



## Transcriptions

### Counting the Tough Steps Toward Multicultural Education

Ted Ward

**Annotation:** *Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges Annual Meeting (AABC), Hyatt Orlando Hotel in Kissimmee, FL. February 16-18, 1995 (AABC now known as Association for Biblical Higher Education).* Transcribed and uploaded to Ward Archives with permission. Ted Ward observes that multicultural education will simply be a fad if it shows up only as new courses. The crucial nature of multicultural education is found in the interaction between today's responsible Christians and a demanding, complex world.



The issue of how we get on with a multicultural education and how much it costs; if that definition or that distinction really holds up, it certainly at least starts us off thinking in the right sort of ways. If multicultural education is a fad, it'll show up as new courses. If we recognize it, however, in the biblical perspective, I think we'll recognize that there is nothing new about it at all. It's just an old problem. It's been with us for a long time. Now it's crucial, then, today as a function of the interaction between today's responsible Christian and a much more demanding and complicated world. It used to be possible for people to stay down on the farm and stay in small towns and in other kinds of situations where they didn't have to confront external realities. External realities are all over us today and there's just no way you can escape a world that has become a great deal more interrelated and interdependent. I sometimes talk about this in terms of giving a metaphoric suggestion that the world is like a whole field full of puddles, and the field, with varying soils within

it, has different-colored puddles. Now those different puddles—we get used to them; we get used to walking around them and we know where they are. But if the water table rises, those puddles begin to flow together. And as those puddles flow together, several things happen. First of all, it becomes a lot more difficult to walk around them. You end up having to walk through some of them. But as you do walk through them you discover that where the differences in the colors of these puddles come together there are always swirl points where there's an interaction between this color and that color, and between this and that degree of openness.

We're living in a world where the world population and technology, itself, is causing the water table to rise. We no longer have the option of thinking in terms of puddles. Even much of our thinking about missions is related to a kind of a puddle philosophy. There's a puddle over there that hasn't been reached yet. We've got to figure out some way to kind of zoom something over into that puddle and make the biggest possible splash.

Now let me tell you, the world isn't a series of puddles anymore nearly so much as it is a series of interconnecting flow lines that are becoming increasingly more turbulent as they mix together. And where they meet at the points of the mixing produce all kinds of reactions that are largely negative. Those interactions can be positive; the consequence of flowing together can be constructive, but it takes reconciliation skills for that to happen. And if there's anything this world is short of today it's in terms of human skills. It is the reconciliation skills. You ask any of the agencies of the international body what they have the greatest need for it is a firing-line reconciliation specialist who knows how to sit down with people and get them to listen to each other and themselves to listen to one another. These are things that we really want to get hold of and then we must deal with, but I'm not going to repeat that. I'm not going to do anything other than move onward with the assumption that you're more or less with me in some basic propositions about this issue, and forgive me if I'm presupposing on an unresolved mind, but we have to start somewhere.

So I'm going to identify for you the things that I'm assuming. I'm assuming that we're all ready to start here this morning with an understanding that intercultural perspective is or ought to be a Christian norm. Now "norm" does not mean here we're already there, but "norm" means that our standard is already there. A biblical standard on the nature of the church and the interrelationship among the disciples of Christ and of the commitment of those disciples to carry out the work of salvation and redemption on the successive behalf of the Lord Jesus Christ; he has left us here to carry that out. It is enough to say, intercultural perspective is, for Christians, a norm. Now I'm not to debate that, just sort of assume it and go on.

Second: intercultural competency as an important educational outcome is something else that I'm going to assume. Therefore, no matter what the major, no matter what the institution, no matter what the program, one of the characteristics of the educated person is that that person has developed some degree of intercultural competency. Which is one reason that I remarked last night that it's very difficult for me to imagine institutions that are essentially monocultural. Being able to fulfill on what would be a responsible educational outcome for today. I hope you follow the logic of this. And, again, it's not a question of adding something to the to the curriculum or if you don't have that in your curriculum you're not an adequate institution.

But the issue goes far beyond that. I know of monocultural institutions that try to teach multicultural perspectives out of books. Now, although that can be valuable, it is not enough; it won't work. Because a multicultural perspective and intercultural competency; these are matters that

do not grow out of simply the intellectual grasp of ideas. They must be acted upon. They must be put into action. They must be experienced.

