

# Reason in the University

By Dallas Willard

Speaker 1:

And welcome to the Third Plenary Session of this symposium on the Christian University in the next millennium that is a culmination of Biola University's celebration of its 90th anniversary. But, um, it really is intended to include the wider community as well. And so we're pleased that many of you from the wider community have joined us yesterday. Yesterday afternoon, Dr. Packer started us off with Thanksgiving for God's blessing in the way in which the, uh, the Christian college coalition has been able to bring about Christian education in ways not found elsewhere. And he focused us upon the Christian educator for the next millennium who would be one who has ruthless realism, piercing communication, and concentrated devotion. Yesterday evening, Professor Marsden challenged us to be a different kind of gap person. I'm not going to forget that one. And in so doing challenged us with the integration of faith and learning and focused our attention upon the opportunity, the possibility and the necessity of us doing so. Yesterday morning before some of you arrived, uh, our plenary speaker for this morning, Dr. Dallas Willard addressed our undergraduate chapel where he challenged all of us, not just the students, but all of us with the question, do we honor Jesus Christ in our fields of expertise.

Just prior to his coming to give us our third plenary address. We're going to once again have the opportunity to nourish our souls. We have two of our undergrad students who will be

performing flute duets. Their names are Michelle loosely and Kevin Cota, Michelle as a sophomore, music education major involved in symphonic winds. After graduation she plans to be an elementary school music teacher, and then Kevin is a freshman. A music performance major in performance in symphonic winds, but just prior to their coming to nourish our souls I'd like to focus our attention upon a passage of scripture from the Apostle Paul. Although I'm a gospels person, a Jesus scholar I do read Paul once in a while and Paul Challenges Timothy as he is getting ready to move off the scene of his earthly ministry and he says remain at Ephesus that you may charge certain persons.

This is in First Timothy Chapter one, verses three and following remain at Ephesus, that you may charge certain persons neither to teach any different doctrine, nor to occupy themselves with myths and endless genealogies which promotes speculations rather than the divine training that is in faith. Whereas the goal of our instruction is love. Love that issues from a pure heart and a good conscience and sincere faith. Certain persons by swerving from these have wandered away into vain discussion, desiring to be teachers of the law without understanding either what they are saying or the things about which they make assertions. That fifth verse has been for me for now some 20 plus years of teaching been a a challenge to me. The goal of our instruction is love. Love that issues from a pure heart and a good conscience and sincere faith

Join me in prayer, please. Father, this is indeed a tremendous venture that we're engaged. The venture of, uh, providing Christian higher education for our culture, a culture that is in many ways in opposition to what we're doing, but therefore, because of that we do have good news and I pray that as we continue this conference today, that we would indeed focus upon the goal of our instruction being love for this culture, love that does indeed issue from a pure heart and a good

conscience and sincere faith in the name of the savior. Amen. Michele and Kevin please come and join us.

[Musical performance interlude]

Speaker 1:

Thank you very much. Michele and Kevin. Dr. Dallas Willard is a professor of philosophy and the School of philosophy at the University of Southern California. He has taught at USC since 1965 where he was director of the school of Philosophy from 1982 to 1985\ . He received his undergraduate education at William Jewell College, Tennessee Temple College and Baylor University and his graduate education at Baylor University and the University of Wisconsin where he received his PhD. He taught at the University of Wisconsin from 1960 to 1965\ . And as I said, he's already. He has been teaching at USC since 1965\ . He's been a visiting professor at UCLA and the University of Colorado and we're happy to say many times here. His many philosophical publications are mainly in the area of epistemology and the philosophy of mind and of logic and among them is his logic and the objectivity of knowledge. Not only is professor Willard a leading evangelical scholar who has had, in my opinion probably the most profound influence among evangelical scholars in many different ways on many different levels among them the training of a host of evangelical philosophers. He truly is a mentor to a host, a host of Evangelical philosophers, but he has also had a profound effect upon the evangelical world in calling its pursuit to spirituality to be grounded in a thoroughly biblical anthropology and soteriology. Quite rare today.

Two books in particular have had a profound effect upon the church's search for authentic sanctification. In his book in search of Guidance, Dr. Willard attempted to make real and clear the intimate quality of life in Christ as a conversational relationship with God, but that relationship is not something that automatically happens and we do not receive it by passive infusion (his words), so in his second book "to Spirit of the Disciplines", Professor Willard explains how disciples of Jesus can effectively interact with the grace and spirit of God to access fully the provisions and character intended for us in the gift of eternal life. The third book of this trilogy will be released this year and is entitled the Divine Conspiracy Reflecting on Jesus' Gospel for life and Christian discipleship. And in that sense, he truly is one of the leaders in helping us to understand what it is to be a truly Christian University in the next millennium. His message title for this morning is "the redemption of reason and the university and the next millennium." Please welcome Dr. Dallas Willard.

