

THE CLASSICAL EDUCATION QUARTERLY - A NEW KIND OF EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL

**A** distinctively classical, Lutheran education is being advanced by the CCLE as the best education that can equip young Christians for what David Hicks has called, the world's fight and the soul's salvation. The fight in the world today for our young people certainly includes the challenge of the contemporary secular youth culture. Dr. James Tallmon provides revised remarks from a banquet address he delivered at the CCLE VIII conference this past August. It sets forth an excellent analysis of the shape and challenge of that culture and how it is invading even the most staunch Christian homes, often unawares. Dr. E. Christian Kopff argues, with good historical support, that the universal component in most all conceptions of a classical education is Latin. Latin has been recognized by the Lutheran reformers and the founders of our nation to be the indispensable subject to really learn our native language - how to speak and how to write it with eloquence and clarity. I have provided for our readers a copy of my CCLE VIII presentation about the paradox of Christian nurture - the radical freedom of grace and faith-life's bondage that serves Christ through the neighbor. And, in case you missed it, we are reprinting the CCLE document, The Marks of a Classical, Lutheran School. Enjoy! S. A. HEIN, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

## VIRTUALLY FREE, BUT REALLY ENSLAVED

BY DR. JAMES M. TALLMON

*This is our island. It's a good island. Until the grown-ups come to fetch us we'll have fun.  
Lord of the Flies*

*It is impossible that the gay little folks should guide and teach themselves. Accordingly God has committed to us, who are old and experienced, the knowledge which is needful for them and he will require of us a strict account of what we have done with it. Martin Luther*

**A** colleague of mine, upon hearing my enthusiasm for Jonah Goldberg's *Liberal Fascism*, asked if I had read Gene Edward Veith's *Modern Fascism*. I hadn't, and he urged me to do so because, in his opinion, Veith had done a better job treating the subject, and from a Christian point of view. Having now read it, I have to agree. There are, for example, some interesting implications one could "tease out" regarding individual versus Christian Liberty when considered in light of the relationships between mass culture, pop culture and high culture Dr. Veith posits in *Modern Fascism*. That over the past 50 years high culture has yielded to mass culture, which creates in the masses a mob mentality that is given to violence and is easily manipulated. "One danger of any kind of mass consciousness," he writes:

*is its proclivity for violence. Crowd psychologists have studied how individual inhibitions are easily lost when a person becomes a part of a mob. Individuals who are personally gentle and kind-hearted can turn murderous when they give up their personalities to that of the larger group. Mobs tend to be governed less by reason than by emotion, less by moral restrictions and more by irrational impulses. That is why Hitler loved them (Modern Fascism, 152).*

Veith does a superb bit of analysis regarding Hitler's manipulation of the masses, how appeal to a mass culture is one inherent characteristic of fascism,

### ... IN THIS ISSUE

<b>VIRTUALLY FREE, BUT REALLY ENSLAVED</b>	
DR. JAMES M. TALLMON	PAGE 1
<b>LATIN AND REAL EDUCATION</b>	
BY DR. E. CHRISTIAN KOPFF	PAGE 8
<b>THE FREEDOM OF GRACE AND THE BONDAGE OF THE NEIGHBOR: THE PARADOX OF CHRISTIAN NURTURE</b>	
BY DR. STEVEN A. HEIN	PAGE 10
<b>ADDENDUM: THE MARKS OF A CLASSICAL, LUTHERAN SCHOOL</b>	
	PAGE 16

then likens Hitler's use of light shows and music to today's Death Metal concerts. Considering the accelerated cultural decay this past generation, how nihilism and the culture of violence and death has taken root in America, gives one pause: the Barbarians are no longer at the gates, they are inside the very temple, destroying the forms of our ancient traditions, tearing down the veil of decency; desecrating the sacred things, and satisfying their appetite for immediate gratification. This dour image of cultural decline begs an important question, of course: Are things really so bad today? Or are they any worse than they were in the 1960's? Are they even worse than when Veith published *Modern Fascism* 15 years ago?

There is a hideous new face of moral rebellion that is nurtured by technology and driven by the pursuit of pleasure. The virtual communities created by social networking sites and cell phones with text messaging, are new, but teen rebellion and pursuit of pleasure are not.

There are two competing visions of freedom: a rampant and rank individual liberty, unleashed by an ascendant progressivism, that rejects traditional morality, and, on the other hand, Christian Liberty, understood from a Lutheran point of view. I'll use vignettes to illustrate those critical arguments that constitute my cultural critique. Some of my conclusions are drawn from personal experience. My wife and I have two children who are older and two who were born five years later: ages 25, 23, 18, and 16. We've noticed a marked difference among them. In my attempt to account for the differences, I've come up with what I think are some interesting, if not chilling, reflections. My personal experiences may not, of course, jibe with others, so take them for what they're worth. In fact, whenever one attempts cultural critique, sweeping generalizations are unavoidable . . . and without them broad social commentary is impossible. But generalizations are all very tenuous . . . even this one!

I've organized my observations around a set of contrasting values that alliterate:

### **We who celebrate the permanent things**

#### **value:**

Transformation  
Tradition  
Transcendence

### **Our adversaries in the culture war**

#### **value:**

Tolerance  
Titillation  
Transience

Transformation vs. Tolerance

Tolerance is the "god term" of our day. To be intolerant is an unspeakable evil for the enlightened ones. Ironically, tolerance is grounded in a rejection of absolutes that leads to conformity of the first order. Christians, on the other hand, believe that we are not to conform to the spirit of this age, but rather, *be transformed by the renewing of your mind*. Again, ironically, Christians are today the true non-conformists: we refuse to conform to postmodern and progressive nostrums.

Tradition vs. Titillation

The standards to which we do conform, and by which we are transformed, come from God's Word, by setting our minds on things above, not on the things of earth. This leads us, by God's grace, to live by the golden rule as opposed to gratifying fleshly appetites. It is an attitude of restraint grounded in conformity to higher things. The spirit of this age is increasingly characterized by a pursuit of pleasure that borders now on profligacy. Consider how profligacy combines sexual gratification with intoxication, and that not all means of intoxication involve alcohol. Some sorts of so-called freedom are very intoxicating! (Intoxication. . . in • toxic • ation) There are myriad examples: Spring Break at South Padre, Daytona Beach, or Cancun; Mardi Gras, Motorcycle rallies have become increasingly sexualized; *Girls Gone Wild*, much of the programming of MTV, and HBO, various online offerings, gangsta rap, theatre, and so on. Talk about toxic influences!

While channel-surfing recently I had the bad fortune to become acquainted with MTV's "Engaged and Under-aged": In an unusually candid mother/daughter moment the daughter was talking to her mother about the upcoming nuptials. The daughter matter-of-factly admitted to her mother that she is bi-sexual and had been to bed with every one of her bridesmaids . . . and the best man. When mom brindled, she replied, with an attitude of incredulity at her mother's naiveté, *Hey, "Sex and*

*the City" is all about sex without emotion and I've been watching that show since I was 12.*

On another documentary a young woman literally develops a "Second Life," as a singer, online. She was terribly shy and couldn't face real people. She derives confidence from her Second Life. She even has a following. People like her singing and it gives her confidence . . . to sing online, in virtual space. She still hasn't worked up the courage to sing in front of real people. She is like the young anorexic girl, from the PBS Frontline documentary, "Growing Up Online," who exclaims (regarding her activity on a site where women celebrate the anorexic lifestyle,) *When I'm online posting things I'm completely, one hundred percent, me.* This does not square with the ethic of authenticity implicit in 1 John 4, *How can we say we love God whom we cannot see when we hate our brother whom we see?*

In terms of the Fourth Commandment, obedience to parents, if a child is making a decision that impinges on identity formation - and has 50 online friends encouraging an unhealthy course of action--"UR awesome. GO 4 IT!"--and one set of parents, and maybe a pastor, saying, *Please don't go there. You'll regret it in the long run* - to whom will that child listen? Anne Collier, co-author with Larry Magid, of *MySpace Unraveled*, says in "Growing Up Online," *It's kind of the new Wild West. Nobody's really in charge.* (Author's note: When you go to Amazon.com to look up the Magid and Collier book, another handful of recent books, like *Totally Wired* and *Generation MySpace* will "pop up." These may be helpful, I haven't yet read them.) The new teen web subculture is a world largely hidden from adults and parents. In another telling instance from "Growing up Online," a fight broke out amongst several girls at the high school around which the documentary is built. The hatred that festered and erupted on that day had built quietly, behind the scenes, on MySpace, as girls posted insults on each others' pages. The teachers were, of course, taken completely by surprise. Some boys who witnessed the conflagration (in which desks were thrown about the room!) thought it was funny, captured it on their cell phone cameras, and posted *that* on YouTube!

