**\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\***

**Honesty, Courage, and Resilience**

**Classical, Jesuit, and Calvinist Conceptions of Virtue and Education for Sustainability**

 I am a Midwesterner, having grown up in one of Chicago’s northwest suburbs and having lived now in the Cincinnati area since 1984. I have seen extreme weather from a very early age, including tornados, blizzards, hailstorms, and, above all, thunderstorms that can make your heart skip a beat. Aside from the general inconvenience and occasional terror of driving in snow, I have loved it all, especially the thunderstorms. I used to look forward to thunderstorms when I lived in the woods in southeastern Indiana, just outside the Cincinnati metropolitan area. I would sit on the ground on a steep hillside I had cleared when we first moved there and watch the clouds roll in and the breeze increase and cool, the leaves dance and fall, the birds chirp and caw, and the smell of the air change to something moist and alive. I’d sit there for the first minutes of the bracing, cooling rain, raising my arms skyward, peering straight up into the falling rain, and then duck under cover and watch the storm with gratitude and ecstasy. I love extreme weather.

 Or rather I did. I can’t much enjoy it anymore. I live in the city of Cincinnati now and have for the past eight years. I sat in my backyard almost four years ago now and watched a thunderstorm roll in. At first, I enjoyed it as usual as the air came alive and the birds and squirrels darted nervously about. I welcomed the first drops and then still sat there as it built to a torrent, still enjoying it, perhaps—what with the devastating storms we have had the past few years—with a bit more of an edge than usual. Only a bit. But then a crack and thud. I passed through the gate into the front yard to find a limb from our large silver maple, poised like a wrecking ball over our house, sitting on the ground. No damage had been done, or at least not much. Five years earlier, a neighbor’s tree had come down in a storm and crashed into and through our roof. But we had been in Paris when it happened and friends dealt with most of the damage before we even got home. This, though far less serious, had happened right before my eyes and in the midst of my revelry.

 Something I had been reading earlier in the day shaped my reaction to the storm. It was a review of Bill McKibben’s most recent book, *Oil and Honey: The Education of an Unlikely Activist* by Verlyn Klinkenborg. Klinkenborg ruminated on McKibben’s remarkable ability to give people the bad news, including the news that personal sacrifices (driving a Prius, pushing for bike lanes) would do little to avert the coming catastrophe because we faced issues far bigger than what individual action might change. McKibben elsewhere boiled our circumstances down to three numbers, the 2 degrees Celsius beyond which climate change would bring near certain disaster, the 565 gigatons of carbon we might yet put in the atmosphere and still avert the worst, and the 2,795 tons of carbon in the proven reserves of fossil fuels that energy companies fully intend to exploit. Klinkenborg explained that McKibben’s facility in delivering bad news is that he “remembers what it is to be naïve” and can deliver the news with no hint of cynicism or impatience with ignorance, indeed with the tenderness we might keep in mind in our own teaching. So perhaps my reaction marked the end of my naivete and a recognition of my willful ignorance. Who really believes the energy corporations--and those whose wealth is embedded therein—are going to write off $20 trillion in assets?[[1]](#endnote-1)

 I do not think that is quite it, however. I would not protest my naivete or, rather, my self-serving belief that somehow these things will not touch me directly. But I had been an early adopter of the global warming concern, as far back as 1990. Behind that, I’ve been an environmentalist for as long as I can remember, gut-punched by evidence of the relentless degradation of the environment whether litter on the roads or burning piles of rubber tires. But that spring, summer, and fall of 2013 had seen a ratcheting up of the frequency and severity of storms. I knew other less fortunate people had already been suffering and dying from its effects for a decade or more. I also knew that some among the rich were making plans to insulate themselves from the mounting dangers. But that heavy limb falling in the front yard as I blithely enjoyed the storm rolling, in actuality nothing but a minor inconvenience, brought home to me my own vulnerability.

 We are all vulnerable as individuals, all of us, and mostly vulnerable as communities as well. No one, regardless of location or financial security, no matter how carefully distanced from the common fate, is exempt from the dangers of storms that can suddenly emerge and wreck destruction. Never mind, for the moment, the existential threats of deteriorating soils, disappearance forests, declining supplies of fresh water. More immediately and unpredictably, a warmer atmosphere is filled with heavier and heavier loads of moisture generating more and more extreme storms and damage from wind and flooding. Picking up the pieces requires resilience and cooperation. When audiences ask McKibben how they should prepare for life in an increasingly precarious world, he advises them to live “anywhere with a strong community.” Where do you find such communities, they ask? You build them is McKibben’s reply. Our fascination with post-apocalyptic survival is nothing but a distraction. We face a rolling apocalypse, a slow, uneven process of de-stabilizing change that will erase assumptions and strain, if not break, social bonds. We are going to have to be resilient.[[2]](#endnote-2)

