
May 2022

Easter 1945: A Call For Christian Intellectualism

Patrick Otto

Oral Roberts University, jotto@oru.edu

Janet George

jageorge@oru.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/icctej>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Otto, P., & George, J. (2022). Easter 1945: A Call For Christian Intellectualism. *International Christian Community of Teacher Educators Journal*, 17(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55221/1932-7846.1283>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Christian Community of Teacher Educators Journal by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

Easter 1945: A Call For Christian Intellectualism

Abstract

There is an urgent need for Christian intellectualism to find its voice again. Institutions of higher education in America today are facing the onslaught of conflicting worldviews. In 1945 C.S. Lewis warned the Church about watering down the faith. In a postmodern world that is trying to be 'good without God', for the sake of their students and the Church, Christian educators must hold firm to scripture. There are several cultural challenges that inhibit the progress of Christian intellectualism, but if Christians learn to 'think Christianly,' and are "unafraid to articulate their own faith assumptions...(thereby allowing) the academic enterprise to benefit from the formative and hope-filled perspective of a Christian worldview" (Edlin, 2009, p.213), they can, with the guidance of the Holy Spirit, bring new hope to an intellectually confused world.

Keywords

Christian intellectualism, Christian scholarship, Christian academia

Easter 1945: A Call for Christian Intellectualism

Patrick Otto, Oral Roberts University

It was Easter 1945. What would be the last V2 rocket attack on the United Kingdom had just killed a woman in Kent three days earlier. Burned and bombed-out buildings were prominent in London and most of the cities in the country. Rubble was everywhere, and food was scarce. The economy was in shambles, and the empire was shaky. C.S. Lewis had been invited to speak at the Carmarthen Conference for Youth Leaders and Junior Clergy of the Church of Wales. The topic that he was asked to expound upon was the future of the Church. Lewis could have spoken about the effects of the war on the Church, but instead, he chose to focus on the strength of the teaching of the Church and his concern that the Church would fail as the catechism drifted away from the central tenants of Christendom. He encouraged faithful adherence to scripture and its presentation in a manner that is understandable for the ordinary person (Lewis, 1970). He also admonished the audience of church leaders to hold firm to the fullness of Christianity:

Do not attempt to water Christianity down. There must be no pretense that you can have it with the supernatural left out. So far as I can see, Christianity is precisely the one religion from which the miraculous cannot be separated. You must frankly argue for supernaturalism from the very outset. (Lewis, 1970, p.99)

Christianity without the supernatural is empty. Thus, when scripture instructs us to “Love the Lord with our whole mind” (John 4:23), it is a reminder to embrace the supernatural with our mind. We are to be mindful and thoughtful in our walk with the Lord. Less than 20 years later, Blamires (1978) decried the end of the Christian mind. He made the observation from a Western

perspective, and at times his work, *The Christian Mind*, seems to assume that we are Christians simply by birth. However, overall, Blamires’ statement applied to the ordinary Christian of the day.

Over half a century later, the question must be asked: What is the condition of the Christian mind today? Does the 21st century allow room for a Christian mind? Do today’s Christians know what a Christian mind is or that it can exist? Does the ordinary Christian today still think on what Lewis referred to as “Mere Christianity,” or has Blamires’ proclamation solidified turning a once vibrant Christian mind to stone? And if the mind is cold stone, the heart and soul cannot be far behind.

As recently as 2018, Dockery and Morgan published an anthology of essays that exemplify the existence of the Christian mind. Its very title, *Christian Higher Education: Faith Teaching and Learning in The Evangelical Tradition*, identifies its cloistered nature. There are still pockets of Christian intellectualism, but these are oases in a growing desert, and the Christian university may be the last major safe harbor for Christian thought.

The Christian exercises the mind because it is “an implicit acknowledgment that things do not exist on their own” (Noll, 1994, p. 50); rather, they point to the Creator. While Blamires (1978) lamented that the Christian mind has long since yielded to secularism., many others believe that the battle for the Christian mind is still being waged. Claerbaut (2004) pointed out that the battlefield is in the mind, with the Biblical worldview on one side, pushing to “view life mentally through Christian lenses... using

Patrick Otto, Chair, Graduate Education, Oral Roberts University, jotto@oru.edu

Christian criteria in making assessments...having a Christian mind” (p. 23). On the other side is any worldview that stands in opposition to the Biblical worldview, including different philosophies such as realism, idealism, existentialism, liberalism, naturalism, progressivism, postmodernism, and transhumanism, to name a few, but none of these have had such a pervasive and far-reaching impact on the Christian mind as secular humanism.

The term *secular humanism* has had several definitions over the years. One view is it encompasses many of the components of the nontheistic philosophies. Its core principles remain firm in its denial of the supernatural and its impact on our thought process. The American Humanist Association, with its defense of nontheistic thought at its core, defines secular humanism as doing or being “good without a god” (American Humanist Association, 2021).

The ideas promoted by secular humanism have had an impact on the intellectual views of individuals over the past centuries.

The human mind is one of the greatest creations and gifts God has given. It is through the intellectual mind that human beings can interact with the world from a Christian perspective. To think from a Christian perspective implies addressing all issues within the framework of the Bible.

However, the reality is that Christians now think about every issue in secular terms except religious or spiritual matters. Unless people are taught to “think Christianly” (Edlin, 2009), it is highly likely that the world will witness a “withdrawn and compartmentalized Christian spirituality severed from contemporary culture by the drugged inoperancy of the Christian mind” (Blamires, 1978, p. 190). This article describes how secular humanism has influenced Christian thinking and explores the desperate need for Christian higher education to be intentional about developing the Christian mind in a way that breaks out of

academia and permeates the everyday world of everyday Christians.