Grown-ups are becoming irrelevant because we're so far removed from our kids' realities. Like kids on an island with no grown-ups to offer the benefit of their wisdom, kids are working out their own rules, their own values, even their own theology in the

"second world." In that world they operate free from parental oversight, but that suits them fine because their parents grew up in a different world. This liberation seems more sinister to me than were expressions of teen rebellion in the pre-internet-text-messaging-mp3.com world. The generation gap is widened through amplification, electrification, and perpetual connectivity into a generation chasm.

Talk about the influence of mass and pop culture on society! For the sake of space, I will leave it to you to work out the multifarious ways in which pop, mass, and high culture affect education and character development. Let me simply point out that we are now poised at the confluence of the culture war, the confessional Christianity, and the classical education movements.

A counselor who did a workshop at my college not long ago posited that researchers now claim sex addictions have recently climbed to 50% among American males. When I discussed this shocking statistic with another professor, he exclaimed (incredulous at my naïveté!), *Oh, yes. I read somewhere recently that close to 30% of pastors view internet porn.*

Robert, a thoughtful young Christian teen who is really into theatre, discovered the musical, *RENT*. He read Anthony Rapp's autobiography, *Without You: A Memoir of Love, Loss, and the Musical Rent*. Anthony Rapp is an affable, outspoken advocate of the gay lifestyle. His mission is to make young men feel free to be gay. Through Rapp's influence and his love for *RENT*, Robert begins to view Bohemianism as a liberating, enlightened lifestyle/philosophy and, predictably, despite the fact that he and his parents viewed together and discussed *RENT* and the father read Rapp's memoir and discussed it with Robert, despite this, Robert concludes he must be gay. Have you ever heard the lyrics to "La Vie Boheme," *RENT*'s lively anthem? Here's a little excerpt . . .

*To days of inspiration,  
Playing hookey, making something  
Out of nothing, the need  
To express-  
To communicate,  
To going against the grain,  
Going insane,  
Going mad.*

*To loving tension, no pension  
 To more than one dimension,  
 To starving for attention,  
 Hating convention, hating pretension,  
 Not to mention of course,  
 Hating dear old mom and dad.*

*To riding your bike  
 Midday past the three piece suits-  
 To fruits- To no absolutes-  
 To Absolut- To choice-  
 To the Village Voice-  
 To any passing fad.*

It is noteworthy that *2 Thessalonians* contains exhortations against both Idleness and lawlessness. I think our prosperity is leading to idleness (which opens up lots of time to imbibe deeply and become intoxicated on pop culture,) which is leading to lawlessness. Where does lawlessness lead? Societal collapse. Idleness leads to licentiousness which leads to lawlessness, until the center no longer holds, and citizens lose interest in governing themselves.

Self-government is a requisite of free society. A free society requires a moral populace. This was axiomatic for the founders. How a society cultivates a moral populace is a question of supreme importance today. The answer is, in part, as we well know, through right education. In his exhortations to the magistrates and authorities to maintain schools (quoted at the outset) Luther is unequivocal that liberal arts education is the proper means to raise up and mold citizens. One of the primary aims of classical liberal arts education is character formation. Education for liberty *is* education for virtue! Citizenship in a free society requires responsibility, loyalty, integrity, fidelity, industry, and duty. But, there is a right way and a wrong way to educate for virtue. Let me briefly conclude my alliteration, and then take up this point at length.

#### Transcendence vs. Transience

When, with the help of the Holy Spirit, we practice the discipline of thinking on "things above" and renewing the mind through reflection on God's Word, in practical terms, we guard our heart "for from it flow the wellsprings of life." This is the civilizing influence of Christianity. The "progressive," one who rejects the traditional view, is very existential; living for the moment. He rides the wave of titillation, enjoying the thrill of the ride as a good in itself. He is a

hedonist and, eventually, will become a nihilist. His appetites are base because he refuses to refine or civilize them, and if he continues down that path, he will join the barbarians in their post-modern slam dance. Or he may become a skinhead or an anarchist or a psychopath . . . or, sadly, just suicidal.

The most tragic vignette from "Growing Up Online" involved a precious young soul who committed suicide because of online bullying, coupled with his discovery of suicide web sites that developed in him a fixation with suicide and the unbelievably powerful dynamic of "online friends" challenging him to "Go 4 it"! Here is the ultimate dare. His father reflects, in deep sadness, at one point in the DVD, that "My son had these online relationships that were completely invisible to me." So, by way of remedy, although it is very tough, we parents have got to be somewhat invasive. If you would throw yourself in front of a moving truck to protect your children, you've got also to have the backbone to protect them from the toxicity of their secret online life, even if they don't want your protection. And they will NOT want it. (Author's note: Frontline: "Growing Up Online" has a great web site and the DVD has a discussion guide. My teens, my wife and I have had wonderful, frank, and productive discussions about the DVD. They now better understand why we insist on monitoring them and are themselves becoming more discriminating users of the technology.)

#### Classical Liberal Arts vs. Illiberal Education

The above reflections bring us back to our theme of fascism. Those Rush Limbaugh calls "Feminazis," the Enviro-Fascists, (who equate "Global Warming Deniers" with Holocaust deniers,) and, if I may coin my own term, the "Gay-stepo" all employ liberal ideology that is fascist: They all employ propaganda and subject to public scorn all who challenge them, sending thought police in jack boots to enforce the party line.

When one becomes committed to an alternative ideology, one that bucks (or chucks) tradition, one cannot countenance competing viewpoints. We all have an intuitive grasp of the validity of this claim. But we classical educators must studiously avoid employing the methods of the progressive when it comes to morals education. We do not indoctrinate and take a highly programmatic approach to morals education. We do not demand

conformity and force-feed ideology. Ours is a more kindly, less direct approach: by cultivating the moral imagination, the moral tale, fables and allegories, through the play of a well-ordered mind, contemplating transcendent truths. (I commend to the reader here Bill Bennet's introduction to *The Book of Virtues*.) Back to Veith:

*The individual must yield to the mass will under fascist rule. Hence, moving an audience is no longer a matter of rational discourse, but of manipulation of the will; the successful fascist aims for a triumph of the superior over the weaker will. "That fascism placed such an importance on the will may help to explain its particular mode of tyranny. Those who dissented with the regime were seen not as people who disagreed intellectually or philosophically, but as people with hostile wills. In rejecting the common will, they were guilty of not belonging. (Modern Fascism, 91).*

Veith raises the specter of another important dynamic of the situation today: the extent to which our children identify with the autonomous, collective, identity of the "Second Life" sub-culture. But the primary point is that postmodern fascists still employ methods of mass manipulation. Though it's tempting to analyze the Obama campaign, I'll take a less political turn by sharing a shocking quotation with you from Richard Rorty, one of the preeminent scholars of our time, who wrote in 2000:

*The fundamentalist parents of our fundamentalist students think that the entire 'American liberal establishment' is engaged in a conspiracy. The parents have a point. Their point is that we liberal teachers no more feel in a symmetrical communication situation when we talk with bigots than do kindergarten teachers talking with their students . . . When we American college teachers encounter religious fundamentalists, we do not consider the possibility of reformulating our own practices of justification so as to give more weight to the authority of the Christian scriptures. Instead, we do our best to convince these students of the benefits of secularization. We assign first-person accounts of growing up homosexual to our homophobic students for the same reasons that German schoolteachers in the postwar period assigned *The Diary of Anne Frank*. . . You have to be educated in order to be . . . a participant in our conversation . . . So we are going to go right on trying to discredit you in the eyes of your children, trying to strip your fundamentalist religious community of dignity, trying to*

*make your views seem silly rather than discussable. We are not so inclusivist as to tolerate intolerance such as yours . . . I don't see anything herrschaftsfrei [domination free] about my handling of my fundamentalist students. Rather, I think those students are lucky to find themselves under the benevolent Herrschaft [domination] of people like me, and to have escaped the grip of their frightening, vicious, dangerous parents . . . I am just as provincial and contextualist as the Nazi teachers who made their students read *Der Stürmer*; the only difference is that I serve a better cause ( "Universality and Truth," in Robert B. Brandom [ed.], *Rorty and his Critics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000, pp. 21-22).*

The thuggery communicated here is sobering! I think it's safe to follow Dinesh D'Souza's lead and dub Rorty's declaration the voice of "illiberal education." Here the educationistas' voice is unequivocal; the double standard is fully justified in Rorty's fascist mind; it is open season on believers with lesser wills. What should we take away from this? We must be strong. We must redouble our efforts to ground our children in the faith, and teach them why it's superior to a secularist vision, and teach them how to defend our traditions. Alexander Solzhenitsyn passed away yesterday. He once remarked to the U.S. Congress (8 July 1975) *Until I came to the West myself and spent two years looking around, I could never have imagined to what an extreme degree the West had actually become a world without a will, a world gradually petrifying in the face of the danger confronting it . . . All of us are standing on the brink of a great historical cataclysm, a flood that swallows up civilization . . .* One can almost hear Rorty and his ilk replying to Solzhenitsyn, *Our world certainly hasn't lost our will! We're just getting started! We're not petrified, but you silly, conservative, fundamentalist, Christians ought to be.* Hrumph! But, why are our traditions superior, anyway?

It seems reckless, almost, even asking such a question. I would here endeavor to make the case that our worldview is superior because it cultivates a liberty that leads to happiness; the other kind of liberty, Rorty's kind of freedom from the constraints of what he calls fundamentalism, leads to bondage and damnation. One is enslaved by sin in either of two ways: through self-reliance or self-indulgence. First, self-reliance is an attempt to be holy by one's own strength. *Are we to sin because we are not*

*under law but under grace? By no means! Do you not know that if you present yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness?* (Romans 6: 15-16). Luther's *Bondage Of The Will* simply pulverizes the Adamic tendency to seek righteousness through works.

We Lutherans understand the problem here pretty well. Secondly, self-indulgence leads to a life of moral rebellion, to pleasing oneself. (see Romans 15:1-3a) *We who are strong have an obligation to bear with the failings of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let each of us please his neighbor for his good, to build him up, for Christ did not please himself* (Romans 15:1-3a). Luther comments on the Romans text:

*We read in Rom. 6 [:19] that this righteousness is set opposite our own actual sin: "For just as you once yielded your members to impurity and to greater and greater iniquity, so now yield your members to righteousness for sanctification." Therefore through the first righteousness arises the voice of the bridegroom who says to the soul, "I am yours," but through the second comes the voice of the bride who answers, "I am yours." Then the marriage is consummated; it becomes strong and complete in accordance with the Song of Solomon [2:16]: "My beloved is mine and I am his." Then the soul no longer seeks to be righteous in and for itself, but it has Christ as its righteousness and therefore seeks only the welfare of others (Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings, ed. Timothy Lull, p.158).*

*In following Christ's example, realizing that he is free from all works, he ought in this liberty to empty himself, take upon himself the form of a servant, be made in the likeness of men, be found in human form, and to serve, help, and in every way deal with his neighbor as he sees that God through Christ has dealt and still deals with him. . . . Behold, from faith thus flow forth love and joy in the Lord, and from love a joyful, willing, and free mind that serves one's neighbor willingly and takes no account of gratitude or ingratitude, of praise or blame, of gain or loss. For a man does not serve that he may put men under obligations. . . . Hence, as our heavenly Father has in Christ freely come to our aid, we also ought freely to help our neighbor through our body and its works, and each one should become as it were a Christ to the other that we may be Christs to one another and Christ*

*may be the same in all, that is, that we may be truly Christians.*

*Who then can comprehend the riches and the glory of the Christian life? It can do all things and has all things and lacks nothing. It is lord over sin, death, and hell, and yet at the same time it serves, ministers to, and benefits all men. But alas in our day this life is unknown throughout the world; it is neither preached about nor sought after; we are altogether ignorant of our own name and do not know why we are Christians or bear the name of Christians. Surely we are named after Christ, not because he is absent from us, but because he dwells in us, that is, because we believe in him and are Christ's one to another and do to our neighbors as Christ does to us. But in our day we are taught by the doctrine of men to seek nothing but merits, rewards, and the things that are ours; of Christ we have made only a taskmaster far harsher than Moses (Lull, pp. 618-20).*

It is not so in our day; at least among our people. There are, of course, legalistic Christians and Pietists who resemble more closely those whom Doctor Luther wished to liberate. Today, the problem that leads to petrification we Lutherans are more likely to face is at the opposite extreme: A lack of regard for traditions of our faith and seeking happiness through a type of personal freedom that is grounded in a desire to throw off traditional morality. It is endemic to our aversion to works righteousness; our "works phobia," and we have become a church body "without a will" to defend our heritage.

Going beyond the church's predicament, one of the differences between the 60's and our day, generally, is that it's not so much that there is a competing morality . . . because of the influence of TOLERANCE, competing viewpoints themselves are called into question. The validity of competition between viewpoints seems pointless to a critical mass in this generation. All viewpoints are equally valid, because, at the end of the day, none of them matters much. Nonetheless, for the benefit of those who have bought into a progressive viewpoint (whether or not they did so deliberately) we need to have a ready defense for the superiority of traditional morality. Entree Arthur Brooks' *Gross National Happiness*.

