense of the term, "sustainability," as long as the element of practicality was observed, along with respect for their expertise. Most importantly, faculty and facilities staff benefited enormously from the bridge created across a classist divide that can too often exist on campuses.

Second, begin your sustainability process by obtaining the leaderships' support. We at CCSU benefitted from staff support, real budget and access to the President and his Chief Administrative Officer. CCSU President Jack Miller serves as the honorary chair of the Global Environmental Sustainability Coalition. We knew, with complete confidence, that our efforts would not end in mere "green-washing." We also had the example of the Facilities director, who has always tackled the biggest problems first, and then used the savings generated to fund other initiatives. One of us had met the Facilities director previously, while working out arrangements to use a small and problematic campus orchard for a student-faculty program. Hence, we abolished the use of the term "low-hanging fruit" as an anti-slogan of the President's Advisory Committee on Environmental Sustainability!

Third, patience is indeed a virtue. Most of the changes required are not "technical fixes" at all, but the socio-cultural work required in helping humans change our practices. Here is

where our Sustainability Council comes in; we recommend constituting an inclusive council or committee with participants from all walks of the campus community, including the greater community in which the campus and its members are located. We also included representatives from major vendors to our campus on the committee, specifically the food service director. Chaired as it is by a Friend, the committee has made all decisions to date by consensus. And given the quality of the initial members, discussion was frank and respectful. We tackled some real areas of contention and difference, and still managed to come out ahead.

Fourth and finally, get the news out about your university's work on sustainability! This is a critical step in gaining recognition and acknowledgement, in education for that slow socio-cultural process of change, and in networking. Other communities and people with something to offer to your university have to learn about what you are doing first.

In conclusion, we have found that serving on the Sustainability Committee and the CAC has been uplifting, for ourselves and others, during a time of fairly low campus morale. As heated divisions polarized and absorbed energy around other areas of the campus, we found that new alliances and warm friendships sprang up among the members of our committee and our coalition. In addition to the considerable accomplishments in greening our students' diplomas and our workplace, we forged relationships among administration, faculty, students, and white-collar and blue-collar staff that endure to date and that we believe contributed to abating the destructive heat of other campus divisions.

*** * * * * ***

Women and Peacebuilding: An Academic-Grassroots Community Collaboration

Mary Lee Morrison

An all day conference, "Building Peace: Women Making a Difference", was held at the University of Hartford in West Hartford, Connecticut, in early November of 2007. The event was a collaboration between several faculty of the university, including *QHE* editor Donn Weinholtz, and Pax Educare, Inc. Pax Educare is a resource center for the research, study and teaching of peace located in Hartford. The conference was funded by the Women's Education and Leadership Fund, a legacy fund of the Hartford College for Women, which incorporated into the University of Hartford several years ago. I share our experiences with the hope that *QHE* readers might find inspiration to replicate our efforts. One of our goals was to provide a new model for academic and community collaboration.

One hundred fifty people attended the conference. Because of the generous funding, we were able to keep registration costs low. Students were admitted free, constituting almost half of the attendees. The conference was a signature event, part of ongoing efforts to develop new working relationships among the University of Hartford, other academic institutions in the greater Hartford area, Pax Educare and other local grass-roots educational and community organizations.

The conference format was an experiment, combining a morning plenary of internationally known women academics and policy experts (the more "heady" format), with morning and afternoon workshops highlighting local, grass-roots peacebuilding activities, skills and initiatives (providing a more intimate, experiential and dialogic format). Another feature of the conference was an improvisational, interactive play addressing women's peace building issues based on insights from the audience, performed by HartBeat Ensemble, Hartford's own social activist theater troupe. Food, beverages and paper products provided during the day, were catered by the university and kept as ecologically healthy as possible.

Goals

Our initial goals in planning the conference were four-fold:
1) To highlight the roles women are playing in leading peace and conflict resolution at the local, regional, national and international levels.
2) To build collaborative, working relationships among conference participants, including the important work of partnering between men and women in building peace.
3) To Illustrate that peacemaking is a real option for average people, as well as for the exceptionally talented.
4) To develop participants' peacemaking skills for individual action and successful group initiatives through interactive workshops.

Pax Educare, Inc. served as the primary consulting organization and as co-sponsor. During the conference a lifetime achievement award was given to Quaker sociologist Elise Boulding, Nobel Peace Prize nominee and a co-founder of the International Peace Research Association, whose work in the area of women and peace has been groundbreaking. A comprehensive overview of the program is provided on the conference website at: http://uhaweb.hartford.edu/peaceconf/.

As our planning proceeded, we developed three additional goals:
1) Enhance the education of women – We deliberately sought to invite students to the conference. Of those in attendance, the substantial majority were women. In addition, non-students who attended were overwhelmingly women. We wanted to see women strongly represented on the speaker panel, leading workshops, in the theatrical presentation, and as participants. Gordan Fellman, professor of peace studies at Brandeis university, the only male represented on the speaker-respondent panel, addressed us humorously as being honored to be a "token male", as he said, this had been one of his lifetime goals!