**Democracy, Community, and Humanism: The Jesuit Contribution**

 McKibben models some of the virtues, honesty, courage, and resilience, that we are going to need. We need to be honest with ourselves about how our civic and business leaders are leading us toward catastrophe, from by turns carelessness and hubris or corrupt malfeasance and malicious avarice. Appearing on a panel with Congressman Lee Terry, a Republican from Nebraska, an avid proponent of the Keystone XL pipeline, and recipient of hundreds of thousands of dollars in campaign money from oil corporations since 1999, McKibben summoned the courage to say that Big Oil “was using the congressmen it funded heavily to make [the pipeline] happen.” Terry bristled and feigning incredulity, asked McKibben if he was saying that Congress had been “bought off.” Klinkenborg found none of that remarkable. What he marveled at is that McKibben blushed when Terry spoke. It revealed McKibben’s irreducible decency, his ability to refresh “the resiliently naïve expectation that our representatives will actually represent us.” That last virtue, resiliency, might be what we need most.[[3]](#endnote-3)

 The resilience Klinkenborg saw in McKibben stemmed from his residual faith, after absorbing all the bad news, that the democratic system can still work. Raised on his family’s farm in Iowa, Klinkenborg stood witness to the relentless depopulation and thus dedemocratization of rural America since 1945. Dedemocratization is not just a residue of industrial agriculture and the concentration of ownership but industrial agriculture’s essential method in its victory over the family farm. Factory farming only flourishes where local democracy has ceased to function and land use controls have been gutted. “No one who has the chance to resist,” writes Klinkenborg, “will consent to live within the ichorous effluent of factory farms.” McKibben is doing what he can to redemocratize the country. That means everything from keeping democracy alive at the local, town meeting level to orchestrating the divestiture movement to deprive the carbon corporations of the financial power to corrupt our representatives. Given the level of corruption and greed we have seen for two generations, there is perhaps little that can surprise us now. “It’s all too easy to give in to cynicism or go home to the farm and the bees,” Klinkenborg concludes. But it is better to be surprised if only to fuel the outrage we will need to keep going.[[4]](#endnote-4)

 Despite all the evidence that would undermine it, I retain my faith in democracy. It has always driven my work, especially my teaching. I believe people have untapped, even unsuspected capacities for intelligent judgment and creative work. My teachers took an interest in me before there was good reason to do so and I have always tried to pass that on. In 2004, when Xavier established its Philosophy, Politics, and the Public (PPP) honors program, I found an exceptionally fruitful field in which to pursue this work. The program is designed as a scholarly and experiential investigation of democracy and democratic institutions. The sophomore block of four courses (two in history and two in politics), which I have helped to teach since its inception, is explicitly committed to creating effective and reflective citizens, equally adept at political technique and political argument. The students investigate the history of American democracy while participating in electoral and legislative politics.[[5]](#endnote-5)

 In 2006, two years into the PPP experiment, I attended a conference in Paris on “The Vocation of the Teacher in the Ignatian Tradition.” As part of that event, I heard the distinguished Catholic historian John O’Malley read a paper on the curriculum and pedagogy of the first Jesuit schools. I recall thinking at the time that it sounded much like PPP. A recent reading of O’Malley’s pamphlet “Jesuit Schools and the Humanities Yesterday and Today” (2015) confirms that impression. The early Jesuits embraced and tried to cultivate in their students the classical conception of civic virtue taken from the ancient Greeks. This conception of virtue points us toward an ethic that should inform our sustainability programs.[[6]](#endnote-6)

 When the Jesuit first established their schools, they had two existing institutions, the university and the humanistic school, that offered models. The university can trace its origins to Aristotle and his effort to codify knowledge of the physical world. He worked for understanding. Aristotle’s contemporary, Isocrates developed a different model, designed to train young men for a life of action in the Athenian polis. Here the ability to speak in public and persuade others of one’s view of the common good stood first. The study of literature and the effective use of language trained these young men in the art of the word. Although Isocrates has generally been overlooked by intellectual historians, his ideas shaped the schools of the ancient world up to the thirteenth century.[[7]](#endnote-7)

 The tradition associated with Aristotle re-emerged as the professional-scientific university in the thirteen century. It quite rapidly took much of its modern form in terms of departments, hierarchical administration, and especially the public certification of professional competence. It also quickly stood for what we think of as the modern values of the university, disinterested inquiry, critical thinking, restless curiosity, and the willingness to question all received wisdom. What seems like the university’s sudden emergence owed much to new Latin translations of the writings of Aristotle, Greek and Arabic medical writings, and new commentaries of Roman civil law. It also had a great deal to do with the growth of cities and commerce and the need for careful record-keeping and other commercial skills.[[8]](#endnote-8)