I would like to share a passage from *Gross National Happiness* just to give you a feel for

Brooks' *modus operandi*. He approaches sociologically the question of happiness in society (and how public policy should be influenced by such an approach) by examining those things which make persons most happy. Brooks bases his analysis on simple self-reporting, but with very penetrating interpretations of the data. For example, after noting several ways in which parents reported that kids decreased their happiness, Brooks writes,

*Children also tend to come bundled with a lot of other things that truly do make us happy. Having children lowers our likelihood of saying we are very happy by only 6 or 7 percentage points. Meanwhile, practicing a religion—compared with secularism—raises the likelihood by about 18 points, and being a political conservative raises it by about 10 points. Being married by itself raises the likelihood by 18 points as well. In other words, there are many aspects of our lives that totally swamp the happiness effects of kids—aspects that are frequently part of the overall "package" with parenthood. Ponder this: 52 percent of married, religious, conservative people with kids are very happy—versus only 14 percent of single, secular, liberal people without kids. Kids are part of a happy lifestyle (Brooks, 70).*

Brooks' research offers a salient distinction: between types of freedom and how they contribute to happiness. He notes that political and economic freedom are vital factors in an overall sense of happiness, but then notes that "moral freedom" is another matter. *In point of fact, moral freedom is in a class of its own when it comes to happiness, and the Boomers could have saved themselves and our nation a lot of pain had they done a bit of reading.* He then elucidates how Emile Durkheim's *Suicide* concludes of his subjects that *the more morally constrained they were by their religious group, the happier they were, and the less likely to do themselves harm*'(94). *How strange to the modern ear!*" exclaims Brooks:

*Freedom is freedom, right? Wrong. Unlike economic, political and religious freedom, moral freedom has not brought us happiness. We can see this vividly by comparing people who favor various moral and social freedoms to those who do not. Do you think a woman should be able to have an abortion for any reason? Even correcting for your age, income, education race, and marital status, you are 9 percentage points less likely to be very happy than those who do not believe in abortion on demand. Do you hate the church's moral strictures and think religion brings more conflict*

*than peace? You are significantly less likely than religion's supporters to say you are very happy. Premarital sex, drug use, you name it—the moral traditionalists have it all over the moral modernists when it comes to happiness (94-5).*

No, freedom is not freedom. One recalls the old dichotomy from political science, "Freedom from versus freedom to." That one may live life free from rules, with a great deal of autonomy, or one may exercise a freedom constrained by certain rules, within a context that attempts to balance autonomy with social obligations. Such considerations are vital when one attempts to articulate a social contract. . . .

If one understands what the framers of *The Declaration of Independence* meant by the unalienable right to the *pursuit of happiness*, for example, the connection between Christian Liberty and happiness is clear. For the founders, *pursuit of happiness* was code for freedom of religion. How so? First, we begin with an Aristotelian/eudaemonist view of virtue ethics, that happiness is the highest good for man, and that happiness is not attainable without living a good life (hence, "good spirit"). If one then illumines that Aristotelian foundation with the light of our Christian sensibilities about what constitutes a good life (Loving God and one's neighbor) it becomes clear how, for the founders, happiness is synonymous with blessedness. If we understand all this in the context of the importance Enlightenment Christians placed on pursuing the Truth according to the dictates of conscience (as opposed to the state religion) ever since Luther's stand at Worms. . . . This is the alternative to the materialist understanding of *pursuit of happiness*. It is the viewpoint of the founders, and it presupposes the kind of Liberty that is an unalienable endowment of our Creator. Christian liberty is not the elusive and destructive kind of individual liberty that leads ultimately to bondage.

## Conclusion

That a free society requires a moral populace was axiomatic for our founding fathers. But too many of our children no longer share our core values--those truths we hold to be self-evident and axiomatic--because they've acquired a taste for tolerance, titillation, and transience at the very time we supposed they were growing in the faith and

embracing transcendent traditions. Too many kids today are not particularly bothered by projecting one persona in church and another in their various online communities. It is not so much that we are asleep at the wheel as that Satan now has ways to engage our kids even while we've got one eye on the road and one on them. They're in the car with us . . . but they're not really *there*.

They never stray much from that other, second, world, where they belong, they work out their problems one with another, and they talk about everything that their parents can't relate to. Though postmodern education has left them supremely ill-suited to the task, they are working out their own rules, their own values, and their own theology (though certainly not consciously, but more by default,) in their second world . . . and we're not welcome. One of my debate coaches, who is 21, recently confirmed my suspicions when he reacted to what I shared with him about my intentions for this presentation: *Yes, you've got to get this discussion started. I am shocked by how many kids, at this college and in the churches I deal with, believe that they have to work out their anxieties and problems with their friends online because they cannot talk to their parents about what they're going through: they'd just freak out.* He mentioned kids who are cutting themselves, depressed, suicidal, and dealing with sexuality in what he takes to be a new, more intense, fashion. Of course we parents freak out! As Solzhenitsyn observed, we are petrified. The community to which they're turning for answers is awash in moral relativism, liberalism, nihilism and death. That counter-culture boldly teaches them to throw off the shackles of slavery to traditional values and celebrates a bohemian lifestyle that leads to lawlessness. This is an illusion of freedom that enslaves one to sin.

The "new face of moral rebellion" is, of course, not new. It is the Old Adam, up to his old tricks. But, there does seem to be a significant series of new developments about which we need to be mindful. Kids today have a significant new capacity to rebel free from parental control. How can you control what you cannot see? The analogy to internet porn addiction versus the less available and anonymous, old means of obtaining pornography at the very public adult book store is rather obvious.

They don't have to let it show because their second life affords them ample opportunities to

express their "true self" anonymously and secretly. There they will gain unconditional acceptance, encouragement, and a community with which they strongly identify. All the vignettes I have shared suggest a new space has arisen in which kids can pursue that sort of freedom kids always desire, but the consequences are significantly amplified by virtue of new technologies and the erosion of traditional bases of valuation. Readers must draw their own conclusions about what type of psychoses and even pathologies will result from chasing after that illusive type of freedom in a virtual realm that promotes leading a "second life" right under the very noses of those grown-ups whose wisdom and guidance these "gay little folk" need most.

(DR. JAMES TALLMON IS A PROFESSOR OF RHETORIC AT PATRICK HENRY COLLEGE, IN VIRGINIA AND A SPEAKER IN DEMAND ON THE IMPORTANCE OF RHETORIC IN CLASSICAL, LUTHERAN EDUCATION.)

#### ... ABOUT CCLE

THE PURPOSE OF **THE CONSORTIUM FOR CLASSICAL & LUTHERAN EDUCATION** IS TO PROMOTE, ESTABLISH, AND EQUIP INDIVIDUALS AND SCHOOLS COMMITTED TO CONFESSIONAL LUTHERAN DOCTRINE AND A CLASSICAL APPROACH TO EDUCATION.

**THE CONSORTIUM** AND EVERY MEMBER ACCEPTS WITHOUT RESERVATION THE CANONICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS AS THE INSPIRED AND INERRANT WORD OF GOD AND ALL THE SYMBOLICAL BOOKS OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH AS A TRUE EXPOSITION OF GOD'S WORD.

## Latin and Real Education

BY DR. E. CHRISTIAN KOPFF

Classical Educators usually understand the value of studying Latin, no matter what their other differences may be, whether, for instance, they are teaching at parochial or charter schools or are homeschooling. Some, like Douglas Wilson, are convinced by reading Dorothy Sayers' famous essay on "The Lost Tools of Learning" that the late ancient and medieval *trivium* is the best basis for educating

children. Others have a commitment to the entire liberal arts curriculum that developed from the ancient and medieval Seven Liberal Arts, like Robert Littlejohn and Charles T. Evans in *Wisdom and Eloquence* (2006). Still others believe that Latin is THE distinguishing mark of a Classical Education, like Tracy Lee Simmons in *Climbing Parnassus* (2002). Andrew A. Campbell's *Latin-Centered Curriculum*, which is aimed at homeschoolers and is now in its second edition (2008), surveys the reasons for Latin on pp. 44-46.

Is there a reason for parents and educators who are not committed to Classical Education to encourage the study of Latin? Recent publications on American education throw an interesting light on this question. In August, 2008 Charles Murray published *Real Education: Four Simple Truths for Bringing America's Schools Back to Reality*. After surveying the history of the SAT examinations over the past forty years, Murray notes that the scores on the verbal and mathematical SATs, which are taken by almost every student who plans to go to college, sank lower and lower during the late 1960's and the 1970's and finally bottomed out in 1980-1981. Since that time the scores on the math SATs improved and by 1994 had reached the level of 1967. (In 1995 the SATs were "recentered" by the College Board that administers the SATs. As a result comparisons with earlier decades have become more difficult, but there is no good reason to think that the math scores have deteriorated over the past decade.)

