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During the fall semester of 2013, Larry Crockett and Russell Kleckley led a keystone course with Science, Business, and Religion as its focus. The course itself grew out of a series of informal, but substantive conversations from the previous year that also included Stu Anderson (Physics), Nate Hallanger (Academic Affairs), and Stu Stoller (Business).

This report summarizes the results of that work to date, with specific attention to the results of the CSBR keystone course. The report contains the following:

- A “Declaration of Interdependence,” a document drafted by the conversation partners mentioned as a statement of our claims on the historical and contemporary relationship between Science, Business, and Religion. This document guided the design and implementation of the keystone course. [pp. 3-4]
- A summary of the results of the course. [pp. 5-7]
- A summary of comments and observations made by students who participated in the course. [pp. 8-11]
- A list of suggested next steps based on our assessment of the results of the course and of the current status of the development of the CSBR. [pp. 12-14]
- A paper prepared by Russell Kleckley that provides a more detailed analysis of the keystone course within the context of Augsburg’s history and mission. The paper was written for presentation at an international symposium to be held in Regensburg, Germany, in July 2014, and will be published as part of the symposium proceedings. [pp. 15ff.]

The title of this report is taken from a conflation of the student comments on the course. We are grateful for the opportunity to teach the CSBR keystone course and hope that the report offered here will serve as a catalyst for further development of the course and other possibilities that are emerging for the academic program of the CSBR.

Larry Crockett
Russell Kleckley
Declaration of Interdependence
Science, Business, and Religion Declaration of Interdependence

(1) Conventional Understanding Is an Illusion
- usual understanding is that science, business, and religion cannot be usefully integrated
- this understanding is mistaken historically, conceptually and theologically
- the academy embraces this illusion in its current disciplinary structure
- education based on this illusion is disabling for both students and society

(2) Tension as Gateway to Unrecognized Connections
- the tensions between science, business, and religion should be highlighted, not avoided
- tensions properly approached can be creative rather than destructive
- creative tensions enable the exploration of human self-understanding
- traditional tensions avoid the tension and miss the fruitful connections
- teaching in the midst of the tensions enables novel insight and growth

(3) Real-World Connections
- religion joined with science motivates study of the natural order
- religion joined with business distills ethics for the common good
- business joined with science identifies effective practice
- Augsburg is uniquely positioned: science and business represent the theological application of vocation

(4) Creating a New Coherence
- inhabiting the integration, we practice specific disciplines more productively
- students who understand the integration see the world more coherently
- greater coherence comes from habituation with the tensions

(5) Our Commitment to Inhabit
- our mission should be redefined to “inhabit the tensions” intentionally
- commitment to inhabit physically is richer than separated dialogue
- by inhabiting the tensions, we can more readily experience the connections
- our graduates will be more skilled at embracing the productive tensions
Course Summary
Science, Business, and Religion Keystone Course Summary

Background
During the fall semester 2013, Larry Crockett (Computer Science) and Russell Kleckley (Religion) led a group of 15 students in a Science, Business, and Religion section of KEY 490. Drawing on their previous Augsburg academic experiences in all three areas, students engaged in interdisciplinary discussions around texts and issues with an aim toward new insights and perspectives into the science, business, and religion relationship.

What we did
Using historical and contemporary sources, we approached the course as a test of the claims made in the CSBR “Declaration of Interdependence” (included in this report). We approached the course as an experiment, inviting students to help shape the direction of the course and to contribute substantially to the conclusions drawn at the end about the science, business, and religion relationship.

How we did it
Over the course of the semester, students
• Shared their impressions about science, business, and religion as academic disciplines and as dimensions of human experience.
• Reflected on their Augsburg College academic course work in the related fields and explored intersections in their previous work.
• Examined and discussed news reports and case studies from each field and looked for actual and potential connections across the disciplines in these examples.
• Studied examples from the past for insight into the impact of modernity in shaping assumptions about the roles of science, business, and religion (Stephen Greenblatt, The Swerve: How the World Became Modern [2011]).
• Investigated contemporary attempts to view science, business, and religion as integrated undertakings (Sharon Harper, ed. The Lab, the Temple, and the Marketplace: Reflections at the Intersection of Science, Religion, and Development [2000]).
• Considered the relevance of Augsburg’s Reformation tradition, and particularly the notion of vocation, for the science, business, and religion relationship.
What we learned

- Students have a genuine interest in exploring the intersections.
- Important elements for building the conversation already exist in the Augsburg College curriculum.
- The conversation gains clarity when investigating specific cases, not just abstract theoretical constructs.
- Augsburg’s theological and educational tradition offers valuable resources for informing the science, business, and religion conversation.
- The course worked well as laboratory for investigating claims about the intersections between science, business, and religion, with students engaged in the process of exploration and discovery.

What students reported

- Recognition of intersections between and among science, business, and religion in practice even when they are kept separate as disciplines in theory;
- Readiness to challenge traditional definitions and approaches to the disciplinary fields;
- Acknowledgement that Augsburg’s approach to education helped prepare them to see and live within the intersections;
- Appreciation of vocation as a point of integration.
Student Comments
Student Comments: Keystone 490 (CSBR section) Fall, 2013
Larry Crockett, Russell Kleckley

These are a series of excerpts from final student papers in the course.

**Higher Education Embraces an Illusion**

The claim here is that the world sees the three subjects of Science, Business and Religion as separate subjects which do not relate. Higher education embraces the illusion and this can be disabling for students.

--Kelly Nelson

**Most Thought-Provoking Experience I Have Ever Had**

The experience I have had in KEY 490 has been one of the most thought-provoking experiences I have ever had. I have had my mind opened to be able to find connections between science, business, and religion in ways that I never thought possible. When I first heard that these three disciplines were “connected,” I could only think of a few ways where this was true, but I have been exposed to many more.

In response to Creating a New Coherence # 2 from “Science, Business, and Religion Declaration of Interdependence” that states “Students who understand the integration see the world more coherently”: I agree with this statement fully. If a student is able to see the connections between the different disciplines, they are able to see the world more coherently and often in a different light than others around them.

--Ryan Cook

**The Surprise**

Obviously, I knew the three disciplines were included in the title of the course, but I did not comprehend that the other two, religion and science, would be so significant in the covered content, let alone realize the depth in which we would be exploring into each area and the instances in which either two or all three were interconnected. This surprise, along with the surprise of the course being set up as somewhat of an experiment, ended up being quite beneficial for us students, the professors, and even the college.

