

THEOLOGICAL FIELD EDUCATION ACROSS THE DIVIDES



Presidential Address
to the 34th Biennial Consultation Association
for Theological Field Education
Saint Paul, Minnesota
21 January 2017

Joseph E. Bush, Jr.

After recent inaugural events in Washington, DC, I feel a little trepidation giving something called a “presidential address” and speaking about the divides we might need to cross. The divides are daunting. I am reassured, though, when I think not about this address but about this audience—you who are theological field educators—friends and colleagues from across the continent and across ecclesial divisions. I’m reassured to be addressing you, and I’m proud to be among you. I want to emphasize this evening that our work does cross divides, that we do so successfully, that we have been doing so for many years, and that we will continue to do so. Our work in theological field education helps our students in their studies and in their ministries to cross ideological divides, theological divides, ecclesial divides, cultural divides, generational divides, disciplinary divides, and even that great divide between life and death. I want to name five aspects of our pedagogy that I think help our students cross divides: (1) the first has to do with areas of commonality between students in theological field education;

Joseph E. Bush, Jr., is Director of Practice in Ministry and Mission at Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington DC. Email: jbush@wesleyseminary.edu.

Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry

ISSN 2325-2847 (print)* ISSN 2325-2855 (online)

* © Copyright 2017 *Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry*
All Rights Reserved

(2) the second, though, is the ways we attend to difference in theological field education; (3) third, our attention on actual practice bridges between false choices; (4) fourth, we help our students broaden their understanding of fidelity, integrity, and vocation to be less self-centered and focused more on community; and (5) fifth, our vocation bridges life spans. I'll spend about five minutes on each of these five areas.

I am hoping that we can notice and affirm these aspects of our work that actually are effective and that continue to be needed—needed by our students, by our churches, by our communities, and by the body politic with its many constituencies. How does the Spirit already seem to make use of that which we do for the formation of ministers in church and society, and how can we be ever more intentional and effective in the ways we do this as we ply our trade through divided waters?

FINDING COMMONALITY

I was preparing this address while also trying to understand and navigate the huge political divide facing the United States at the moment and the worry that this divide presents to people in other parts of the world. Anachronistically, though, I find myself thinking about when I first started doing theological field education several years ago in New Zealand. At the time, the Presbyterian Church in New Zealand was threatening to split along lines that were sometimes demarcated as conservative and liberal. Being not a Presbyterian New Zealander but a United Methodist American, I was greeted with both warmth and suspicion when I first arrived to take my post at the School of Ministry in New Zealand. Which side would I be on? Everyone seemed to be on one side or the other—fundamentalist or liberal; open and affirming or restrictive regarding LGBT individuals; evangelical or progressive. The small student body was divided along these lines like the rest of their church.

We structured field education there to keep students on the move through multiple contexts. Because the church paid each student a bursary while they studied for ministry, we were able to shift their field education placements frequently, every semester, in fact. Over two years, each student was required to have five kinds of placements: a congregation representing their own culture, a cross-cultural placement in a congregation, a social services agency, a unit of CPE, and a summer intensive split between urban

ministry and an immersion within an indigenous Maori community. We kept the learning curve steep. Students could never simply rest on what they thought they already knew. But we kept them in the same cohort for the duration of field education experiences so that they journeyed with each other through these changing placements and challenging experiences, reflecting together in colloquy.¹

After a couple of years working with these students, one of them shared: “Joe, when you first came here and we started having classes together, we couldn’t tell if you were conservative or liberal. Now after two years,” he noted, “I can’t tell if *I’m* conservative or liberal.”

“Success!” I thought.

It strikes me that there are a number of things we regularly do in theological field education that already help students cross the divides they face. One thing we do is to help them—from their many different divisive experiences—to draw on the same set of resources for addressing very similar situations in ministry. This is the first, rather obvious, asset of theological field education that I want to emphasize. Our common theological heritage, diverse as it is, provides a common set of resources to draw on when doing theological reflection about ministry in church and society. We have the same Scriptures and the same diverse theological voices informing our common heritage.