The Roots of Secular Humanism in American Intellectualism

Secular humanism, declared a religion by the U.S. Supreme Court, may be the fastest-growing worldview in America (Hughes, 2011). It has its roots in the 17th century Enlightenment period when French intellectuals began a move to extol a dependence on reason and science as opposed to religion and superstition. The coupling of religion and superstition was deliberate and made way for the rejection of religious thought, which was considered to be scientifically unverifiable and not on par with intellectual reasoning. According to enlightenment logic, human beings were fully capable of interpreting truth and reality without the aid of religion or the Christian God. This was the basis for the idea of secularism – “living as if God did not exist” (Claerbaut, 2004, p. 27).

The humanist perspective, which is foundational to the secular worldview, is that human beings are the only gods. The American Humanist Association, which has been a voice for this particular worldview, defined humanism as “a progressive philosophy of life that, without supernaturalism, affirms our ability and responsibility to lead ethical lives of personal fulfillment that aspire to the greater good of humanity” in its 2003 Humanist Manifesto III (American Humanist Association, 2021). The association freely admits to the nontheistic nature of humanism, which they defined as the absence of proof of the supernatural life. The secularist worldview is one in which truth and knowledge can no longer be determined on the basis of Judeo-Christian philosophy; instead, these are concepts that must be tangibly proved by scientific inquiry (London, 2008). Secular humanism is thus a “comprehensive nonreligious life stance that incorporates a naturalistic philosophy, a cosmic outlook rooted in science, and a consequentialist ethical system” (Flynn, n.d.).

A significant stakeholder that has direct access to the mind of the next generation is any institution of higher education. Over the years, higher education has played a significant role in transforming the mind by transferring new

information (Scott, 2006). The initial mission of institutions that were established to provide higher education in the United States was to pass on “a valued spiritual and intellectual heritage to succeeding generations” (Nieli, 2008, p. 318). In order to comprehend the key role of universities in terms of their influence on various disciplines of study, policies, law, and society in general, it is helpful to take a look at the historical role of universities in America and how secular humanism gained such a strong foothold.

Secular Humanism in U.S. Universities – A Historical Background

The idea of secular humanism began to take root in higher education in the U.S. under the guise of seeking truth using science and human reason instead of relying on the Bible as the only source of interpretation. Universities in the United States can trace their origins to the earliest renowned centers of learning in medieval Paris, which were run by the church. The struggle for power always existed between the church and the university in the name of pursuing truth; these tensions developed even further with the Enlightenment. The initial goal of education was to develop a balance with a “...broadly based liberal arts education, by regular devotional and prayer exercises, and by the living example of cultivated Christian gentlemen who provided day-to-day role models for those entrusted to their care” (Nieli, 2008, p. 316). The early settlers in the United States were strongly influenced by these struggles and new ideas, reported Adrian (2003), as they sought to establish universities such as Harvard, Cambridge, and Yale, as “the means to build a Christian civilization” (p. 18), where their objective was to “blend rational thought, piety, and scholarship” (p. 19) while upholding the Bible as the ultimate authority.

However, there was a gradual shift to exclude the same Protestant belief system from university classrooms. As America faced the prospect of a world war, discussions on the future of intellectual leadership began to resonate in scholarly circles. For instance, scientists such as Einstein suggested that the answer was for religious people to “give up the idea of a personal God and avail themselves of those forces which are capable of cultivating the Good, the True, and

the Beautiful in humanity” (Marsden, 1994, p. 382), indicating that people could find those answers within themselves. By the mid-20th century, the university was transformed into a “multiversity,” a term coined by Clark Kerr, President of the University of California, who used it to describe the loss of a unified purpose. This loss also included the tendency to marginalize Christian references from mainstream academics to seminaries and theology departments (Adrian, 2003).

In 1945, the Harvard Report on General Education published a report stating that the purpose of higher education, which was to “train the Christian citizen,” had mostly disappeared and speculated that the new unifying purpose was human dignity. On the international scene, American higher education was being recognized for its research activities and scientific discoveries, but locally, universities, on their part, instead of working at connecting the dots between scriptural truths and scientific discoveries, mostly chose to play a passive, silent role. Gradually, in the name of academic freedom, university officials were no longer allowed to bring in Scripture as a guide (Claerbaut, 2004). In 1966 Pattillo and MacKenzie (as cited in Adrian, 2003) conducted a groundbreaking study to investigate the Christian institutions that were set up for higher education. Their report indicated that these institutions had “an uncertain foundation for religiously oriented educational programs” (p.24) and that the Christian faith was now seen as “one among numerous other faiths in higher education” (p.30) due to the increasingly pluralistic nature of the American culture.

By the twentieth century, a key player who influenced the course of education in the U.S. was progressive educator and reformer John Dewey. Dewey’s experimentalism rejected the acceptance of eternal truth and absolute values found in the Scriptures in favor of the use of scientific research to discover tentative truths and relative values (Guterk, 1995). He advocated the type of education that was based on the learner’s personal experience instead of traditional religious education and believed that “rational thinking would lead to right behavior, and morality, essentially social in nature, would be best understood using the new evolutionary paradigm

emerging from the natural sciences” (Valk, 2007, p. 275). He also openly rejected any transcendent goals for education. To him, the ultimate aim was the creation of an equal society that would strengthen democracy in the nation (Green, 2002). Hunter (2000) commented that Dewey “positioned not God at the centre of the moral universe but the individual—supreme, autonomous, rational, evolving, and basically good” (p. 64).