Each week you are gaining experience by physically practicing, whether you know it or not, talking about serious and important theories and issues with people in the class who are from a different upbringing and have different beliefs and perspectives. This allows you to see where you can come to an agreement or where you are similar to others who are indeed different in many ways. Whether it is ironic, a coincidence, or intelligently devised by the professors, one can see how this relates to what this course is attempting to do: recognize the intersections between and among science, business, and religion.

--Gary Marsical
Giving Me the Courage to Converse

This class does a good job at taking us out of our comfort zone to be able to converse with other people in the class no matter what the topic is. I personally would not normally talk about something I am uncomfortable with or am not educated enough in to the class, but there is something about this class that gives me the courage to do so.

--Emily Smith

Religion Gives Science and Business Purpose

One conclusion this class has provided me with is that religion has the ability to give science and business purpose.

The integration of science, business, and religion can also enhance one’s sense of vocation. Alternatively stated in the Science, Business, and Religion Declaration of Interdependence: “Augsburg is uniquely positioned: science and business represent the theological application of vocation.” Vocation is a calling that each individual experiences and can manifest in every aspect of life.

The Declaration of Interdependence states “tensions can be productive and lead to novel insight”. This has definitely been the case with this course. First of all, the domain of this course has offered a unique perspective as opposed to traditional courses, which stray away from integrating different disciplines into their study. Hence, the approach of this course fosters creative discussion, pushing the boundaries of learning.

--Ryan Sullivan

A Non-Religious Perspective

Firstly, I feel it is necessary to prelude my essay with the fact that I am adamantly anti-religious. Furthermore, I am convinced that religion has been, and still remains a serious barrier for human development and growth.

I think that this Keystone course and the CSBR are positive steps for introducing students to an important component of real life, and that is the fact that all things are interconnected and nothing can realistically be viewed in a vacuum.

In fact, I think having two professors from differing backgrounds was a brilliant idea, in terms of heeding to the “mission statement” of the Keystone course.

I am slightly let down by the fact I will be graduating before I have the chance to see the CSBR come into culmination. I think it will be a great way to draw prospective students and I am sure that it will even catch the attention of potential students that would have previously overlooked Augsburg for other reasons. I am hoping that Augsburg is able to create a set of majors or minors that are directly related to the study of science, business, and religion – not as three separate entities, but as one.

-- George Papagapitos
The Interdependencies Are Everywhere

From taking Neurobiology at Harvard University to studying art in Paris with Gustavus Adolphus College, my college experience has covered a wide range of topics.

At first I was a little hesitant grasping the importance of these three subjects. ... Now, I can't look at the world without seeing the interdependencies of the three fields. ... It is everywhere, so why don't college students study the interdependencies of SBR? The point of college is to get a person prepared for the real world, right?

Academia could use the revitalization that the concept of SBR would offer. A center for Science, Business and Religion could start to break down the barriers set up within institutions of higher education.

--Kevin Leak

Evolution of My Calling at Augsburg

A topic that has also come up is that we need to challenge traditional definitions and approaches to the disciplinary fields of science, business, and religion.

Also, being able to find the true integration between different experiences enhances our vocation to be more open-minded and question what has already been engraved into our minds as “socially acceptable.” Looking back at my last four years here at Augsburg, I can see an evolution and development of what my ‘calling’ or ‘meaning’ in life is, from being able to construct conversation in a mannerly way that is constructive and intuitive.

--David Zastrow

Probably the most interesting and effective aspect about having this class at Augsburg College is the fact that so few institutions teach it, and even fewer of them have a building named “Center for Science, Business, and Religion.” When I first heard about the plans for this new building, combining those three practices, I had little belief that such a place could gain support of investors and those involved with the Augsburg community. As the project gained more and more ground, it became more apparent just how unique the Augsburg community is.

--Marques Townsend

I believe that my experience at Augsburg has enabled me to recognize and appreciate the integration of science, business, and religion. Being a liberal arts college, we are able to study various fields, which makes the student more well rounded. I think Augsburg’s strong emphasis on vocation really brings in that religious aspect as well, even if people don’t see it as that.

--Molly Glynn
Next Steps
Science, Business, and Religion: Next Steps

Based on our experience with the CSBR Keystone course in fall semester 2013, together with our continuing conversations with colleagues, staff as well as faculty, on campus, we propose the next steps in the development of the Center for Science, Business, and Religion:

- **Transform the CSBR section of KEY 490 into a self-standing Keystone course.** We believe that the KEY 490 prefix will work well to identify the course as an interdisciplinary Keystone course and that giving the course its own number will help it to stand out as a distinctive course with its particular CSBR emphasis. Based on our work last semester, we are prepared to develop a new course proposal to go to AAC this spring.

- **Develop interdisciplinary minors across Science, Business, and Religion.** Departments already have in place a number of courses that could provide the foundation for interdisciplinary minors in science and religion, religion and business, business and science, or in science, business, and religion. From the Religion Department, these courses include:
  - REL 220 – Religion and Science in Popular Culture;
  - REL 280 – Religion and the Rise of Science (previously offered as a topics course, now as a regularly offered course beginning fall 2014);
  - REL 2XX – Religion and the Modern World (currently under development and will focus directly on science, business, and religion themes, to be proposed to AAC this spring for offering in 2015-2016).
  - REL 313 – Environmental Theology and Ethics.

We would like to meet early this spring with representatives from the natural sciences and business to see what courses they currently offer, would like to offer, or could adapt to support one or more of the combinations of minors possible through the CSBR. Our aim is to have a proposal to AAC by the end of the semester.

- **Encourage broader faculty participation and initiative in CSBR programming.** We believe that other faculty members have an interest in developing initiatives that could serve the academic program of the CSBR. We do not believe, however, that we are yet ready to coordinate planning through centralized structures. Rather, it is our sense, as well as our experience to date, that creativity can best be generated through smaller, ad hoc initiatives of faculty and staff working to develop their own interests and insights. These efforts can then be coordinated as they emerge through a structure and processes that develop around them to encourage continuing creativity and initiative.

We are willing to work to encourage other faculty in such initiatives and ask for continued administrative support for these efforts. We plan to meet informally with colleagues in other departments to report on our work and invite their
participation with us as well as to offer our support for their independent interests.