Moreover, we find ourselves facing very similar situations in ministry. Whether we as ministers think of ourselves as liberal or conservative, we all get to baptize and to bury, to counsel and console, to challenge and to comfort, to preach and to listen, to run meetings and sometimes to run away. Each situation is unique, but these situations nonetheless so often seem, at least from the vantage point of experience, typical of pastoral practice. Even the most outrageous pastoral encounter one student might share in reflection group will find its corollaries among the experiences of classmates. When students who may self-identify as either liberal or conservative find themselves confronting similar pastoral situations with the same set of theological resources, their ideological differences become less important.

In theological field education, we help our students to reframe problems from rather reductionist ideological frames to more open pastoral ones. Praxis provides the bridge. Thinking praxeologically about pastoral practice puts things in a different perspective. It’s more inductive than deductive, more an examination of concrete reality than a deduction from first

principles. And in the context of a theological reflection group, one person's experience becomes the shared experience for group reflection, common experience. It becomes less about drawing the lines of debate and more about drawing the circle of fellowship.

RESPECTING DIFFERENCE

Of course, there is still debate, sometimes very heated, sometimes extremely divisive. This is especially so when cherished assumptions are challenged, commitments questioned, fears confronted, call tested. Seminary can be a tumultuous time as students confront themselves in ministry. I'm reminded often of Jacob wrestling with God, and the seminary is like the Jabbok River. But over time, when committed to the practice of reflecting together on ministry, I do find debate abates.

This was brought home to me just the other night when I was teaching a three-hour course in pastoral ethics that focuses on cases that students share from their ministries. We were focusing on the pastoral challenge of creating more inclusive community. During the first hour of class, we were looking at the six-stage continuum for organizations developed by Crossroads Anti-Racism Organizing and Training. This continuum between being an exclusivist organization, on one end of the continuum, and becoming fully inclusive, on the other end, sees institutions passing through stages of passive acceptance of differences, symbolic change, identity change, and structural change.² We were examining our own seminary as a common social context for trying out this framework. The class was mostly African American but with a diversity that included white, Latino, and Indian students. One white male student was very resistant to the whole idea and refused to participate in conversation, saying merely that he did not agree with the whole theory. Okay.

In the second hour we divided into two small groups. I went with one group to analyze a student's case study in ministry, while the other small group met without me to discuss the reading for that week. Toward the end of the second hour, the group I was with was in prayer for the student who had presented the case and for the student's parishioners. While in prayer, though, I heard yelling—actually, swearing—from down the hall in the other group. I started praying for the other group. After the "Amen" I went down to the other group, which was now quiet, but one of the students had

gotten verbally angry at the student who had refused to participate earlier. I didn't know exactly why.

"You guys ready for a break?" I asked, thinking to give them a little space.

"No," several members of the class calmly said.

"Well, what do you want to do?" I asked.

"We want to hear what he thinks," they said, again calmly, indicating the non-participative student.

"Okay," I said, and then addressed that student, "Do you *want* to share what you think?"

And he did . . . while the rest of the class listened respectfully. Once he concluded, I asked the class, "Are we ready for a break now?," and they were. When we gathered for the third hour, I stayed with that group to discuss a student's case study, and they all participated respectfully. After class I observed quiet, serious, but amicable conversation occurring between the student who had initially refused to participate and his classmates.

In subsequent class sessions, class dynamics continued to be marked by a greater degree of honesty, mutual respect, and patience as differences were both acknowledged and challenged. It didn't have to be. It could have proceeded with sullen animosity and mistrust. I have had classes like that, too. But that explosive class session proved to have been a pivotal class session. In a single pericope of experience, we watched the group move from disengagement with one another, to clearly articulated irritation, to patient listening, to growing mutual appreciation—and to growing humility.

This points to the second asset that we bring to theological field education. Focusing on practice as well as theory helps us to recognize and honor differences. The first area I mentioned has to do with recognizing our commonality. The second thing we do, though, is to help our students respect difference, including the emotions involved when diverse people encounter each other in community.