Third assumption that I'm making is that we're at least understanding why one would hold that the campus environment, itself, should be seen as a multicultural learning experience. In other words, if an institution wants to get serious about a multicultural education, it has to look at the whole campus. It has to look at the environment—the place where the learning is taking place in that environment, and how that environment's being used.

But couple that one to the fourth assumption—one that we also mentioned last night but kind of indirectly—and that is the importance of diverse off-campus learning experiences integral to the whole academic process. Now this doesn't mean, you know, when they get all done send them off for a short-term mission experience. It means the very opposite of that. If you're really serious about getting this kind of an educational outcome, you're going have to do something integral with the whole with the whole experience.

Now I think if you're dealing with a largely monocultural campus, you may want to make a first step by putting your people into some kind of short-term experience as they go along so that some kind of a one-week, two-week, three-week experience every year. That would be, to me, a minimal track record so that there would be some kind of exposure in another cultural context every year.

Take a lesson from medical education. Medical education in the United States, as a result of the Flexner Report in 1908, just about went under because one of the things the Flexner Report revealed—by the way, the Flexner Report was the first study of academic education sponsored by the Carnegie endowment which now is one of the biggies in terms of sponsoring educational research—and the findings were focused on the character of medical education at the turn of the century in the United States. And one of the things they discovered was that the medical education in the United States—in sharp contrast with European education—was still using a seventeenth- and eighteenth-century model of lectures and examples, observations and readings as the nature of medical education. And that the typical medical doctor trained in the United States did not have any clinical, hands-on experiences to a live, warm human body all the way through medical school as recently as 1908.

Now I maintain that in theological education today we need a Flexner Report. Now this is one of my discussion points with seminaries because I think that it would bomb theological education about as badly as it bombed medical education to face up to that reality that we're teaching people a lot of stuff without any contact with the people that this stuff is supposed to relate to. Well, I don't want to belabor the point there, but let's take the thing on down to the level of Bible college—or over to the level and function of Bible college and ask how in the world can we expect to teach people to cope effectively with people who are different if they've never really rubbed shoulders with those people who are different and work in context that they, themselves, did not dominate? The real issue is getting into another cultural context and recognizing that others are dominating that particular culture.

We have two things. Let me do a couple of definitional things here. First of all, the difference between the way the word cultural is used in contrast with other ways of defining human difference: Cultural versus Ethnic. Ethnic versus Racial. Now what are we talking about here? Interracial,

interethnic, intercultural. Now that's the first echelon of difference. Generally, these words have a great deal of overlap. They are not in some kind of a vocabulary that it's like red and green and yellow and purple. They are not divisions of a spectrum. They are like a spectrum in that they're kind of falling all over each other.

The word ethnic usually refers to some characteristics, whether they're based in language or racial genetic characteristics, or whether they're even history or even age in a given culture. Like I was mentioning last night, there's a kind of an ethnic difference between youth and the geriatric set. It's virtually an ethnic difference; ethnic I would usually use as a kind of a reflection of our notions of racial difference. But it can be as simple as language difference. So, for example, back in the Jerusalem church these converts to Christianity that had come into the church came out of Judaism. And they were Jews, but they talked funny. The very fact that they talked funny was what had made them ethnically different in Jerusalem and why they had to have their own little synagogue over there that was nicknamed, in a kind of a pejorative way, 'where the slaves go', synagogue of the freed men; you know, where they talk funny. Now, that's ethnic.

Racial usually means the things that are genetic: skin, hair, shape, profile, etc. Those are the genetic stuff that we usually refer to as racial. Racial is not a real good categorization because it's the easiest one to put a finger on and say, oh, boy, there's a person who is obviously Asian. But the more you know about Asian; the more you work among Asians, that is not a useful distinction because Asians come in all sorts of sub-strata, sub-division. The same thing's true of Blacks. Oh, there is a person who is a Black. Well, let me tell you, lots of people are Black and lots of various racial groups are Black. That's not a good handle because it suggests a precision that is not possible. And Whites the same way, oh, the Anglos. Well, you'd be surprised how the word Anglo gets in trouble because Anglo is not actually a racial distinction. It is a linguistic distinction. It has to do with it being a person out of an English-speaking background, hence Anglo. So the Chicanos throw it up to the Whites that they're all Anglos though they're not. There are Italians and there are a lot of people who aren't English-speaking that are floating around getting named Anglos. These naming systems don't work very well and people use them generally in a very negative way to cut themselves off or to create a focal tension. Now the issue—I like the word ethnic and I use the word ethnic a lot.