- **Explore Possibilities of a CSBR emphasis in Rochester, Phoenix**
  We believe that the student populations in Rochester and at the proposed program in Phoenix are prime candidates for courses, minors, and perhaps majors related to the CSBR. We should begin immediately to explore programs and delivery formats for these audiences, perhaps building such a design into the Phoenix initiative.

- **Continue to work with Institutional Advancement and the CSBR Campaign.**
  We are grateful for the interest shown in our work by those who are working to promote the CSBR among donors. We believe that as we develop the academic program for the Center, these features, and the enthusiasm they generate, can be useful in making the case for the CSBR to potential donors. We are ready and willing to work with the campaign in any way that is useful in promoting the cause.
Religion at the Intersection of Science and Business: An Experiment in Pedagogy, Method, and Engagement
Religion at the Intersection of Science and Business: An Experiment in Pedagogy, Method, and Engagement

Russell C. Kleckley
Augsburg College

In 2007, Augsburg College began exploring an initiative to create a Center for Science, Business, and Religion (CSBR). The vision consisted of two parts. First, the plan called for a new building to house the Center’s three departments, with much needed facilities dedicated to the natural sciences in particular. Second, the hope was that shared space would lead the departments to dialogue, collaboration, and the discovery of new intersections, questions, and possibilities in theory and practice.

From the beginning, the proposal to bring these three areas into physical and academic proximity struck many people as odd, even contrived. To be sure, dialogues between science and religion currently abound across the academic landscape. Ethics offers a clearly recognizable point of contact between business and religion. Science and business already share a robust relationship in a wide range of industries and corporately supported research programs.

But what contribution would the third partner add to the mix in any of these existing combinations? How would expanding the conversation beyond a dialogue between two disciplines clarify rather than confuse the discussion? What reasons suggested the possibility that a joint venture undertaken by science, business, and religion would lead to promising paths of understanding and insight rather than toward a dead end? These and other questions that have continued to greet the initiative suggest that the idea of a Center for Science, Business, and Religion has proven to be provocative. But for many people its rationale remains far from obvious.

This paper traces and summarizes some of the first steps that have been taken on the road from concept to clarity in the formation of the Center for Science, Business, and Religion. As such, it serves as something of a status report on what has been learned in efforts so far to engage in mutual conversation the disciplines envisioned in the Center. Because of my own particular academic perspective, I will concentrate on the role of religion in the conversation.

In order to convey something of the evolution of the project to date, this report will adopt a narrative form that allows specific points to emerge in the context in which they began to appear. The context itself is often instructive, particularly with regard to pedagogy and method. The report begins with a preliminary and brief discussion of Augsburg’s own context and tradition. The particular features of this setting suggest that the emergence of the CSBR concept at Augsburg College is perhaps more than merely coincidental. The paper will then trace some of the steps that have occurred so far to investigate the Center’s academic potential and what has been learned from these efforts. The report concludes with a summary of some of the key points and indications for directions moving forward.
The Augsburg College Context: Identity – Practice - Theory

The idea for a Center for Science, Business, and Religion arose more out of intuition than from theory. That is, no existing model or conceptual framework either inspired or shaped the proposal.

The idea did reflect, however, both the disciplinary demographics of Augsburg’s student population and the tradition and culture of the College. Currently, 32% of Augsburg’s students in its traditional undergraduate program are pursuing majors in Professional Studies, which includes business. An additional 37% are majoring in one of the natural or social sciences. The Humanities and Fine Arts attract about 23% of the remaining student population. Although Religion majors make up a relatively small number of the overall student population, the College continues to define its mission as an educational institution “guided by the faith and values of the Lutheran Church.” All students, regardless of major, take two courses in Religion as a part of their general education requirements. Through these courses, students are introduced to the theological understanding of vocation inherited from the Lutheran Reformation tradition.

But behind the statistics and Augsburg’s place among the colleges and universities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, other forces at work in the College’s history have shaped its identity and mission that also are reflected in the spirit of the CSBR initiative. The College began as a preparatory school, or “college department,” for Augsburg Seminary, established in 1869 by the Norwegian faction of the Scandinavian Augustana Synod. Augsburg’s early Norwegian-born leadership brought with it to America a commitment to education that aimed to be both classical and practical.  

1 Augsburg College operates its undergraduate program on three tracks. The largest is designed for traditional students on its Minneapolis campus. The figures above represent this track. Augsburg for Adults serves non-traditional students, typically pursuing degrees part time and comprised generally of an older student population. The statistics for this program trend more in the direction of the Professional Studies disciplines, which include 60% of AfA students, followed by 19% in the Natural and Social Sciences, and also 19% in the Humanities and Fine Arts. The third track, operating in Rochester, MN, predominantly serves nursing students connected with the Mayo Clinic and also students pursuing business degrees, as indicated by the statistics for this track: 95% in Professional Studies, 0% in the Natural and Social Sciences, and 4% in the Humanities and Fine Arts. In each track, “undecided” students make up the balance required to bring the percentages to 100%. These statistics are taken from the total undergraduate student population in Fall semester 2013. I am grateful to Dr. Lori Peterson, Associate Vice President and Dean of Graduate and Professional Studies, and to Dr. Karl Wolfe, Interim Director, Minneapolis Adult Undergraduate Studies, for providing these statistics.

2 Augsburg College Mission Statement (2010).

3 The family of Georg Sverdrup, who arrived in the United States to begin teaching at Augsburg Seminary in 1874, had been heavily involved in educational reform along these lines in Norway. See Carl H. Chrislock, From Fjord to Freeway: 100 Years, Augsburg College (Minneapolis: Augsburg College, 1969), 12. Soon after the agreement to establish the seminary, the Scandinavian Augustana Synod split into separate organizations along the line between its Swedish and largely Norwegian factions. The Norwegians, in turn, divided into the Norwegian Augustana Synod and the Conference of the Norwegian-Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Augsburg Seminary aligned with the Conference. See Chrislock, From Fjord to Freeway, 5. The emphasis on both “liberal” and “practical” education was maintained in Augsburg’s academic program throughout its subsequent history under various Lutheran bodies, including the United Norwegian
By the 1920’s, Augsburg College had evolved into a recognizable, co-educational college in its own right. As it made the transition in the middle of the 20th century into the ranks of “The Modern American College,” Augsburg faced the challenge of “two academic revolutions” especially confronting church-related colleges and universities at that time: 1) escape from “sectarian ghettos,” and 2) updating its curriculum to meet the realities and needs of a changing world.