The shift from a Christian to a secular viewpoint in universities was gradual. The Jewish philosopher Herberg described this shift quite accurately as “the prohibition against paying any classroom attention at all to God...(with) the effect of removing from the students’ intellectual consciousness the entire supernatural dimension” (as cited in Claerbaut, 2004, p. 31). Hitchcock (1982) had warned that secular humanism in America “dispensed with God” (p. 44) and allowed man to “deny all moral constraints...and invent his own morality” (p. 48). With their judicial decisions, the American law courts also played a strategic role in this shift. As a result, “...the transcendent gave way to an official policy of secularism within public education” (Lee, 2010, p. 23).

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Smith (2003) noted that there was a nationwide initiative to professionalize all fields, which implied “throwing off a Christian worldview and cultivating a secular approach that was scientific and value-free” (pp. 2-3); colleges were asked to change from their “general Protestant worldview and morality” and promote a more “objective, a-religious and irreligious pursuit and transmission of knowledge” (pp. 2-3). Marsden defined the word *secularism* as “the transformation from an era when organized Christianity, and explicitly Christian ideals had a major role in the leading institutions of higher education to an era when they have almost none” (as cited in Adrian, 2003, p. 20). In today’s society, observed London (2008), there is hardly any room for the free exchange of ideas due to the emphasis on political correctness. In post-secondary education, students are expected to adhere to the existing worldview or risk ridicule and social isolation. He added, “Instead of being presented with a variety of perspectives and encouraged to think for

themselves, they are often fed an orthodoxy which they must regurgitate for their professorial masters” (London, 2008, p. 72) – all in the name of secular humanism.

Former U.S. Education Secretary Bennett’s description of the higher education scene of the 1960s and 70s appears to have been almost prophetic:

When students demanded a greater role in setting their own educational agendas, colleges and universities eagerly responded by abandoning course requirements of any kind and with them the intellectual authority to say to students what the outcome of a college education ought to be...The curriculum was no longer a statement about what knowledge mattered; instead, it became the product of a political compromise. . . among competing schools and departments overlaid by marketing considerations. . . all knowledge came to be seen as relative in importance, relative to consumer or faculty interest. (as cited in Nieli, 2007, pp. 326-327)

This can be directly linked to the consequent loss of Christian intellectualism from the forefront of higher education as well.

As a result of growing up “religiously illiterate” (London, 2008, p. 24), American graduates are not presented with a Christian worldview as part of their education. So, the non-Christian is not exposed to such ideas, and the Christian is not taught how to integrate faith with personal career goals (London, 2008). As Roberts (2009) pointed out, it appears that the tragedy of the loss of the Christian mind occurred with the shift from the pursuit of knowledge based on trust in God to that of doubt.

The Secular/Sacred Dichotomy

On September 8, 1974, C.S. Lewis made the cover of *Time* magazine. In the cover article, entitled *Don V. Devil*, the authors discussed Lewis' impact on Christians and the secular world. The article gave a complementary view of Lewis' scholarship and teaching and viewed him as an intellectual, albeit with some unusual thoughts. Hence, according to one of the most prominent media sources of that day, Lewis belonged to the club of intellectuals and was seen as a thought leader in society. The article also referred to Lewis as a "heretic among modern intellectuals" because he really believed in God and the supernatural. Today, however, the fact that Lewis was unapologetically Christian, thought Christianly, and applied Christian thoughts to the everyday world around him would certainly "cancel" him. Modern society would probably have no room for the likes of Lewis and his superior, albeit Christian intellectualism.

According to Claerbaut (2008), a Christian worldview and a secularist worldview will always be on an "ideological collision course" (p. 31). Pearcey (2004) clarified that one reason such a dichotomy exists between the sacred and the secular realm is because of a mistaken assumption by modern-day Christians. They mistakenly assign areas of worship, morality, and religious preferences into the sacred category and assume that science, politics, economics belong to the secular section. Pearcey (2004) borrowed Francis Schaeffer's "two-story theory of truth" to describe this intellectual split. According to this theory, people divide their thought life into a two-story structure; all the rational and verifiable ideas are delegated to the lower story, and the upper story is meant to house all the non-rational and the non-cognitive ones. Christians believe they have to make a leap of faith when they are required to shift from their intellectual reasoning, which is in the lower story, in order to affirm values like moral freedom and dignity, which has no other course but to fit into the upper story. Because Christians delegate religion to the upper story, they are unable to bring their faith into the sphere of everyday life. Edlin (2009) observed:

The Christian faith is a personal, belief-based position that is divorced from the intellectual rigor and values-free

investigation of daily life and vocation...Western secular culture tolerates—even supports—religion as long as it remains in its private realm. It is assumed that religion should not seek to give direction to commerce or political structures or international relations—or scholastic investigation, which, it is claimed, can only really be directed and measured in terms of an objective scientific paradigm. (p. 209)

It is because of this underlying conviction that Christians can be sincere about their faith in their personal life but be totally unaware of how to incorporate their Christian worldview into their secular life. Bonhoeffer, in his *Letters and Papers from Prison*, observed that "... the Christian ... cannot split up his life into water-tight compartments. The common denominator is to be sought in thought and practical living in an integrated attitude to life" (as cited in Naugle, 2009, p. 242). The solution to ending this dichotomy is for the Biblical doctrine of revelation to "close the gap between fact and value" (Pearcey, 2004, p. 246) and, by extension, between the sacred and the secular.