Culture is so broad and it embraces everything, but it really has to do with, much as anything, a lifestyle. Culture is ultimately lifestyle. And so we talk about cultural artifacts, you know, vases of a certain shape. Oh, they were part of a lifestyle of the Greeks of a certain period or the Romans of a certain period. So those things which are cultural are ultimately lifestyle matters. Certain kinds of music, you know, I'm culturally attuned to a to a diatonic scale whereas some of my friends in in Asia are attuned to a pentatonic scale and some of my friends in Africa are attuned to a scale that defies description from Western categories because it just slides all over the place, you know. And so these are matters of culture. Now the problem with culture is that it is both a very good big word and also sufficiently fuzzy; throw everything under it. So when we talk about dealing with people who are different, we are usually talking about intercultural dealings.

The field of anthropology and social psychology has been using the term cross-cultural for a good long while, but it originated out of the research world within those fields where the issue was, what things are common from culture to culture. Such as, for example, a phenomenon like family pattern; how families are patterned. Family is cross-cultural. Everybody has family, but the nature of the family is differentiated. Therefore, to study the family cross-culturally is to look at those

differences. Now thanks to a few people in California, echoed by a few people in Illinois, and then a few people more in other centers; the word cross-cultural was brought over about twenty years ago to refer to anything that meant going *across* a culture. This is distinctly a misuse and is distinctly devastating to language because it is forced into being a whole bunch of new words like supra-cultural which is actually what the word cross-cultural originally meant: something that exists in some form *across* cultures.

The real crucial problem is that it suggests that a person going to another culture is working cross-culturally. I can show you a lot of people who were in foreign missions who were working mono-culturally because the only people they know how to work with are other people from their own country. You know, they are across there, but they are not working cross-culturally. They're not even working effectively. But I think you will find the historic literature in this whole field to refer to that kind of interaction across a cultural line as intercultural. So we talk about intercultural missions much more precisely than we talk about cross-cultural missions.

Now the gospel is cross-cultural. Do you see the distinction? The gospel is cross-cultural; not that it's already there, but that its meaning is there. It is available for all like family is cross-cultural; God is cross-cultural, but a missionary is always intercultural. Does that make sense? If it does, I'd wish you talk to some of the people who edit books today because this is rapidly becoming a big problem. And even in mission publicity it's real sloppy and it's doing violence. An interesting thing, talk about the power of Christian influence. The field of anthropology, itself, is shifting to conform to what the missionary literature has been using. And now you find cross-cultural even in the better journals of anthropology. Maybe I'm just old-fashioned, but I happen to think that it misses the point and forces us to find some more words. The minute you use one word that was designed for this purpose and use it for a different purpose then you've got to get something else to re-name this. And across generations that use of language gets real sloppy. How I did I get into such a response to that simple question you asked about that? Don't ask another one like that Art.

Any other questions for clarification? Instead of Anglos? Well, you better decide if you mean White or if you mean North American non-Hispanic or North American—this isn't a good word to replace Anglo because Anglo is a generalization that usually doesn't mean cultured out of an English-speaking language. There are just a lot of those words that just, you know, you might as well go ahead and use them in ordinary conversation. You don't have to be a purist just because you know the history of words. But you do have to be sensitive to the fact that they may not be meaning the same thing to everybody.

The more we know about human genetics, the more we know that the word race and racial just don't hold up. And back to our old presuppositions about the sons of know-it-all. And that is so far from the way God put things together that it's just absurd. Now I don't want to get into the theology that was flogged the other day, but I appreciate your pointing this out.