Dallas Willard:

Thank you for the gracious words and thanks to those of you who are responsible for inviting me here to take part, uh, in this wonderful. And I hope that will be an epoch making symposium. Now, I'm to speak this morning on the topic, the redemption of reason, uh, and I'm doing that because I think that is the most salient thing I could talk about from the point of view of my work as a philosopher. The task assigned to me by Dean Wilkins was to address the philosophical pitfalls and prospects of the attempt to interface reason and revelation in a Christian university. I think one of the greatest needs today is to help people to understand the changed situation between reason and understanding and a revelation in our time and in particular to understand that what is in trouble on our campuses today, uh, is reason itself. Reason is in trouble. And, um, the topic that I have chosen, the redemption of reason is to say

that in the, the task of the university in the next century and millennium I can hardly get to the millennium. I guess we're in it once we crossed the line about the next century. Certainly uh is to redeem reason and bring it fully into the camp of God. And, um, if we don't do that, when I first heard the topic about the reason in the next university in the next century, my first thought, my first thought was, I hope it does better than the next century that it did in this one. Um, and, and I believe it can by the power of God. And my claim will be that the only the body of Christian knowledge. I would say this slowly; only the body of Christian knowledge and intellectual method can redeem reason.

Now, I'm not going to try to, uh, keep you awake this morning. I'm going to plod along. Please forgive me. So I'll just have to ask you to, in Biblical language, gird up the loins of your mind and stay with me. Uh, and I want to just say that to you again. Only the body of Christian knowledge and intellectual method can redeem reason. Now if you'd have said that in most places of intellect and knowledge, for

Anytime up probably to the First World War in the Western world, they would have looked at you and said, yes, what else is new? But in the last 50 or so years, the cultural transition has followed the wave of intellectual ideas that has been developing for some centuries so that in the words of Max Picard's wonderful little book, there has been a flight from God, a cultural flight from so that all of the automatic assumptions about life, intellect, truth, knowledge, and so on that prevailed in culture generally, and please understand I, I know that within tiny circles, uh bishop Butler in the preface to his analogy of religion commented in a in a rather wry manner that certain advanced intellectuals seem recently to have found out that Christianity is a hoax. Well that group of intellectuals was extremely small and through the years it has grown and only in recent decades has it come to have the weight of cultural assumption on

its side. And once that came about then reason itself, which was thought to be the hallmark of humanity for good and against evil began to crumble. And for reasons which I shall try to explain could not sustain itself.

And now I'm going to repeat for the third time only the body of Christian knowledge and intellectual method can redeem reason in our time and for the future. Now, let me give you a preliminary survey of the ground. The contest now in our culture and in our universities is not between revelation and reason. Reason is as much or more in trouble in the academic world today as revelation. Now, I admit that in some cases this is because the people who are attacking reason don't think revelation is worth troubling with, but generally speaking, the, the, and uh; the human enterprise that is taking a beating is reason. The opponent of Christian understanding of the Christian understanding of reality today is a set of socially powerful ideas or prejudices. At one time they were called empiricism. And you have the fruit of that in the philosophy of David Hume. A little later, they were called positivism. And you have the fruit of that in the work of thinkers like, Ernst Mach and Nietzsche. Uh, then later on, the logical positivist and the existentialists in the middle of this century, the name for it currently is naturalism, and naturalism is a form of what can also be called scientism, the idea that truth and reality is marked out by the boundaries of the concretely existing sciences and their future.

The central opposing idea to both reason and to revelation is that the sense perceptible world is reality. The sense perceptible world is reality. The so called public world, which is really not very public on most accounts when you get right down to it, uh, but the sense perceptible world is reality. Now we can go various ways from there, but that's the basic idea. On this view reason and knowledge itself becomes incomprehensible. All reason and knowledge itself become, becomes in comprehensive. This is the fundamental fact of our time, from which

reason must be redeemed. The incomprehensibility of reason and knowledge in naturalistic terms. Reason and knowledge are not to be found in the sense perceptible world. It's just that simple. And if then you have to understand everything in terms of the sense perceptible world, reason and knowledge are gone, and that is why you have the many strained and forced interpretations of knowledge and consciousness and reason, including all of the creative arts and all of the areas of expression of the human spirit that we study in the academy. The forced interpretations of these as sociological, as behavioral or even chemical.

And so we heard a wonderful discussion, a presentation, just comments that text that Mike just read about love. And the interpretation of love has to be put in the naturalistic mode. Now when you do that, I'm reminded of the man who said sawdust is wonderfully nourishing, if you will, substitute bread for it. And when you try to put truth into the naturalistic mold, it's gone. When you tried to put evidence and try to put logic, logical relationships, probability, all of these fundamental things. And if you know there, there are many dimensions of evidence, um, and many of them fall into very variegated way within what we would call since perception, but not sense perception in the narrow sense that the naturalist wants to take it. And so we have to simply understand that the sociological, behavioral, and chemical attempts to treat knowledge reason creativity are due to the fact that the only categories available are the ones posed by the naturalistic worldview.