The SAT verbal scores, on the other hand, improved only slightly over the low point they had reached in 1981. Murray argues that a restoration of ability and rigor in the use of language is the most serious challenge that faces the education of bright students today. This conclusion confirms the observations of former Harvard President Derek Bok in the fourth chapter of his recent book, *Our Underachieving Colleges* (2006). Their arguments are confirmed by other types of evidence. For example, throughout most of the Twentieth Century, incompetence in writing was viewed by colleges as a failure that had to be corrected by taking remedial courses that did not give college credit. Those days are long gone. Most colleges and universities have regular writing programs and departments that teach remedial writing courses that receive full college credit. Too many students arrive at college without the requisite abilities in writing. Schools do not feel justified in denying credit for educational gaps that have become so common.

Before beginning his argument for the importance of "rigor in verbal expression," Charles Murray comments, "In a generic sense, I am calling for a revival of the classical understanding of a liberal education at the college level...but I am not trying to make a case for obligatory study of Greek and Latin or for a St. John's College curriculum that consists exclusively of the classics." (p. 113) When Murray does get around to discussing K-12 education in the next chapter, he is satisfied to recommend E. D. Hirsch's Core Knowledge curricula and an expansion of "choice" through vouchers and charter schools. Tom Wolf's puff on the book's back cover calls this "a practical plan for literally reproducing, re-creating, a new generation of Jeffersons, Adamses, Franklins, and Hamiltons." Whether we can "literally" reproduce these worthy gentlemen without access to cloning is a question I shall defer to another occasion. I will comment that we know the education of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams and most of the other Founding Fathers and it had nothing to do with school choice. It was what we now call Classical Christian Education. Even George Washington, a Founder who did not enjoy a Classical education, made sure that his stepson, Jack Custis, received one.

This was not just an historical accident. Jefferson and Adams listened to the pleas of their good friend, Dr. Benjamin Rush, to eliminate the classics and Latin from young people's education and concentrate on mathematics, science, engineering and Christianity. Both gentlemen devoted time and energy to responding to Rush. They employed the same arguments Classical educators still use. Latin is the basis for a rich English vocabulary. Few people can really understand grammar by studying their first language. They need the discipline of studying a rigorous and coherent language like Latin. A rich vocabulary and a command of grammar are the essential bases for effective writing and speaking. Finally, the literary, historical, and philosophical masterpieces written in Greek and Latin are essential for understanding our culture and they are best understood and appreciated when read in the original language.

Luther, we may remember, made a similar point about the religious texts from the ancient world. He wrote in his open letter *To the Councilmen of all the Cities in Germany*, "The languages are the scabbard in which the sword of the Spirit is sheathed." This is not a coincidence. The revised Humanist curriculum developed by Luther, Melancthon and Sturm was

the basis of education in every Protestant country. Latin was fundamental in this curriculum. That is why I wrote a decade ago, "We need to know Latin if we want to think like the Founders." I could have mentioned almost all the great thinkers of the early modern age including the Reformers. Charles Murray's *Real Education* describes clearly and powerfully the challenges that face American education in the new century. This is no time to turn our backs on Classical education or on Latin. Classical education is the most successful curriculum every developed, whether measured by its results in literature, art, music, science, philosophy, law or politics. Latin is the language of such decisive works as the Augsburg Confession and Newton's *Principia*. It formed the styles and provided the content of the writings of America's Founding Fathers, as Jefferson and Adams insisted. America still needs the Classical Tradition and that includes Latin.

(DR. E. CHRISTIAN KOPFF IS DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR WESTERN CIVILIZATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER, AUTHOR OF *THE DEVIL KNOWS LATIN: WHY AMERICA NEEDS THE CLASSICAL TRADITION* AND SERVES AS EDITOR IN THE LANGUAGES DEPARTMENT OF THE CEQ.)

## THE FREEDOM OF GRACE AND THE BONDAGE OF THE NEIGHBOR: THE PARADOX OF CHRISTIAN NURTURE

BY DR STEVEN A. HEIN

While not a Lutheran, it was David Hicks who eloquently described a fundamental paradox inherent in a classical, Christian education, particularly when viewed from a Lutheran perspective. He described a pedagogical tension in an education that would seek simultaneously to equip young minds for *the world's fight and the soul's salvation*.<sup>1</sup> This description closely parallels the paradoxical character of the Christian's life in one of Luther's early, but most profound essays, his *Treatise on Christian Liberty*, better known as *The Freedom of the Christian* (1520). In this essay Luther put it this way: *A Christian is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none. A Christian is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all.*<sup>2</sup> It is the intent of this essay to explore the central importance of these paradoxes and how they are so important. More than ever parents and Servants of the Word need understand them for the nurture of our children with an education that is distinctly classical and Lutheran. And, this is the education that they vitally need. In this interest, I would add another way of describing Luther's paradox that shapes the Christian's identity. The Christian life is characterized by living in *The Freedom of Grace and the Bondage of the Neighbor*.

On the one hand, a distinctively Lutheran education needs to nurture understanding and attitudes that are shaped by the faith into which we are baptized. That faith centrally proclaims a life of secured freedom; a freedom just to be the Children of God enjoying life with our Creator for the sake of the grace of Christ. When it comes to securing and maintaining God's favor; when it comes to grappling with the gap between the people we are and the people we ought to be; when it comes to securing our own welfare; there is nothing for us to do, nothing to accomplish, nothing to perfect. We must teach that getting saved is a matter of flat doing nothing.

### EDITORIAL STAFF OF

#### THE CLASSICAL EDUCATION QUARTERLY

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF DR. STEVEN HEIN

#### DEPARTMENT EDITORS

THE SCIENCES DR. ROSS BETTS

THE TRIVIUM DR. JAMES TALLMON

EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY PR. WILLIAM HEINE

ADMINISTRATION PR. STEPHAN KIESER

LANGUAGES DR. E. CHRISTIAN KOPFF

ON-THE-FRONT-LINES SUSAN TUCKER

PR RICHARD GAUB

#### WESTERN CIVILIZATION

#### (HUMANITIES)

THE CLASSICAL WORLD KATHLEEN HEIN

ANCIENT & MEDIEVAL

WORLD PR. JOHN & ANGELA HILL

RENAISSANCE &

REFORMATION ERA DR. KENT HEIMBIGNER

THE MODERN ERA ERIKA MILDRED

#### BOOK REVIEW EDITORS

PR. ROBERT SCHAIBLEY

NATE BOHLMANN

The real offense of the Gospel as it addresses the soul's salvation, it that it calls us to a ridiculously passive life, not unlike that of a beggar. Beggars lack the basic things that are needed to live. Moreover, should they be given what they need for life, they have nothing to offer in return. They just stand there - hat in hand - ready to receive again and again whatever they can get. It is recounted that Luther's last spoken words on his deathbed were: *We are all beggars, and that's the truth.* And so here is our task: to raise up young beggars who make it a habit, simply to go - spiritual hat in hand to the throne of grace - and receive all the donated dignity and sustenance for life they can get from the bleeding charity of a crucified Christ. They are to learn how to have and maintain a spiritual appetite simply to receive from the bloody hands of Jesus, all that they are and all that they need for life today and every day. And as beggars, they are to do this with the clear conviction that they do not, nor will they every have, anything to offer their Lord in return. And this is just how it ought to be. When God has his way with us - we passively grow in an awareness and appreciation of our poverty and His graciousness. We may experience our spiritual poverty by the inner workings of Law and the external events that bring *tentatio*, but we grasp the graciousness of God by faith alone. We are to teach our children to enjoy a *freedom from* being obligated ever to do anything for God. As Luther so eloquently put it in his Heidelberg Theses: *The Law says "do this," and it is never done. Grace says "believe in this," and everything is done already.*<sup>3</sup> What Luther learned from the Apostle Paul is that we can live life under the Law or we can live it under the Gospel. Under the Law, when all is said and done, there is always more to do. But under the Gospel, when all is believed about the promises of Christ, all is already done, and there is nothing left to do. And with nothing, you get everything. You are free. This is the grace by which we are saved, and it brings an outrageous freedom; an outrageous freedom that has God whispering to us what Gerhard Forde has called the hilarity of the Gospel: *what are you going to do now that you don't have to do anything.*<sup>4</sup>