Reno (2016) pointed out that the American Christendom of the 1950s is gone and will not come back. Instead, he called for a new approach to society, one that defended scriptural concepts assertively but with civility and one that demonstrated Christian hospitality. He observed that Christians may have their voice heard in society by standing firm on Scriptural beliefs and communicating them with civility in a setting that reflected God's love, grace, mercy, and other attributes of hospitality.

Challenges Inhibiting Christian Intellectualism in Higher Education

There are many cultural and legal challenges in higher education today that contend with Christian intellectualism. One of the foremost challenges is that the Bible is no longer the standard against which values are assessed and truth measured. Values are now seen as "subjective preferences, personal and social, over against the objective realities provided by scientific knowledge" (Sloan, as cited in Pearcey,

2004, p. 177). The Christian faith is considered to be a matter of personal experience rather than universal truth; as a result, Christians automatically “relegate religion to the ‘upper story,’ which keeps the question of true or false off the table altogether” (Pearcey, 2004, p. 202).

Joeckel and Chesnes (2012) presented a study by Weeks and Isaak demonstrating that only 1% of the faculty in the elite universities are professing to be “born again Christians” and that 37% of the faculty profess atheism or report to be agnostic. In essence, this study tells the Christian scholar two things should they wish to enter secular academia. First, it points out that they will be part of a very small minority in the secular university setting. Second, with 37% of the faculty self-reporting to be atheistic or agnostic, there will be no shortage of faculty holding a strongly opposing point of view. This difficult and alienating environment that the world of academia offers the Christian scholar is indicative of the challenge for Christian intellectuals.

Christian universities are also confronted by the absence of a framework where Christianity is considered to be true. The entire idea of religion is now widely seen as a subjective reality, whose popularity or success is measured by how much it can benefit the lives of its believers. It is fashionable to consider faith, or, to use the more popular term, “spirituality” as something personal and subjective, thereby automatically delegating it to Schaeffer’s “upper story” and leading to a loss of intellectual credibility (Pearcey, 2004). Hitchcock (1982) pointed out that truth, values, right and wrong, are all now regarded as something relative and justifiable, based on each individual’s needs, which implies that people have the freedom to “create their own values and resist those imposed by others, including religion” (p. 74).

In the late 1960s, a belief began to emerge that the existence of God meant the existence of unfair and superfluous constraints on personal freedom. Why live to fulfill God’s plan when one has plenty of plans of one’s own? The attitude of these secularists, aptly called the “me generation,” consisted mainly of new-age pretensions of self-knowledge, a cloak, essentially, for the relentless fulfillment of personal wishes” (London, 2008, p. 15). Such an outlook that has become even more

prevalent today has direct effects on the legal challenges that Christian intellectualism faces today. When the nation’s judicial system legalizes choices such as abortion and same-sex marriages, Christian intellectualism is faced with enormous roadblocks due to the immediate aftereffects and the long-term consequences that apply to individuals and society at large. In both, we see the accumulative effect of making choices without considering God’s purpose for our lives. That is why it is crucial for Christian intellectuals to explain to students why such decisions are wrong by offering a Biblically-based, intellectually satisfying defense.

Under the guise of building peace and tolerance, the academy has pursued multiculturalism – a new “ism” that removes the need for a foundation built on Judeo-Christian values. Wenyika and Adrian (2009, p. 116) pointed out the danger of receiving an undergraduate experience through the secular lens of multiculturalism because it can lead to the “fragmentation of knowledge with no basis for value judgments in the search for truth.” Corts (2011) noted in his commentary on Masden’s work that the desire of the academy (is it ok to use this word?) to be inclusive led them to “exclude all religious perspectives” (p. 20). Marsden (1994) saw this challenge coming to Christian intellectualism almost thirty years ago:

Groups who do not match the current . . . ideological norms are forced to fend for themselves outside of the major spheres of cultural influence. Almost all religious groups, no matter what their academic credentials, are on the outside of this educational establishment, or soon will be, if present trends continue. (p. 440)

Role of Christian Intellectualism in Higher Education

Christian intellectualism has its foundation in scripture. The Bible is the source, the “Word of God, from which we receive ...revelation concerning the nature of God, humankind, ultimate reality, goodness, and life expectations” (Braley et al., 2003, p. 56). The goal of Christian education is to teach students “how to live and love, how to raise a family, how to shape and transform culture along Biblical lines” (Green,

2002, p. 90). As followers of Christ, we are instructed to “demolish arguments and every pretension that sets itself up against the knowledge of God, and ... take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ” (2 Cor 10: 5, NIV). The goal of a Christian thinker is to “seek out the meaning of the Lordship of Jesus Christ for every dimension of human experience, through every discipline” (Litfin, 2004, p. 66). Christian intellectualism calls for “rigorous thinking, careful research, and thoughtful publication” while always “recognizing the sovereignty of the triune God over the whole cosmos” (Dockery, 2002, p. 12). Christian universities need to train their students to recognize that their faith is not and must not be restricted to Schaeffer’s “upper story.”

Edlin (2009) lamented that many Christian academicians do not know how to think Christianly. So often, Christians in academia have compartmentalized their faith and their academic discipline. Their faith does not inform their discipline, and in many cases, their discipline will inform, transform, or weaken their faith. Edlin (2009) went on to pose the painfully honest question of whether it is possible for the Christian academic to stay true to both faith and the academic enterprise. Hypothetically, the one-way door on the wall of separation now opens the wrong way; thus leaving Christian faculty serving in universities ineffectual as representatives for Christ. Jacobsen and Jacobsen (2012) suggested that the “difficult dialog” and the “big question” concepts may be reopening the door for Christian intellectualism in the secular higher education setting. If so, Christian academicians may regain their voice in the academy.