So of course, that's why I say only the Christian knowledge tradition can save knowledge in our time. If we don't have that, then we have a constant struggle within our Christian schools with what one writer has recently called the problem of stemming the drift in our Christian schools. The question comes up, what is it about higher uh academy academic life that seems to

make it so hard, such a hard and fast rule, given enough time any institution, no matter how rooted in Orthodoxy will sooner or later slip away from its anchors.

In an article that appeared in world magazine in May of 1997, uh, Joel Belts tries to address this. And he quotes Galen Biker, president of Calvin College, uh, on the problem. The problem is how do you secure faculty for first class programs and Christian colleges without losing them to the secular mindset. And when you're hiring faculty, you begin to think thoughts like, is it really important that a math professor hold to his school's theological position and, um, the experts in the various subject matters Biker comments and it's very true in this simple statement he makes. It's hard to justify hiring a third rate Christian when you can get a first rate non-Christian. Those are his words. And I think we all, I think every one of us understand the problem. It is a serious problem. It is not something to be dismissed. Now Joel Belt in that article comes up with a formulaic response and that is simply in terms of being faithful to a high doctrine of scriptural inspiration.

And he's commenting actually a bit about Calvin here in Calvin is a, a kind of a lightning rod that draws a lot of blows on its head. A Calvin College. Calvin, of course, is beyond all that. And Belt's comments that the debate really got under way when professors at Calvin and other folks in their sponsoring denomination got wobbly on the doctrine of scripture. That's when the underpinnings get knocked loose. And I agree with that. The question is, what are you going to do about it? Uh, I have a friend who says, when he goes to France, he just speaks French louder when we're dealing with this problem do we just affirm the doctrine louder?

You see, the real problem is how do you integrate a, a high doctrine of scriptural inspiration into the body of knowledge that makes up our academic life. That is the real problem.

Back of drift. We speak of the integration of life and faith and of learning and faith. But that means in practice, let's have a theory of knowledge that incorporates an authoritative scripture. How does that fit in with no special pleading? No dodging, no poopooing, no evading. How does that fit in? Now, you may feel like I've taken unfair advantage of. I'm taking unfair advantage of this morning because I'm going to drag you through some of the hardest patches in philosophy and the reason for that is simply you cannot deal with these questions unless you're really to face up to the question of what constitutes knowledge. You know one of the reasons why people drift on the authority of the scripture is because they have been taught that somehow it is in a separate category and that's what they do. They put it in a separate category and then they do their mathematics. They do their, um, Slavic languages and philosophy and whatever it is, uh, as if it were knowledge. And then when they come to the authority of the Scripture and the contents of the scripture, suddenly that's not treated as knowledge.

It isn't so much it isn't treated, it's not it doesn't even appear in the same category. And that is a kind of compromise that has been worked out over a long period of time. And it was worked out first. I'm going to talk about that a little more in a moment. Worked out first among philosophers such as Spinoza and laid her on thinkers such as Kant and Fichte who, uh, developed a view that the historical content of the religious traditions was only a fasony palai [sp] it was a manner of speaking. It was a way of saying something that could be said better if you laid it aside and did it on the basis of reason so you have a compartmentalization, an idea that somehow, you know, sure, we tell the biblical stories and all of that, but well, you know, they're teaching something which we can all know on a different basis and we can get past all of the sectarian divisions and we can have peace by making this little division here so that religious faith as traditionally understood and real knowledge never meet. They never meet. That is the

circumstance in which drift occurs and drift occurs because that is a falsehood. They do meet and you cannot keep them from meeting. Just the fact that you have one person who's trying to play both sides of that street means that it can never succeed as a device. And what do we have to do is we have to recognize that and we have to begin to understand that the content of the Christian tradition stands on all fours with any other knowledge, tradition and where they deal with the same thing stands as a knowledge claim on the basis of evidence. Authority is not opposed to evidence. Authority is a form of evidence, but we have to have a theory of evidence that brings them together. Well, you may be discouraged to learn. Now that I'm ready to start.

And now I want to just in the pedestrian manner, just go over some things. I want to tell you what reason is. I want to tell you what knowledge is. I don't do this in any, in any high handed way I trust, but we need to have definitions before us to work from. And so let's just begin with reason itself. And I've given you a very simple description. I will. I will not split and start all of the available. Here's what reason is. Reason is the power to determine by thinking what is the case. Reason is the power to determine by thinking what is the case. Really it is the capacity to discern necessary connections, hypothetical connections. And this is true when you're balancing your checkbook, you are using reason. You are saying, if this happened, and that happened in the other happened in the other happened, I wrote this check, I made that deposit. There was this, uh, this, uh, service charge. There's this much going into as much coming out. Then there's this much in the bank that's a use of reason. Some of us may not be familiar with that particular case. anytime you're trying to puzzle out what is happening in the middle of a of an event on the freeway, sometime you're using reason, uh, you are trying to understand your child or your grading a paper are there. Now there's a fine use of reason. Very often it's a great challenge to reason to determine what, if anything is being said.