 Many of the early university students attended for the recognizably modern concern with securing a career and making a living. The university, in other words, prepared its graduates to “get ahead.” Of the four prominent faculties of the early university, Law, Medicine, Theology, and Arts, the first three all provided degrees promising greater prestige and higher fees in professional careers. The Faculty of Art provided a core curriculum of sorts, consisting of grammar, rhetoric, and logic along with arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. Although designated the liberal arts, the curriculum included neither history nor literature. Logic and mathematics predominated, at least until the philosophical works of Aristotle, organized under the heading of metaphysics, ethics, and natural philosophy, began to reshape the curriculum. Natural philosophy, the codification and analysis of natural phenomena, attracted the greatest number of students, conferred the most prestige on its faculty, and laid the basis for modern science.[[9]](#endnote-9)

 The medieval university operated out of an unarticulated educational philosophy that marked it as a secular institution. Rather than concern itself with matters of salvation or the proper development of church and society, or the shaping of students’ character, the university taught technical skills for professional advancement. It promised upward social mobility for a tiny fraction of the population. Although religious practices and a sense of service undoubtedly appeared here and there in university settings, as everywhere in Catholic Europe, neither played any explicit or even implicit role in the university as educational institution.[[10]](#endnote-10)

 Before the rise of the university, the humanistic school had dominated educational practice since its invention in the ancient world. But it did not develop its mature institutional form until the Renaissance. Known most commonly as “the college,” the humanistic school borrowed much of its structure and curriculum from the university. But the art of the word, especially rhetoric and persuasion, received greater emphasis than logic; the mathematical subjects played a secondary role. The college focused on *studia humanitatis*, the study of our humanity. The college curriculum, O’Malley explains, examined “our human strivings, failings, passions, and ideals”; it tried to communicate “wonder, as expressed especially in poetry, dram, oratory, and history.” The 14th century poet Petrarch first reasserted the importance of this tradition, criticizing the university for neglecting literature and history and, thus, failing to attend to the ethical, emotional, and physical development of students.[[11]](#endnote-11)

 Most important, the humanistic school had an explicit philosophy that differed from the unarticulated philosophy of the university and it promoted a different set of values. The humanistic school emphasized preparation for a satisfying and constructive life, rather than “getting ahead,” as its mission. Renaissance humanists—and eventually the Jesuits--updated and Christianized the philosophical rationale for such schools inherited from the ancients. This philosophy acknowledged the value of technical skills but held the personal development of the student paramount (*cura personalis*). Aristotle, as Petrarch put it, taught the meaning of virtue but his philosophical teaching “lacks the words that sting, that set afire, and that urge toward the love of virtue and hatred of vice.” History and literature could best dramatize the central questions of human life and the difficult decisions they posed. The best of ancient and Christian authors stretched the students’ minds and introduced them to the varied expressions of the human spirit.[[12]](#endnote-12)

 Concern for the public good stood as a central principle in this educational philosophy. It aimed to create responsible citizens of every status, capable of identifying and articulating the common good and prepared to make sacrifices or take a leadership role as circumstances demanded. Hence the central importance of the art of the word in the humanistic curriculum. Rhetoric, vocabulary, interpretive skills, eloquence, even some philology, these served the tasks of persuasion and consensus building. All this implied that the cultivation of written and spoken expression could not be separated from the process of thinking itself. “The proper use of language,” Isocrates had put it, “is the surest index of sound understanding.”[[13]](#endnote-13)

 The humanistic school produced public persons, engaged in the life of their communities. In honing the skills essential to communicating worthy ideals and goals, rhetoric became known as “the civic discipline.” Such an education came to be seen as essential preparation for participation in public affairs. The Jesuits extended the benefits of such education to those lower down the social strata. The humanistic school did not, of course, extinguish the university and the two institutions interacted and overlapped. But distinctions remained. And many of the universities of the United States, most notably the Jesuit ones, began as humanistic colleges.

Even as they also became prep schools for professional training, the Jesuit colleges retained their commitment to training men and women for others and promoting justice.[[14]](#endnote-14)

 The Jesuits embraced the compatibility they saw between their Christian mission and the spirit of this institution derived from the pagan past. The early Jesuits, the Reformation historian Carlos Eire writes, embraced the “most advanced educational principles of the day, those of Renaissance humanism,” and focused on the “training of civic leaders, entrepreneurs, and functionaries.” Some of the Jesuits had themselves been educated at humanistic schools; they found it fruitless to distinguish between the worldly and the spiritual; to search for truth, beauty, goodness, was to search for God. The aim of the humanistic school intersected with the aim of the Spiritual Exercises and the development of persons who did not simply conform to ethical standards but examined and embraced them in a discerning manner. The Spiritual Exercises are designed for an active spirituality, practiced in the world, and rooted fundamentally in a capacity for good public judgment. The Jesuits, Eire concludes, believed that “the purpose of human existence is to find God *in* this world” and to “work *within* the world to magnify God’s glory through selfless and humble service to others.” The founding charter of the Jesuits (the *Formula of the Institute* 1550) thus added “the common good” to the Biblical and traditional values it commended.[[15]](#endnote-15)