The Christian educator teaching in Christian institutions is fully dependent on the Holy Spirit for the wisdom to develop a curriculum that will adequately address the needs of the whole person. The ultimate goal is to develop, instruct, and mentor students

as they discover their unique calling.

At a post-secondary level, one of the primary goals is to equip students to function successfully in their perhaps unchristian world and to gauge everyday issues against the scale of sound biblical principles. This requires the teacher to consciously depend on the Holy Spirit in each phase of the learning-teaching interaction, follow His leading, and allow room for flexibility in the process (Pazmiño, 2010).

“If Christian educators are to avoid compartmentalization and recover personal and professional integrity, then that worldview perspective that undergirds their academic work must be solidly biblical and deeply Christian” (Naugle, 2009, p. 262). Porter, the former President of Yale, foresaw the danger of excluding Christian teaching from the universities back in 1869 when he cautioned: “Religious influences and religious teachings should be employed in colleges in order to exclude and counteract the atheistic tendencies of much of modern science, literature, and culture” (as cited in Nieli, 2008, p. 319). The first step is to re-introduce the concept of the Christian worldview in the higher education classroom. Teaching from and about a Christian worldview is paramount for the professor teaching in Christian higher education. Unfortunately, the doctrines of specific disciplines often impose limits on this approach, even in traditional Christian universities (Moll, 2009). Christian educators need to interweave their classroom teaching with a clear explanation of what it means to think from a Biblical perspective. As Treuren and Eisenbarth (2009) noted, it is “... incumbent on faithful Christians within academia to develop curricula and educational processes that help their students reject a false dichotomy and embrace an integration of their faith with their chosen profession” (p. 120).

Not only must Christian educators in Christian universities teach from a

Christian worldview, but they must also teach students how to develop and defend a Christian worldview in their own subjects and careers.

They must teach students about the cultural mandate that “the ideal human existence is not eternal leisure or endless vacation – or even a monastic retreat into prayer and meditation- but the creative effort expended for the glory of God and the benefit of others” (Pearcey, 2004, p. 48). Then, instead of Christians compartmentalizing their faith, Litfin (2004) suggested that Christian educators can focus on an education where the Lord Jesus is the center of the entire curriculum. He is “the One to whom we must relate everything and without whom no fact, no theory, no subject matter can be fully appreciated...the claim that every field of study, every discipline, every course, requires Jesus Christ to be understood aright” (p. 65); “an education that rigorously and without apology insists upon looking through and beyond the created order to see the Christ-centeredness of all things” (p. 67). Christian scholars have an added incentive because they are studying the handiwork of their Master, to “...see how it will point them to the Truth who stands at the center of all we can know” (p. 71), and then, the entire activity becomes “an act of worship” (p. 75).

Glanzer et al. (2017) cast a vision of a Christian culture wherein “... every Christian professor at a Christian university should have a basic knowledge of standard set of works addressing the relationship of Christianity with their discipline and the Christian university as a whole” (p. 237). If faculty at Christian institutions knew how to help their students make the connection between their areas of studies and biblical principles, that would be a useful first step. For instance, when students read Shelley’s Ode to the West Wind, they can be taught how to identify the author’s desperate longing for immortality and hope and be reminded that the answers he seeks are found in the One he rejects. McMillin (2002) reminded us that “most critical approaches, even those considered at greatest odds with Christianity, can be applied from a Christian worldview and can yield compelling and insightful

Christian analysis of a given text” (p. 150). Thus, students can be taught to read any literary work, regardless of the religious beliefs of the author, and analyze it using the lens of a Christian worldview.

The same principle can be used with works of fiction too. Han and Bagley (2009) exemplified this principle by examining the work of popular writer John Grisham when they note that he “... not only entertains readers with a masterful use of suspenseful plot but also makes them ponder important moral issues from a Christian perspective: inner-city poverty, greed and materialism, environmental concerns, ... and the mistreatment of indigenous people” (p. 197). In his inimitable style, C.S. Lewis’ (1970) remark on Christians and writing holds sway even today: “What we want is not more little books about Christianity, but more little books by Christians on other subjects – with their Christianity latent” (p. 99).

Edlin (2009) reported that Christian intellectuals are on the lookout for an appropriate scaffold that will provide a faithful platform for scholarship and academic engagement while being true to scripture. He suggested the skill of rhetoric, which

enables scholars to explore narrative as a means of understanding reality...and also opens the door for Christian scholars to weave the Christian metanarrative through their studies rather than adopting the alternative attitude of preemptive capitulation that is practiced by Christians who are defeated before they start when they accept the falsehood that Christianity and scholarship are at opposite ends of the intellectual spectrum. (p. 215)

The field of social sciences also provides faculty with ample opportunities to explore relevant topics such as “social problems, social and economic justice, community studies, the family, world religions, deviance and criminology, intergroup relations, social stratification, social change, social policy” (Chiareli, 2002, p. 240) through the light of the Scriptures. Instead of submitting to a secular framework built on cultural relevance, in which truth is diluted and

presented in a politically correct manner, the Christian educator can be intentional about showing students how to think and apply God's principles of justice and compassion. This is another example of how the university can go beyond the four walls of a classroom and expand its reach.

