Quaker Higher Education QHE

A Publication of Friends Association for Higher Education

Volume 5: Issue 2 December, 2011

This is a landmark issue of *QHE,* as Donald Smith, Assistant Professor of Physics at Guilford College, is our new co-editor. Friends Association for Higher Education is fortunate to have someone with Don's talent and dedication taking on this responsibility, and readers will increasingly see his influence shaping our issues.

On the other hand, this will also be the first issue of *QHE* that has not benefitted from ***Kori Heavner's*** capable, administrative assistance. Kori, a vital and stabilizing force within FAHE for many years, has moved on to a new, career opportunity with the Free Library of Philadelphia Foundation. All of us who have known and worked with Kori over the years will miss her, dearly.

With the exception of the poignant, concluding poem by peace activist **Tim Bagwell**, all of the items in this issue were developed from presentations at the 2011 FAHE annual conference at Bryn Mawr College. So often, our Friendly rhetoric is far loftier than our day-to-day behaviors. The articles here point to concrete ways that we might bring our practices more into line with aspirations, and perhaps better model the Integrity Testimony.

The lead article, by **Gary Farlow**, tackles the challenging questions, *"What makes a Quaker College Quaker?"* and *"What can FAHE do to promote the Quaker identity of these colleges?"* **Douglass Bennett** follows with a piece examining the responsibilities that Quaker meetings and Quaker colleges have for one another, offering Earlham College's covenant with Indiana Yearly Meeting as a model for other colleges and meetings. Then, **Stanford Searl,** drawing on the work of Paul Lacey and others, provides a searching examination of how Quaker educators, and their students, might benefit by drawing on Quaker methods for finding "the Inner Teacher and Guide." Stan's insights should be kept in mind as you read the issue's final article in which **Jeffrey Dudiak** probes how the *"tears in the Quaker body"* might finally be healed by Friends setting aside our preconceptions and engaging in a *"communal project of imaginative discernment*" guided by the *Spirit of Truth*.

Submissions: *QHE* is published twice a year, in the spring and the fall. Articles submitted for possible publication should be sent as Word documents to: ***weinholtz@hartford.edu*** or to **dsmith4@guilford.edu**. Since *QHE* is not wed to any particular referencing format, you may use the professional style of your choice. In case you want to send a hard copy, our addresses are: **Donn Weinholtz**, Department of Educational Leadership, University of Hartford, 223 Auerbach Hall, 200 Bloomfield Ave., West Hartford, CT 06117 and **Donald Smith,** Guilford College, 5800 West Friendly Ave., Greensboro, NC 27410. If you would like to discuss an idea that you have for an article, our telephone numbers are: 860-768-4186 (DW) and 336-316-2162 (DS).

FAHE ANNUAL CONFERENCE

June 21-24, 2012

WILMINGTON COLLEGE

Mark your calendars now for June 1-24, 2012 at Wilmington College to consider *Building Sustainable Academic Communities*. The call for papers with queries is available through this link; submissions will be accepted and reviewed during the fall and winter.

FAHE

A Quaker-Valued Education

The significance of Quaker Identified Colleges and the role of FAHE in that identification from a 30-year, personal perspective

Gary C. Farlow
Wright State University

Historical Context

In 1981, I was asked to sit on a panel exploring the unique qualities of a Quaker college. This panel and its topic presumed that the justification for a Quaker college was that a Quaker college is somehow unique, that it is somehow irreplaceable. I was a green, graduate student worried more about defects in Silver Bromide than defects in Quaker Colleges, and the one from which I had just been graduated (Guilford) seemed perfectly OK to me. I was set up among such thoughtful Quaker worthies as Earl Redding, Linda Eliason, and Ward Harrington. It turned out I had the unenviable task of telling the nescient FAHE - which at that time included educators, administrators, trustees and students concerned by their alma maters drifting from Quaker allegiance - that there was nothing they could do that could not be done by someone else. The text can be found in the proceedings of FAHE – 1981.

Consider now the context of 1981. Most Quaker, and other religiously affiliated schools, had alienated their putative sponsors, e.g. yearly meetings, through the liberality of thought that had become the norm on college campuses. My God, whatever became of a "guarded education"? Well, Quaker families after World War II were less tied to their Quaker institutions having become more 'of this world' than merely 'in it'; and these good Quaker families quite frankly preferred the testimony of frugality to the one of Quaker peculiarity. As a result, fewer Quaker students were showing up at Quaker Schools at the same time the Quaker schools had grown to the point where there was no possibility of populating these schools with Quakers – even if you included the attendees who decided to become Quaker based on their experience at that Quaker school. As the number of Quakers declined relative to the population, and as many of us academics found more lucrative positions or more challenging research careers in state or other non-sectarian institutions, there was also no way to populate the faculty at a Quaker School with a 10% leavening, much less a majority, of Quakers. It looked to the old timers of 1981 like the next event in the sequence was taps for the Quaker college as a Quaker College. Does this resonate with the present?

However, thanks to Canby Jones (Wilmington College) and Charles Browning (Whittier College), the trumpet was sounded and the dead-in-despair were raised with an enthusiasm for rescuing the Quaker College from the amorphous identity of 'a liberal arts college'. A number of colleges re-embraced their Quaker roots with considerable purpose. Great interest arose in the social testimonies of Friends

on the campuses of Quaker Colleges - so long as it was not the testimony on temperance. Quaker governance practice, with its protection of minority view, became a cause celeb among faculty in particular. At least four Quaker schools instituted Quaker Scholars programs, and others strengthened their library holdings. A few even attempted to make peace with their Yearly Meetings. This looks good.

But, there is no new thing under the Sun, and as of Fall 2011, no Quaker college will have a Quaker president. Only five of the eleven will have a majority of the board of trustees who are Quaker. (May I say, one can be very creative in identifying Quakers when looking for trustees.) Only three Quaker colleges have trustees who are appointed by a Yearly Meeting. Three have dissolved all ties with any organ of the Religious Society of Friends (not counting FAHE). The sad reality is that there are still not enough Quaker students, educators, or influential citizens to maintain either institutional or cultural control of one Quaker college, much less eleven. Periodic tiffs aside, there really is no interest among Quaker judicatories (the official National Council of Churches designation of a denominational organization) in trying to assert institutional or cultural control over any one of the Quaker colleges, much less all of them. We find however, increasingly prestigious Quaker library holdings at Quaker schools and increasingly prestigious Quaker Studies programs. We find an institution as prestigious as Haverford College asking itself, "What is our Quaker identity?" Does this sound like something we have heard before?

Where Do We Go From Here?

So, what will it mean to be a Quaker college in the 21st century? Or, as most of our institutions so coyly put it: "Colleges founded by the Society of Friends".

Some semantics: if the designation 'founded by Friends' were adequate; we could include Johns Hopkins, Cornell and Brown Universities since a majority of the original endowment of these schools was provided by wealthy Friends. Presumably there was even some Quaker influence in their early days. In the present day "Quaker-affiliated" would stretch our testimony on honesty, if not break it. I prefer to use the term "Quaker-identified colleges" as being those colleges who were indeed founded by Friends and who choose to continue to hold some identification with the Society of Friends, its practices, and its values. All the institutional members of FAHE fall into this category. In the remainder of these remarks I will propose what I believe is a proper and fruitful identification with the Society of Friends for our time, as well as the role of FAHE in promoting, informing and eldering such an identification.

Parameters

First, it is impossible to make the Quaker identified colleges be naturally Quaker. We have established that there are not enough Quaker students, nor faculty to establish constitutional operation nor cultural domination of a Quaker identified college. The demography of the populations does not allow enough role models for this to be practical and to survive economically, nor to allow the kind of academic freedom to which academia has become accustomed. Despite the number of

books written on the subject, being Quaker is not something that can be learned from a book or rule ledger. This identity is learned by living in a practicing faith community and cannot be prescribed. You must talk the talk, walk the walk, and meet God in the private places of your heart and mind. Modern colleges are not intrinsically faith communities, so they will not naturally be Quaker.

Second, Quakers are not going to 'own' the Quaker identified colleges. As more and more of the alumni of Quaker identified institutions are non-Quaker and live in a secular, professional world; their vested interest in the institution is its professional, academic, and athletic reputation. A religious or spiritual culture is not high on the list of vested interests for such institutional stake-holders. Donors are needed to keep these institutions economically alive, and the vast majority of donors are not Quaker. Donors are also significant stakeholders in the reputation of the Quaker College and their interest need not be intrinsically Quaker. Alumni and donors eventually drive much of College function and identity. This must be acknowledged.