Twenty years ago, Charles Foster studied multicultural congregations and noted in his book *Embracing Diversity* that the members of congregations seeking to be truly multicultural must constantly recognize and negotiate their respective differences.³ Also twenty years ago, Nancy Ammerman published her important study *Congregation and Community* in which she studied twenty-three congregations facing social changes in their surrounding communities. She noted that congregations able to adapt constructively

and to embrace social changes were all marked by internal conflict during the periods of transition and change; none of the nonadaptive congregations she studied experienced such conflict.⁴ One lesson that can be drawn from these studies is that the skill of embracing cultural differences requires the development of a concurrent ability to deal with the constant tensions that inevitably arise as people with varying cultural patterns gather. This is no facile unity. It is an emotionally dynamic forming of community.⁵

More recently, our colleague Bill Kondrath, retired now from Episcopal Divinity School, has provided us with very helpful resources—both his *God's Tapestry: Understanding and Celebrating Differences* and his more recent *Facing Feelings in Communities*.⁶ At Wesley Theological Seminary where I teach, we use this material in all our field education reflection groups. Kondrath provides both theory and practical exercises to help students name the complexity of their feelings and to honor that in others. This capacity for emotional awareness and expression is important in all aspects of pastoral ministry—both for pastoral care of individuals and to help pastoral leaders engender community in organizations.

The first area I mentioned has to do with drawing on our commonality of both theological resources and experiences. The second area I mentioned has to do with naming and respecting difference—in the classroom, the church, and the society. Emotional awareness pertains to both. Commonality of feeling allows us to relate to each other at an emotional level, and increasing emotional awareness allows us to honor the diversity of feelings—pleasant and unpleasant—in both ourselves and others.

REFLECTION ON PRACTICE BRIDGES FALSE CHOICES

Ours is an integrative discipline. We integrate reflection with practice, feelings with intellection, community with self-discovery, teaching with listening. In the process, we debunk some of the rhetorical divides that would provide facile pictures of the problem, divides such as maintenance vs. mission or pastoral care vs. public leadership. This is the third area I wish to highlight, the bridging of false choices.

On one Sunday morning, I conducted a site visit to a congregation where one of my students was serving as an intern in ministry. On this occasion, the congregation's pastor, who was her field supervisor, had suddenly become ill and was not able to offer leadership within the worshipping community that morning. This student calmly attended to all the gaps in

leadership: coordinating others' efforts in Sunday school, planning and announcing activities for the coming week, and leading in worship to a degree that she had not anticipated beforehand. At every level, she functioned marvelously, and people received her leadership with a calm appreciation. Afterwards, in her seminar group at the seminary, her classmates and I strongly affirmed her leadership on this occasion. But she initially deflected our praise. "Oh, I'm really not a leader," she demurred, "that's not where my strengths lie." When asked where her strengths do lie, she offered that she is more of a "people person" who is caring for others and encouraging of them, especially in one-on-one situations or face-to-face. "But that IS leadership!" the class insisted—especially in this instance. It is indeed how this student expresses her leadership—qualities of leadership that were received by members of the congregation and affirmed by members of her class.

This student was aware that she had strengths for ministry—interpersonal skills in particular, but she was not interpreting these strengths as skills in leadership. For her, leadership was more of a public role and less interpersonal. Her daunting image of leadership entailed such capacities as motivating large crowds. By reframing her understanding of leadership to include interpersonal skills, however, she was also able to reframe her self-understanding as a leader. Her new or emerging model of leadership incorporated this interpersonal dimension so that she understood leadership to include her abilities for interpersonal caring and for encouraging others in their work and worship together.⁷

This story illustrates the third asset I wish to discuss, the idea that theological field education helps our students to move beyond those rhetorical divides that unnecessarily limit our thinking about ministry. Notice in this story that the very distinction between vulnerability and strength gets blurred. Jean Morris Trumbauer, who has written comprehensive guides for gifts-based ministry,⁸ speaks of gifts of vulnerability that can actually provide strengths for ministry. Notice as well that the dichotomy between organizational leadership and interpersonal care becomes dissolved in practice. The student's self-awareness is transformed in the process. This learning occurs inductively in the context of the reflection group. These students are primarily engaging not with theory but with their fellow classmates and ministers, and both leadership theory and self-discovery emerge through this process.