The push to extend classroom discussions to the everyday world and teach students how to integrate the two using a Biblical lens has been steadily growing in the past few years. In their 2002 work, editors Dockery and Thornbury presented several such examples of integration in different disciplines such as natural science, music, media, teaching, health care, social work, and business, to name a few. Adrian et al. (2009) continued the trend by publishing a selection of papers on making a global impact by integrating faith with learning in the fields of engineering, intelligent design, novels, to name a few. As a result of such integration, their hope was "the formation of individuals who will impact their communities in truth and love" (Chiareli, 2002, pp. 260-261) by learning to think from a Christian perspective regardless of their discipline and not be blinded by secular thought. Dockery and Thornbury (2002) explained in detail how Christian intellectualism has a specific place in every person's world, whether it is literature, arts, social sciences, media, the world of business, or health care. Edlin (2009) aptly observed:

What this generation needs are Christian scholars who are adept at their craft—who, like Paul in Athens, understand the contemporary philosophical forces, ... who are unafraid to articulate their own faith assumptions, and who therefore can allow the academic enterprise to benefit from the formative and hope-filled perspective of a Christian worldview. (p.213)

Kang (2018) pointed out how essential it is for the Christian university to clearly define and affirm the philosophical perspectives of a Biblical worldview when selecting board members, determining leadership, hiring faculty, and admitting students. He proposed a modern catechism for Christian higher education. These include the metaphysical, the axiological, and the

epistemological bases. The metaphysical aspect is based on the truth that God is the basis of all reality; the world exists because He does. The question of aesthetics – what is considered beautiful – has its foundations on the truth that God has made all things beautiful, and therefore all things in creation are a reflection of His beauty. "The epistemology of a Christian worldview is that human beings have the capacity to recognize truth, which is rooted in their discovery of God's creation" (Braley et al., 2003). Identifying these concepts clearly will equip Christian educators to teach "...what it means to think like a Christian about the nature and workings of the physical world, the character of human structures like government and the economy, the meaning of the past, the nature of artistic creation..." (Noll, 1994, p. 7).

Colson and Pearcey (1999) summarized what Christian intellectualism ought to look like

Christian education is not simply a matter of starting class with Bible reading and prayer, then teaching subjects out of secular textbooks. It consists of teaching everything, from science and mathematics to literature and the arts, within the framework of an integrated Biblical worldview. It means teaching students to relate every academic discipline to God's truth and his self-revelation in scripture, while detecting and critiquing nonbiblical worldview assumptions. (p. 338)

Conclusions and Recommendations

"Most students enter college," wrote *Los Angeles Times* editor David Savage, "... expecting that the university and its leaders have a clear vision of what is worth knowing and what is important in our heritage that all educated persons should know" (as cited in Nieli, 2008, p. 331). It is long overdue for Christian universities to respond to this expectation. As Lewis reminded us, just as we cannot not take the supernatural out of Christianity, we cannot forget the supernatural in how classes are taught and students mentored in Christian universities. Lewis can still be our model. Voth (2021) provided hard sales data from multiple sources showing that C.S. Lewis still has

more media sales than any Christian author. He is often a gateway author for non-Christians to be introduced to a Christian worldview. After all of these years, the evidence suggests that he is still influencing culture, but he needs our help.

The Bible places great emphasis on educating and transforming the whole person – mind, body, and spirit. The Christian is reminded: “Do not conform to the pattern of this world but be transformed by the renewing of your mind” (Rom 12:2, NIV). Educating the whole person necessitates offering courses that develop the ability of students to “critique, develop, and refine” (Claerbaut, 2004, p. 308) and result in producing a transformed intellectual. Braley et al. (2003) commented that Christian educators need to “translate theology and philosophy into street sense, enabling students to live a Christlike life in the real world” (p. 65). The challenge is to develop “... a Christian mind and to express it confidently in all of life” (Roberts, 2009, p. 90).

Willimon (2005) looked at the state of higher education and warned that if Christian intellectualism is not brought back, higher education could change from: “... a place where the young are initiated into the wisdom of the past ... into a place where the old abandon the young to their own meager resources because the old have nothing of value to say to them” (p. 21). When the humanist chaplain at Harvard University published his views that “we are forced to be good without God” (Epstein, 2009, p. 220), transformed Christian intellectuals in institutions of higher education should have the intellectual training and revelation to be able to counter that comment with Scriptural evidence that there can be no good without God. Goheen and Bartholomew (2008) challenged Christian intellectuals everywhere with this sobering reminder:

Scholarship, like all other aspects of human life, is on the field of battle between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of darkness. Both powers vie to shape and direct scholarship for their own ends. This is a vital place for Christians to be involved. (pp. 164-165)

Every year, thousands of graduates, destined for positions of leadership, graduate from institutions of higher education. The types of economic, social, and cultural decisions that these people make are determined by the philosophical foundations that undergird what they are being taught at university. These foundations will be the guiding principles that determine how they raise their families, how they vote, how they function in society, and how they respond to times of crisis. With the world becoming so interconnected, these decisions have the potential to have global implications. The Christian university should provide optimal conditions for the growth of Christian intellectualism and character development, which will impact future generations on every level (Dockery & Thornbury, 2002).

Albert Meyer, head of a higher education board and a scientist noted, “At the heart of any higher education is ... a conception of truth” (Corts, 2011, p. 36). The secular humanist argues that truth is evasive and subjective. But for a Christian higher education institute, truth is Jesus the Christ (John 8: 31-32), and the ultimate mission is transformation of the individual. “We pursue our mission through a commitment to holistic education, nurturing the intellect, shaping and molding the heart and soul, modeling servanthood as a way of life, and touching our neighbors throughout the world with a touch of the love of God” (Corts, 2011, p. 38). In order to derive standards of truth, Ross (2009) pointed out that “... only a biblical standard shows promise for deriving an enduring criterion of truth in higher education” (p. 173).