 The Jesuits, of course, added a distinctive emphasis on religious growth and social assistance to the least fortunate to the mission of the humanistic school. But concern for and openness to the world stood next to evangelism in the Jesuit “way of proceeding” with schools providing the central means of expressing that concern and openness. In the list of fifteen goals for Jesuit schools written by Ignatius’s secretary (Juan Alfonso de Polanco), humanistic goals took the place of the anti-Protestant polemics and Catholic apologetics that might have been expected by those who see the Jesuits as essentially agents of the Counter-Reformation. The last goal read: “Those who are now only students will grow up to be pastors, civic officials, administrators of justice, and will fill other important posts to everybody’s profit and advantage.” The Jesuits avowed a civic purpose in their schools, describing them as effective instruments “for the reform of the cities.” Education provided Jesuits with a means of engaging the civic life of the secular world in ways their churches could not.[[16]](#endnote-16)

 One of the Jesuits’ favorite texts, Cicero’s “On Public Responsibility,” captures their civic intent. “We are not born for ourselves alone,” Cicero began. “We as human beings are born for the sake of other human beings, that we might be able mutually to help one another. We ought therefore to contribute to the common good of humankind by reciprocal acts of kindness, by giving and receiving from one another, and thus by our skill, our industry, and our talents work to bind human society together in peace and harmony.” The “duties prescribed by justice must be given precedence over everything else, including the pursuit of knowledge, for such duties concern the welfare of other human beings, and nothing ought to be more sacred than that.” Those who lived a private and self-absorbed life, Cicero concluded, “become traitors to the life we must all live together in human society, for they contribute to it none of their interest, none of their effort, none of their means.”[[17]](#endnote-17)

 All of this underscores the similarity of the earliest Jesuit curricula and that of Xavier’s Philosophy, Politics, and the Public honors program. So, too, does the emphasis on active learning. As with the early Jesuits, PPP is devoted to the principle that active engagement is an essential part of learning. As they believed it was not enough for a student to read a speech by Cicero, they must also deliver it, we also believe it is not enough for students to read about democracy, they must practice it as well. And just as an early PPP student characterized her peers as people who wanted to do good but also do well, the Jesuits borrowed from the university the commitment to teaching practical skills that helped students do well in the world even as they did good for others.

 O’Malley ended his account of early Jesuit education by suggesting five ways in which the tradition can shape our current efforts and did so in ways that align with our interest in sustainability. First, he urged us to help our students escape from an uncritical and unreflective embrace of their own experience, to examine their assumptions and prejudices, and ask difficult questions. Second, he urges us to help students understand how the past has brought us to our current situation, to secure some perspective on their world. Third, we must foster a sense of agency in our students, a commitment to use their skills and talents to the betterment of the world. An emphasis on eloquence, not “you know what I mean” but a capacity for precise thinking and effective communication, is his fourth point. Finally, he calls for attention to “the spirit of finesse,” an appreciation of the ambiguity of human situations and the difficulty of making the right decisions.[[18]](#endnote-18)

O’Malley’s five suggestions have obvious application for sustainability education. Whether we like it or not, we face difficult questions that put our past practice into a critical light. We deeply need some perspective on that past practice and some understanding of how we are responsible for our current situation. But we do not want to paralyze our students or ourselves with the enormity of the challenges ahead. We need to act, based upon our best available information and with an understanding of the values that shape our action. Settling on the best possible course of action will require clear thinking and building consensus will demand effective communication. Nothing, moreover, will led us further astray than self-righteous certainty. Our choices are not only difficult but also ambiguous. The limits of our knowledge and understanding, and of our individual perspectives, means that our plans of action must be open to constant questioning and revision.

I would add two more suggestions. We need to model and impart a resilience that comes from hope and a humility born of wonder. To some extent, I find these things in the Jesuit tradition that has been a central part of my life and work for the past thirty-three years. The *Spiritual Exercises* are just what they say they are, exercises that strengthen our will, our capacity for analysis, our ability to transcend our personal weaknesses, and to keep doing so regardless of the size or gravity of the challenges before us. Emphasizing the power of the human mind and our free will, the Jesuit tradition demands resilience of us. As for humility, the Jesuit tradition requires service to something larger than ourselves. An important part of the *Spiritual Exercises* is to find the right disposition, a right relationship to God, and to “ask God for what one should desire.” Above all, Jesuit spirituality is devoted to finding God in all things, including every situation, no matter how dire, that we find ourselves in.[[19]](#endnote-19)

**From Terror to Resilience and the Puritan Ordeal**

 But I find all these things, but especially resilience and wonder, even more profoundly in the Protestant tradition that is part of my upbringing. I grew up in a divided household, held to the Catholic faith by my mother but also deeply influenced by the attenuated Calvinism of my agonistic father. John Fairfield of Wenham, my direct ancestor, came to New England in the 1630s, part of the great migration of Puritans from England in the wake of King Charles I’s dissolution of Parliament. Family lore has it that the Fairfields had been French Huguenots (the “Beauchamps”). A published history of the Fairfields notes that John Fairfield of Wenham (the patriarch of the New England Fairfields) had in his estate a Geneva Bible, with commentaries from Theodore Beza, Calvin’s associate and successor in Geneva. Calvinism is in my blood.[[20]](#endnote-20)