Nevertheless, a college's culture is appreciated as a distinguishing mark and is part of its reputation. I believe for Quaker-identified colleges one of the principal, if not the principal, distinguishing mark is a Quaker ethos; that it is in the interest of a Quaker identified college to maintain this ethos as a distinguishing mark; and that this ethos will form the basis for a Quaker identified college continuing to have an interest in identification with the Society of Friends. A Quaker ethos forms an added value to the degree and can form a non-sectarian community spirit for alumni even though it has sectarian roots. It can be a tool for institutional promotion, or should I say branding, in a time when competition for students demands any effective tool for recruiting that is available. It is a recognizable Quaker ethos that will make the larger Quaker community proud of the Quaker identified colleges and want to claim them.

This however poses a problem. Without an adequate practicing core, how does a Quaker identified college sustain a distinguishing character that can honestly be recognized as a Quaker ethos? I believe that this ethos will be driven explicitly by the values that Quakers hold and for which we are known through our testimonies. It will be expressed by practices for which we have also become known. It should additionally be informed by the spiritual foundations from which these values are derived. It can be effectively promoted and made genuine by the involvement of FAHE because 1) as Quakers we understand the foundations of Quaker values and practices and 2) as academics we understand the academy.

The Prescription

I will now review some of these testimonies and practices that ought to be part of a Quaker ethos, and will address the ways that I believe Quaker values can be articulated and made comprehensible to an academic environment.

I will start with **Plain Speaking**, because it is integral to the academic enterprise, as well as public Quaker spirituality. More importantly, unless we exercise this testimony ourselves what comes after will not connect with our putative audience, the academy, and therefore will be fruitless. 'Saying what

you mean, and meaning what you say' is a basic part of what scholars do in trying to explain an insight that is the result of deep thought, research, or experience. It should be a natural connection between non-Quaker academics and Quaker culture. However, "plain speech" and "Quakerisms" are mostly 19th century relics. As such, they are not at all plain in the sense of universal comprehensibility - which was the original testimony. Acknowledgement of this linguistic evolution will mean that we must give up some of our favorite slogans. Consider "as way opens." To render this saying into modern usage for non-Quakers one must say something to the effect of : "as opportunity or circumstance is provided by divine agency." This version doesn't ring true, but it is plain, and it is not particularly subject to awkward misinterpretation. By the same token, we must call our academic brethren to account when they obscure their exposition in pursuit of eloquence, equivocate in the name of precision, or claim "I can't possibly explain this to you because you don't have my experience." We also should not forget that the testimony of plain-speaking derives from Jesus's admonition (in paraphrase): "let your yes be yes and your no be no, for equivocation has its roots in evil."

Academic honesty has been too much in the news of late: fabrication of data in the laboratory, failure (intentional or not) to recognize others' work, and massive cheating on entrance and course exams in prominent institutions. The academic community responds to these failings with outrage: **Honesty** is the foundation of its credibility. The Quaker testimony on honesty should thus be immediately recognizable by our non-Quaker brethren. One of my fondest memories of Guilford was when a professor passed out an exam and then walked out of the room. Contrast this with the honor code, "I have neither given nor received help on this exam," as a statement that one would be required to sign. The former is a clear testament to the expectation of honest work from knowledge honestly gained. The latter is a demand for a declaration that "while I could have been bad, I wasn't." The Quaker take on honesty is that we expect it. The basis for this view is the Quaker assumption that the soul of man yearns for nobility. It need not be second-guessed. When someone fails to be honest we are not so much outraged as wounded. Indeed John Donne's admonition, "Ask not for whom the Bell tolls, it tolls for thee" expresses the Quaker view of how dishonesty affects the academy and life in general.

Peace is the hallmark Quaker testimony in the public mind, and deservedly so. Quakers and Quaker Schools were in the forefront of establishing the legitimacy of conscientious objection to war. One of the ways that Quaker schools can and do promote peace as part of their Quaker ethos is to tell the stories from WWI and WWII about how they provided outlets for alternative service when it was a new idea. There are also stories of how students from Quaker Schools went to Europe to help bind up the wounds of war. These can be compared to the efforts of students on campus to do the same today by publicly objecting to warfare and studies showing how military expenditures are inflationary. There are also the evidences of student mediation in crisis and in community building in the environs of the college. Who will collect and tell these current

stories? What are the fora in which they can be told? I believe it is a proper function of FAHE to collect these stories and help organize events on campuses where they can be told.

To those of us who are Quaker, however, just telling stories seems pale because for us the peace testimony grows out of a deep appreciation for the holiness of the other person. Stated this way, the peace testimony seems rather hopelessly old fashioned; yet if not communicated to students and institutions, the Quaker ethos of peace becomes just more do-gooder-ism. One of the functions of FAHE should be to find ways to say that the other is holy, in a manner that can be, and will be, heard by modern students and modern academic institutions.

I am told by my colleagues on Quaker campuses that **simplicity** is the hardest of our testimonies to convey. Outwardly, it looks 'simple' enough - doing without. This is not naturally a high value at highly valued institutions. Frugality gives us the reputation of tight wads. Plain dress makes us look Amish. Yet the bedrock of the practices arising from the simplicity testimony is in choosing clothing, food, and amusements that are of good quality and long service. Why? Because items so chosen add measurably to an ennobled life, and sometimes to a spiritual life. Simplicity includes temperance as well, in the context of an ennobled life. Not only do we wish to avoid spending our treasure on wastrel goods, we want to avoid spending our lives on wastrel activities. Of course it does not hurt that this quality-based simple living is good, long-term economics. Our function as FAHE is to explain, in plain language, the importance of unadorned quality and unadorned living to those who educate at Quaker institutions and to their students. Most importantly, FAHE should help our Quaker schools understand that by living well within our means (there is a pun here - living well, within our means), *we have the ability to charitably serve others as God would have us*.

Faculty tend to like **Quaker Governance.** Reverence for the minority voice allows us to 'put our foot in it' when we don't like something. Younger faculty like that everybody has their own say independent of rank. It seems the ultimate in democratic, reason-driven governance. It has been described as an anti-political, consensus-based governance by a Jesuit priest. Quaker governance, however, has never been democratic in its traditional form. There have always been "Weighty Friends." The clerk has enormous power to guide and direct the conversation. The process is not really *consensual*.

Modern gurus of Quaker governance have delighted in promoting the practical benefits of having the whole body in one accord, of synergistic ideas and of having the lone voice in the wilderness pulling the group back from a precipitous or thoughtless decision. But, they frequently forget to point out that Quaker governance is a pursuit of a higher understanding of truth and proper action – not the lowest common denominator of our individual wills, nor a bland synthesis of proffered ideas. Now how do we explain to a group of academics, whose DNA is dispute, that they are gathered as a faculty to seek an almost metaphysical higher understanding and a more excellent course of action. I am told that the faculty at Whittier gave up this model, finding it just too bizarre.

It is too much to hope that a group of non-Quaker academics will admit that they are actively seeking to implement the insight of a higher being. It should however be possible to convince our colleagues that faculty governance is ultimately driven by the considered and humble pursuit of a goal higher than ourselves or our disciplines. I would suggest that goal should be what will best ennoble and best empower the student. But whatever the goal, the role of FAHE should be the explainer, the exemplar, and perhaps even the advocate of governance based on that in the academic environment which can truly be said to be higher than ourselves.

There are many more Quaker testimonies and practices to examine, but I want to address only one, **equality**. I think this testimony is the most problematic for the academy, which is constitutionally a meritocracy. The academy celebrates rank and prestige, which are acquired only by their pursuit. The term 'equality' also is problematic in the modern context. In the modern world it carries significant connotations from the civil rights movements of the last half-century which semantically include "equality of opportunity" and "equality of value." Both of these goals get muddied in application by how they are measured. I will not address that question because neither value is directly related to the Quaker testimony.