Promoting Christian intellectualism is a Biblical mandate. The advice that the apostle Paul gave the church at Ephesus is relevant for today's Christian educators:

So Christ himself gave the ...teachers, to equip his people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up until we all reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ. Then we will no longer be infants, tossed back and forth by the waves, and blown here and there by every wind of teaching and by the cunning and craftiness of people in their deceitful scheming. Instead, speaking the truth in love, we will grow to become in every respect the mature body of him who is the head, that is, Christ. (Eph 4:11-15, NIV)

Christian higher education has repeatedly addressed the decline of Christian intellectualism in society. Nevertheless, this decline continues to persist in today's culture. We must be intentional about reaching out to our students. It is not enough to impress them with our academic prowess, but they should also see our heart and love for the Lord and His Word. We do not water down the content of our teaching, but we do bring our teaching into their world and the world that they are going into after they graduate. We can help them to decompartmentalize their secular and sacred life. We can model for them how Christians should be in but not of the world.

Our academic credentials still give us access to media sources. The doors for a few national media sources are still open to Christian intellectuals. Recently, one of our alumni was a guest on one of the leading cable programs. He was a great representative for Christ and was willing to step into a huge opportunity. He did so knowing that he risked being "canceled" by some, but he was not afraid to simply speak truth on a national stage. Additionally, there are even more opportunities in the smaller local media sources. These outlets provide opportunities for the Christian intellectual to speak directly into the culture of the local community. Our academic degrees qualify us as "experts," and when we use

this opportunity wisely, we often find that our expertise becomes even more in demand.

Social media provides opportunities to speak into our culture. This is not a time to just post lectures or articles, but rather engage directly in today's issues with the love and wisdom of Christ and by employing our specialized skills. Some of our best teachings are the carefully developed elevator speeches that are bathed in prayer and thought. We ought to craft logical, succinct words of encouragement and life specific to the issues of the day. Perhaps when Christian intellectuals propose cogent arguments that are not merely argumentative but are stated in a way that has earned them the right to be heard and not simply argumentative in tone, we will make room for an audience that wants to see Christian values brought back into the culture.

Economists read the world through the eyes of economics, reducing all activity to the needs and trends of the market. Sociologists create their own fantasy worlds based on their limited observations and analyses. Biologists interpret everything through the lens of Darwinian evolution.... It does not matter what the discipline is; those who are engaged in it find themselves obliged to use it as a tool for discovering something more fundamental and all-embracing. It is here that Christian higher education can make its contribution by restoring the divine dimension to academic study and putting the human mind firmly in its place, not in order to diminish it but in order to allow it to be the instrument of learning that it was originally intended to be. (Bray, 2011, p. 66)

The ancient cry recorded by the prophet Isaiah echoes even today: "Whom shall I send? And who will go for us?" (Isa 6:8, NIV). The onus is now on Christian intellectuals to respond to that cry, defend the minds of future generations from the influence of secular humanism, and bring the 'Christian mind' back to life through the medium of higher education. After all, ours is a system of faith that believes in redemption, restoration, and resurrection. Easter 1945, Lewis warned the

Church of a watered-down faith. What would he say to the Church this Easter?

References

Adrian, W. (2003). Christian universities in historical perspective. *Christian Higher Education*, 2(1), 15 – 33. doi: 10.1080/15363750390175618

American Humanist Association. (2021). <https://americanhumanist.org/>

Bartlett, J. C. (2007). A Christian philosophy of education of a public school educator. *Christian Perspectives in Education*, 1(1), 1-13.

Blamires, H. (1978). *The Christian mind*. Servant Books.

Braley, J., Layman, J., & White, R. (2003). *Foundations of Christian school education*. ASCI/Purposeful Design Publications.

Bray, G. L. (2011). The challenge to the mind in Christian higher education today. In Corts, P. R. (Ed.), *Thinking Christianly: Christian higher education and a vigorous life of the mind* (pp. 33-54). Samford University Press.

Claerbaut, D. (2004). *Faith and learning on the edge: A bold new look at higher education*. Zondervan.

Colson, C. & Pearcey, N. (1999). *How now shall we live?* Tyndale House.

Corts, T. E. (2011). Transforming lives. In Corts, P. R. (Ed.), *Thinking Christianly: Christian higher education and a vigorous life of the mind* (pp. 9-31). Samford University Press.

Dockery, D.S. (2002). Shaping a Christian worldview: The foundations of Christian Higher Education. In D. S. Dockery, & G. A. Thornbury (Eds.), *Shaping a Christian worldview: The foundations of Christian higher education* (pp. 1-15). Broadman & Holman.

Dockery, D. S., & Morgan, C. W. (2018). *Christian higher education: Faith, teaching, and learning in the evangelical tradition*. Crossway.

Edlin, R. J. (2009). Keeping the faith: The Christian scholar in the academy in a postmodern world. *Christian Higher Education*, 8, 203-224. doi: 10.1080/15363750802664101

Epstein, G. M. (2009). *Good without God: What a billion nonreligious people do believe*. William Morrow Harper Collins.