 About twenty-five years ago, I encountered a personal narrative of religious conversion written by the eighteenth-century New England Calvinist Jonathan Edwards. I learned about Edwards and his “theology of consent” in Christopher Lasch’s *The True and Only Heaven: Progress and Its Critics* (1991). I had studied with Lasch at the University of Rochester and this is the book he had been working on in my last years in graduate school. Edwards served Lasch as portal into a Protestant conception of virtue, something akin to be different from the classical Greek conception of civic virtue that animated the humanistic school. Lasch’s treatment of Edwards, a central part of a chapter on “the world without wonder,” made a deep impression on me. What I took from Edwards is as easy enough to summarize as it is hard to live by; demand more of yourself and less of life and embrace the gift of life in the teeth of its pains. Lasch’s argument about wonder is harder to encapsulate. I have spent the last quarter center trying to work through it.[[21]](#endnote-21)

 I recently returned to a small detail in Lasch’s discussion of Edwards’s conversion. In his personal narrative of conversion, Edwards recalled being “uncommonly terrified with thunder, and to be struck with terror when I saw a thunder-storm rising.” From an early age, Edwards objected to what he saw as the “terrible doctrine” of “God’s sovereignty, in choosing whom he would to eternal life; and rejecting whom he pleased; leaving them eternally to perish, and be everlastingly tormented in hell.” Thunderstorms brought that doctrine to Edwards’s mind it all its horrible immediacy, conjured all his fears about salvation and damnation, and enabled him to “express that concern by the name of terror.” Apparently, this was not an uncommon experience in an era before our disastrously presumed mastery of nature. Caught in a frighteningly violent thunderstorm that boomed and crashed all around him outside Saxon village of Stotternheim on July 2, 1505, the twenty-one-year old Martin Luther prayed to Saint Anne to preserve him, promising to become a monk if he survived.[[22]](#endnote-22)

 Edwards’s religious conversion began in contemplation of a passage from 1 Timothy (Paul’s letter to Timothy in which he speaks of an inflowing of grace): “Now onto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory for ever and ever.” Edwards came to accept God’s majesty and justice as the most beautiful doctrine. Once he accepted the doctrine, Edwards recalled, the “appearance of everything was altered; there seemed to be, as it were, a calm, sweet cast, or appearance of divine glory, in almost everything. God’s excellency, his wisdom, his purity and love, seemed to appear in everything; in the sun, moon, and stars; in the clouds, and blue sky; in the grass, flowers, trees; in the water, and all nature.” Edwards built his theology of "consent and good will to Being in general" around this unconditional embrace of the goodness of God's creation in the teeth of its pains. He struggled to describe the calm, the gratitude, the sense of wonder it brought him. It might best be understood by us as the doctrine that the key to happiness is the renunciation of a right to happiness. The state of grace Edwards found himself in expressed itself in an exuberance, a courage, a resolution, and a vitality in response to adversity. He enjoyed the faith that moved mountains, braved the deep, and, yes, tamed the thunder. Edwards’s true virtue is what we might call resilience.[[23]](#endnote-23)

 To understand how Edwards’ struggles with the doctrine of God’s sovereignty echoed that of his fellow New Englanders, we must go back to the founding of the Puritan colonies. The New England Puritans who fled England in the 1630s hoped to leave behind the chaos they found in England. Hailing from the most commercially active classes in England, the Puritan migrants hoped to root out the impious complacency and materialism they found in themselves and others in England. Stricken with a profound anxiety about social and personal corruption, the Puritan migrants sought solace and reassurance by returning a directness and vitality to their relationship with God. Out of their deep longing for emotional fulfillment and an end to an anguish and emptiness of soul, they developed a faith that provided them with an awesome power to face persecution at home and the challenges of settlement in America.[[24]](#endnote-24)

 The New England Puritans soon shifted, however, from being a persecuted minority in England to being the majority establishing a colony in North America. Without enemies, they lost cohesion and had to impose order and orthodoxy upon themselves. Worse, at least for their emotional longings, their colony met with commercial success and expansion. As an abundant wilderness and an active Atlantic trade multiplied commercial opportunities, the river valleys of New England filled with prosperous colonists. Puritans became Yankees concerned with land, rum, and furs, guilty of every sort of private malfeasance and utterly without civic spirit. Haunted by a sense that they had failed, the first generation of New England Puritans felt an overwhelming sense of anguish, a loss of what the great historian of Puritanism Perry Miller called “the dream of a possible harmony between man and his environment.”[[25]](#endnote-25)