For many institutions, escaping the “sectarian ghetto” eventually came to mean severely diminishing, if not abandoning, any religious confessional identification or even church affiliation. Curricular battles between “liberal arts” and “professional studies” also at times developed into virtual open warfare over what constitutes “education” in the modern university. Because Augsburg College embraced early on open inquiry and academic freedom as consistent with its theological commitment to seeking truth, and because of its long-standing commitment to both the “liberal” and the “practical” as integral to higher education, these potential points of conflict became instead creative points of tension integral to the College’s continuing sense of identity and mission even into the 21st century.

For example, Augsburg’s 1998 self-study and vision document, Augsburg 2004: Extending the Vision, charted a path where:

Augsburg will prepare its students to make [a] difference through an education that unites the liberal and practical arts. Its liberal arts curriculum asks students to connect their individual biographies to the history of all human intellectual and creative endeavors; to the social, political, economic systems to which they contribute and can affect; and to the natural world which they are called to care for and of which they are a fundamental part. Through its practical education, Augsburg will equip its students with the skills they need to be leaders, participants, and decision-makers in the world.

The revised version of the document, The Augsburg Vocation: Access and Excellence, (2005), reaffirmed the commitment:

[Programs of professional education, we would argue, can be fully consistent with the vision of Augsburg’s founders. Further, understood within the Christian humanist view, the liberal arts and professional studies are necessary companions. The vita activa demands that liberal learning be professed – affirmed, claimed, and practiced – in public arenas: in government, in social service agencies, in schools, in business, in

Lutheran Church (1890), the Lutheran Free Church (1897), the American Lutheran Church (1960), and finally the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (1988).

4 Ibid., 151.
5 Ibid., 234-235.
industry. Thus professional education formed an early foundation of Augsburg’s curriculum and will continue to be an essential part of its educational offerings.\(^7\)

These vision documents, along with the Augsburg College mission statement, intentionally ground the institution’s commitment to liberal and practical education in the “unique historical and theological roots” of Lutheran education.\(^8\) At the core of Augsburg’s model of education is Martin Luther’s concept of vocation. With a grant from the Lilly Foundation, Augsburg began in 2002 to lay the foundation for a programmatic infusion of the theological exploration of vocation throughout the curriculum and campus life. As interpreted through *The Augsburg Vocation:*

An Augsburg education focuses on equipping students to realize and use all of their talents in service to and celebration of creation – that is, to discover and fulfill their vocations. The discovery of vocation involves more than choosing the right major or finding the right job. Vocation represents the Lutheran view of the congruence between one’s being and one’s doing; it claims the entirety of one’s life.\(^9\)

This view of vocation, historically and in Augsburg’s immediate context, emphasizes engagement with the world, not withdrawal from it. Vocation comes into focus at the intersection of faith, which governs the person’s relationship with God, and reason, which guides the person’s relationship with the world. From this vantage point, “the worlds of science, literature, arts, and commerce are the proper realms of reason, and thus are proper tools for Christian service. Education becomes an important means of preparing for, and carrying out, one’s calling.”\(^10\)

A Center for Science, Business, and Religion was not the inevitable product of Augsburg’s past and its continuing reflection on its theological tradition and mission. Any combination of disciplines, forged by the theological energy of vocation, could claim a shared home in Augsburg’s educational neighborhood. But to the extent that vocation is not merely an abstract concept but a concrete reality shaped by the contingencies of the immediate context, science, business, and religion seemed to emerge at this particular point in Augsburg’s own sense of institutional calling. Declaring the connection, however, seemed easier than explaining it.

**Declaring Interdependence**

With Augsburg’s commitment to establishing a Center for Science, Business, and Religion in place, a small group of faculty and one staff member began meeting informally in Spring

\(^7\) Mark Engebretson and Joan Griffin, *The Augsburg Vocation: Access and Excellence* (Minneapolis: Augsburg College, 2005), 11.

\(^8\) Ibid., 1.

\(^9\) Ibid.

\(^10\) Ibid., 3.
2012 to explore the academic vision and rationale for such an undertaking.\footnote{Participants and their departments/areas included: Stu Anderson (Physics), Larry Crockett (Computer Science), Nate Hallanger (Academic Affairs, with background in Theology), Russell Kleckley (Religion), and Stu Stoller (Business).} Representing all three disciplinary areas incorporated in the proposed center, the group began its discussions without any preconceived notion of the theoretical foundation for the center or its programmatic implementation.

These open-ended conversations ranged from issues of methodology, to pedagogy, to theory, as well as to the historical roots of each discipline. Ultimately, the discussions led to at least two critical conclusions. First, we recognized more clearly than we had done previously the common concerns and motivations across the disciplines. Second, we realized that the process in which we had engaged – bringing together individuals from across the disciplines for dialogue without a preconceived theoretical or ideological framework – offered a potentially useful approach for expanding the conversation more broadly across the campus community.

By the end of the Fall semester 2012, the discussions had generated consensus around several specific points sufficient to document them as a framework for further exploration. Under the heading, “Science, Business, and Religion Declaration of Interdependence,” the group proposed the following theses, organized under five headings:

(1) Conventional Understanding Is an Illusion
   * the usual understanding is that science, business, and religion cannot be usefully integrated;
   * this understanding is mistaken historically, conceptually and theologically;
   * the academy embraces this illusion in its current disciplinary structure;
   * education based on this illusion is disabling for both students and society.

(2) Tension as Gateway to Unrecognized Connections
   * the tensions between science, business, and religion should be highlighted, not avoided;
   * the tensions properly approached can be creative rather than destructive;
   * creative tensions enable the exploration of human self-understanding;
   * traditional disciplines avoid the tensions and miss the fruitful connections;
   * teaching in the midst of the tensions enables novel insight and growth.

(3) Real-World Connections
   * religion joined with science motivates study of the natural order;
   * religion joined with business distills ethics for the common good;
   * business joined with science identifies effective practice;
   * Augsburg is uniquely positioned: science and business represent the theological application of vocation.

(4) Creating a New Coherence
* inhabiting the integration, we practice specific disciplines more productively;
* students who understand the integration see the world more coherently;
* greater coherence comes from habituation with the tensions.

(5) Our Commitment to Inhabit
* our mission should be redefined to “inhabit the tensions” intentionally;
* commitment to inhabit physically is richer than separated dialogue;
* by inhabiting the tensions, we can more readily experience the connections;
* our graduates will be more skilled at embracing the productive tensions.