Historically, the testimony of equality had its origins in the rejection of "hat honor" to one's social betters, in the rejection of "pronoun honor" to one's superiors of class, and in the recognition that women and the untrained could speak on behalf of the Almighty. In each case these were manifestations of equality in how people are treated. The historic Quaker testimony on equality therefore has to do with way we treat people, not the standing we accord them, nor the recognition we give them. If FAHE is to properly represent the testimony of equality to our colleagues at Quaker schools, I propose the following test. Consider the student who is in your office yelling at you for keeping him out of Medical school because you did not assign one problem on one homework set its full credit. We must be able to convey to our colleagues that this student is wonderful in God's sight, if not in ours, and deserves to be treated so. Treatment may seem like a lower standard, but if it is based on the holiness of the other, then standing and recognition will be afterthoughts.

Is this effort worthwhile?

If FAHE can convey the foundations of Quaker testimony and practice, which is the same as conveying the depth of the tradition on which these schools were founded, then I believe FAHE will have justified its worth and its existence to its member institutions. If our Quaker colleges can infuse through practice these insights into the human condition and human relationships, I believe they will be a light unto all the academic world, they will be true to their foundations (even without any Quakers present), and we Quakers can be proud to claim them. I believe this is a worthwhile effort and a tribute to FAHE's founders.

* * * * * * * * * * *

Quaker Meetings and Quaker Colleges: What Should They Do for One Another?

Douglas C. Bennett
President Emeritus, Earlham College

When I first became a member of the Religious Society of Friends at Germantown Meeting in Philadelphia in the mid-1980s, I was surprised to discover that there were recurrent tensions between the meeting (which I had grown to love) and Germantown Friends School, the splendid k-12 day school it sponsored. Sponsored? Even finding the right word is a little tricky. Certainly the meeting appointed members of the School Committee (GFS's Board), and the school used property belonging to the meeting. Many members of the meeting worked at the school or were alumni or had sent their children to GFS, but that simultaneously soothed and aggravated the difficulties.

I soon grew familiar with the tensions. I encountered them again at Wilmington Meeting and Wilmington Friends School when I moved there; came to be more aware of the tensions between Haverford College (where I am an alumnus) and Philadelphia area Friends; encountered them again at 15th Street Meeting and Friends Seminary when I moved to New York City; and lived very much in the middle of the strained relationship between Earlham College and the two FUM Yearly Meetings (Indiana and Western) when I was President of Earlham.

The common threads in these various situations are mismatched mutual expectations. The Meetings expect the educational institutions under their care (again the language is tricky) to be more responsive to their concerns, and to do more for their members. The educational institutions, on the other hand, expect more support, especially more financial support, from the Meetings that sponsors (?!) them.

Another commonality is the lack of any statement of the appropriate expectations on either side of the relationship. Each assumes it knows what it has a right to expect of the other, and feels disappointed when this isn't forthcoming. The disappointments (and simmering anger) can endure for decades.

While the issues are similar for Quaker k-12 schools as for Quaker colleges, I want to focus here on the mutual obligations of Quaker meetings and Quaker colleges. Should Quaker meetings and their members feel an obligation to support Quaker colleges? And if so, what forms should that support take? And on the other hand, should Quaker colleges feel an obligation to support Quaker meetings (monthly and yearly) and their members? And if so, what forms should that support take?

I'll mostly try to excavate the tensions, but at the end I'll describe an effort between Earlham and Indiana Yearly Meeting to achieve some shared clarity through a Covenant.

What do I mean by a Quaker college? Eight U.S. Colleges officially acknowledge a religious affiliation with Friends: Barclay (KS), Earlham (IN), Friends (KS), George Fox (OR), Guilford (NC),

Malone (OH), William Penn (IA), and Wilmington (OH). Each grew out of a relationship with a Yearly Meeting, and most of these still have Board members appointed by the Yearly Meeting(s). Four other U.S. Colleges were founded by Friends and still (to some degree) think of themselves as Quaker colleges but have no formal religious affiliation and no connection to a Yearly Meeting: Bryn Mawr (PA), Haverford (PA), Swarthmore (PA) and Whittier (CA). All of these institutions are members of the Friends Association of Higher Education (FAHE).

The default (perhaps unthinking) perspective of Quaker meetings toward Quaker colleges is to think of the meetings as primary, and the colleges as subservient. "We created them; they should do what we ask them to do," or something along those lines. The meetings expect the colleges to be straightforward outreach efforts of the meetings.

The obverse default perspective of Quaker colleges toward Quaker meetings (also perhaps unthinking) is to consider themselves as independent organizations, in no way subservient, capable of steering themselves without interference, but at the same time expecting a greater level of material support than they receive. From this perspective, their founding by Quakers is a sufficient warrant to call themselves 'Quaker;' they need no help to think through what this entails.

It is easy to understand why Quaker meetings might easily fall into thinking of themselves as having primacy in the relationship. After all, the Religious Society of Friends is a gathering of religious communities; the meetings, monthly and yearly, are how we organize ourselves to worship together. It is easy to slide into thinking of Quakerism as a tree where the yearly meetings are the trunks, the monthly meetings the branches, and the array of schools, colleges, service organizations and retirement communities as fruits that hang from these branches. How can we not consider the meetings as primary? And what can Quaker colleges mean by calling themselves Quaker if they insist on complete independence, acknowledging no relationship to the worshipping communities of Quakers?

On the other hand, the Quaker schools, colleges, service organizations and retirement communities are much too large and too heavy to hang from the branches of a Quaker tree so conceived. As organizations, most monthly meetings have a staff of a few, and a budget under $100,000; most yearly meetings are only a bit larger as organizations. A Quaker college, on the other hand, will have hundreds of employees and a budget in the tens of millions of dollars. How can we look at them as delicate emanations budding from the worship life of Quaker meetings?

Each Quaker college (or other organization) may have started as a project of some monthly or yearly meeting, but the successful ones grew well beyond that beginning to have their own primary substance and identity. And let us note that many newcomers find their way to Quakerism by first encountering it via a school or college or service project.

So let us start with a fresh conception. Let us look at Quaker meetings and Quaker colleges as two kinds of Quaker organizations that stand in some relationship of mutual obligation, but **not** a relationship where one has primacy or dominance. What

might be the substance of these mutual obligations? Let us consider the possible mutual obligations under three headings: governance, mission, and support.

Governance. In most relationships between Quaker meetings and Quaker colleges, it is governance that is most often the focus of attention. The substance of being a Quaker college becomes primarily a matter of a yearly meeting appointing a certain percentage of members of the college's board of trustees. At its best, such a governance relationship can knit together a college and a yearly meeting. Over time, however, the college can come to feel that it cannot build the board of trustees it needs because the yearly meeting lacks sufficient talent or well-resourced individuals, or seeks to impose its own directions on the college.

Mission. A Quaker meeting provides a community for worship together; a Quaker college provides an education that has some grounding in the faith and practice of Friends. These are not identical missions. But what does "some grounding in the faith and practice of Friends" mean? Every Quaker college has found itself in some turmoil over this question; Quaker meetings can become overbearing participants in that discussion seeing the college as having a responsibility to enact its Quakerness in a manner expected by the meeting.[1]

Does this grounding mean explicitly teaching and expecting all students to learn Quaker beliefs? Does it mean that the college expects all students to attend Quaker worship services, or simply that it provides an opportunity for students to do so? Does it mean that the college employs some practices common among Friends, for example consensus governance, no use of titles, or regular employ of moments of silence? Or does it simply mean that the college pays deference to its founding by Friends? There is quite a wide spectrum of possibilities here, and the twelve Quaker colleges that have membership in FAHE show considerable variety in where they fall along that spectrum.

With respect to mission, the question of mutual obligation can especially arise over the use of the term "Quaker:" Quaker meetings may object to a college describing itself as Quaker when the college allows expression or activity that meeting members consider un-Quakerly. (Of course the embarrassment can run the other way.)

A different kind of mission issue arises over the question of whether a Quaker college should feel an obligation to provide privileged access (preferential admission? extra financial aid?) for Quaker students. How about Quaker faculty? In either case, how should such privileged access be granted? As an affirmative action category? Or as a component of excellence in making judgments about best candidates?

The obligations that Quaker colleges owe to Quaker meetings are generally *mission* issues. Quaker meetings expect Quaker colleges to be exemplars of Quaker beliefs or to be instruments of outreach. On the other hand, the obligations that Quaker meetings owe to Quaker colleges are generally ***support*** issues.