Ironically, one of the rhetorical divides that seems to plague our guild is that between maintenance and mission. I say ironic because, to the best of my knowledge, this distinction was coined by James D. Glasse at Lancaster

Theological Seminary, who is one of the chief architects of our overarching model of contemporary theological field education. In the 1970 Currie Lectures presented at Austin Presbyterian Seminary and then published in 1972 as the book *Putting It Together in the Parish*,⁹ Glasse proposed the basic model we still use of experiential parish-based practical theology partnered with supportive processes of reflection at the seminary. He provided the basic method of case study that is still widely used by many of us. By distinguishing between institutional maintenance and mission, though, he was not intending to posit a strict divide between the two but rather to argue that professional clergy need to be able to do both. His suggested model of theological field education and his method of case studies of events were meant to help students become ministers who can bridge this divide. In fact, I believe, we still use this basic model and methodology because it works.

So far, I've mentioned three assets in our portfolio of methods that equip us as theological field educators to help our students cross divides: (1) affirming our commonality of theological resources and shared experiences; (2) honoring our differences in terms of strengths, vulnerabilities, and emotions; and (3) recognizing the limits in practice of rhetorical dichotomies. I want to discuss two more. Fourth, as theological field educators, we help our students to think more broadly about integrity and vocation. I will then conclude, fifth, by addressing our opportunity to cross life-span divides, including the ultimate divide between life and death.

PERSONAL INTEGRITY AS FIDELITY

The fourth aspect of our work is our helping students bridge the divide between their personal integrity and a deeper solidarity with others. Basically, theological field education helps students to deepen and widen their commitment so that they see integrity not simply as personal consistency of opinion but as fidelity with others. Seminarians can be very focused on, even preoccupied with, figuring out what they believe. They are being exposed to new ways of configuring the faith we share. Their personal integrity often feels on the line to them when they are exposed to new ways of thinking, especially new ways of thinking about ultimate reality and their own faith commitment. But we ask them to think pastorally and sympathetically about the theological assumptions of those they are working with.

A man came into my office a little distressed, at least puzzled, and seeking my advice. He no longer believed that God micromanaged events or that God would answer prayers for specific occurrences such as the healing of particular ailments. A parishioner had asked him for prayer for healing, and he was uncertain what to do or say. He wanted my advice. Should he or shouldn't he pray for healing with this parishioner? He wanted a yes or no. My response to him was, "Well, whose prayer is it?"¹⁰

Our colleague Barbara Blodgett, in her book *Lives Entrusted*, emphasizes the importance of pastoral care and leadership being a matter of keeping faith with others, of ministering within a community of trust.¹¹ It is important for students to clarify their own beliefs and the way these beliefs may or may not align with other confessions within our tradition. It is equally important, though, to know that one can minister faithfully within a broad range of belief in order to provide the means of grace for others. In theological field education, we constantly attend to relationship and to ministry in relationship, to ministry entrusted. We do want our students to clarify their beliefs and commitments, and we ask them to do so as we engage in theological reflection. But we equally want them to be able to interact faithfully with others, and we ask them to clarify those relationships and what fidelity means in the context of the pastoral relationship. Integrity becomes not just a matter of one's own belief system but also incorporates as equally important the keeping of faith with others.