By the standards of the world and good old fashioned religion - even that which often seeks to pass itself off as Christian - this is an understanding of grace that is both outrageous and hilarious. We get everything we need in our baptismal inheritance, even adoption into the royal family of His Son, yet we remain beggars. We become kings with the Lord Christ in His Kingdom who also made his appearance

to the shout of *hosannas* as a royal beggar.<sup>5</sup> That makes us royal beggars! Our God is a God who demands perfect righteousness, yet it is this God who gives us just what He demands in the righteousness of Christ, given in the sacred things to us, again and again. And here is another paradox about that righteousness: We are now perfectly sufficient in the righteousness of Christ, yet we always are in need of more. Royal beggars for life.

The freedom of the Gospel is God's wisdom, but it is usually seen as foolishness - religious foolishness from the human perspective. With man's sense of justice, everybody gets what they deserve. With God's justice, everybody gets what they do not deserve. The righteous Christ receives the wrath of God and punishment for sin, and we wretched sinners received mercy. For us, it is all about getting saved, doing nothing. From the human standpoint, it sounds like a con job to keep us uncaring and lazy. Worldly wisdom operates with the assumption that the more important the issues connected with human existence, the more we need to get busy. And the more God commands us, and He certainly is commands us in his Law (they are not the Ten Suggestions!), the busier we think we need to be. Man's religion always advances the notion that there is Divine help for those who help themselves. Thus, the apex of spiritual commitment is manifested in what we do. But, against such a sensible perspective, we must teach our children to understand and appreciate the divine foolishness of the Gospel which operates with different logic. The Gospel teaches, ironically, what is contrary to what well-meaning Christian parents often teach, especially around Christmas time: *tis better to give than to receive.* The logic of the Gospel, however, is just the reverse: *tis better to receive than to give.* When it comes to the soul's salvation, let me repeat, when it comes to the soul's salvation; we must teach that all commitments to generous giving produce just what Aristotle promised: they produce a growth in worldly virtues. But, when such things are trusted in, they also produce a ticket to Hell. Conversely, the passive reception of the saving gifts of Christ produce just what the Apostle Paul promised: a perfect righteousness, and a ticket to Heaven.

Our challenge, today more than ever before, is to provide the experiences, vantage points, and the theological logic by which our children can see (first of all) and then appreciate the freedom that the grace of Christ imparts. In this regard, Christian

pedagogy for our children has often made a critical mistake, and one that, unfortunately, has been passed on for generations. We think that life in Christ can best be nurtured and appreciated by our small children by engaging their hands in handicrafts and their minds in watered-down Bible stories. We then mix this formula with sweet thoughts about a milk-toast love of Jesus for bunnies, butterflies, and little children. We have witnessed how this regimen of soft religious pabulum produces mischievous boredom in our strong-willed boys by age 8 and utter rebellion by many of both sexes by age 13. In the eyes of these children, the youth culture of today may not be seen as very wholesome, but it certainly is not so boring!

We need to recover the distinctively Lutheran understanding on how hearts and minds are prepared for the Gospel. We must renew our faith in what Professor Ronald Feuerhahn has called *the power of negative thinking*<sup>6</sup> - the power of negative thinking which is harnessed by frequent sojourns in the way of full-strength Law. Spiritual Beggars are made - and renewed in their passion to beg - by a continual experience of their own spiritual poverty. Only those who die to sin may live in Christ. This is as true for the two and three year-old baptized as it is for their parents.

The theological logic that anchors the freedom of the Gospel entails three very important adversaries that must be overcome - sin, death, and the Devil. Without a real awareness and appreciation of these three enemies, the foolishness of the Gospel will be simply foolishness, and progressively uninteresting foolishness at that. We must continually expose our children to these evils in their own life and world in order to nurture and maintain a beggar's mind-set for life. Sin has rendered our little children dead in their trespasses, prone to make idols out of most anything or anyone, and curved in upon themselves with inordinate self-love. As with all of us - to use the botanical metaphor - they have become bad vines, in a bad vineyard, producing nothing but sour grapes.<sup>7</sup> We are and remain in this life - apart from Christ - wretched sinners.

One of the biggest challenges for the Christian nurture of our young people is to make these realities, clear, important, concrete, and related to the fabric of how life must be lived in a fallen world. The freedom to live as beggars of God's favor in Christ Jesus and the peace and security that they bring make little sense apart from an awareness and appreciation of the

magnitude of the problem of evil. For this the Law needs to have more than its instruction; it needs to have its impact. The power of negative thinking needs to have an impact in the lives of our children early and often, not just for discipline, but also for appropriate character formation. The problem of sin needs not simply to be instructed, it needs to be experienced. The power of negative thinking is the conviction in the hearts of our children by the work of the Spirit that they can die to sin. . . or they can just die. This conviction is what creates a passionate life of begging for God's outrageous grace, trusting to exercise the freedom of the Gospel to receive the riches of God's grace without nary a concern over the issue of what they might give in return. For them as for each of us - they can live by grace or they won't live at all. But thanks be to God, they will live by grace. The awareness of the riches of God's grace may be no greater than the awareness of the magnitude of one's sin. Our children can only grasp the wonder of the way of the Gospel, as it is balanced by the impact of the Law. They will make progress maturing in the image of Christ bit-by-bit, as Luther put it, by always starting over again - dying to sin in the way of the Law and rising up unto new life in the freedom of the Gospel.<sup>8</sup> This is as true for our little ones, as it is for our teenagers, as it is for each of us.

Now at this point you may have been thinking - *but. . . but. . . but you are leaving things out, important things!* Yes, that is true. There is another side of the life of the Christian. The freedom of grace we have covered. But now, we must turn our attention to the other side of the paradox, the bondage of the neighbor. We must prepare our children for what Hicks calls *the world's fight*. Christians are simultaneously free and bound. Strangely, the notions of freedom and slavery are not always opposites from a biblical perspective. In the civil sphere, our forefathers closely linked the idea of freedom with the idea of liberty, that is self-government or autonomous self-rule. Our Declaration of Independence declared that we would be a free people, determined to govern ourselves, independent from the British Crown. However, when the Scriptures address what Luther called *things above us* - spiritual matters - they know nothing of human autonomy. We are either ruled at all points by the powers and principalities of evil or we are ruled by God.<sup>9</sup> The Scriptures do not tie the notion of freedom to autonomy, rather they tie the idea of freedom to purpose - God's purposes. The

Christian's life is free and yet it is a life of slavery. Yes, Jesus taught that *if the Son has set you free, you will be free indeed*.<sup>10</sup> But He also instructed his disciples that as they rightly acknowledged him as Lord, that meant that they are slaves, *doulos*, and a slave is not above his master.<sup>11</sup> In the same vein, the Apostle Paul explained that in our baptism, we have been set free from the slavery of sin and are alive to God in Christ Jesus. But, we have also thereby become slaves to God and righteousness.<sup>12</sup> As slaves are bound to their master, so we are bound to Christ. We are a new creation fashioned after his human nature, and created for works that God has planned from eternity that we should be about.<sup>13</sup>

The sense of bondage here involves a necessary connection between our being and our doing. When it comes to spiritual things, we do as we are. Good fruit comes from a good tree as bad fruit from a bad tree. Grapes come from grapevines because that is how God has made them. Jesus taught that He is the vine and we the branches and that abiding in Him we can produce some pretty good vintage. What we do, flows from what we are. It is God Who has so connected our being and doing. There is freedom here for this is how God has designed us to be, but not autonomy. This again, is Aristotle on his head. Aristotle taught that we are perfected in our being by a progressive perfecting of what we do. *Doing* is an investment in *becoming* - for good or ill. For this reason, Luther saw Aristotle's *Nicomachian Ethics* as of the Devil for it runs counter to the whole sense of the creating and saving work of God.