Support. Quaker colleges hope that yearly and monthly meetings will provide them with financial support, but the colleges have long since abandoned

[1] I have considered at greater length what it means today for a college to be Quaker in "The Idea of a Quaker College," a Convocation address I gave at Earlham in August 2000. http://dougbennettblog.files.wordpress.com/2011/09/idea-of-a-quaker-college1.pdf.

any expectation that such support will be at all significant. (From time to time I would be dismayed to hear an Earlham student surmise that the reason the college didn't take some hoped-for action was because the college worried we would lose financial support from Indiana or Western Yearly Meeting.)

In the absence of financial support, Quaker colleges hope and expect that yearly and monthly meetings will urge their young members to apply and enroll at the college.

Earlham's New Covenant with Indiana Yearly Meeting. After more than a century of friction between Earlham College and Indiana Yearly Meeting, the two made a dramatic change in the character of their relationship in the summer of 2010. The two came to a mutual agreement that Indiana Yearly Meeting would no longer appoint members of the Earlham Board of Trustees. In revising the college's Articles of Incorporation to make this change, Earlham obligated itself to continue to have a board of trustees more than half of whose members are Quaker.

Indiana Yearly Meeting arrived at this decision because many of its members had come to feel ill at ease about any governance relationship, and largely for mission-related reasons. Appointing trustees made them feel 'responsible' for the college, but the college had a conception of its mission with which they disagreed. Simply stated, the college was committed to allowing its students a high degree of autonomy in seeking the truth and a high degree of responsibility for their own conduct. Yearly meeting members wanted a more didactic and directive approach to education, one in which the college would tell students what to think and how to behave. Earlham came to this decision wanting to be able to draw Quaker trustees from across the geographical and theological spectrum of Friends.

The change in governance was accompanied by the signing of a Covenant in which each side made promises about what it would do for and on behalf of the other. (You can see a copy of the Covenant **here**.) With governance no longer an aspect of the relationship, the Covenant addresses both mission and support issues.

Earlham promises, for example, to actively seek Quaker students and faculty, to support research by and about Quakers and to maintain a Quaker archives, to continue preparing pastors for Quaker churches, and to be an exemplar in its organizational behavior of Friends testimonies. The promises from Indiana Yearly Meeting are more modest, but they include a commitment to provide tangible support for a Christian ministry presence at the college.

What is most noteworthy about the Covenant is that it gives both Earlham and Indiana Yearly Meeting an explicit statement of mutual obligations. In so doing, it also provides Earlham with a statement (something, surprisingly, it has never had before) of what it means for Earlham to be a Quaker college.

The Earlham-IYM Covenant took two years to write and approve, but these were two constructive years. It may be useful for each Quaker college to develop a similar statement of mutual obligations with whatever Quaker meeting(s) it is situated in a relationship of mutual accountability. Both Quaker meetings and Quaker colleges would be the better for it.

* * * * * * * * * *

Struggles for Renewal and the Inner Teacher

Stanford J. Searl, Jr.
Union Institute & University

This article combines the concepts of embodied knowledge with the Inner Teacher in order to promote ideas about educational renewal in Quaker teaching and learning. The argument is that there's potential for renewal in Quaker education if one makes connections among experience, metaphor and Quaker spiritual practices, all focused upon identifying and listening to one's Inner Teacher as a central core practice of Quaker education. This article investigates the potential for such renewal by an analysis of combining embodiment discourse and the Inner Teacher, presenting a model for an integrated, holistic life as teacher and learner.

Aspects of Embodiment

According to Anthony B. Pinn, the scholarly literature about embodiment draws upon Foucault and reflects a tension between the body as signifier or metaphor in contrast to the material body (Pinn, 8). In part, the question is this one: is the concept of the body in this approach to embodied knowing only, or even primarily, another form of inscribed discourse as Foucault would argue, or does it make a difference if one understands the "body" as a material body, in fact, carrying somewhat different meanings? Pinn sums up this particular contested aspect of embodiment and language as follows: *"The body occupies a social space whose texture and tone cannot be fully assessed only through the workings of spoken language, but we also must be sensitive to the physical placement, condition, and actions of real and specific bodies. Meaning is embodied ... Bodies serve as nonmaterial text to be read, but they are also material realities that shape information within the context of the world"* (Pimm, 9). These contested aspects of theory about the body play out in this approach to embodied knowledge. It's important to be clear about the both/and dimensions of the argument: this is a culturally inscribed body, informed by discourse analysis and its implications about power and authority. At the same time, this embodied knowing comes with an authentic material body as well.

Todres and Galvin present ways to think about embodiment and interpretation in their overview about innovative ways to present phenomenological research (Todres and Galvin, 573-575). In particular, I note this approach to embodiment and words that remain open to a body-based hermeneutics that explores *"... the vibrant tension and relationship between words and the bodily felt sense, and the way that both language and the body move together in meaningful ways. Therefore, in pursuing a more aesthetic phenomenology in practice, we arrive at the following principle: the aliveness of language and the empathic use of language to facilitate an experience of homecoming for others"* (Todres and Galvin, 573-574). It's intriguing to note how Todres and Galvin think about how

"... feeling is a form of understanding" (Todres and Galvin, 574). Drawing upon the work of both Gadamer and Gendlin, these critics make the following overall argument about interpretation, epistemology and the body: *"Embodied interpretation is a body-based hermeneutics in which qualitative meanings are pursued by a back-and-forth movement between words and their felt complexity in the living body. This movement between the whole of the felt complexity at any moment (that is `in the more') and the part that `comes to language' is a practice that keeps open the creative tension between words and the aliveness of what the words are about"* (Todres and Galvin, 575).

These ideas about the interplay between words and experience as developed by Gendlin (filtered here through Todres) have special relevance to the study of Quaker silence. That back and forth movement between words and the "*whole of the felt complexity of any moment*" provides ways to interpret the Quaker worship silence and its meanings. These ideas about Gendlin's "*body-based hermeneutics*" allows the interpreter to move beyond the words themselves only and then to pay attention to the back and forth meanings between the experiencing body and the potential for additional words, especially when those words originate from the experience of the silence through metaphor. In particular, I would link Gendlin's ideas about the embodied experiencing of the "*more*" of the felt sense with Heales and Cook and their drawing out of what it can mean to use words in creatively infused ways that originate in the deep worship silence. Later in this article, I wish to apply these embodiment ideas to the search for one's Inner Teacher, an application to explore what it means to engage in Quaker education from an embodied perspective.

In their work on behalf of British Friends through a traveling ministry, Heales and Cook (especially through the 1992 published version of their Swarthmore Lecture, *Images and Silence*) have expressed the paradoxical connections as between a deep worship silence and the potential to create new images (or what I refer to as metaphors). Their 1992 Swarthmore lecture challenges Friends in Britain to come home to the silence of God and they draw illustrations from Julian of Norwich and Meister Eckhart, among others. They argued that in too many instances, British Friends had strayed from the path of an alignment to the silence of God and that Quaker worship had become variations upon Meetings for Counseling, Meetings for Discussion and Current Events (Heales and Cook, 10-20).

Here's how they express their fervent longing for a more centered, God-informed Quaker silent worship that goes to the center of the experience of silence: "*Friends, then, would offer, as the monastic orders do, havens of silence - but out in the world, as meetings as individuals. At the heart of this would be the renewed Meeting for Worship, where the ministry of silence and the ministry of images come together. It truly is the experience of the Religious Society of Friends that the deep silence of God is the womb of all true images. Traditional images, including treasured Quaker images, need to be taken into the absolute silence and surrendered to be tested for validity; here old images are reinfused with power and new images are forged*" (Heales and Cook, 115-116). These havens of silence uncover one of the

primary themes in the Quaker worship silence: there's the potential for embedded experiences of the Divine, particularly through the lens of silent waiting beyond the words. Furthermore, it is possible that such deep experiences of silence allow participants knowledge of experiential realities that generate renewed and transformed words as well.

Through this lens of embodiment, there are consequences about and connections with what it means to find the Inner Teacher and Guide in the work of teaching and learning. Embodied knowing emphasizes a number of relevant dimensions about this Inner Teacher. For one thing, the emphasis remains upon one's experience, here the offering of a conceptual framework that presents the possibility to draw from one's feelings, emotions, a sense of the heart and the carrying over of the felt sense in the body, as well as the head and its cognitive parts. As a Quaker educator, I hunger for an educational model that integrates the pieces and promotes a holistic and relational knowing, putting together head and heart and soul in one's learning and teaching.