This further allows students to cross divides in the ecumenical church. Nearly every congregation I visit has participants whose faith has been formed in other denominations. Catholic parishes often have Protestants in attendance, family members of Roman Catholics who attend Mass with their loved ones. I'm a United Methodist minister, but I attend a United Church of Christ congregation where there are also Baptists, Roman Catholics, Episcopalians. Protestant seminarians need to know how to administer the sacraments or ordinances in a manner that respects the traditions that are actually represented in the congregations they serve. The emphasis on relational ministry that we provide in theological field education also helps students to attend appreciatively to the ecumenical nature of congregations and congregants.

Related to both students' personal integrity and their faithfulness to others is the way we ask them to engage in vocational discernment. We ask them to look for God. Seminarians are following their call and testing their call. We

ask them to engage in ministry while they are preparing for ministry. Theological field education brings the horizon near. It's not just a question of what I am going to do with my life after graduation. It is also the question of how I can serve God and neighbor now. If vocational discernment is spiritual discernment, I think three things apply: (1) it is not just about later, but it is discerning and cooperating with the work of the Holy Spirit now; and (2) it is not just about me and how the Spirit might be present in my life, but it is about you and discerning how the Spirit is moving in your life; and moreover (3) it is not just about me and you, but it is about all of us and discerning what God is doing in our congregation, in our community, and in history. Each of us as an individual is a part of that corporate venture.

A young student in reflection group was troubled one morning. He had been offering pastoral care to a woman in a persistent vegetative state. She was unresponsive to his ministry, and he didn't know what to do. He didn't see how to minister to her, and it was troubling to him. "What should I do?" he asked.

"Well, what is *her* vocation?" I asked.

"I don't know what *my* vocation is," he replied with some agitation, "That's why I'm in this seminary."

"I didn't ask about *your* vocation," I clarified, "I asked about *hers*."

"She doesn't have a vocation," he declared, "She's comatose!"

"Now wait a minute," I said. "God has known this woman since before she was born, and God has been with her every day of her life and every step of her way. Her time on earth may now be short, and she may not be able to communicate. But it does not mean that she does not have a vocation just because you can't talk with her. How has and how is God calling to her? When you can discern her vocation, you will be discerning how to minister to her."

CROSSING LIFE-SPAN DIVIDES

This brings me to the fifth kind of divide that I want to address, which is life span—both the divide of communication between generations, if I have time, and the ultimate divide between life and death. Ministering at the time of death is one our greatest privileges, and it is one of the more daunting aspects of ministry for many of our students. And it *is* daunting, especially in tragic circumstances. But even when the end of life is predict-

able and is the expected outcome of a life well lived, both younger and older ministers are challenged to offer means of grace.

This is on my mind because both my father and my father-in-law have died recently with very little pastoral care provided. My father died in his vacation home under hospice care but in another state from the Baptist congregation he normally attended and his ministering community. There was some contact but no pastoral calls because of the distance. The hospice chaplain visited but did not seem to realize my father was delusional and dissociative. He talked with my mother about possibilities for the funeral and then prayed before leaving. When he had left, my father asked, "Is that it?"

"Is what it?" I asked.

"Is that all there is?" he continued, "just a little prayer and goodbye—not much of a funeral for him after all he's done and with all his friends. It wasn't very much!"

In his delusional and dissociative mind, my father had just witnessed his own funeral and considered it depauperate. I was disappointed in this chaplain for not really trying to communicate with my father and to hear his concerns at the end of his life. The chaplain's visit saddened him instead of honoring him.

My father-in-law had been a devout Methodist all of his adult life. When he was having open-heart surgery, he was already preparing to die. The hospital was in a city about one hundred miles away from his home. His home pastor did call on him there but didn't offer to pray. It was more like a friendly social call, and he left to go see a friend in that city. My father-in-law and mother-in-law were perplexed by this. They really were preparing not just for surgery but for eternity, and the Methodist minister's call did nothing to help them face that divide.

My father-in-law actually survived the surgery but was in poor health, and he moved in with his son and daughter-in-law in another city for the last few years of his life. His daughter-in-law and their children are Catholic, so he attended Catholic Mass with them every weekend. Deacon Hank was his favorite of those who led worship, and he would have a jovial word to say to him after every time he preached.