 Standing alone in the wilderness, minute and insignificant, out of touch with justice and beauty, the first generation of Puritans felt cut off from full and joyous participation in the universe. The children and grandchildren of these early Puritans, born into a going and prosperous community, could not even identify what it was the first generation felt it had lost. In his account of *The Puritan Ordeal,* historian Andrew Delbanco argues that the younger generations had lost the idea of evil as a privation, a personal loss in the form of an alienation from God. Instead they understood evil as something external, outside themselves. Lacking the ability to recognize their own complicity in their fate, the second and third generations of Puritans found Satan everywhere but in their own failings. In their “desire for divine abrogation of the limits that time and culture impose on human lives,” Delbanco writes, they had become Americans moving “toward the catastrophe of self-reliant solitude.”[[26]](#endnote-26)

 This is the context in which Edwards grew up. Beguiled by their own commercial success and attributing it to their upright morality, affluent eighteen-century New Englanders found it difficult to embrace an inscrutable God who might blast their hopes at any time. They believed God smiled on them because they deserved to be smiled upon. The Puritan embrace of a covenanting God who agreed to act in knowable way (unlike the inscrutable God of strict Calvinism) facilitated this belief. Inquiry into the natural law, scientific study, and engagement, including commercial engagement, with the world, all these seemed ways of understanding the God of the covenant. The covenant theology tended to hold God accountable to human definitions of justice.[[27]](#endnote-27)

 The doctrine of original sin became a sticking point. Affluent New Englanders could not understand why decent men and women, even helpless infants, should share in the punishment of eternal damnation meted out to Adam. They came to see original sin less as an inherent and ineradicable pollution (as in Calvin’s belief in human depravity) than the violation of a contract, an overt act of immorality that could always be atoned for and the bargain restruck. Edwards tried to get New Englanders to see original sin as not a crime, not an overt act toward others, but a disposition, a rebellious, disbelieving heart. Rebelliousness against the limits of life is the natural disposition of us all, infants included. It is galling to be under a higher power, difficult to credit the goodness of this higher power in a world with evil, hard to reconcile blasted hopes of happiness with the idea of a just and loving God. It is perhaps no less so today than in Edwards’s age that spoke so highly of happiness and increasing pleasures.[[28]](#endnote-28)

**Is There a Calvinist Environmental Ethic?**

 In asking if there is a useful environmental ethic in all this, we encounter the vexed relationship between Christianity and environmentalism.[[29]](#endnote-29) One side of the argument is that Christianity established a duality, separating humanity from nature. Stripping nature of spiritual dimensions, Christianity held that nature had been created by God for the benefit of humanity. Calvinism, then, deepened the dualism, further disenchanting the material world. In opposition to Catholic mysteries of mystical union with God, Calvinists saw the earth divorced from the supernatural and otherworldly. New England Puritans complicated things further, treating nature as both (in the words of Cotton Mather) “a temple of god” and “the Devil’s territories.” The first description demanded reverence, the second demanded the civilizing hand of humanity. This duality made it difficult to unite spiritual aspiration with economic practice. As environmental historian Mark Stoll explains, the Puritans “marveled at the beauty of parts of God’s creation while making fortunes from the destruction of other parts.” Cotton Mather put it more simply: “Religion brought forth Prosperity, and the Daughter destroy’d the Mother.”[[30]](#endnote-30)

 The other side of the argument is founded on the Christian and Calvinist reverence for God’s creation and the injunctions to stewardship. Calvin loved nature and saw it as an essential route to God. “We know the most perfect way of seeking God,” Calvin wrote, “is not for us to attempt with bold curiosity to penetrate to the investigation of his essence, . . . but for us to contemplate him in his works whereby he rendered himself near and familiar to us, and in some manner, communicates himself.” His respect for creation led Calvin to confess “that it can be said reverently, provided it proceeds from a reverent mind, that nature is God.” While a popular New England Puritanism took from the Bible and from Calvinist teachings the injunction to work hard and transform the wilderness, an educated elite found in Calvinism an injunction to understand and nature and preserve its purity. New Englanders shaped by Calvinism founded many of the early corporations that degraded the American environment, but they were also over-represented in conservation other environmental reform movements into the twentieth century (from Frederick Law Olmsted through Gifford Pinchot to Rachel Carson).[[31]](#endnote-31)

 For his part, Edwards bordered on the pantheistic in his approach to nature and the divine. In Perry Miller’s famous essay “From Edwards to Emerson,” where he attempted to connect Puritanism to transcendentalism, Miller argued that what connects the two is “the Puritan’s effort to confront, face to face, the image of a blinding divinity in the physical universe, and to look upon that universe without the intermediacy of ritual, of ceremony, of the Mass and the confessional.” In such a vein, Edwards recalled that after his conversion “I often used to sit and view the moon for a long time; and in the day spent much time in viewing the clouds and sky, to behold the sweet glory of God in these things.” Scarcely anything, Edwards continued, “among all the works of nature, was so sweet to me as thunder and lightning…. I felt God, if I may so speak, at the first appearance of a thunderstorm; and used to take the opportunity, at such times, to fix myself in order to view the clouds, and see the lightnings play, and hear the majestic and awful voice of God's thunder, which oftentimes was exceedingly entertaining, leading me to sweet contemplations of my great and glorious God.”[[32]](#endnote-32)