Additionally, this embodiment framework clarifies the Quaker educational foundations by emphasizing the inward dimensions of teaching and learning, precisely as Paul A. Lacey states in his pamphlet, *Education and the Inward Teacher*:

"*When it is faithful to its foundations, Quaker education is neither student-centered, nor discipline-centered; it is inward-centered. Quaker education operates from the conviction that there is always one other in the classroom -- the Inward Teacher, who waits to be found in every human being. If we appear to be student-centered, it is because we know that the student has an inner guide to whom he or she can be led. If we appear to be content-centered, it is because we know that another name for the Inward Teacher is the Spirit of Truth"* (Lacey, p. 26).

When one combines the embodiment perspective with Lacey's argument about the foundational aspect of the Quaker Inner Teacher, then there is the potential for significant renewal within the world of Quaker educators and beyond. In the remainder of this article, I wish to analyze the areas of what I am calling a potential for a renewed vitality in Quaker education if guided and shaped by the Inward Teacher, particularly as connected to these ideas about the relevance of embodied knowledge and its consequences.

This is about a reclaiming of the foundations of Quaker education, attending to multiple dimensions including paying attention to communal discernment in a receptive silence, making sure that this reflects a group process, trusting in aspects of an embodied creation of knowledge and allowing for prayerful consideration of metaphor and its meanings. Of course, all of this needs some unpacking.

Receptive silence and communal discernment

Quakers have hundreds of years of experience in silent worship and can draw upon this tradition and apply some of its meanings to becoming open to and guided by the Inner Teacher. Quaker education should pay attention to one of its primary sources of knowing and being, namely the experience of receptive openness in the group silence. There's a paradox here about the process of going inward: the paradox consists of the fact that an inward, receptive listening -- constructed with others --

leads to sources that are not necessarily about the ego and its discontents. Of course, it happens that it's precisely here when the group needs to practice discernment and clearness. How can one's own inner truth become connected with and informed by a larger purpose, a source of knowing and being led by an Inner Guide or what Quakers would call the Inner Light?

The group discernment process remains crucial here as related to being open to one's Inner Teacher. One key to this group discernment process in the silence is to come together in an intentional, prayerful and receptive listening, praying to become faithful listeners to one's Divine Spirit, the Inner Light, the Inner Teacher. This represents a process analogous to what can occur in a Quaker worship period; however, in this instance, it is a more educationally focused time together as a group, in an open, receptive and deep listening to the potential to learn and experience the Inner Teacher. In a sense, there's a communal, spiritual discipline at work that it might be helpful to both name and acknowledge.

In fact, as Paul A. Lacey recommends, this kind of spiritually informed, prayerful process is one of what Lacey has identified as six steps to gain access to the Inner Teacher. In a section about *"Welcoming the Inner Teacher,"* Lacey's first step addresses what he considers the necessary preparation to make oneself available to this Inner Teacher. The first step reflects a prayerful openness to the possibility of being in the presence of a power, energy and meaning greater than oneself. Here is a summary of some of the issues and this process from Lacey's perspective: *"As we get older, the greedy self becomes more sophisticated in how it makes its demands, so the practice of discernment must also become more sophisticated. The meeting for worship and meeting for business can become powerful supports to the testing of inner impulse; in a school or college where the sense of community is especially strong, older students might be encouraged to use committees of clearness when they are trying to understand what they are led to do"* (Lacey, Education and the Inward Teacher, 27-28).

The recommendation about the practices of a clearness committee strike me as particularly significant here. As Parker Palmer has suggested elsewhere, the Quaker clearness committee process can be used as a powerful group discernment tool for clarifying problems and challenges for individual teachers. See Palmer's *The Courage to Teach*, pp. 152-156, where he presents ideas about using the clearness process as a way to discern, in a small group, some underlying clarity and direction for faculty. This clearness process has much to recommend it, especially as an approach to a communally based discernment process about becoming open to and listening for the Inner Teacher and Guide. This clearness process creates a group container, a spiritual holding tank, if you will, into which a small group can practice a spiritual discipline of engaging together what it might mean to search for the Inner Guide and Teacher. It is a group discernment process; there is a reliance upon prayer and contemplative attention; it is a form of listening together for the movement of the Spirit and a process of deep, concentrated listening in this communal spiritual container, construct-ing meaning together, here focused upon

being in touch with whatever one means by the Inner Teacher and Guide.

These ideas about clearness committees as a way to explore together in small groups a welcoming of the Inner Teacher has great potential and connects to Lacey's second recommended step about inviting the presence of the Inward Teacher. *"... we can invite the Inward Teacher by providing occasions which seem most propitious. Some of these ought to be established parts of the school schedule, such as regular weekly community meeting for worship and daily worship in smaller groups"* (p. 28). Further, Lacey suggests: "*Students should be given at least some modest suggestions about how to center down, ways to use the silence, themes or readings which might help them feel at ease in the quiet waiting. All this must be done with a light touch so as to help students, especially younger ones, feel at home in silence. The silence itself must not be made sacred or so solemn that people are afraid to break it or find that it is a medium for nothing but gloomy thoughts and feelings. We do not worship silence; we find that stillness and silence are ways to worship ... True speech comes out of silence, true silence comes out of speech, Dietrich Bonhoeffer tells us. So sometimes words -- read, spoken, sung -- may be used to lead us into silence; and out of that silence other words or music may emerge"* (Lacey, pp. 28-29). So, access to the Inner Teacher means a version of centering down, entering into the group silence and becoming open to the potential for this spiritually informed, inner listening to the Spirit, constructed together, as a practice of inner attention and prayer in community.

Lacey's third and fourth steps to welcome the Inner Teacher are similar and are variations on the theme of possessing examples. Lacey urges that Quaker educators and curricula be surrounded with real-life, present-day illustrations of encounters with the Inward Teacher. *"We can deliberately fill the curriculum with works and activities which reveal its presence in their fabric. The Inward Teacher is not found only through the arts and literature or in small discussion classes. We cannot find inwardness by gazing inward all the time. The Light is not* given to us to stare at but so we may see everything through its power" (Lacey, 29). The fourth step is similar as Lacey argues the following: "*We encourage our students to listen for the Inward Teacher by showing them living examples of people who do" (Lacey, 31)* and he adds, *"The good teacher knows where the source of any goodness is and how far short he or she falls in attaining goodness. The outward teacher is most effective when he or she is, in Kierkegaard's words, `a witness, never a teacher'"* (Lacey, 31-32).

These are important dimensions of invitations to go to the Inward Teacher, in the sense that the illustrations and people embody the ideas, both in actual people and through compelling, multiple illustrations as well. The earlier perspective about embodied knowledge becomes relevant here: so, the living, breathing curriculum about finding the Inner Teacher becomes most relevant when it is enacted through the presence of living, breathing people and illustrations. It is the holistic, integrated embodiment that matters here, one in which -- for all of the flaws and vulnerabilities -- such teachers demonstrate what it can mean, again together and in a communal container, to have access to such inner guides and the

Inner Light and Inner Teacher. In books and pamphlets, then, we can see such illustrations, ironically enough, in teachers and scholars such as Paul A. Lacey himself and through people who he cites, including such a Quaker as John Yungblut as well as the mystic Meister Eckhart.

The fifth step to gaining access to the Inner Teacher reinforces and extends the earlier ones: *"... we can search for the methods and disciplines which best open us to the inner voice. Some of these may be startling. Denise Levertov reminds us that waiting for the muse or musing means standing with your mouth open. Donald Hall says he is often most in touch with the vatic voice in times of laziness, when he daydreams and naps a lot. Hall is joined by many others when he speaks of needing to write every day"* (Lacey, 32). This step implies that listeners might employ a full range of arts-based research approaches to keeping one's heart and soul and mind open and receptive to the infusion of the Spirit, of the contemplative mode.

Finally, in what he calls Step six, Lacey urges us to balance the inward and the outward life. However, I find his concluding remarks to be touching and profound. *"All we need to know about living the centered spiritual life we can learn by turning within ourselves, where Christ the Inward Teacher waits to instruct us; right worship is waiting in silence, to be taught what to do; true religion is to visit the fatherless, the widows and strangers, and to keep unspotted from the world; it brings unity and the fruits of the spirit, love, joy, peace, patience"* (Lacey, 36). As the inspired prose implies, it's a matter of living life in the fullest, most integrated and embodied sense, open to the inflowing grace of the Divine.