Of course that's a loving activity because we want to be able to read the paper and I'm sure you feel the same way as a teacher. You wanted to find contact with the mind of this person that is working and it's a great thing. I, I, uh, it's, it sounds a little little Pollyannaish, but I really, I grade most of my own papers, no matter how large the chorus and I do that so I can stay in touch with my students and I have a problem with doing it because I'm apt to get too absorbed in their papers. Uh, so I have to sort of take the lash and drive myself onward to the end. But, uh, that's a use of reason. Reason is power to determine or discover what is the case by thinking.

And we see it in its formal properties. And the, one of the, one of the indicators of the sad state of reason in our culture today is there's almost no training in logic now in our universities. I have to take my undergraduate society and say, no, I know you don't have to take a course in logic, but I encourage you to take a course in logic and to those who are Christians I used the old saying of late hub house. The old English philosopher who used to say all that religion requires of philosophy is a Fairfield and no quarter given because that's exactly right and when you learned it on that basis, you've got something, but now you can go to a PhD. and never know the difference between nonsectarian and post hoc Ergo propter hoc.

Though you think you're never required. Now you're more or less. You fit into a particular field and you learn how the ball bounces in that field and you try to keep the ball bouncing and that's often thought to be good method. That's one reason why in the academy very much today people are judged in terms of where they come out rather than how they got there and that is a fundamental failure of intellectual virtue which should indeed judge where you come out by how you got there and instead of judging how you got there by where you come out, but increasingly in our culture you see reason is put in a position of defending a corner of the academic map for oneself and reason, as Freud might say, has degenerated into rationalization.

Now what is knowledge? Another simple but I think correct statement knowledge is the capacity to represent things as they are. Knowledge is the capacity to represent things as they are on the on an appropriate basis of thought and experience and that is purposely designed to incorporate the authority of tradition and the authority of scripture properly chastened and we learned a lot about evidence by looking at how the tradition of knowledge in the Bible and from their own has developed a. When Abraham, when God comes to Moses, he identifies himself in terms of a previous experience with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and then Moses is a point of reference as the structure of verification if you wish for religious authority and revelation moves down through time until it comes to a head and Jesus Christ himself and when Jesus Christ comes, he fits himself perfec-

[gap in recording]

Lesion that had already been given and he completes it. That is an appropriate basis of thought and experience. If you want to know what God is like, you have to take it in those terms. You're not going to be able to derive and knowledge of what God is simply from a blast of your own experience or from some clever thinking that you did one day after breakfast and we have to understand the nature of evidence and that's a large part of the task that stands before the Christian universities today is to reinterpret and come to an understanding about the nature of evidence and all of the professions today, in my judgment are in epistemological crisis because any solid sense of evidence has departed and it has been taken over by good professional practice and so evidence has become a social logical reality. And then what you do you do with the verse

that says, Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil. Well, if you're following the multitude for your evidence, you don't have much choice left do you. No, we need to say because of the history of our circumstances at this point, that reason is not inherently bad. Knowledge is not a bad thing. It is a good thing. It is like all natural abilities. Reason is simply a natural ability. The ability to know is a natural thing. It is like the ability to grow corn and cook chicken and do all the other things that we need to do to stay alive. There's nothing wrong with it. It's good. God made it. It is good like all of the aspects of the human being that God has created, they're good, but it may be taken as a place to stand independently, have gone, and even against God that it also has in common with all other human abilities.

And that is what has happened in the last 100 years in our academic culture. Uh, if you have not read George Marsden's book on the soul of the uni- American University, go out and read it immediately. And one of the most telling passages in there is where he explains the encounter between William Graham Sumner uh and Noah Porter who was president of Yale, uh, in the 18 nineties. And the heart of that discussion is very simple. Sumner wanted to use a book by Herbert Spencer on sociology, as I recall, and Porter objected that Spencer's book did not include discussions of God and Sumner's reply is like the point where you go over the waterfall. His reply was simply that the subject matter had nothing to do with God that it had nothing to do with God. I know a putter realized the significance of this and there's a wonderful statement that Dr. Marston includes in his book where a porter is saying everything teaches theology. It's just a question of which theology. And he cites Spencer and others. The only question is whether it's going to be their theology. We can do that same thing today. It's only a question of whether we're going to teach the theology of BF Skinner or Carl Sagan or somebody else. Teach a theology. Because when you teach a subject matter in a way that God is irrelevant, you are teaching a

theology and the Christian theology is precisely God is not irrelevant to anything. More on this later, you see the problem is that reason can be socially corrupted. And, uh, what you see in Sumner is the result of uh two or three centuries of the social corruption of reason. And the deeper issue here, as it is always is what is to count as knowledge.