By the way, you mentioned last week's *Newsweek*. I challenge you to pick up any first-line news magazine and not find at least 15% of it given to interethnic matters. It is the hottest-selling topic having surpassed sex about eight years ago and the journalists all know it. And that, you know, evidenced in the O.J. trial and it's evidenced in the thing we were talking about last night which helped to trigger this this ferocious preoccupation. And I don't think that we, as Christians, have begun to actualize the full implication of what's on the board here. And, therefore, although our norms are there, I don't think our behavior is.

Now I would say that the secular world is having at least as much trouble. If you look at the data that May Stewart points out; how many of you have gotten a hold of a copy of those data? Be sure to look at that. And the name of it is, *Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges: Cultural Diversity Research Project*. This is an internal study done at great pains by a number of the institutions. But she used some very appropriate data from sources as referenced to non-Christian institutions. No. I would like to see a lot more distinctives among Christians on these matters. And I think that it's a pain to me—just a real deep pain—that we are not producing from Bible colleges and Christian liberal arts colleges, people who are who are snapped up for occupations and roles in reconciliation ministry. There's plenty of room for it. And talk about a bi-vocational role for ministers. Wow! And there is such a demand for it that if we were to get serious about, in the name of the Prince of Peace, becoming competent in these matters, the Christians could make a very real impact in a hurting world because it's such a gas.

Now let me ask you to look at a way of assessing how do you get on with this with your own institution. Because the purpose of this session is perhaps not that of a of a workshop, but I thought it would be valuable for me to try to do something other than just lay out the problem which I tried to do last night. Today I want to try to work with you as a kind of an educational consultant. If I were to come in and work with your faculty or, more particularly, if you were to take some ideas and try to work with your faculty; what are some of the ways you could help focus these issues and get them to think seriously and plan carefully? And this was a little bit of a simplification of process, but it's replicable and I think you'll find it'll work. Take this as a kind of a starting place and where I have the word “your” you change it to the word “our.” What would our catalogue say if our Bible College placed a high value on multicultural education? Now let me ask first of all just so we know who we're talking to, “How many of you represent an institution that already places high value on multicultural education?” Your institution places a high value on that. Now I I'm glad to see that and I'm not doubting you; but I'm saying that what I think still today is unfortunately not the norm. I think that in most of our institutions that we do not. We may place a great deal of emphasis on foreign missions. We may place a great deal on even home missions and ethnic evangelism, but in terms of the whole program of the campus; the whole impact of the Bible College education, in my observation this is perhaps less than a quarter of the institutions that are placing this at high value. It's not surprising to me that we have about a third of the group here put a hand up on that because generally the people that come to a session like this are the ones that are already convinced. So I think that's kind of where we're at. There were a lot of people at the session last night that I think are thinking today but they are not really ready to go on forward today, or at least something else is a lot more dramatic and appealing, and they don't want to have to listen to me for another hour. I can understand that.

Now just using the catalogue idea—catalogue and the publicity—if your institution does or should or is engaged in increasing the emphasis on a multicultural education, what would you expect to find in that catalogue about purposes, objectives, intended outcomes? Now you see what I'm saying here is that if you can actually run an exercise like this over a period of two or three sessions of faculty development hour within your own faculty and say, “Let's just look at this. What would we want our catalogue to communicate about our outcome? What would we want our catalogue to communicate about our purpose in being here as an institution?” Now some of you, especially those of you who are already doing this, can you tell me something from your catalogue? And I'm talking primarily about the purpose material, the upfront material. Why are we in business? What are we trying to accomplish where you already have disciplines and you you're already communicating them? What kind of thing do you try to communicate? So you're saying upfront that it is a clear,

identifiable part of the mission of this institution. So that if a person got into your institution and began to be oppressed by having to deal with people who are different, you would be able to say, “That’s what you got into. Did you read that? Did you know that? It’s on the front page of the catalogue.” That’s a very, very constructive response, by the way. I wish we had more institutions doing that.