Luther observed in his Heidelberg Theses that *the love of God does not find, but creates that which is pleasing to it*.<sup>14</sup> God never comes to us as a beggar - hat in hand - hoping to get from us what he desires. (e. g. God really would like you to become a Christian. How about it? What do you say?) Whatever God wants, He just makes all by Himself. He needs no help from us. The general interpretive rubric for the Bible is this: whatever God commands, God creates. And whatever God demands, God gives. He commanded the creation of human beings in Genesis 1 and through the power of His Word, it was so. He demands of us a perfect righteousness in his Law, and He gives us just that in the righteousness of Christ through the Gospel. In the Gospel, he exhorts faith, and that is what He creates by the power of the Spirit through the Word of Christ.<sup>15</sup> His redemptive will is that we become a New Creation in Christ, and that is just what he fashions by the power of the saving Word in the waters of Baptism.

We are as He has made and remade us; and we do as we are in accord with His will and work.

One would conclude that if God has regenerated us to be slaves of the Lord Jesus, then we must above all serve and be obedient to Him. Indeed, this is how much of the theology in the Church through the ages has seen it. The Christian has been called to a life, bound by a higher calling, to perform special spiritual works for our Lord Jesus out of obedience to Him. The more pious you are, the more time you devote in your life to doing them. Such an idea flourished in medieval monasticism. You go to the monastery to perform super spiritual works for your merit and for Christ's benefit. Today we see the remnants of such thinking even in our Lutheran congregations. We dream up special works to serve Jesus in our congregations and then we implore our members to come and do them on a regular basis. Congregations that can fill up a *Thrivent* monthly calendar with such events are called *alive*. And those who busy themselves doing them are called *active members*. We call this congregational monasticism and it is a misunderstanding about Christian piety and works.<sup>16</sup>

To engage the world's fight is to leave the confines of monastery and church building and enlist your talents and energies in the temporal orders of life - to be of some earthly good. In the thinking of Luther; it is to make things in this life a little bit better. The Christian life proclaims a bondage to our neighbor and his welfare. I have made this point elsewhere, but it is also fitting here. We cannot serve our Lord Jesus directly for two rather unflattering reasons. The first, is that we do not have anything that He needs. The second - equally unflattering - is that whatever we have that is worth anything, He gave us. Faith generates love, and God would have us channel our fear, love, and trust in Him (things that are just part and parcel with being a new creation in Christ) distributing as stewards the blessings that God has entrusted to us. He binds our deeds to our neighbor and gives us some significant things to do in this life. At the same time, He schools us in the gentle art of loving - something that we shall be doing for an eternity. And then He makes this arrangement: serving the neighbor in faith is reckoned as service rendered to Him, even when that service is rendered to those one might consider the least of His brothers.<sup>17</sup>

The bondage of the neighbor is to be

understood in a two-fold sense: in the way of the Gospel, and in the way of the Law. As a new creation in Christ, this bondage is composed of the compelling demands of gratitude and love. In the way of the Gospel, we serve the neighbor out of delightful gratitude for all that our Lord has done and given to us.<sup>18</sup> This is a bound freedom from all concerns about our own welfare as these are put to rest in the secured gifts and promises of Christ. Moreover, we serve our neighbor out of love because that is just what the New Creation has been created to do. We are God's piece of work and we do as we are. These realities undergird the usually taught *because-you-want-to* side of things. This is the delightful bondage of love. The neighbor becomes a beloved and it is love's compulsion to serve and bestow gifts for her welfare. Little Suzie falls down and skins her knees. Her loving mother picks her up, comforts her and tends to her wounds. Now should we be so silly as to ask the mother why she did this or if she thought she *had to*, she would surely think we were crazy. Works of love have a bondage about them - even a compulsion - as one is captivated by the needs of a beloved, but legal considerations of duty and calculation have no place.

Such is the bondage of the neighbor as the Christian as seen in light of the realities of the New Creation in Christ brought forth from the waters of Baptism. There is another side to the bondage of the neighbor, because there is another side to the Christian. Apart from Christ, the Christian remains a fleshly sinner, sold as a slave to sin in which nothing good dwells and nothing good comes forth.<sup>19</sup> The bondage of the neighbor occasions for the Christian a context to carry on the subduing and disciplining of the flesh. Moreover, it is a significant hill on the battlefield where spiritual warfare is to be engaged against the world, the flesh, and the Devil. To our children we are to say- *you don't want to? . . . well you have to*. This is the bondage of the neighbor in the way of the Law.

We need to be very clear on this. There is no liberty in the bondage of the neighbor. There is no liberty in our doing, or in the nurture of our children's doing. We can be constrained by the love of Christ and captivated by the needs of the neighbor, or we can be strained by the Law and serve our neighbor for our own good . . . or as is often the case, we can be constrained by both.<sup>20</sup> It is a win-win situation in either case. In the paradoxical nurture of our children that addresses the bondage of the neighbor, we are to use discipline with all its rewards and penalties to teach what *the fat relentless ego*<sup>21</sup> in all of our children needs

to understand: life will go better for them if they follow the rules than if they break them. We call such service that flows from discipline, *civil righteousness*. It is not intrinsically the stuff of godliness, it is the stuff of practical wisdom. So we teach our children: *do yourself a favor, follow the rules!*

A good tree bears what the Lord considers good fruit, and a bad tree bears what is considered bad fruit. But the Lord can use either or both to feed your neighbor quite sufficiently. Warming the heart of our children by the Gospel produces the bondage of love; and warming the butt of our children produces the disciple of the Law. . . or other such applications that get the message across. Both Law and Gospel are needed to nurture the bondage of the neighbor.

Nurturing children to live in the freedom of Grace and the bondage of the neighbor corresponds to a dual citizenship that God has called all of His Children to occupy as the Church Militant. Under the lordship of Christ, we are simultaneously citizens of the Kingdom of God and worldly earthly communities. We live a secure life as beggars of the grace that makes us free, and we live significant lives with works that bind us to our neighbors. These are great and wondrous truths about the fundamental identity of all of us, including our children - yes even the smallest of these. These children are simply on loan to us from their Heavenly Father and, through adoption, their Brother-in-Gospel. Let's put away the glitter, the finger painting, and the silly things that we do in the name of Christian education and teach this paradoxical identity of life in the Cross of Christ. Let us rightly divide the Word of Truth, teaching and applying God's law and His Gospel that our children might adopt a life-long habit of dying to live - dying to sin, and rising unto newness of life, serving Christ in the neighbors need - Lords of all, beholding to none, and servants of all and subject to all. Let's us nurture our children with the goal and confident hope that in that day when you gather your earthly family together in the fullness of salvation, by the grace of God, they will be there.