You see Spencer and Sumner, and now nearly everyone in the academic world simply defines knowledge in such a way that what can be known is something that God has nothing to do with. Well see what I have to say to you is that is not a discovery that is a decision they did not discover that they decided that now the weight of history had pushed them along, it's true to the point to where they thought for their own professional risk respectability, they had to make that decision. And now I think it's so important to understand that the skids began to really move at this point because the old model of responsibility for knowledge before God, which was basically that the president or perhaps a community minister or perhaps some of the more distinguished members of the faculty would interpret the whole college career, uh, to the student in the light of Christian revelation that could no longer sustain itself in the face of specialized knowledge. Noah Porter could not convincingly come back to William Graham Sumner and say you don't know what you're talking about; you understand what I'm saying. The growth of specialist knowledge posed a problem for Christian intellectual leadership in the academy, which it was never able to get over or has not thus far after this conference of course it will. So the deeper issue here you see is what is to count as knowledge and the decision that you see in Spencer and in William Graham Sumner uh has its roots back in people. Like I mentioned, Spinoza. Spinoza wrote a book called *Tractatus Theologico Politicus*.

So I think our political theological side I never can quite remember that, uh, but it was tract on the relationship between theology and politics. And it is worth your time to read it

because Spinoza more than anyone else set a foot. Well, there are many, many dimensions of this including a, he really gave great impetus to bodies called higher criticism. Uh, and the, and the function of higher criticism, uh, is very apparent in what Spinoza has to say in his book. The function of higher criticism is to disarm historical traditions and authoritative texts and to put them in a position where they can be reinterpreted as having a local cultural significance, but not significance as conveying truth about reality that now is going to be left to the sciences and to philosophy of course, and the state will stand back and not enforce theological truths, which of course is a major issue and in Holland at that time were Spinoza lived. Mennonites were hunted down and burned at the stake.

This is not a small thing is it, but with the good comes a time bomb and it takes away the irrelevance of the content of historical revelation to reality and then we have the positive side and that seemed no more clearly than in a piece of writing by a Frenchman named Condosay [sp]. And it's a a piece that he entitled Sketch for historical picture of the progress of the human mind. A ironic piece, condo say wrote this while he was in hiding from the French revolution, which he had earlier sponsored and which killed him before he got the book written, and it's full of confidence about the progress of the human mind on the basis of scientific knowledge, knowledge of scientific laws, scientific laws are of course to be interpreted precisely in the naturalistic way that I have described already. And indeed, you see we're going to solve every conceivable problem in including the problem that we still talk about today. So amusing to see how these things keep going, that we're going to overcome aging and death on the basis of natural law. We will also learn how to make people virtuous and happy. Uh, and uh, see, that's the positive side. What do you need religion and priests for? If you have science? Well, this is not exactly worked out, uh, but liberal thought. I don't mean to use that in a derogatory term, but

descriptively liberal thought as it's historically understood, including liberal theology, adopted this course that you see both in Spinoza and then later in Condo say, uh, it says, the it buys into the idea of the scientific and knowledge as defined by the scientific and what's it in opposition in another category to faith and I think many of you will know that story so I will not spend much time on that.

Now, the reaction on the part of fundamentalism and likewise, I don't use that as a term of derogation at all, but rather as a descriptive term reaction to fundamentalism was mistakenly to attack reason and I came up through Christian colleges and I know how bad this can be at times at the very idea that thought is wicked and you can quote verses on that. That the imagination is wicked and the idea that there is nothing good in human beings and that therefore one should sorta try to blotto every element of creativity and thought and action. Of course, we were in. I was in a very confused tradition. Anyway. I'm southern Baptist and in that tradition we will preach to you for an hour that you can do nothing to be saved and then sing to you four and a half an hour trying to get you to do something to be saved and that is confusing. So the real problems here, and I just say very simply, mistakenly, the fundamentalist reaction was generally speaking and of course there are exceptions and if we had time we could name them. There are exceptions, was to see the problem to be reason and not to be wrong reason. It's like the people who quote Paul from Colossians two about vain philosophy and suppose that the idea to respond with is no philosophy at all. I hope if I advised you against vain clothing you would not supposed, etc.

So there was a, there was a progression that really went on by and large did the disowning of particular fields from the authority of the Christian tradition, the disowning of knowledge of such regarding it as outside the pale and so many times in Christian institutions.

The idea was that we really do spiritual life here and we protect our students from those bad people in the other universities and we do what is necessary to qualify them for jobs, but we don't honor. We don't think of honoring the intellectual or artistic life in its own right. Somehow that would. That would be ungodly. So now the next stage is how reason itself left on its own, left without the life giving sustenance of the content of scriptural revelation, reason on its own falls, victim to empiricism and positivism. It's a long story. I don't have time to tell it to patron saint who is Nietzsche. Nietzsche, himself philosophically was the dupe of all kinds of shallow and unconvincing philosophical positions. Most notably phenomenalism or positivism. Simply buys the whole bag. The weight of authority falls on him and actually he gives a theory which justifies it. Anyway. It's always nice to do. You're going to be irrational. Give a good reason for it, but Nietzsche is of course the patron saint of irrationalism now and the campus is generally.