 Edwards’s experience helps us see that the children and grandchildren of the founders had lost wonder, gratitude, and humility. The lost idea of evil as privation is Edwards’s understanding of sin as a rebelliousness toward God and toward the limits of life. The first generation felt “the overwhelming anguish to which man is always subject,” Miller wrote, when “standing alone in the universe,” he feels not only minute and insignificant, but completely out of touch with both justice and beauty. But they also knew those brief moments of illumination, when harmony seems possible and they felt an “influx of an energy which pervades the world.” Their faith demanded the effort to live by the strength of that illumination and to live in “full and joyous participation.” This is the energy, the consent to being in general, that Edwards found and tried to share with his fellow New Englanders.[[33]](#endnote-33)

 Consent to being in general must be distinguished from quietism or passivity. The Calvinist faith that Edwards tried to revive held that everything that came our way was the work of God and therefore good. That belief, Eire writes, “gave Calvinists immense resolve, especially in the face of adversity.” Jean Calvin put it this way: “Yet when that light of divine providence has once shone upon a godly man, he is then relieved and set free not only from extreme anxiety and fear that were pressing him before, but from every care.” He knew, Calvin continued, “that he has been received into God’s safekeeping and entrusted to the care of his angels, and that neither water, nor fire, nor iron can harm him, except as it pleases God as governor to give them the occasion.” That resilience would be needed, moreover, because Calvinists, in conscious dissent from the Catholic monastic tradition, committed themselves to transforming the world by living in it, not by setting themselves apart. This is what Calvinists mean by a calling, Eire explains, and “the fact that it was a difficult task was the clearest possible indication that it was what God had willed for him, and what he must do. Predestination may have been a godly person’s greatest comfort, but one’s calling in this life was not necessarily trouble-free. In fact, trouble was an essential part of it.”[[34]](#endnote-34)

 Edwards fulfilled his vocation by bringing his courage to bear on the issues confronting his community in ways that recall McKibben. In 1748, at the funeral oration of his uncle, protector, and chief of the local militia Colonel John Stoddard, Edwards warned his community of impending dangers. Great leaders, Edwards began in praising his late uncle, discerned “those things wherein the public welfare or calamity consists, and the proper means to avoid the one and promote the other.” Standing before the proud merchants and sharp speculators of his affluent Northampton, Massachusetts. congregation, Edwards said the community stood in much need of such a ruler, someone prepared to oppose all those “of a narrow, private spirit that may be found in little tricks and intrigues to promote their private interest,” those who “will shamefully defile their hands to gain a few pounds, are not ashamed to hip and bite others, grind the faces of the poor, and screw upon their neighbors.” The grandees shortly removed him from his position as pastor.[[35]](#endnote-35)

 Edwards failed to transform a society that expected happiness as a natural right. Worse, the evangelical tradition he helped to build in reaction against market selfishness soon accommodated itself to capitalist enterprise. Edwards’s favorite student, Samuel Hopkins, accepted a Newport, Rhode Island pulpit on the eve of the American Revolution. Horrified by the complacent wealth of rum distillers and slave traders (“built up by the blood of the poor Africans”), Hopkins found his ideal of the Christian life in Newport’s housewives. Protected by their “retired circumstances” in domestic settings from “the numerous schemes for the acquisition of wealth,” women exemplified a disinterested benevolence. Rejecting the inscrutable Calvinist God of power and judgment, Hopkins described a maternal God of love who might turn Newport’s wealth toward Christian purposes. Abundance might generate disinterested benevolence out of market competition, Hopkins argued, as “great advances...in all arts and sciences” provided “worldly prosperity for all.” Just as loving women redeemed competitive men, so disinterested benevolence and gradual reform sanctified capitalist striving. It would be hard to find a clearer example of the failure to connect spiritual aspiration to economic practice.[[36]](#endnote-36)

**Education for Sustainability and Resilience**

 Edwards’s story might not seem terribly encouraging but it certainly underscores our need to act with courage and resilience. But some of us, myself included, might need a more secular translation of its meaning. I think of myself as an agnostic, always recalling the nineteenth-century philosopher Chauncey Wright’s adage: “Atheism is speculatively as unfounded as theism, and practically can only spring from bad motives.” In the end, I find the most compelling case for action and resilience in evolutionary naturalism. The philosopher John Dewey understood thinking as an evolutionary adaptation, like sharp claws or long necks, but one that gave us unparalleled control over our fate. But it gave us far from complete control. Experience can and should tell us about both the extent and the limitations of our powers. If we understand both the power and the limitations of our efforts, we will reject hubris and despair in favor of humility and faith.[[37]](#endnote-37)