In order to explore these assertions, the group decided that the time had arrived to engage students in the conversation and to use the classroom as a laboratory for testing the claims that had emerged so far. We decided to use as our platform an existing senior level seminar, or “keystone” course for business majors, Vocation and the Meaning of Success. This course is designed to provide a summative reflection on students’ overall college educational experience, with particular focus on the theological application of vocation to careers in business and in the lives of graduating business majors.

With the endorsement of the administration, two faculty members from the informal CSBR discussion group offered to teach one section of the course, expanding the course’s existing scope that included business and religion, bringing the natural sciences into the discussion as well.

**Engaging Students**

In Fall 2013, Larry Crockett (Computer Science) and I led a group of 15 senior students in the keystone course exploring the intersections of science, business, and religion. Thirteen of the students came from one of Augsburg’s business majors, one student was a mathematics major, and one was majoring in computational philosophy. Through their general education requirements, all of the students had at least some academic exposure to religion and to the natural sciences.

Through the “Declaration of Interdependence,” students in the course were aware of the claims the faculty members intended to explore. While some of the students had experienced interdisciplinary courses in their college careers, none of them had entered the course with an existing sense of any meaningful connections across these particular disciplines. Some assumed the disciplines, particularly religion and the natural sciences, to be hostile to each other.

---

12 We are extremely grateful to the students in the course whose interest, participation, and critical questions created the atmosphere for engaging and insightful discussion. This report would not have been possible without their contributions: Mitchell Brum, Ryan Cook, Vy Dam, Molly Glynn, Alex Hein, Kevin Leak, Gary Mariscal, Kelly Nelson, George Papagapitos, Timothy Serratore, Emily Smith, Ryan Sullivan, Marques Townsend, Roger Ung, and David Zastrow.
To establish a baseline for gauging students’ initial impressions and to lay a foundation for future discussion, we assigned students the task of completing each of the following three sentences in ten different ways:

1) Science is…
2) Business is…
3) Religion is…

The intent was to push students to think beyond their surface impressions of what each discipline represents.

As students shared their work from the exercise, we charted common points that students had identified not only within each category but also across them. Some of the more interesting observations that came out of the individual work and follow-up group discussion were recognitions that all three areas – science, business, and religion – involve at some level:

• Explanations;
• Communities;
• Ethics and values;
• Meaning and purpose;
• Fulfillment;
• Identity.

Without assuming that these categories applied uniformly in all areas or that they mean the same things for each category, students nonetheless recognized that they had identified some common and fertile ground for exploration. Does “explanation” function in the same way for all three disciplines? Does religion intend to “explain” in the same way that science does? Does religion have a role beyond ethics in its engagement with science and business? Are issues of meaning and purpose exclusively religious concerns? Can a person’s identity be shaped by all three areas of concern? These are examples of the kinds of questions the exercise allowed us to put on the table.

A second activity that extended throughout the course made use of a weekly section in the local newspaper, the Star Tribune, dealing with matters of health and science. Students read articles from the newspaper through the lens of each discipline, looking for the implications that arise as the lens changed. Articles from the Wall Street Journal and other sources supplemented the exercise. More often than not, discussions based on these articles provided support, through specific examples, to students’ growing recognition that science, business, and religion have at least some common interests and characteristics. Using actual cases allowed us to pursue in more detail earlier observations from the sentence completion exercise and to bring the overlapping interests of the disciplines into more focused conversation.

In many respects, the classroom discussions using these exercises replicated the experience of the informal faculty/staff discussion group that had produced the “Declaration of Interdependence.” Connections, common concerns, and relevant issues emerged through dialogue and discovery, not through the application of an existing conceptual framework.
Historical Precedence

In order to gain some perspective on the origins of the “the usual understanding... that science, business, and religion cannot be usefully integrated,” the class began to investigate some of the historical precedents feeding modern assumptions about the role, status, and relative importance of religious belief, scientific knowledge, and economic well-being.

We began with a reading of *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern*, by Stephen Greenblatt. In this book Greenblatt argues that the 15th century reintroduction of Lucretius’ 1st century BCE poem, *On the Nature of Things*, prepared the way to modernity. The text had fallen into obscurity throughout the Middle Ages until discovered and brought to light by Renaissance humanist and papal secretary Poggio Bracciolini.

In the poem, Lucretius conceives of a universe composed of atoms, constantly “colliding, hooking together, forming complex structures, breaking apart again, in a ceaseless process of creation and destruction.” Lucretius describes this infinite process, which requires no deity to sustain it, as a “swerve,” “an unexpected, unpredictable movement of matter.” In Greenblatt’s account, the reintroduction of Lucretius’ poem in Renaissance Europe constituted a “swerve” in its own right, adding momentum to a discernible shift away from a cosmological worldview based on the Bible and Aristotle. More significantly, Lucretius’ poem, in Greenblatt’s account, also impelled a “swerve” away from the theological and ecclesiastical foundations of authority on which matters of truth were determined.

Greenblatt’s book enjoys far more popular appeal than scholarly acclaim. But by mirroring the “conventional understanding” more than challenging it, *The Swerve* offered a case in point for evaluating many of the assumptions behind the perceived non-integration of science, business, and religion. In doing so, the book pointed to some intriguing intersections while also raising a number of critical questions useful to the course: Did religion promote or hinder the rise of modernity? What is the impact of technology (e.g.,
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14 Ibid., 5.
15 Ibid., 7.
16 One reviewer argues that the book “…substitutes polemic for scholarship and calculated sophistry for disinterested critical reflection,” and characterizes it as an example of “the myth of the secular enlightenment according to which the Renaissance represented the emergence of a purely worldly humanism, which, by shattering the mental fetters of superstitious, anti-intellectual medieval Christianity, made possible modern science and technology, political and personal freedom, and all forms of social progress” (R.V. Young, “The Lucretius Code,” review of *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern*, by Stephen Greenblatt. *Modern Age* 54 [2012]:184). Another critic similarly accuses Greenblatt of using the rediscovery of Lucretius’ text “as a foil to elevate one particular view of the contemporary world,” claiming that the author “demonstrates a willingness to cherry-pick evidence to support his own postmodern views” (Jeffrey Polet, “Modernity Through a Distorted Lens,” review of *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern*, by Stephen Greenblatt. *Humanitas* XXV [2012]: 175, 176).
Gutenberg’s moveable type printing press) on the economic climate as well as on the spread of ideas? How do financial interests influence claims about truth? Does a “scientific vision of the world” (to use Greenblatt’s phrase) require or lead to the rejection of a religious worldview?