Let’s hear another one. Now let’s talk about what’s upfront. What’s the purpose of the institution? Okay, okay, but is it upfront? It’d just be lodged in the specifics. Now the question is, are those specifics organized in such a way that people would come across those things if they elected certain emphasis majors? But they would not come across those things if they did not elect those majors. For example, I see a lot of very fine statements along this line with reference to the mission curriculum in a lot of institutions and it’s almost as if, if I came into this institution and suddenly found myself confronted with intercultural matters, I could go to the dean and say, “Look, I’m in a communication major not the mission major. What’s all this stuff for?” That’s what I’m worried about in terms of particularization. You have it built into the general education requirements. That’s a good thing. Somewhere somehow the kind of response to this first question that I think you ought to work toward as a faculty is how can we put this upfront. Now, at this point, we’re just talking about claims. And as we go through this list, we’re also going to see the substance underneath those claims. But if you can’t at least identify the claims that you want to make, it’s not going to do much good to discuss what kinds of activity or emphasis you want to put into a curriculum or into a schooling experience. Right? So the issue is how much do we want to commit ourselves to upfront. And I’m quite literally using the upfront of the catalogue as the illustrative point.

Let’s go to the next one. I’m just going to walk through these seven so feel free to raise questions and let’s get some dialogue going here, if you will. What would your catalogue say if your Bible College placed a high value on multicultural education? What would it say about lifestyle of faculty? We ought to start with the curriculum, maybe. No, any page. If you don’t start right off with the lifestyle of the faculty, everything else is lost. And this one is the one that is typically overlooked and I insist on putting it right after this question of what is the claim of the institution. The point being if the claim of the institution is such and such, then the very first thing that the administration has in its command is faculty. And if you are hiring people without checking these characteristics, you’re making a big mistake. Now what kind of characteristics? What would you want to be able to say upfront about the lifestyle of your faculty? And don’t tell me they all go to church. That would be a nice thing to say, “All faculty members are involved in local churches.” Boy, I wish that were true. But that’s the kind of statement I’m after, but not the *one* I’m after. I want to see that one and a lot of other things. Most faculty are engaged in . . . come on, put your thinking together . . . intercultural ministry. That is what I mean by lifestyle. You thought I meant whether or not they drink. A lifestyle, in general, doesn’t necessarily deal with whether or not they drink. It’s a much bigger concept than that. The issue is what do they value and how do they express those values in their decisions and activities in life. So if you were to say upfront, most faculty are engaged in multicultural ministry, you would say a lot to your students. Many times people are not recruited in institutions that they cannot see anybody there doing things that would relate to them.

Tell me something else about faculty lifestyle that you would want to work toward. Obviously you can’t make a claim like that in your catalogue if it’s not true. But if you don’t think about it, you don’t have a standard on which to hire faculty. I get so sick and tired of faculty in—let me use theological education as the whipping boy here for a moment, because everybody likes to jump on

theological education so let me do it, too. I get sick and tired of theological education institutions that say we really do believe in the importance of the relationship between the church and the seminary. So they hire faculty with absolutely no church experience. Something's wrong. Do you follow that? Now if an institution says we really believe that a multicultural education is very important, but we don't have any faculty with that kind of experience. Something's wrong. Do you see why that's a legitimate question? You say well, it's the faculty's own private business. And I say no it's not. Once you hire them, it's your business. If you hire them without certain kinds of experience, that's your fault. So most of us are pretty good about being sure if they've got degrees. Most of us are pretty sure about checking whether or not they're living with three women, or four men. We're pretty good at checking *those* things. But how good are we at checking things about these claims we would really want to make upfront about the nature of our multicultural institution?

Now what about being able to say something about the people, themselves? We've presupposed right now it's still a basically White faculty haven't we? Be honest with yourselves. Haven't you been hearing me talk as if the faculty were White, if you please, Anglos? What if you want to say about the lifestyle of the faculty: well, it isn't a matter of lifestyle if they're racially different. Oh, yes, it is. That's really what it means. We have faculty who are racially different, but they all have the same lifestyle. What do I know now? They are just simply all White now. What would you want to be able to say about your faculty lifestyle if you're really committed to diversity? Our faculty represents various ethnic communities. If you're really serious about that, that's what you got to do. And if you look at May's data, that's where we fall down. Now it's interesting how many AABC institutions have really been trying on this today. And increasingly, as I come back to AABC conferences from time-to-time and over the years that I've been involved on the board, I'm seeing a lot of change. But it's mostly in your new institutions. This organization's going to change because of the nature of the new institutions. Because the growing edge of the Bible College movement is multiethnic, not White. So help me. If I were to take trend data at present I'd say twenty years from now this organization will consist of about half non-White institutions. But that's neither a triumph nor a loss. It's just kind of a sad commentary that we move from one kind of ethnicity to another kind of ethnicity.