The idea is that everything is an expression of power and so then all of the very real problems in our culture about diversity and oppression and so on are brought to bear on this and the idea is comes to be now that even truth is oppressive. Logic is a male conspiracy. I've I. You hear these things actually said that reason itself is a part of the problem because reason gets formed in a cultural way so that those in power kind of pressed the weak and guess what? There's a lot of truth to it, a lot of truth to it, but it's a fundamentally, it is used to undermine the role of reason as an authority and reason cannot sustain itself, and the reason it can't sustain itself is because it does not fall within the naturalistic worldview. And so it is pushed over into that worldview and standards of reason and rationality are then treated sociologically or behaviorally. It's only when you get in and philosophy that you find any attempt to even say that they are chemical, but you know, that's, that's quite a stretch. So they're usually treated sociologically or behaviorally and frankly, they are lost reason cannot sustain itself on its own as no natural

created power can reason was never meant to function on its own any more than any of other are other natural power. Sexuality, the ability to cultivate the landscape, to, uh, work with chemicals, chemicals and physical powers and so on. None of that was ever meant to be alone. Reason wasn't, neither won't stand, it won't stand on its own. And so we come to the point now that reason must be redeemed. Okay? I hope you're still with me. Uh, again, I apologize. I know no way to do this other than this way. Maybe I should stop my foot more often, but I just know of no other way to do it. So now in my, uh, overall outline, I've talked about what reason is and I talked about the history of reason and I'm now down to the point to where reason must be redeemed. And I want to say some things about that reason must be redeemed because it becomes, it falls under the influence of fallen patterns in our social context.

I'll read you a few words from C.S. Lewis, wonderful *Screwtape Letters*. Um, this is a prophetic book. Uh, I'm stunned when I read Lewis, especially these, and he's, I see Lewis as standing midstream where everything that I'm talking to you this morning is sweeping past him and he's standing there and he sees it and he knows it. Uh, I what he says his prophetic because it's, it has become increasingly true. But, uh, in the first letter you have Screwtape saying, my dear wormwood, I note that you are what you say about guiding your patients reading and taking care of that he sees a good deal of his materialist friend. But you are, are you not being a trifle naive? It sounds as if you suppose that argument was the way to keep him out of the enemy's clutches. That might have been so if he had lived a few centuries earlier, at that time, humans still knew pretty well when the thing was proved and when it was not. And if it was proved, they really believed it. They still connected thinking with doing. And we're prepared to alter their way of life as the result of a chain of reasoning. But what were the weekly press and other such weapons we've largely all heard that you're a man has been accustomed ever since he was a boy

to having a dozen incompatible philosophies is dancing about together inside his head. He doesn't think of doctrines as primarily true or false, but as academic or practical as outworn or contemporary, as ruthless or conventional jargon, not argument is your best ally in keeping him from the church. Don't waste time trying to make him think that materialism is true. Make him think it is strong or stark or courageous. That is the philosophy of the future. That's the sort of thing he cares about. The trouble about argument is that it moves the whole struggle under the enemy's own ground. He can argue too. Whereas in really practical propaganda of this kind I'm suggesting, he has been shown for centuries to be greatly inferior to our father below. By the very act of arguing, you awake the patient's reason and once it is awake, who can foresee the result? Even if a particular train of thought can be twisted, so as to end in our favor, you will find that you have strengthened in your patient the fatal habit of attending to universal issues and with growing his consciousness, his attention from the stream of immediate experience. Your business is to fix his attention on that stream. Teach him to call it real life and don't let him ask what he means by real.

You see this, the flow of human events around academics proves that they too are sinners and they too are ready to give in to the pulls and pushes of the social context. Another little piece by Lewis called the inner circle is one of the most important things for any Christian academic to read the inner circle and it is a story about how we hunger all of our life to be included and that is one of the main reasons why reason has to be redeemed. I often jokingly say, but not so jokingly that the lie most commonly told in my context is, oh yes, I've read that book. Now, why do we say that? Because we want to be included. We don't want to be left out. We want to be in the whole word. Party is an interesting word. It means to be a part of right, and we like to be included where you like to be brought him, only the strength of a greater community that is

provided by Jesus Christ can stand against that and that's why Paul refers to the church as the pillar and ground of truth. It really is only the person in a redeemed relationship to God that can stand for truth. Truth is too hard. You often hear the verse quoted to the effect that the truth will make you free.

The truth will not make you free. That verse doesn't say that. Read the whole thing. It doesn't say that and it's about discipleship. Uh, if you continue in my word, then you are my disciples. Indeed, and you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. We've don't even have to know it anymore. At USC on the elevator, in the humanities building, it just says, dot, dot, dot. The truth will make you free; Truth will not make you free. You probably better said the truth will make you flee. Truth is hard to live with, and that is one reason why there has to be a community of redemption that comes down to earth and provides a context in which people can truly walk free in the truth because they are supported by their spiritual redemption before god in relationship to him. They're living in what I call a conversational relationship with god. Now I want to spell out in rather a full detail just exactly why uh reason has to be redeemed. I'll give you just a true. It follows reason cannot prevail within the naturalist paradigm and reason will not prevail. And of course, generally. Now, if you're familiar with postmodernist talk, you know, it's ordinarily assumed. That reason is, uh, it goes along with technology and you have two magical words which you chant when the topic of reason comes up. One, one is Hiroshima and the other is Auschwitz. And these are taken to prove that reason has failed from the other side.