Given Augsburg’s claim to its Lutheran heritage, and also because of the historical proximity of the Reformation to the Renaissance, the rise of modern science, and the development of market economies, we turned next to a brief consideration of the Reformation’s role in shaping modern viewpoints about religion’s relationship to science and business. Since at least the late 19th century, the perception of the Reformation’s impact on modernity, and especially its relationship to modern science, has been largely negative. Not surprisingly, Martin Luther looms large in the discussion.17

The characterization of Luther as an obstacle to the rise of modern science stems almost exclusively from a single comment, reported from an apparently informal conversation that took place in 1539. In the two existing versions of the conversation, Luther dismisses out of hand a report that is similar to, but not exactly like, Copernicus’ as yet unpublished heliocentric model of the cosmos. In one report, Luther refers to the unnamed perpetrator of such an idea as a “fool” and affirms his support of a moving sun and stationary earth, citing the story of Joshua commanding the sun to stand still (Joshua 10:12) in support.18

Far more deserves to be said about the comment than most references to it invest in this paper allows.19 Suffice it to say that in other contexts where Luther addresses more directly issues in natural philosophy, the discipline taught in universities governing academic knowledge of the natural world, the case against him as a Bible-thumping reactionary appears in a different light. While Luther, along with most people of his day, took the Bible to be an accurate account of the historical record, his beliefs about God’s activity in and through nature were grounded more in his commitment to divine omnipotence than in a blind acceptance of biblical inerrancy in the modern sense.

More to the point, Luther scathingly rejected the standard practice for teaching natural philosophy in the universities of his day that relied on the interpretation of texts from received sources, such as Aristotle, as opposed to the actual observation of and experience with nature. He applied the term “fool” specifically to those who made speculative claims

17 This impression was solidified largely through Andrew White’s A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1896), 1:126, where White cites Luther by name in claiming that early Protestants “vied with each other in denouncing the Copernican doctrine as contrary to Scripture.” The impression remains widely, and uncritically, accepted. 18 The two versions appear in D. Martin Luthers Werke, Tischreden (WATr), Kritische Gesamtausgabe (Weimar: Böhlau, 1912-21), 1:419.16-23 (no. 855), and WATr 4:412.32-413.3 (no. 4638). In the American Edition of Luther’s works, only the latter version appears; see Helmut T. Lehmann, general ed., Luther’s Works (LW), vol. 54, Table Talk, ed. and trans. Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 358-359. 19 For more on both the comment and on Luther’s views on natural philosophy in general, see Russell C. Kleckley, “Recultivating Natural Philosophy: Luther, the Magi, and the ‘Fools of Natural Knowledge,’” in Anna Marie Johnson and John A. Maxfield, eds., The Reformation as Christianization: Essays on Scott Hendrix’s Christianization Thesis (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 189-210.
about the natural order that cannot be experientially verified. His alleged rejection of Copernicus likely sprang from the assumption that this latest report was an example of another in a long line of baseless, unverifiable speculations.

Luther’s theological interest in nature focused far more on the appreciation and use of it as a divine gift than on understanding its processes. In his explanation to the First Commandment in the Large Catechism, for example, Luther declared that the appreciation of creation as a divine gift and its proper use are both a duty and an expression of faith, nothing less than what it means to obey the First Commandment.

The step from the God-intended use of creation as a divine gift to Luther’s notion of human responsibility in the economic realm is a short one. The marketplace, in effect, becomes a mechanism through which the gifts of God in creation are made available for the use and benefit of all. Consequently, his explanation in the Large Catechism of the Seventh Commandment, “Thou shalt not steal,” expands the common notion of theft in order to address Christian responsibility in the business world. His writing against usury specifically targets practices in the early emergence of a capitalist economy and similarly calls for economic and business practices attuned to the needs of others, not merely to serve one’s own self-interest.

The point of revisiting the precedents of the past, and particularly those of Augsburg’s own Reformation tradition, is not to suggest a return to outdated cosmological or economic worldviews as the direction of the CSBR. A reassessment of the “conventional understanding” through a more careful analysis of the historical record hardly transforms even the most progressive Renaissance humanist or iconic Reformation figure into a visionary who anticipates a universe conceived by the likes of Albert Einstein or Stephen
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20 See especially Luther’s 1522 postil on Matthew 2, recounting the story of the magi and the star of Bethlehem (WA 10/I, esp. 555-574; LW 52, 159-170). Luther’s own initiative at reforming the curriculum of the University of Wittenberg, already underway at the time of his commentary on Matthew 2, called for a significant revision in the teaching of natural philosophy to emphasize approaches that were descriptive rather than speculative.

21 Robert Kolb and Timothy Wengert, Book of Concord (BC), Large Catechism, explanation to the First Commandment, especially 389.27 and 392.47. The explanation to the Apostles’ Creed in the Large Catechism makes a similar point in reference to the first article, “I believe in God, the Father almighty, Creator of heaven and earth,” where Luther states, “This is the shortest possible way of describing and illustrating the nature, will, acts, and work of God the Father;” and again, “Thus the Creed is nothing else than a response and confession of Christians based on the First Commandment” (BC 432.9–11).

22 See the Large Catechism, Explanation to the Seventh Commandment. Here, Luther extends the point of the commandment to include a concern for honesty and fairness. He is particularly harsh toward those who take advantage of the market to maximize their profits without regard to the impact on others: “The same fate will befall those who turn the free public market into nothing but a carrion pit and a robber’s den. The poor are defrauded every day, and new burdens and higher prices are imposed. They all misuse the market in their own arbitrary, defiant, arrogant way, as if it were their privilege and right to sell their goods as high as they please without any criticism” (BC 418:240-241).

23 For a cogent discussion on Luther’s evaluation of the market economy of his day see Carter Lindberg, “‘Christianization’ and Luther on the Early Profit Economy,” in Johnson and Maxfield, eds., The Reformation as Christianization,” 49-78.
Hawking. Nor is Luther’s advocacy, in his criticism of profiteering, for capping interest rates at 5% likely to gain much hearing in today’s global economy.