One of the major denominations in the United States; the largest single Protestant denomination which will go nameless at this point nevertheless. Most of you know whom I'm talking about there in the South. Now they're all over the world. They keep church in the United States—in the borders of the United States—they keep church every week in 106 different languages; 106 different languages. No single denomination has ever achieved that: 106 languages of church worship in this country. That's staggering. But you can hardly find a multicultural church anywhere in the denomination. It may be Hmong, but it's all Hmong. It may be Korean, but it's all Korean. It may be White, but it's all White. It may be Chicanos, but it's all Chicanos. Second largest church in that denomination today is pastored by a Black pastor. What can you tell me about the congregation? R-i-i-i-ght. They haven't yet discovered how to break the bond of an ethnically limited perspective on the church. They simply create more different kinds of churches. Now I think that the images that we need in the in the Bible College of the future are not simply let's balance out the ethnic representation within AABC. But let's see more institutions that are doing the job on a multicultural basis because what we need is not simply to demonstrate our outreach, which is basically what the Southern Baptists have done—not the group I mentioned a while ago is it? Or is it? Maybe it is. They've demonstrated their capacity for different kinds of outreach, but what they have not demonstrated is a grasp of the church as an 'all communities' meeting of the people of God.

Let's go onto another one. What would you want to say in your catalogue about lifestyle of students if you really were serious about being a multicultural church? Okay. Now the difference between "we tell them about it" and "we introduce them to it experientially" is exactly at the point where I say the issue is lifestyle, and you get to it. That's what you're saying. Because you're saying "we introduce them to it. We involve them in it" and that's going to affect their lifestyle. Because the minute you get a human being involved with people who are culturally different, that person's lifestyle's going to begin to change; and, in general in my observations, begins to change in very constructive ways. The people begin to see themselves more critically in terms of their own biases. And they begin to see others in terms of a more genuine appreciation of difference, and that can be a glory to God. These are good.

Another one: lifestyle of students. You want to communicate upfront in your catalogue. What are you after? At least providing the opportunity in like the introducing phase for social interaction along lines that are different. Now, by the way, one of the things that I know just as well as anybody here is that there are minority groups that are very hard to integrate into a majority. You get five of this and seven of that and they're going to create new enclaves and they're going to be tighter than the folk around them. That's a reality; that's a reality. You have to work with it. You have to help people learn out of it; that you don't quit simply because that reality shows up.

On our campus we have now the largest single minority. It's Korean. Now that's one of the reasons why a lot of people have played around the edges of these things and have tried. They've gotten frustrated because it takes an educative process over time to help people to relate effectively. We simply take the assumption sometimes that it's this matter of the issue of opening the doors. No way. That's the starting place. If the doors are slammed closed, there's nothing's going to happen. But simply opening the doors or encouraging people or saying hey, but we offer. We make it possible. We let them in. Oh, man. That is like not even getting to first base without being thrown out. But it is necessary. You got to hit the ball. Get going.

So let me tell you a little story about that. When you ask the question about how it could affect dietary services. I think this is an important matter and our cafeteria caters to the diets of several sorts. One of the one of the things I helped to change at Michigan State—kind of a trivial thing, but it was causing a lot of grief—the cafeteria in the graduates' hall served rice once a week, and yet almost 30% of the people in that dormitory were Asians. Now that's called suffering. And that's just not a matter of taste; that's a matter of suffering. Here are people that are keyed to a rice diet. The institutions are totally insensitive that it doesn't pay attention to that. That's an upfront problem. Every meal, including breakfast. Or at least they did last time, I don't know, they kept slipping back. But we, we helped; did you? You helped them turn that thought of it. Oh, you know, a dumb little thing. Now things like that, I believe, are important. Throw-away chopsticks. Could be. In every Christian college dining hall throw-away chopsticks, you know, single-packaged throw-away chopsticks. Two reasons. Number one: Asians who are used to them—not all Asians are—are going to say hey, I'm not going to use those because I'm in America, but they're there in case I want them. Or they're going to say, hey, I'm going to use these. And Americans say hey, that's funny. I wonder how that works? And little by little, people begin to see that there are other ways of doing things. Margaret and I brought our kids up eating with chopsticks. In order that they could already have that notion that there are other ways to eat, and when several of them had gone into international work for various periods of time, they had that mindset that says hey, that's not that different; that's just another way that human beings do it. So it affects their lifestyle that they have those kinds of