Eventually my father-in-law's congestive heart failure became severe and he received hospice care. The hospice chaplain visited and did try to communicate with him and engage him in conversation. He even got a theological book out of the library that he had seen on my father-in-law's table

and wanted to engage him in conversation about it. But, you know, when you have severe congestive heart failure, it is an effort—a very uncomfortable effort—to talk. I was glad this chaplain wanted to communicate with my father-in-law about ultimate matters but disappointed that his ministry was so dependent on having my father-in-law speak. My father-in-law asked him not to return.

No one from the church ever made a pastoral call during my father-in-law's time in hospice. But when the funeral was held, it was held at the Catholic church that he had attended, and the service was led by Deacon Hank. I was moved to tears when Deacon Hank sprinkled water toward the remains and acknowledged my father-in-law's baptism. I felt so relieved. Now, at his death, this was the first time my father-in-law's baptism had been acknowledged—at least liturgically acknowledged—in the church he attended every week.

Friends, this divide between life and death and death and life is one that we are uniquely gifted to cross. "This is how one should regard us," writes Saint Paul, "as servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God." Christ crosses this divide with us—in the incarnation, in the crucifixion, in the resurrection. We cross this divide with Christ—in our baptism, in a life lived in faith, in a life ended and commended to eternity.

I am not sure we help our students with this, though, as well as we could or as well as we should. There are more proximate divides that seem to hinder us. One is that we continue to be divided ecumenically in ways that profoundly affect the baptized. Another is that we are often divided by dislocation of place toward the end of life, living and dying in communities other than those which have held us in life and nurtured us in faith, away from friends and congregations, making pastoral care and fellowship more challenging.

Another divide is the divide between generations. Our church leaders and seminary administrators are eager to prioritize reaching out to the younger generations. I am not sure we are always as eager to focus on aging and dying. Church and seminary are afraid of appearing old and dowdy when we want to appeal to young and edgy. There seems to be a "cool divide" that I would also like to discuss as part of the challenge of ministering across the life span. Now, I've actually decided not to try to cross the cool divide any longer, and I'll close with this story.

When I was at United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities, I wanted to get to a meeting of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Theological Field Education that was meeting in Brisbane. There weren't enough funds budgeted in faculty development to provide airfare, but I had enough mileage points with one airline to enable me to get to Australia. The trouble was that the airline only flew to Sydney, and Brisbane is a day's drive away. So I decided to use my points to get to Sydney and then use the dean's budget to rent a car and drive to Brisbane along the coast, camping along the way, birdwatching, and taking the opportunity to body surf in the waves. Which I did, had a good time, found myself with great colleagues in Oz, and we had a great meeting.

I decided to return by a different route closer inland to try to find some different birds. There was a wooded area that was a park, and I pulled in there during the morning. One other vehicle was in the lot, a quiet camper van.

I went into the woods with my binoculars and after a while became captivated trying to identify a small bird that was coming and going through a brushy area. I stood very still during this time, hoping not to scare the bird away. Finally, I was able to see it well and identify it in my bird book. It was a striated pardalote, by the way. I thought it was time to return to my car and head on. As I walked away, I looked down at my sandaled feet and was horrified to see leeches (which I thought were supposed to live in water). Oh, gross! I brushed them off and continued on my way.

When I got back to the parking lot, a young couple had come out from the van and was brewing coffee. They invited me to join them. I was feeling pretty tired and grody, so I was very happy to sit and rest and have coffee with them. They were a good-looking young couple from Belgium who had just graduated from college and were taking an Australian vacation. He liked to surf and was interested in my take on the waves along the coast, where to find them and how they break.

After a while the young woman exclaimed, "Your feet are bleeding!" And indeed they were. I was embarrassed. I got something to mop up the blood. I carry a powdered antiseptic with me and was able to doctor my foot. I explain about the leeches. I felt stupid. Here was this nice couple, and my disgusting feet were bleeding all over their campsite.

It didn't seem to bother my hosts as much, though. "So what kind of meeting were you attending?" they asked.