It is this struggle for renewal within the context of embodied knowing in our search together for the Inner Teacher that makes a difference here. Potentially, this means that Quaker educators explore multiple ways to construct a curriculum that infuses communal spiritual practices into the center of teaching and learning. And this center originates in the working realities of embodiment, the listening spirituality of the body in action, turning over the influence to one's Inner Teacher, open to the stirrings through us in the silence.

Relevance to Non-Quaker Education

In addition to the Quaker origins about embodiment and the Inner Teacher, there are wider implications for such educational approaches as well, including applications about the teacher as embodied listener as well as the potential uses of the Quaker clearness committee process in a more secular context.

In the process of awareness about what it might mean to discover one's Inner Teacher or Guide, it might be useful for non-Quaker teachers as well as students to reflect upon the centrality of centered listening as a potential strategy to deepen one's roles as learner and teacher. It may be only a shift in emphasis after all; but, if the teacher explores the role of becoming a more thoughtful listener, one who is open to inner guidance (whatever this might mean), then the role may shift a little, moving to a somewhat more integrated one, connecting head with the heart, for example. In her reflection from a Fetzer Institute retreat, where participants explored the ideas of Parker Palmer about the "courage to teach," Mary Frances Gibbons offered the following:

"*Question: What is the longest 18 inches in the world*?

Answer:The distance from our heads to our hearts (or the distance from Neiman-Marcus to meditation)" (Gibbons, p. 39). In her commentary, Gibbons writes: *"Fortunately, I have found truth in the maxim that when the student is ready to learn, the teacher will appear. I found myself ready for my lesson from Palmer's message to `teach who you are -- your authentic self'"* (Gibbons, p. 39). In another context entirely, citing other studies as well as their own, Marcia Gentry and colleagues identified teacher's "passions" and related enthusiasms as one of the key indicators of teacher effectiveness, in the 4th of four themes in their small sample: "*Theme 4: These teachers have a clear passion for their students, teaching, and for their content"* (Gentry and all, p. 120). This is a way to acknowledge the significance of the integrated role, one that brings the heart and its commitments into the mix of being a highly effective teacher and learner.

Finally, the uses of the Quaker clearness committee process could have much wider applications than in the traditional Quaker version. For example, in an article in *Educational Leadership*, David Hagstrom applies the clearness committee process to concerns and challenges in the work lives of teachers at Lewis & Clark College in Oregon. Hagstron described the practice of this clearness process at his College and offered concluding reflections about its effectiveness and relevance as follows: *"This experience taught us to abandon the pretense that we know what is best for others. We learned that we must help others find their own answers. We do not need advice about our problems. What we need are good, honest, and direct questions that cause us to think about our situations differently"* (Hagstrom, 57).

Hagstrom argued that this application of the Quaker clearness process to problems and challenges at his college demonstrated the power of the Inner Teacher (Hagstrom, 54). The clearness provided ways to listen deeply, with respect and allow for a meditative pace, guided and informed by silence to assist the participants. As it happens, the clearness process brings together the two major thematic clusters of this article, namely embodied knowing and the Inner Teacher. In the clearness process, there is an emphasis upon becoming more centered, of allowing one's attention to be fully present, to be embodied in a sense. At the same time, there is a concomitant emphasis in the clearness process to listen deeply, a recommendation that participants become open, listening to the other person and his or her issue with one's entire and embodied heart and mind. Here, in fact, then, within the clearness process, there is a group or communal dimension of this embodied openness to one's Inner Teacher and its meanings.

Works Cited

Gentry, Marcia, Saiying Steenbergen-Hu and Byung-yeon Choi, "Student-Identified Exemplary Teachers: Insights from Talented Teachers," *Gifted Child Quarterly*. 55 (2), 111-125, February, 2011.

Gibbons, Mary Frances, "From Neiman-Marcus to Meditation." *To Teach with Soft Eyes: Reflections on a Teacher/Leader Formation Experience*, Rica Garcia, Editor, ERIC, ED 439-748, 2000.

Hagstrom, David. "Seeking Clarity About Crisis," *Educational Leader-*

ship. 56 (4), 53-57, December, 1998 and January, 1999.

Heales, Brinda Clifft and Cook, Chris. *Images and Silence: The Future of Quaker Ministry*. London: Quaker Home Service, 1992.

Lacey, Paul A. *Education and the Inward Teacher*. Pendle Hill Pamphlet 278. Wallingford, PA: Pendle Hill Publication, 1988.

Palmer, Parker J. *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998.

Pinn, Anthony B. *Embodiment and the New Shape of Black Theological Thought*. New York and London: New York University Press, 2010.

Todres, Les and Galvin, Kathleen T. "Embodied Interpretation: a novel way of evocatively re-presenting meanings in phenomenological research," *Qualitative Research*, volume 8(5), 568-583, 2008.

* * * * * * * * * *

The Spirit of Truth Among Friends

Jeffrey Dudiak
The King's University

I Introduction

After the popular perception, one of the most conspicuous casualties of the rather amorphous critical energies that we gather under the name of "postmodernism" is "truth." The supreme confidence, a dream four-hundred years in the making, whose crescendo was reached roughly a century ago (the first major blow coming in the events of 1912-14), that reason and science could and would deliver universal truths, and that these could and would be translatable more or less straightforwardly into social, technological, and personal progress (toward the ends of peace, prosperity, and happiness), has proven rather more complicated than we had imagined - at the level of both theory and practice, and at the level of their relationship to each other. This "modernist" dream is still alive; it's still our dream - just read the literature in which the universities try to sell themselves to potential donors. We've invested a lot in this dream, perhaps even our very souls, and are loathe (in fact, scared out of our skin[2]) to give it up (if, mirabile dictu, we could even begin to imagine how). On my view, "the postmodern" is nothing more than the increasing level of doubt that this dream will come true, the growing suspicion that, despite its spectacular production of truths, the dream itself has been a lie, evinced perhaps by the almost reflexive incredulity with which we greet anyone claiming to possess the Truth (even though, on a certain level, this is what we still all long for). Parochial, regional, interested "truths" - okay. But not the Truth. Yet, as Karl Jaspers observed already over a half century ago (noting that universality and internal coherence are built into the very notion of truth) : "If there are truths, then there is no Truth." It is truth in this comprehensive sense that, whether for good or for ill, seems to have lost its luster for us, when it has not simply been lost to us altogether.

As a life-long Quaker, one raised among evangelical Friends, but having worshipped with unprogrammed, universalist Friends for most of my adult life (feeling at turns equally at home and equally alienated in each of these settings), and now representing the liberal Canadian Yearly Meeting to the orthodox Friends United Meeting, I find myself caught up, existentially, in what I am beginning to understand as a struggle over truth, not only a struggle over "what is true," but - more profoundly - a struggle over "what truth itself is." My thesis (tentative at this point; it should still be in the form of an interrogative) is that the struggles over truth among Friends fall out along lines that follow the contours of the modern era, which is not surprising given that it was in this era that Quakerism took form and developed. I want to try to understand some of the tensions among Friends today as a byproduct of this adherence to

[2] Since it has become itself a kind of second skin for us.

a modernist conceptuality. And further, I want to suggest that the cracks in the modernist edifice to which the postmodern sensibility is the attunement might well be precisely the opportunity that contemporary Friends have to re-conceive of truth along lines that are less beholden to a withering modernity, and more faithful to our future. If a century ago Rufus Jones, John Wilhelm Rowntree, and company took it upon themselves to "modernize" Quakerism, perhaps our call today is to "postmodernize it," to find a Friendly, faithful way forth in and for our times.