#### ENDNOTES

1. David V. Hicks, *Norms and Nobility: A Treatise on Education* (New York: University Press of America, 1999), p. 2.

2. Martin Luther, *The Freedom of the Christian, American Edition of Luther's Works*, Volume 31 (St. Louis, Philadelphia: Concordia, Augsburg Publishing House, 1955-95), p. 344, here after cited as *AE*.
3. *Heidelberg Disputation*, 1518, Thesis 26, *AE*, 31:41.
4. Gerhard Forde, *Justification by Faith: A Matter of Death and Life* (Ramsey, NJ: Sigler Press, 1990), p. 33
5. Our royal beggarly identity flows, in part, from our union and inheritance with Christ, whose royal reign was hidden under a beggarly appearance. Luther refers to Jesus as the royal beggar as he expounds on Matthew's connection with the prophecy of Zechariah 9:9 concerning His triumphal, yet humble, entry into Jerusalem. "He rides there so beggarly, but hearken to what is said and preached about this poor king. His wretchedness and poverty are manifest, for He comes riding on an ass like a beggar having neither saddle nor spurs. But that He will take from us sin, strangle death, endow us with eternal holiness, eternal bliss, and eternal life, this cannot be seen. Wherefore thou must hear and believe." WA 37:201-202 as cited in David Steinmetz, *Luther in Context* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1995), p. 28.
6. The Rev., Dr. Ronald Feuerhahn has been a faithful and stimulating professor of Systematic Theology at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO for many years.
7. An allusion to the metaphor in Isaiah 5:1-4.
8. *AE*, 25:478.
9. This means that in Christ we are bound to His righteousness which produces the fruit of faith; and apart from Christ, we are bound to sin. Luther used the unflattering illustration of a mule who is ridden by its master in this regard. In spiritual matters we are as a mule, either ridden by the Devil or we are ridden by Christ. Oberman's discussion of "man as a mule" is a delightful explanation of Luther's analogy here. He writes: ". . . for Luther, man is *not* the mule that, stupefied by ignorance, cannot decide between two haystacks - education could help that mule. No the condition of man does not depend on the breadth of his education but on his existential condition as a 'mule' ridden either by God or the Devil, but with no choice in the matter, no freedom of decision, no opportunity for self-determination." Heiko Oberman, *Luther: Man between God and the Devil* (New York: Image Books, Doubleday, 1990), p.219.
10. John 8:36.
11. John 13:13-16.
12. Romans 6:7, 17-19, 22.
13. See Romans 5:17, Ephesians 2:10, 4:13-15.
14. *Heidelberg Disputation*, 1518, Thesis 28, *AE*, 31:41
15. Romans 1:16, 10:17, I Corinthians 12:3.
16. For a more complete discussion of the false piety exhibited in monasticism and contemporary congregational forms of the same thing, see my essay, "The Outer Limits of a Lutheran Piety," *LOGIA - A Journal of Lutheran Theology*, Vol. 3:1, January, 1994, 4-10.
17. See Jesus' teaching about the works of the sheep on Judgment Day in Matthew 25:31-40.
18. We serve out of a sense of loyalty to Christ who is Lord and has made us servant/slaves - not out of a sense of legal compulsion but by grace. The life of service flows from an ethos under grace, not law.
19. See the Apostle Paul's description in Romans 7:14-20. Luther expressed this *you do as you are* understanding between faith and unbelief in the following way: "So it is with the works of man. As the man is, whether believer or unbeliever, so also is his work - good, if it was done in faith, wicked if it was done in unbelief. But the converse is not true, that the work makes the man either a believer or an unbeliever. *AE*, 31:361.
20. Forde expressed this duality of motivation as rather typical of ordinary saints, and even more so. "To be realistic, this side of the eschaton we shall no doubt have to say that in our actual deeds there is something of a mixture of the *have to* and the *want to*, maybe even a good deal more of the former than the latter. But we must not lose sight of the hope, the vision, inspired by the absolutely unconditional promise. For in the end, that alone will survive - true sanctification." G. Forde, *Justification*, p. 57.

21. A delightful term for the central enemy of moral life coined by Iris Murdoch. See her *The Sovereignty of Good* (London: Rutledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), pp. 52, 66.

(DR. STEVEN A. HEIN SERVES AS DIRECTOR OF THE CONCORDIA INSTITUTE FOR CHRISTIAN STUDIES, AN AFFILIATE FACULTY MEMBER IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF COLORADO CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY, COLORADO SPRINGS, CO, AND EDITOR-IN-CHIEF OF THE CEQ)

## ADDENDUM

### MARKS OF A LUTHERAN AND CLASSICAL SCHOOL (CCLE POSITION STATEMENT)

I. The School confesses and incorporates a commitment to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ in all aspects of its educational mission as it is taught and confessed in the inspired sacred Scriptures and the confessional writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

A. This faith commitment is explicitly articulated in the school's charter as expressed in the constitution and bylaws of the sponsoring congregation or governing body.

B. This faith commitment shapes -and is reflected in - the school's faculty, staff, instructional program, educational philosophy, and worship life.

1. Faculty and Staff confess and reflect this commitment in their personal faith, worship life, and professional service to the school.

2. A Lutheran, Christian world-view shapes, integrates and unites, the instructional programs of the school - its courses of study, educational resources, and priorities.

3. Catechesis - teaching of the faith with confession and prayer - is central in the instructional life of the school on all grade levels in accord with the school's confessional commitment.

4. Worship life uses and teaches the historic forms of liturgy and hymnody as they express and convey the gifts of the pure Gospel in Word and Sacrament.

C. A regular evaluative strategy is in place to continually evaluate the school's performance in light of its confessional commitments with established ways and means to implement improvement.

II. The school demonstrates a commitment to a classical approach to curriculum and instruction within the framework of its confessional, Lutheran character.

A. The school's curriculum and instruction is shaped on all levels by a pedagogy that nurtures the basic language skills - grammar, logic, rhetoric - to progressively equip learners to carry out successfully their own inquiries into what is true, good, and beautiful.

1. These skills are taught and exemplified by instructional strategies that are informed and shaped by levels of student intellectual maturity and aptitude - grammar in the lower grades; logic, and rhetoric added at learning-appropriate higher grades levels.

2. All faculty and staff are committed to the classical approach in education and exhibit an enthusiastic willingness to grow in their understanding, skills, and appreciation of this approach to pedagogy.

3. Each member of the faculty demonstrates being an enthusiastic ongoing learner in their assigned teaching areas of responsibility in and out of the classroom.

4. The school's governance possesses and implements ways and means for the continuing education of its staff in the classical approach - appropriate to the levels of the school's educational program.

B. The scope and sequence of the schools curricular and co-curricular programs are normed by the goal to raise up a virtuous, educated person for responsible earthly and heavenly citizenship.

1. The courses of study to be mastered by students are shaped by the significant fund of information to be passed on to the next generation for responsible citizenship in the Church and world.

2. The basic subject areas of English language skills (reading, spelling, vocabulary, and writing), Latin, mathematics, history, science, geography, literature, music, art, physical education, and theology form the primary courses of study on all elementary levels of instruction.

3. The higher language skills of dialectical thinking and analysis, and then later, rhetorical uses of language (written and oral) are exemplified by instructors on all levels but then, integrated into strategies for student mastery in the higher grades 7-12.

4. Instruction in Latin, even in the early grades, is integrated into the strategies of teaching linguistic grammar and syntax and serves as a foundation for increased mastery of English and other foreign languages.

5. The upper grades instructional program (grades 7-12) will reflect an increasingly sophisticated exposure and mastery of the primary resources of the literature of the Western Canon (The Great Books) that are age appropriate.

III. The school's institutional governance establishes and expresses clearly articulated rules, regulations, and responsibilities that are in harmony with God's revealed orders of creation - for students, parents, and school staff.

A. The school has written faculty, parent, and student policy manuals and has secured appropriate commitments.

B. Staff, parents, and students give ample evidence to their knowledge and compliance of the school's policies for conduct and responsibilities.

(ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CCLE, APRIL 27, 2006)