contacts. It's so cheap and easy a way to make a little bit of a statement that'll make a big difference. That's a good one.

Let's go to another one. What about recruitment of students? What would we want to say upfront about recruitment of students? Is there any difference between the words 'open to' and 'welcome' and 'encourage?' Big difference. What is it? 'Open to' says yeah, go ahead and push it. It'll open, but you got to push it. 'Welcome' says somebody's standing there smiling. Many of our catalogues say 'open to.' You know, almost to lead the risk of saying that we do not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, and color. I love that, you know, we do not discriminate, which is a guarantee that you do not do it in any way that would be legally wrong. That doesn't say much about the building of Christian community does it? How do you say welcome upfront in a catalogue? How do you say in your publicity materials that you really are encouraging people to join you even though they're not part of a minority set? How do you do that? How does it sound? They're pouring in with words and with pictures. Aye, there you go. This isn't the time at least to say diddly. We're really trying to show you that we are interested in a multicultural, hint, hint, in this case multiracial, couldn't do it. Let the faculty do it. I've seen a couple of brochures that showed you that that institution only had, let's say, two minority students so those same two kept showing up in all the pictures. And it's easy to get a little bit cynical about that except that I think that's to say, nevertheless, nevertheless. They're running out on the dangerous edge of saying that is true; we only have a couple, but we're going to make sure that people see us. As long as it's not done in a kind of cynical tokenism, I think that's a necessary step. Most of us have to have one before we have two. And sometimes faculty campaigns set goals that are unrealistic: we're going to have at least three Black and two Chicano faculty by 1997. I say well, what you're really doing is setting yourself up for failure so that you can say, hey, look how hard we tried. I get very weary of numerical goals like that—so that's a side note and a footnote but I think what we really need is a commitment that says, we will take all we can get. [He invites comments on the issue of recruiting through the inducement of tuition grants in order to bolster or make possible the increasing of sectors in the population.]

This is a sensitive issue because with reference to any kind of concession—whether they're financial concessions or grade-level concessions or, you know, academic standards or previous degrees, or anything like that—any time you start making concessions, they very easily become condescension. And you have to go at this very gingerly. I think this is one of the reasons why the brilliant solution of the apostles in Acts 6 ought to be our main mark. The issue is—and we've got a problem like this—we really need to bring people from that minority in to counsel on the matter of, how do we solve that? And I think part of what's suggested here is the notion of getting the resource schools from among the ethnic sector itself that you're trying to deal with and ask how they can help. And, in some cases, to create a committee of seven people and say help us with this. And that's exactly what the apostles did when they had a minority problem in the church, and I don't see why we don't do a comparable thing.

We need [to add] ethnic advisory persons to our board—and adding an ethnic person to the board won't do it; won't do it. Should I say that again? Adding an ethnic person to this board won't do it. It's a step in the right direction, but it won't make the difference. There's got to be some kind of a critical math somewhere and I believe the critical math can occur first, in the twinkling of an eye, by the establishing of advisory committees. And you will find out quickly that there are some people willing to do that; other people not willing to do that and it takes a good bit of coming and going and telephoning and everything else to really make that work. Because, in the first place, there's a great deal of suspicion that these sorts of things usually aren't all that sincere, and that we're

really talking again about why are you pulling another trick? And that's the fear, you know, it's a fear. We talked last night about fear, and that fear runs both directions. White people fear Black people. Black people fear White people. Fear runs both ways across these divisions especially if they originate in the divisions; why there is slavery. Right. That's right. That's why I put this one so far down the list because, you see, that's one of the places where we often start out. How are we going to recruit some minority students? You will never recruit minority students if part of the bargain is you have to become like us. And you have to be able to accept our view of curriculum, our view about outcomes, our notion of why we're here, our view of church, our notion of worship, and all the rest of this stuff is basically our little package of sensitism. Sensitism is a wonderful word because it says something very vital and very critical to all of us and that is that we put into our images of the gospel things from our culture and then perceive the gospel in terms of the biblical truth and those interpreting additives that come out of own cultural submissions.