Flynn, T. (n.d.). Secular humanism defied. *Free Inquiry*. <https://secularhumanism.org/what-is-secular-humanism/secular-humanism-defined/>

Glanzer, P. L., Alleman, N. F., & Ream, T. C. (2017). *Restoring the soul of the university*. InterVarsity Press.

Goheen, M. W., & Bartholomew, C. G. (2008). *Living at the crossroads: An introduction to Christian worldview*. Baker Academic.

Green, B. (2002). Theological and philosophical foundations. In D. S. Dockery & G. A. Thornbury (Eds.), *Shaping a Christian worldview* (pp. 62-91). Broadman & Holman.

Gutek, G. L. (1995). *A history of the western educational experience* (2nd ed.). Waveland Press.

Han, J. J., & Bagley, M. C. (2009). Making a difference: John Grisham as a Christian novelist. In W. Adrian, M. E. Roberts & R. Wenyika (Eds.), *Engaging our world: Christian worldview from the ivory tower to global impact* (pp. 196-205). W&S Academic Press.

Hitchcock, J. (1982). *What is secular humanism?* Servant Books.

Hughes, B. (2011). The worldview war. *American Thinker*. http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/07/the_worldview_war.html

Humanist Manifesto III. (2003). *Humanist*, 71(4), 39.

Hunter, J. D. (2000). *The death of character: Moral education in an age without good or evil*. Basic Books.

Jacobsen, D., & Jacobsen, R. (2012). *No longer invisible: Religion in university education*. Oxford University Press.

Joeckel, S., & Chesnes, T. (2012). *The Christian college phenomenon: Inside America's fastest growing institutions of higher learning*. Abilene Christian University Press.

- Kang, S. S. (2018). Faith, Learning, and Catechesis. In D. S. Dockery & C. W. Morgan (Eds.), *Christian higher education: Faith, teaching, and learning in the evangelical tradition* (pp. 365-384). Crossway.
- Lee, H. (2010). *Faith-based education that constructs*. Wipf & Stock.
- Lewis, C. S. (1970). Christian apologetics. In W. Hooper (Ed.), (pp. 86-103). *God in the dock: Essays on theology and ethics*. William B. Eerdmans.
- Litfin, A. D. (2004). *Conceiving the Christian college*. W.B. Eerdmans Pub.
- London, H. (2008). *America's secular challenge: The rise of a new national religion*. Encounter Books.
- Marsden, G. M. (1994). *The soul of the American university*. Oxford University Press.
- McMillin, B. (2002). Christian worldview and literature. In D. S. Dockery, & G. A. Thornbury, (Eds.), *Shaping a Christian worldview* (pp. 149-161). Broadman & Holman.
- Moll, R. (2009). Hard choices for higher ed. *Christianity Today*, 53(9), 36.
<https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2009/september/24.36.html>
- Naugle, D. K. (2009). Squashing Screwtape: Debunking dualism and restoring integrity in Christian educational thought and practice. In W. Adrian, M. E. Roberts & R. Wenyika (Eds.), *Engaging our world: Christian worldview from the ivory tower to global impact* (pp. 242-266). W&S Academic Press.
- Nieli, R. K. (2008). From Christian gentleman to bewildered seeker: The transformation of American higher education. *Academic Quest*, 20, 311-331. doi 10.1007/s12129-007-9025-7
- Noll, M. A. (1994). *The scandal of the evangelical mind*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. Eerdmans.
- Pazmiño, R. W. (2010). Christian education is more than formation. *Christian Education Journal Series 3*, 7(2), 356-365.
- Pearcey, N. (2004). *Total truth: Liberating Christianity from its cultural captivity*. Crossway Books.
- Religion: Don v. Devil (1947, September 8). *Time*.
<http://content.time.com/time/subscriber/article/0,33009,804196,00.html>
- Reno, R. R. (2016). *Resurrecting the idea of a Christian society*. Regnery Faith.
- Roberts, M. E.. (2009). How the west lost its (Christian) mind and can find it again. In W. Adrian, M. E. Roberts & R. Wenyika (Eds.), *Engaging our world: Christian worldview from the ivory tower to global impact* (pp. 76-90). W&S Academic Press.
- Scott, J. C. (2006). The mission of the university: medieval to postmodern transformations. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 1-39.
- Smith, C. (2003). Introduction: Rethinking the secularization of American life. In Smith (Ed.), *The secular revolution: Power, interest, and conflict in the secularization of American public life*. University of California Press.
- Treuren, K. V., & Eisenbarth, S. (2009). The integration of faith and profession in the engineering discipline. In W. Adrian, M. E. Roberts & R. Wenyika (Eds.), *Engaging our world: Christian worldview from the ivory tower to global impact* (pp. 119-136). W&S Academic Press.
- Valk, J. (2007). Plural public schooling: Religion, worldviews and moral education. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 29(3), 273-285. doi: 10.1080/01416200701479661
- Voth, J. (2021). *Why Lewis?: Seven reasons why C. S. Lewis is the second most influential author in modern Christian history*. Resource Publications.
- Wenyika, R. & Adrian, W. (2009). Religion of the heart: Expelled from the American university. In W. Adrian, M. E. Roberts & R. Wenyika (Eds.), *Engaging our world: Christian worldview from the ivory tower to global impact* (pp. 101-118). W&S Academic Press.
- Willimon, W. H. (2005). Recreational sex. *Christian Century*, 122(8), 20-22.
- Worley, T. B. (2018). Faith, Learning, Worship, and Service. In D. S. Dockery & C. W. Morgan (Eds.), *Christian higher education: Faith, teaching, and*

learning in the evangelical tradition (pp. 385-408).
Crossway.