"A meeting of theological field educators," I replied

At that, though, they hesitated. "What's that?" they wondered.

"We're all theologians and educators that work with students when they are just starting out in Christian ministry or becoming priests."

They look at me a little puzzled, trying to understand. "Oh," one of them said at last, "You must be one of those *cool* theologians."

Now there I was, probably at my most disgusting, dirty and bleeding." I've never been called "cool" before, and I hardly felt very cool at the moment. I didn't even really try to understand their standards. I just accepted their explanation and their apparent compliment. I realized then, though, that I never was going to understand the concept of cool. It was a divide I had never expected to cross. And having somehow crossed it, I had no idea how I had done it. This too is a mystery. I'm not going to understand it or worry about it.

At any rate, these are the divides that I think we as theological field educators cross regularly with our students, and I want to affirm you all in this.

First, our pedagogy of theological reflection on practice is integrative, and it allows students to draw on common theological resources to address shared practices in ministry. This not only bridges between theology and practice, it also draws students closer together across their ideological divides.

Second, our pedagogy attends respectfully to human difference—both in identifying students' strengths and vulnerabilities and in naming and identifying a diversity of feeling. This capacity to better appreciate diversity in self and others prepares our students, in turn, to lead congregations through change and community-building amid human diversity and division.

Third, our attention to actual situations in ministry helps to overcome reductionist dichotomies such as the choice between maintenance and mission or between pastoral care and organizational leadership. Reflection on real situations reveals how ministry is able to attend in multiple directions at once and address multiple needs. It transforms these conceptual either-ors into more realistic both-and.

Fourth, formationally we help students to expand their understanding of integrity and vocation from narrowly individual concerns to matters of keeping faith with others and with the Spirit's movement in community.

Fifth, with the rest of the body of Christ, we and our students have been uniquely gifted to cross the divides between life and death and between death and life. We are bearers of this gospel of salvation, servants of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. It is Christ who has already charted the course and who has given us the gifts to guide others along the way—across all of life’s span and for each generation.

And for that, and for you, I am deeply grateful.

NOTES

- 1 See Joseph Bush and Twyla Susan Werstein, “Integrative Learning for Ministry: A Case Study for the Presbyterian School of Ministry in New Zealand,” *Reflective Practice* 30 (2010): 187–202.
- 2 Crossroads Anti-Racism Organizing and Training (Matteson, IL), adapted from original concept by Bailey Jackson and Rita Hardiman and further developed by Andrea Avazian and Ronice Branding. For more information, see crossroadsantiracism.org.
- 3 Charles R. Foster, *Embracing Diversity: Leadership in Multicultural Congregations* (Bethesda, MD: Alban Institute, 1997), 13–16, 22–23, 36–47.
- 4 Nancy Tatom Ammerman, *Congregation and Community* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 334–35.
- 5 This paragraph is excerpted from its original context in Joseph E. Bush, Jr., *Practical Theology in Church and Society* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2016), 38, where I discuss Ammerman’s and Foster’s insights with reference to the liminality of pastoral authority.
- 6 William M. Kondrath, *God’s Tapestry: Understanding and Celebrating Differences* (Herndon, VA: Alban Institute, 2008); William M. Kondrath, *Facing Feelings in Faith Communities* (Herndon, VA: Alban Institute, 2013).
- 7 Bush, *Practical Theology*, 58–59.
- 8 Jean Morris Trumbauer, *Created and Called: Discovering Our Gifts for Abundant Living* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1999); Jean Morris Trumbauer, *Sharing the Ministry: A Practical Guide for Transforming Volunteers into Ministers* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995).
- 9 James D. Glasse, *Putting It Together in the Parish* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972), 10.
- 10 Joseph E. Bush, Jr., *Gentle Shepherding: Pastoral Ethics and Leadership* (St. Louis: Chalice, 2006), 101.
- 11 Barbara J. Blodgett, *Lives Entrusted: An Ethic of Trust for Ministry* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008).