Now, last, uh, yesterday, there was mention of the name Derek Bach and Derek Bach is a man I greatly admire in his presidents report to Harvard or the corporation for 86 and 87 Derek Bach, comments on the problem of teaching and fostering moral development in the university.

He has reason to do this because several outstanding graduates of Harvard had recently been escorted to jail from Wall Street. And uh, so he's reflecting on this. And actually Derek is uh very deeply committed, I think, and I do admire him greatly and I'm not in the least trying to belittle him, but rather to use his concern as, as to make this point drive this point home. Derek Bach says the church is no longer succeeding in forming character. Interesting observation, but he says, perhaps the universities should look into this matter. Well, you know, you almost want to say wrong turn, but on the other hand Bach realizes that the universities have had responsibility for this. He knows the tradition well enough. He's very well informed man. And he knows that in the past universities did assume a lot of responsibility for this. And again, read George Marsden's book to see the depth to which this is true, so he wonders about this and he sort of changed Harvard and other universities for not doing it and now unfortunately if he had walked across to Emerson hall and inquired of the people who perhaps are thought to be most knowledgeable about this, he would have discovered that there is no such thing as moral knowledge. And it's very hard to have development of anything of which you have no knowledge.

Now, why is there no moral knowledge? And again, I just have to lay that on you and I will be happy to try to say more about it later. But that's the situation we're in today. There is no moral knowledge and people often wonder why has there been such a fuss about political correctness? Answer. There isn't any other kind of correctness that's disappeared as a topic of discourse. Now, in my final moments, stay with me please. I'm going to try to say very specifically what we as Christians might begin to do about this. How are we to be redemptive? How are we to redeem reason and understanding? How are we to bring back a social framework within which reason can fulfill her God-appointed function? Please understand my claim. Reason

cannot stand on its own. It cannot stand on its own. It will be swamped by the sinfulness. I can say that here which is present as an actual reality in the most exalted corridors of learning. What one finds is there are no original sins. It would be nice if we could find one sometime that would be refreshing, but when you're standing around with the highest levels of learning, you find that it's drearily present and this desire to fit in the divine desire to advance one south, the desire to be secure and so on, which are of course valid needs. They simply corrupt the power of reason and make it serve at the mills of the philistines like blinded Samson. Here's what we must do institutionally and individually treat the content of, and again, I use Lewis's word, Mere Christianity, treat the content of mere Christianity as a certified body of knowledge.

This is going to be a tremendous effort and nothing I'm going to say now in these closing moments is going to be easy, but I say it again. Treat the content of mere Christianity as a certified body of knowledge and Lewis used that phrase basically to shear off all of the odd accretions that come to us from our more or less a recent history. Usually you know which way you get baptized three times forward or whatever and so and that's that's not included. The doctrine of the trinity and the incarnation, the presence of Christ and his people, the authority of the word and so on. That's mere Christianity. I'm saying, treated as a certified body of knowledge on stop acting as if it were something else. Strip that gear in your transmission which allows you to shift over intellectually. When you come to the doctrine of the trinity, the resurrection of Christ, the origin of matter from mind and so on. The biblical tradition is a tradition of knowledge. I've already said what it is. Don't have time to go back and repeat it. What knowledge is the biblical tradition is the tradition of knowledge. And many of you may be getting uneasy at this point. You can see what's happening to grace. This is not a, you know, work knowledge, effort. Grace is not opposed to effort. It's opposed to earning, not opposed to

effort. It's opposed to earning. Jesus said, without me, you can do nothing and you to be sure if you do nothing, it will be without him.

So in all firmness, in love and openness and humility, we say this is knowledge. It is certified, it is certifiably. It is certifiable to anyone who will look into it. You hear of people who decided to look into the resurrection and how many of them that are converted. Now, I don't know. There may have been some that weren't converted. They didn't write a book, but Morrison and Wallace and all these other famous people looked at. It just needs to be looked into. We don't need to poopoo. We don't need to be high handed. We don't need to be arrogant. We must not be arrogant. We must live in the spirit of Christ. We must love our neighbor as ourselves. If my neighbor is Jacques Derrida or Nietzsche, he's still my neighbor. I love him as myself and I'm going to be faithful to him and I'm going to be faithful to him in truth. Secondly, confront the main issue at every turn. Con- again and I include, I say institutionally and individually because we can't go this alone.