2) Advance women as scholars and as the subject of scholarship - We had women scholars as speakers, respondents and workshop leaders. Many were scholar-activists involved in high level policy making. We also wanted to show that these roles are not dichotomous. The panel of speakers included Mishkat Al-Moumin, an Iraqi human rights lawyer, currently a Visiting Scholar at George Mason University, who served as the First Minister of the Environment in Iraq during the Interim government; Rachel Myanja, a native of Uganda and the United Nations Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on

Gender Issues; and Lina Sidrys Nealon, Policy Specialist with the Initiative For Inclusive Security, a research and advocacy organization that promotes the full participation of all stakeholders, especially women, in peace processes, located in Cambridge, MA with offices in Washington D.C.

Respondents on the plenary panel included Melinda Salazar, Director of Education at the Cloud Institute for Sustainability Education in New York City and two local/regional peace studies faculty, Gordon Fellman of Brandeis University and Carol Shaw Austad of Central Connecticut State University. The format of the conference was participatory and invited audience interaction as much as possible. We wanted to promote an inquiry-based approach, with mutual sharing and learning. Our goal was to enhance learning and promote dialogue about the important work women are doing in building peace.

3) Cultivate and sustain women's leadership skills - Participants were given the opportunity to observe women in key leadership positions, from women representing the majority on the planning committee, to speakers, respondents, and workshop leaders. Yet we did not wish to exclude men. The mission of the conference included the goal of enhancing partnering between women and men in building peace.

Quaker Pedagogy

Though only two of us on the planning committee of five were Quakers, we sought to engage from the beginning in processes that highlighted a consensual, participatory, experiential and experimental approach, all elements of what I like to believe is the best of Quaker pedagogy.

A document from Guilford College's Department of Educational Studies outlines core objective themes for an ideal Quaker education. These include experience and scholarship that lead to learner as discoverer, learning in community, and wonder at the mystery of being. Learning is continuous, people and cultures have value, and there is a deep and important ecology of humans and of the natural world that must be studied within its local and global contexts. These help shape the development of educators who: respect individuals, build community, build in values of reflection and communication, respond to the spiritual dimensions of learning and living, value ambiguity and paradox, learn throughout life, seek insight into many cultures, and understand themselves as world citizens. [1]

Our hope was that the developmental of the conference, its planning and execution, could tap into the best of those pedagogical processes that represent a Quaker philosophy of education. We deliberately used consensus during our planning meetings. We sought to be as inclusive and dialogical as possible for the conference format. Workshops were designed to be small, experiential and interactive and included students as facilitators. There was plenty of time for conversation and networking.

[1] undated. "The Process of Developing Program Objectives for Education Studies at Guilford College"

What Really Helped

- We developed and maintained a web site, with up-to-date information on speakers' biographies, format, workshops, directions, hotel information and parking. One of our team took on this important role.
- We all took on the big task of "walking and talking publicity", using posters and each of our networks of colleagues and friends. The internet proved an invaluable asset as did as the university's wider network of contacts.
- We used a cooperative model for differentiating and delegating tasks among committee members.
- We lined up a cadre of volunteers to help with registration, resource tables and information. For the most part, these were students and young adults who had an interest in peace work.
- We eschewed the use of bottled water and instead, served it in large, several gallon-sized containers. Food was unwrapped in stages by the university's caterers and items that were not used were taken at the end of the day to a local shelter. Food was deliberately kept simple.

Conclusions

We asked ourselves at the planning outset…will our "experiment" combing a more traditional, plenary format with smaller, more intimate workshop settings be successful? Will our funded mandate to include many students succeed? Will we reach our goals of highlighting the peace work of women, building collaborative relationships, showing that peacemaking can be a genuine option for everyone, and helping to build participants' skills in peace-building ?

After the conference, at our debriefing session, we reflected on these questions. The evaluations were overwhelmingly positive, proving to be a source of much satisfaction and relief to the planning committee. And comments confirmed most of our initial hopes for reaching our goals. Our conference would not have been complete without the kind of interactive learning that allows true dialogue to occur. Yet we also needed to hear the stories, in a more traditional lecture format, of the women doing key international work. The question of whether our attempt to combine these formats was effective was gratefully and gracefully answered, in part, when, at lunch, seated at a small table with several other participants, Rachel Myanja, United Nations Special Advisor to the Secretary-General, affirmed her delight in the format of the day. In addition, new connections and relationships were formed during the day between and among participants and planners. Plans continue for collaborative work involving Pax Educare, the University of Hartford and several other local academic institutions to develop, in an intentional way, activities and curricula which help to promote the best practices of peace pedagogy. It is our hope to establish peace studies as a cross-institutional, academic major, utilizing a model of cooperation with local, grass-roots, community-based organizations as sites of learning.