II Modernity and the fracturing of truth

Certainly, a broad, comprehensive cultural phenomenon like modernism lends itself to any number of characterizations, each potentially valid within its own sphere of discourse, but if the focus is truth, it is hard to avoid characterizing modernism other than along the lines of the relationship between the knowing subject and the known object, the central problematic of modernist epistemology, and which has enshrined the correspondence theory of truth (where truth is the correspondence between some proposition and some ontological state of affairs) as the paradigmatic way to think truth. This subject-object split is indeed pretty standard fare among commentaries on modernism, but I will draw here briefly on two articulations that I find particularly illuminating. Charles Taylor in his most recent tome, *The Secular Age*, refers to the modern subject as a "buffered" self: buffered because (over against the medieval version of the self with which it is a decisive break) no longer caught up in the meshes of spiritual forces beyond its control, but a subject operating in a disenchanted world (i.e., one mechanically governed by natural laws), and thus capable of withdrawing into a rational, self-transparent nuclearity, a subject that has itself to itself, a self "buffered" from external influences and thus the master of its own interiority. This mastery does not end with itself, however, but extends to a mastery over the world from which it has extracted itself and that it now takes up as its object, not as that in which it is implicated, but that which it places over against itself, in what the Germans refer to as a *gegenstand* ("standing over against") relationship. The subjectivity of the subject (where subjectivity is no longer thought of as being "subject to," but the "subject of") and the objectivity of the world are natural correlates of one another in modern thought. Martin Heidegger, noting precisely this, can then with startling perspicacity describe modernity as "The Age of the World Picture:" the world is that which is out there, in front of me, that upon which I as a rational subject have, literally, a perspective. As moderns we intuitively try to understand ourselves by distinguishing our picture of the world from, say, the ancient or medieval pictures of the world, but Heidegger suggests that to do so is already a modern prejudice. It is not that there is a distinctive modern picture of the world; rather, to see the world as one sees a picture is itself the modern distinctive.

Thus, what we call the Enlightenment, the recourse to the light of reason over against the darkness of myth, tradition, prejudice and authority from which modernism sees itself as the emancipation, is thus both the product of and the inspiration for a burgeoning natural science: the production of truths

about the external world available to the "buffered" observer. The "facts" produced by science, dazzling in their scope, in their at least apparent verifiability, and above all in the power - predictive and technological - that they provide, thus become for Enlightenment thinkers the very standard for truth, even truth per se, the age-old philosophical distinction between truth and opinion now given a new footing, the former associated with the objective, and the latter with what is merely subjective. On the Enlightenment doctrine my feelings about things, my prejudices, my personal perspective, is not only discounted in matters of truth, but is precisely what must be eliminated, as is illustrated most graphically in the scientific method.

The reaction against this impersonal order and its hegemonic claims to truth comes in the form of what we today, retrospectively, refer to as Romanticism. What is of especial note here is that Romanticism is not so much an objection to modernism (even if it was sometimes perceived to be so) as it is the opening of a trajectory within the modernist framework itself, albeit the one suppressed by the admittedly largely predominant Enlightenment trajectory. Romanticism accepts the modernist subject-object dichotomy, the sequestering of feeling and personality to the subjective side and the confinement of facts to the objective side - but over against what it perceives to be the aridity of, and diminution of personal meanings in, the Enlightenment, Romanticism emerges as the flip side of the modernist coin. If we take as the Enlightenment motto Kant's charge in "*Was ist Aufklärung*," *sapare aude*, or "dare to know," the Romantic correlate might be "dare to feel." It is not so much that the loose assemblage of thinkers and aesthetes and enthusiasts that we retrospectively collect under the moniker "Romantic" rejected the Enlightenment confidence in the objective truths of reason and science, rather they strove to carve out an independent, often correlative regime of truth whose center of gravity was the subjective, on at least equal footing with objective truth, and often, when it comes to deep matters of truth, to be preferred. Against the dry, stand-offishness of modernist dissecting analysis, the Romantics "sensed" that only intuitive and immediate contact with, immersion and participation in, the larger and living, organic whole could put us in touch with a truth not merely about matter, but a truth that matters.

Now, it is important to recognize that the categories I am describing here are "ideal types"; few if any real, flesh and blood thinkers completely dismissed the concerns and assertions coming from the "other side," although the place for such was diminished as the "ideal" was approached at either pole, and, because of the nature of dichotomy, thinkers at least "tended" in one direction or the other, as the enduring distinction between, and relative isolation of, the natural sciences and humanities testifies. Though historically a reaction to Enlightenment, I am suggesting that philosophically we view Romanticism as contemporaneous with it, as a trajectory latently embedded in the very framework of modern conceptuality, as an emphasis on the subjective side of the subject-object relation of which the Enlightenment is the emphasis on the objective.

I am suggesting, that is, that we think of Enlightenment and Romanticism not as differing fields (as our dividing up of the academic disciplines suggests,

despite the increasingly dubious pretensions of the uni-versity), but as different trajectories traversing a shared field, oriented in complex patterns around poles of subject and object, explaining perhaps both the perpetual antagonisms between, and seeming ineradicability of, the "opposing" trajectories.

III Tears in the Quaker Body

If this framework is the conceptual background (or at least an important aspect of it) against which the problematics and struggles of modernism are constituted and played out, we should not be surprised if religion in the modern age takes the shape that it does against this same horizon. Of course, religion is no more the product of modernism than is science, or art, or truth itself - but in each case these "something mores" take on the shape that they do in terms of the ideas available at the time.[3] Thus, one possible way of characterizing the differences in religious sensibility that have developed in recent centuries in the Occident and that continue to divide us, is over the question of whether religious truths should be taken to be of the objective, or the subjective, kind: dividing those who take religious truths as objective from those who take religious truths as subjective. Indeed, it is the modernist subject-object dichotomy (always among other factors) that provides the conceptual space for the possibility of positing two kinds of truth, answering to as it invites and consolidates two (now purportedly) dichotomous religious sensibilities. Again, as following from the subject-object dichotomy, these too are "ideal types," seldom if ever purely realized,[4] but they do name identifiable inclinations, and thus something real, even if not absolute.

Now, for those who have been exposed to a broad range of contemporary Quaker religious expression and practice, I suspect that - infinite details, particularities and complications notwithstanding - a certain resonance with this characterization will begin to emerge. That the death of Descartes, generally taken as the father of modern philosophy, and the inception of George Fox's ministry are contemporaneous events is purely coincidental, but not without consequence. While irreducible to modernism, early Quakerism took form within a burgeoning modernity, and has been progressively articulated as modernity has become increasingly entrenched and presupposed. So we should not be surprised to discover that it too finds articulation in the terms available to it.[5] The tendencies of those who self-identify as orthodox or evangelical Friends and those who self-identify as liberal Friends map fairly straightforwardly onto this schema, the orthodox taking religious truths as

[3] The depth of this entrenchment is illustrated by the way in which even the critics of modernism frame their protests in categories that are only possible within it - the most vivid example being creation science.

[4] No liberal really thinks that what one believes in religious matters is a matter of complete indifference (indicated by a consistent hostility towards "fundamentalism"), and no orthodox believer ever asserts that his/her commitment to and involvement in the truth isn't in some sense essential to it.

[5] This does not mean that it was not or is not counter-cultural, but rather that it could only be so through such [an albeit negative] participation.

objective and the liberals taking religious truths as subjective. Note here that I am not identifying the related but independent theological issue of whether our access to truths comes to us by means of inner or external illumination, by means of the Christ within or the scriptures without. Truths that arrive by means of inner illumination can be just as objective as those coming from external sources, and externality is no guarantee of objectivity. (This is one of the reasons why contemporary Liberal Quakers are not really the spiritual descendants of Elias Hicks, at least not without significant qualification and modification.) The question of the mode of delivery of truth, though a crucial one, is independent of the question of the nature of the truths themselves, and it is the latter which is my focus here.

I confess to painting this picture with a broad brush. Sweeping generalities of this kind are difficult to identify, precisely because in all concrete cases particular influences are interwoven with any number of others, so I'll allow myself here the crutch of an illustration in an attempt to clarify what I have in mind. I pick up for analysis a phrase which has become a part of the Quaker canon on both sides, Fox's revelation/realization - after many previous disappointed attempts to find religious orientation - that: "there is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition."

From the liberal side the meaning here is clear: only that which speaks to my condition is true, and I have heard liberal Friends evoke this phrase to reject as authoritative The Richmond Declaration, the Bible, even the same Christ Jesus that spoke to Fox's condition, because these did not speak to their condition. Here we have a case where religious truths earn their status as truths across their capacity to appeal to subjects, and are therefore taken as true only for those to whom they do. The truth, religiously speaking (and so here meaning something like meaning-fulness), is indexed to the subject. This does not make the truth merely "subjective" in the sense of "indifferent," as it is not a matter of picking willy-nilly among all possible truths whatever one wants, because the truth does have to speak to me (and so I am passive here more than active), but I remain after a fashion the standard for truth as any potential truth must meet my condition to be considered true, at least for me. And a truth that speaks to no one would, on this heading, simply not be true.