Let's go to number five. What would such a document say about recruitment—or available support persons and procedures for students with special needs? And this actually comes to your point. You've got to be able to do more than just bring them in with inducements. You've got to be able to do something with people who are different in order to help them accommodate themselves and help the institution accommodate itself to them. And you do need to have to bring people in here. And again one of the things that I could probably look up right now, but you've got it on the tip of your tongue: How do the AABC institutions stack up with the norm, the typical, with reference to support persons for international students, foreign students are common, and ethnic Americans? Now the meaning of that should be fairly clear to us: that we find it easier to commit funds and assign persons to accommodate the sorts of needs that the international student brings, but we are not as willing or able to do this with reference to differences in the ethnic American. Now you have to ask yourself, what does that say? One of the things it says is that recruiting international students is a little bit more like being sure you're going to get more money; that generally international students bring money whereas, many times, ethnic American sectors are not able to support themselves at the same level and you have to find other kinds of ways to help with support. But I think it goes far deeper than that and I think it goes to the institutional commitment. One of those is just a lot more important than the other.

And ironically it comes out of our view of missions. Again I talked about that last night. I do believe that one of the reasons that the American higher education institution has a better mindset toward the international student than it does toward the American ethnic student is that we have this Jerusalem and outermost parts mentality with the two intermediate pieces that just have to be clipped out. We have perceived missions so largely in terms of an outermost parts mentality and we've not seen the logic and group exposition of that logic of the movement of persons up. Find Philip, track Philip, right after the Acts 6 experience—another of the ones identified in the seven—and then find out how he moved. And he moved, after successful Judea experiences, into successful Samarian experiences. And then God gave him the privilege of being the first documented interaction with a true outermost parts person down on the road to Gaza. Remember that one? I think we've just clipped that out and we're paying a price for it. And, by the way, if you ever want to stop and think about why we teach evangelism with less success and with less interest among students than foreign missions it could very well be because that has been exactly the same biases: that evangelism is something that you have to put to work starting today. Foreign missions is something you can prepare for several years and then face it. And we're just not as willing to face those immediate things as we are the farther things.

Let's go to the next one. What about recruitment of faculty? Again this one quite often appears very top or second in the list. There's a need to recruit more of minority faculty. Let me tell you something. You'll never recruit minority faculty if you don't have minority students, and you'll never recruit minority students if you don't have minority faculty. So give up, or recruit both. Do you see it? The institution has to be serious upfront about a multicultural faculty if it's going to proclaim to be a multicultural institution. You say, yeah, but there are so many more available. Well, that's statistically true because we tend to filter people through the same institutions they've been filtered through in the past. It's a self-fulfilling processing. How do you break the cycle? Institutions have to put some money on people and develop them as faculty people and that's really one of the burdens that I've got: how can institutions get smart enough to pick out the people who are able, willing, and appropriate, and help invest in them to get them back as competent faculty?

Again, many of these things cost money. But in this climate, in our time, any institution that moves with seriousness on this choice will find, as never before, willing sources of funding and I trust that you have some ideas of what you might do. Let me suggest again that if we really are ready to complete some kind of an assumption list that looks like this that I gave you first, then one way to work with faculty and with the board is to sequence things more or less like this and work down through that list and say how do we want to come across to our public. Your sequence may be a little different from this one, but at least consider the logic of this one. It comes out of a good bit of trial and error and experience in doing this kind of thing and I commend it to you as one possible way to go.

May God's blessings be on you and may we meet on happy circumstances in the future. And may God's work be done through you and may you be found faithful in all things. And may we learn to enjoy one another more because we are stretched through our encounters with people who are different. God bless you.

Thanks so much.