The role of history in the work of the course, and of the CSBR, rather provides:

- A clearer understanding of how and why we view the relationship – or non-relationship – across science, business, and religion in the way that we do;
- A recognition that the way things are is not how they have always been nor how they inevitably must be in the present or future;
- An awareness that ideas, beliefs, claims, values, and practices are invariably shaped by the social, cultural, and intellectual environment they inhabit, in the present no less than in the past;
- Principles for guiding the conversation in our context, not necessary and binding conclusions imposed from different historical contexts.

To illustrate from Luther’s own example, at least three particular points illuminate the contemporary discussion of religion at the intersection with science and business:

- With regard to science, the task is not necessarily to reconcile apparently competing or even contradictory explanations of causes and processes about the natural order. Much of the so-called “dialogue” between religion and science tends to reduce the discussion to engaging theological concepts with scientific theory, thereby assuming that the primary task is an intellectual one with an underlying equivalency to the way that science and theology function. Luther’s example takes the theological interest beyond the reconciliation of ideas to the application of what science offers for both the human appreciation of creation as divine gift and as a resource for service to the common good. This perspective, then, qualifies the claim that both religion and science offer competing “explanations.” What religion attempts to “explain” is different from the concern of science as “explanation,” a point clarifying an observation made by students early in the course.

- With regard to business, the interest of religion extends beyond ethics. For Luther, the misuse of economic resources and business practices is not only harmful and unfair but idolatrous. His critique of certain practices of his day illustrates the role of religion in the social order that moves from the ethical to the prophetic. This insight also prompted an adjustment in the initial impressions of students in the course who recognized an immediate and common ethical concern across all three disciplines but who tended to restrict the role of religion to the realm of ethics. With the recognition that ethical systems and moral codes are possible even apart from religious considerations, the introduction of the category of the “prophetic” provides a point of entry for a distinctively religious point of view into the conversation.

- Luther’s notion of vocation provides a convergence point for religion’s intersection with both science and business. The idea of “calling” is implicit yet inherent in Luther’s understanding of creation as gift and the economic order as an arena for

24 See again, explanation to the First Commandment in the Large Catechism, in BC 386.1-390.29.
service. The proper understanding and use of both nature and the market begins with the First Commandment, the recognition of God as creator and provider for human beings called to live in the world. How we understand ourselves in relation to God makes a direct impact on how we understand ourselves in the world. For Luther, this idea of calling takes shape within his understanding of human identity scarred by sin but marked by grace. This dual dimension of human nature, captured in Luther’s famous phrase, simul justus et peccator, simultaneously righteous and sinner, encourages freedom in our exploration of the world and for our social arrangements within it. At the same time, it guards against the presumption and arrogance that our claims and knowledge are absolute or that our actions, socially as well as individually, are ever pure. The point clearly aligns with, applies, and extends Augsburg’s emphasis on vocation at the heart of its academic mission. It also adds to the discussion elements that are missing when science and business function independently.

The Contemporary Context

To bring the discussion more directly into the contemporary context, the course turned to the book, The Lab, the Temple, and the Market: Reflections at the Intersection of Science, Religion, and Development, a collection of essays written in connection with the Science, Religion, and Development (SRD) project of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). Established by the Canadian Parliament in 1970, the purpose of the IDRC is to “…initiate, encourage, support and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world and into the means for applying and adapting scientific, technical and other knowledge to the economic and social advancement of those regions.”

Inspired by “…the recent efforts of the World Bank to open a dialogue with representatives from nine world faiths on the issues of poverty,” the SRD project undertook the task to “…explore the potential for a new symbiosis of science and religion to rethink the questions of ‘human well-being’ and address the dilemmas of development.” By placing religion at the nexus of science and development, the project rejected two common, but reductionist, tendencies. The first is the habit of “…thinking of religion and spirituality as private matters with no place in our professional lives or in a public domain like that of ‘international development.’” The second is the reduction of religion to a system of beliefs and doctrines abstracted from the historical and cultural contexts containing those beliefs. By embracing religion’s role in shaping cultures, worldviews, and identities, the project sought to “…bring

---


26 From the IDRC Act (1970); see http://www.idrc.ca/EN/AboutUs/WhoWeAre/Pages/IDRCAct.aspx. More information about the IDRC is available on its website, http://www.idrc.ca/EN/Pages/default.aspx.

27 Harper, “Preface,” The Lab, the Temple, and the Market, x.

28 Pierre Beemans, “Foreword,” The Lab, the Temple, and the Market, viii.
to light – indeed, question – the accepted values that underlie Western economic and scientific assumptions while building an appreciation for the insights and rationalities of other cultures and worldviews.”

The four essays appearing in *The Lab, the Temple, and the Market* reflect the common conviction that “the various religious traditions of the world have guided humanity throughout its history under a diversity of conditions and, today, offer humanity a wealth of spiritual insight that it sorely needs.” Yet each essay also represents particular contributions, insights, and perspectives of the religions of the respective authors, all of them with connections to the social or natural sciences and each a practitioner of the faith of her or his own tradition. The religions represented are Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, and the Bahai’s faith tradition.

A few points from each of the first three essays that were the most relevant to the course will illustrate the direction of the discussion and indicate paths for further conversation.

The first essay, by the Hindu from the group, the sociologist and counselor Promilla Kapur, examined the application of the “principle of fundamental oneness” as a unifying perspective for addressing social, religious, intellectual, and ecological challenges and as “…an alternative outlook and an important balance to the divisive effect of modern systems and materialist mindsets.” Some of the significant notions from the Hindu tradition that Kapur identifies include:

- The concept of “Self” where the questions, who am I, what is the world, who is God, and what is my relation to this world and God converge,
- Sanatana dharma, or the “unfolding of truth,” as a concept that can unite the perspectives of religion, science, and the social order since it “…embraces the development of the self…, others, and the entire universe (that is, the well being of all living things, including the environment);” and
- Artha, or the principle of economic self-sufficiency.

These and other resources from the Hindu tradition, Kapur argues, bring balance to “…the existing development paradigm with its overemphasis on economic development and scientific-technological achievement.”
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32 Ibid., 14.
33 Ibid., 18. Sanatana dharma is the hinge between dharma, understood as right conduct or duty leading to good karma, and moshka or liberation, including the release from samsara, the cycle of life, death, and rebirth (20).
34 Ibid., 20-21.
35 Ibid., 55.
Gregory Baum teaches religious studies at McGill University in Toronto but also has a background in mathematics and sociology. He writes his essay, “Solidarity with the Poor,” from the perspective of Roman Catholic moral theology. Two documents in particular inform his discussion, Pope Paul VI’s 1967 encyclical *Populorum Progressio*, and John Paul II’s *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, issued in 1987 to commemorate the 20th anniversary of Paul VI’s earlier letter.