Individual faculty, people can do a lot and thank God for the heroes, but basically we need to stand together and we need our institutions to encourage us, but on the other hand, our institutions, we can't send Clyde cook out front and let him get a hand shot off if we're not prepared to stand back, I'll have him in our fields and that's often what happens to college presidents. They stand up for stuff that the faculty wouldn't be caught dead defending in their professions. I'm sorry, I don't mean to be unpleasant, but my heart goes out to these men and women who stand up like this and we. They need them. We have to stand with them. We're the ones that have to deliver the goods. I said, we never got over that hump of specialist knowledge that effectively shut the mouths of the people who stood as spokesman, people like Noah Porter and and he was a not a bad philosopher in his own field, but when you stand up as president,

you've got to have people back of you saying, yes, I'll deliver the goods. You write the order and I will deliver the goods. I'll deliver it in sociology or deliver it in Slavic literature. I'll deliver. The goods are delivered in algebra. I'll deliver the goods. We confront the main issue at every turn in the main issue. It's the reality of the spirit that is the main issue, the reality of the spirit and of the spirit, and we have many people teaching in some of our evangelical seminaries even who will dodge this like it was a silver bullet.

The reality of the spirit, and here we come back to the very heart of theology. God is spirit, often shocking to people. I tell them, god doesn't have a brain. When they go into a state of shock, he doesn't miss it, doesn't need it. Everything is a no brainer to god. Thirdly, make a point of specifically treating our subject matter in relation to god, and now here I'm just going to get down to the real nitty gritty. I suggest that at least one whole lecture; each course in a Christian university shouldn't be devoted to the relationship of the subject matter to god. One whole hour specifically devote down you can't force people to do this and this not. I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about leadership, about opening the way. Suppose the members of the Christian coalition of colleges and universities took this as an ideal and opened up a home page and started a discussion. I'll tell you, it won't be hard once you get into it. It's like jumping into a cold swimming pool. It's hard when you're entering, but this going to be done and I'm suggesting that every Christian faculty member should as appropriate; develop one lecture for each course which explicitly relates to their subject matter to fundamental Christian doctrine. Well, what does Pascal's theory have to do with the trinity? Might be more interesting than you think it is.

No. Jive, no poopooing, no forcing, just hard, honest thinking, accompanied by the grace of god. Fourth, devote one week of research each year to exceed to exploring the connection of my subject matter to fundamental Christian doctrine. The mere Christianity devote one week of

research time each year to that. Now, you know, after a few years you might not need it and that's good. You can go fishing or whatever you'd like to do, but until it's done, until it's done and a fifth, that institutionally, individually and individually, we refused to allow the secular mind to continue to define what counts as knowledge. This is the bedrock issue. What counts as knowledge? That's why William Graham Sumner said what he did about using Spencer's book. What counts as knowledge? Don't farm this out to your philosophy department. Or your theology department. Each of us work it through ministers desperately need to work this through and if they worked it through carefully and it isn't an endless task and you don't have to have a PhD in it. On the other hand, Christian faculty needs to lead the way.

That's what we're Christian faculty for, isn't it? we need to lead the way, but if ministers began to teach and talk about this as some do, then we'd have a lot less Christians coming to our universities and hanging on by the skin of their teeth, if at all, until they had finished their requirements and got out where they could begin to practice their religion privately and conduct their profession in secular terms. Now, if we approach it in this way, six, we will solve the problem of freedom. In the Christian academy. The problem of freedom of thought is absolutely, absolutely crucial one, one of the things we know is it cannot be settled by force. You cannot stuff things down people's throats and thank god you can't. The problem of freedom in the Christian academy is solved by intellectual leadership. That is what can stop the drift. Set the students free because of the strength of the leadership of intellect on the campus.

Well, I must quit. There's a little a little folder out in the foyer has my old colleague Stan Madison's picture on it. Old badger. It looks a little like a badger here. Looks like this was a wonderful title. Loosen the fire; they're out in the foyer. That's, that's, that'd be a good thing to

put on your bathroom mirror. I've you got stands. Picture off stands had enough hard times in his life. He can take this loose in the fire and not a wonderful phrase. You know where that store is?

[gap in recording]

All the academic music. You hear this music, you're going to bow down or you're going in the fiery furnace and these guys said, we don't even need to have a committee meeting. We're going in. And you remember the old king after he threw them in, some men got burnt. Throwing him in. Said what? We put three in there. There's four loose walking in the fire. The power of god will be with us as we walk loose in the fire. Thank you.

Speaker 1:

I probably don't need to stay at. But um, that was an absolutely powerful, uh, essential and nonnegotiable in the development of the Christian university. Only the body of Christian knowledge and intellectual method can redeem reason in our culture. In the university. Thank you very much, Dallas. I knew you'd do it. We now have, um, just a few moments. We now have two final parallel faculty papers and these promise to be also essential. Robert Saucy on being a Christian university, reflections from a theologian and Sherwood Lingenfelter, our provost university church and culture, prisoners or partners for the great commission. Dr. Lingenfelter will be in a Meyer's auditorium.