But another interpretation is available. On this "orthodox" reading, that it is Jesus Christ who speaks to Fox's condition is not idiosyncratic to Fox (that is, that it was Jesus Christ who spoke to Fox's condition made it true for him, but not for me if Jesus Christ doesn't speak to mine), but essential and universal, and this because the truth claimed here is, for orthodox Friends (and I suspect for Fox himself and for almost all Friends up until the last half century or so[6]), of the objective kind. For orthodox Friends, generally at least, a religious claim is not true because it speaks to my condition, it speaks to my condition because it is true. And if it does not speak to me the fault is not with the truth, the fault is with me (or better, since it is speaking to me, as the light that enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world, I am not properly listening). In the experience of the

[6] A claim that even if true does not, of course, in itself recommend this reading as right.

orthodox, and, as I understand it, most earlier Friends, "quaking" was not a sign of ecstasy, the confirmation and exaltation of the self, but agony, a sign that the self had to be convinced (i.e., convicted), changed by something outside of itself that called it not to self-expression, but to transformation.

What I am trying to suggest here is that this disagreement among Friends is a reflection of broader cultural/ intellectual orientations, and as such is not merely a difference over what is true (and so theological), but, more profoundly, and thus more intractably, a difference over the very nature of religious truth (and so to some degree philosophical as well). That the different branches of Quakerism can be thought as exploiting different trajectories within a shared conceptual field, as the development of different potential conceptions of truth each latent[7] in a basically shared horizon, may already be significant. Are we really arguing over the truth of Quakerism, or over diverse but interdependent conceptions of truth in which we have, variously, articulated this truth? And if each side in the struggle is advocating one conception of religious truth over against its polar correlate, and where this difference is opened up by the tacit adoption on both sides of a modernist conceptuality, then (and ironically) both sides may be inadvertently collaborating in reinforcing the modernist framework precisely across this internecine struggle - when it is perhaps (or at least in part) this framework itself that is constitutive of the disagreements.

The more radical approach might be to call into question the very framework of modernism in terms of which our current tensions are framed. My strategy here has been to encourage us to question, to begin to "see through" the "modernist" conceptual schemes "through which" we generally, and unquestioningly, "see." Might "postmodernism" be precisely the opportunity to break out of the old either/or debates around religious truth bequeathed to us by modernist conceptuality, creating a space in which something fresh, something less beholden to our crumbling modernity, is able to be imagined?[8]

IV The Spirit of Truth Among Friends

My sense is that a deeper understanding of truth, one that transcends even as it encompasses the more limited forms of subjective and objective truths, is already operative both within Quaker experience, as in life more broadly understood. That is, when Quakers speak of publishing the truth, when we pose and respond to the query of how truth is prospering among us, in the frequent linking of the ideas of truth and testimony, we are giving expression to a sense of truth that is "richer" than the epistemological one that presides in the concern over objective truth, and that is "thicker" than the existential sense that prevails in the emphasis on subjective truth. It is the task of philosophy, as I understand it, not to invent this "new" sense of truth, but to trace and describe it across a critical retrieval that captures its potential for renewal going forth in our situation. In this context, I suggest that, over against the epistemological and existential meanings on offer within modernism, we

[7] And thus perhaps structurally if not historically "necessary."

[8] Is this what "convergent Friends" are about in a non-intellectually qualified way?

attempt to think this deeper sense of truth as "spiritual."

By "spiritual truth" I do not mean here anything metaphysical, at least not in the first instance, that is, any reference to some supernatural realm that operates independently of the natural one. Spirit, the Hebrew *ruach*, *pneuma* in Greek, signifies rather the very "breath" of life, that which brings life to nature, and nature to life. Spirit in this sense (distinct from without contradicting the theological sense of the personified Holy Spirit) is "no thing," is "nothing" in itself, but is the breath, the wind, that blows in, and across, and through everything that lives, no thing, but that which, literally, "animates" every living thing (*animus* being Latin for "spirit"), this animating itself, or again, and again quite literally, the "inspiration" of life. Connected to life, to liveliness, to quickening, spirit needs be understood not in the realm of things, but in the realm of energies, of dynamics: spirit suggests the dynamic of life, and life as dynamic, which is simply to say life as alive. "Spiritual truth" thus has principally to do, neither with facts, nor with what is personally meaningful, but with being caught up in life, to be faithful to it, to be filled with life, abundantly, to the point of cups running over, as the gospel promises. To be in the Spirit means to live truly, and to be truly alive, to be taken up into God who, as the gospel avers, is Spirit, and Life.

Allow me to give some brief indication of how we might think this notion of spiritual truth across the discussion I have been undertaking here, and do so by elaborating upon a dialectic suggested to us by Paul in Philippians 2, in which Paul charges the *koinonia* at Philippi (he is writing to a church, not to individuals) to "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God who works in you both to will and to do for His good pleasure." Here the subjective task of working out one's own salvation in community is referred, in the next breath, maybe in the same breath,[9] to God who is already at work, calling this activity forth, and so in a sense preceding the work of the subjects, but where this "objective truth" in no sense obviates the full responsibility of subjects to work out the meaning of this for themselves, to give this truth the shape that it will have. The "objective truth" of this process, God's working in you, thus both precedes and follows upon the work of the subjects. To work out one's own salvation is to give meaning and form and shape to the God who has already called us forth into this project of giving form and shape to God, who has already called us to imagine God, to image God. That that which initiates the process (the work of God) only takes on the shape that it will have for us at the end of the process (when we have worked out our own salvation) means that the relationship between subjective and objective truths is not a linear one running in one direction or the other, but a circular, or spiraling one. It is in the circulation between this call that solicits a response and the response that gives shape to the call that the dynamic, living process that I am referring to as the spiritual takes shape.[10] To be "in the

[9] Perhaps as inhalation is to exhalation.

[10] Here subjective (existential) truths and objective (epistemological) truths are potentially understood not as isolated realms or regimes of truth but as "moments" of another, deeper (spiritual) sense of truth that takes on the articulation it does here, as the circulation between the subjective and objective poles, because we are moderns, and the spirit that animates our truths will always be the spirit of *our* truths. My

truth" is to be taken up into this process in a way that enhances, deepens, and broadens the Life that spirit names. To be in the truth means to constitute an image of God that permits of an increasingly faithful response. To live truly is to take up a role in constituting a truth that speaks to our condition, and so one into which we have already been implicated. Liberal Friends are stronger on the first moment of this dialectic, orthodox Friends stronger on the second. If we are to enter more faithfully into the Spirit, and more fully into the Truth, perhaps we need each other.

The prospects for a rapprochement between liberal and orthodox Friends are perhaps enhanced to the degree that we can speak and think through and beyond the conceptual limitations that have, most often tacitly, framed current debates. That, at least, is my humble hope, and toward which my reflections on truth are a humble contribution. But for that we need to trust the spirit, which blows where it will, to abandon our certainties on both sides and engage in a communal project of imaginative discernment, to seek to be in the truth, to work out our salvation together in fear and trembling, or, in our own idiom, to be Quakers.

* * * * * * * * * * *

suggestion here that there is hope, even necessity, in "transcending" our deteriorating modern conceptualities is not to advocate the escape from modernity towards some "elsewhere," but of being in it in a way that keeps it attentive to "life," to be in it uneasily or, if one prefers, the "elsewhere" is (potentially) here and now. To be postmodern is not to be other than modern, but to be modern non-violently.

*We built a wall for 58,195**

by Bagwell, 2426288

But the Vietnamese built cemeteries for their millions dead.
We stand captured, enraptured, idolizing our shiny black slash,
hurling, into dullard's history as so much reeking rancid trash,
the humbling lessons we—*could* have, *should* have—learned.
Yes, we built that wall and the darkly mirrored names haunt,
glistening prettily through pretty clouds on clear and pretty days.
But these names have morphed, for me, today, into a catalogued
grotesquery of those-who-died -in-vain, for-ought.
Unknowingly or not, *we* defecate on their gloomy dying,
refusing to look into our hubric Achilles-faces that got them killed,
dead, so that errant honor would not be sullied after a deserved ass-kicking.
Where! the catholic discussion of why we so easily go to war?—
Where! the angry hearts to know who's making big money off Sgt. Jim's
Kandahar death or reaping coin from Baghdad Billy's blown-out brain?

Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall, Washington, D.C.

Tim Bagwell, a Vietnam Veteran, works in the Office of Student Ethics at Indiana University.