In this essay Baum largely defends the efforts of the World Bank to incorporate religious considerations and sensitivities as it establishes policy. “Inwardness or spirituality,” Baum writes, “has social consequences.”36 Recognizing, then, the impact of religion on social and cultural circumstances, Baum chastises social scientists in particular for adopting a “dominant secularism” that reduces “religion to its social functions.”37 When social scientists dismiss the possibility of the existence of a transcendent order as irrelevant to their work, they risk distortion in their perception of the very conditions they are investigating, since those conditions are shaped by people who not only hold such beliefs but act from them. Baum does not mean that social scientists themselves must regard religious belief as valid but only that they recognize the importance and validity of such beliefs in their own contexts. “Not belief, but empathy, is required.”38

Baum, then, makes the case for giving religion standing in conversations and issues related to the economic and social realm without requiring that religious beliefs necessarily be embraced by everyone in the discussion.

Azizan Baharuddin makes the case from an Islamic perspective for the relevance of religion, particularly with regard to the natural sciences. With a background in the philosophy of science, Baharuddin argues that “the dichotomy between scientific knowledge and religious values has also separated development from religion and spirituality” and has encouraged the false perception of “…human activities, such as commerce, education, art, politics, and religion, as separate spheres.”39

Baharuddin challenges both scientific reductionism and materialism, along with the tendency to elevate either science or economic interests to quasi-religious status:

Scientism inappropriately raises science and its methods to the status of unquestionable truth, a hegemony that seems to have imposed itself on development strategy and to have helped to create its current inadequacies. Developmentalism – the belief that economic and even human progress depends on an expanding consumer society – derives from scientism.40
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36 Gregory Baum, “Solidarity with the Poor,” in *The Lab, the Temple, and the Market*, 74.
37 Ibid., 79.
38 Ibid., 81.
40 Ibid., 110.
Religion plays a positive and necessary role in the conversation by providing insight into “…the human relationship not only to the cosmos but also, more importantly, to transcendent being.”41 Islam stresses the integrated nature of humanity with the natural and socio-economic order within a religious framework. This perspective contextualizes, then, the claims of science as well as practices within the economic and social order. Islam is not understood as merely one dimension of a person’s life; it “…involves the totality of life, if not reality itself.”42

But this religiously based recognition of an all-pervasive reality does not mean that science, and by extension, economics, are bound by religious dogma. Religious language, Baharuddin claims, can bend to and adapt itself to the claims of scientific “fact” in a way that can only benefit religion as “a sound expression of truth.”43

These are a few examples of insights that provided students with perspective on their own changing perceptions about the interrelationship of science, business, and religion. The essays also provided helpful points of entry for questioning the tendency to reduce religion to personal point of view and individual experience, to relegate the relevance of religion to ethics in the public sphere, and to view science and religion as competing forms of explanation.

Summary, Conclusions, and Directions for Further Inquiry and Exploration

By the end of the course, students were able to recognize their own transformation from thinking about the relationship between science, business, and religion in terms of dichotomies and were also able to articulate, using their own examples, points of intersection and relevance.

The following points indicate some of the more significant conclusions and directions reached by the end of the course:

- While engaging three disciplines in mutual conversation complicates the discussion, it also enriches it. The model of “dialogue,” involving two partners, may at times reduce the range of issues to the point of distortion and create false impressions of what is at stake. The introduction of business interests into the discussion between science and religion adds dimensions to the conversation that otherwise are easily overlooked. Similarly, the inclusion of science in a discussion between religion and business, while widening the range of ethical concerns, also broadens the conversation beyond ethics and helps avoid the reduction of religion to ethics.

41 Ibid., 117.
42 Ibid., 127.
43 Ibid., 116. On this point, Baharuddin aligns Islam with the philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead.
• “Religion” means more than “theology.” The consideration and contribution of religion includes not only ideas and beliefs but also worldviews, cultural contexts, practices, and issues of identity.

• The inclusion of a diversity of religions is critical to the discussion, evidenced by the depth and richness across the essays in The Lab, the Temple, and the Market.

• The absence of an existing theoretical framework proved useful to the experimental nature of the course. In many ways, the experience and method of the course followed the pattern of the informal working group of faculty and staff who developed the “Declaration of Interdependence.” The conversations were open and inquiry based, allowing students to arrive at conclusions through their own discovery rather than being convinced to subscribe to a particular point of view or conceptual model.

But the future direction of the discussion should not simply be aimless. One model for guiding the future work of the CSBR is available from the Project on Lived Theology. Established in 2000 and housed in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Virginia, the Project on Lived Theology aims “…to reconnect the theological enterprise with lived experience” by “encouraging younger theologians and scholars of religion to embrace theological life as a form of public responsibility.”

By offering “…a variety of familiar and unconventional spaces where students, theologians and scholars of religion can collaborate with practitioners and non-academics,” the Project works from the “conviction that the patterns and practices of religious communities offer rich and generative material for theological inquiry.” The aims of the Project on Lived Theology correlate well with Augsburg’s understanding of vocation. Its methods of inquiry-based research and its interest in the exploration of theological significance in “unconventional spaces” matches well with the endeavor to challenge the “conventional understanding” that regard science, business, and religion as distinct and even separate realms of human understanding and experience.

In the end, perhaps the most important outcome of the course is not to be found in any particular conclusion or set of conclusions that we reached. Rather, the significance lies in the potential demonstrated through the course for continuing the conversation. The Center for Science, Business, and Religion has the potential to become a research program in its own right, pursuing in collaboration with students, professors, and those outside the academy the claims made in the “Declaration of Interdependence” and following the leads of other questions and insights that are yet to be discovered.
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44 http://livedtheology.org/. Dr. Lori Brandt Hale of the Augsburg College Religion Department has been involved in the work of the Project on Lived Theology and is responsible for the Religion Department’s familiarity with its program. Most recently she was a speaker at the 2011 Spring Institute for Lived Theology and has a chapter in the Project’s forthcoming book, Lived Theology: Style, Method, and Pedagogy.

45 http://livedtheology.org/overview/.