 Along with William James, Dewey also argued that thinking brought at least the possibility of intelligent design into the universe. In “Nature and Its Good,” Dewey wrote that “when the sentient organism, having experienced natural values, good and bad, begins to select, to prefer, and to make battle for its preference; and in order that it may make the most gallant fight possible picks out and gathers together in perception and thought what is favorable to its aims and what hostile, then and there Nature has at last achieved significant regard for good.” In *Experience and Nature*, he added:“Fidelity to the nature to which we belong, as parts however weak, demands that we cherish our desires and ideals till we have converted them into intelligence, revised them in terms of the ways and means which nature makes possible. When we have used our thought to its utmost and have thrown into the moving unbalanced balance of things our puny strength, we know that though the universe slay us still we may trust, for our lot is one with whatever is good in existence.”[[38]](#endnote-38)

 Our ideals and desires are a part of nature, we put them in the balance against all precariousness and contingency. If we recognize this, we must bestir ourselves to use all our imagination, energy, skill, and bravery in the service of our ideals and desires. “Neither optimism and self-aggrandizing arrogance nor pessimism and self-denigrating abasement,” the historian Robert Westbrook writes in capturing Dewey’s argument, “but rather meliorism and hope were the appropriate responses to ‘the peculiar intermixture of support and frustration of man by nature which constitutes experience.’” Avoiding the stance of “ruthless overlord” as fully as we renounce that of “oppressed subject,” we must recognize that intelligence offers us the chance of amelioration but not domination. Intelligence is no guarantee against shipwreck and claims no absolute virtues: it is just the best--relatively better--means we have of securing the goods of experience.[[39]](#endnote-39)

 Some collection of these ideas has shaped my teaching and research over the years. I began teaching environmental themes and issues in 2001. But in the past decade my interest and commitment has increased. Kathleen Smythe and I taught a course together in the fall of 2010 with the explicated intention of exploring ways to communicate the urgency of our environmental challenges without paralyzing students with overwhelming bad news. Instead we wanted to contribute to the development of clear and independent thinkers motivated to learn about and engage environmental issues. The course, “Green Urbanism and Urban Gardening,” grew out of my teaching of urban and environmental history and Smythe’s teaching of agricultural history and her avocational interest in urban gardening. But above all, it grew out of Smythe’s conviction—and my embrace of that conviction--that students needed chances to act rather than just learn about the challenges. Nancy Tuchman’s presentation at Xavier on Loyola’s sustainability programs supplied the final catalyst.

 We offered the “green urbanism and urban gardening” as an alternative to the traditional sophomore block in the PPP program. The second course of the fall block combined the usual introduction and experience in electoral politics with academic and experiential investigations of urban gardening and community organization. It proved to be a transformative experience for the two of us and, we believe, for at least several of the students who have gone on to work on sustainability issues of one sort or another. As an intellectual experience, the course clarified old questions and raised new ones.

 My central purpose in Green Urbanism/Urban Gardening had been to offer an attractive vision of the good city as an alternative to what I saw as the essentially negative concept of wilderness at the center of the environmental movement. The wilderness ideal offered a vision of the world without us, refusing to take seriously any of our needs and aspirations. It therefore provided nothing to help us develop an ethic of the responsible use of nature. I also wanted students to see that I value what I see as the experiment of civilization, would like to see it continue, and believe it can be better and truer to its own aspirations. Toward this end, I asked the students to read Lewis Mumford, *The Culture of Cities* (1938), a broad survey of western urbanism that ends with an extended argument for regionalism. Supplemented with other more recent work, *The Culture of Cities* captures the audaciousness and the accomplishments of the experiment in civilization but also suggests where it had gone wrong and to provide suggestions about how we might get it back on track.[[40]](#endnote-40)

 Smythe pushed back, however, on what I saw as valuable in civilization and especially in large cities. Urbanism raised several questions for her, including the scale of economic, political, and social institutions that exist within settlements of various sizes. She also asked what it means to be human (genetically, a hunting-gathering animal) and how our environment (in its broadest sense including both human and non-human elements) influences our expression of that humanity. She also pointed out the ways that nutrient recycling (a key to sustainability and something Smythe has gotten me to focus on) is tied to our choice of settlement. Earlier peoples experienced more humane scales of operation and much more significant nutrient recycling than do we. So the study of environmental history is the study of what kinds of sustainable ideas and institutions we have given up on the way to the energy, dynamism, and density of human settlement (aka cities). History often becomes the study of progress and technology and wonder at human achievement, yet, such a trajectory leaves aside what we have given up in the process as well as the rest of the natural world upon which our societies depend.[[41]](#endnote-41)

 Although I have not continued to ask students to work in urban gardens for reasons that have everything to do with my own limitations, I recognized the tremendous value of that. They gain a sense of how the human population lived for most of recorded history and can look at their lives, work, and actions in a new light. It makes sustainability a much more complex and ambiguous term. It is not about buying green products anymore but about systems and institutions, whether one participates in them, opts out of them, seeks to change them from within and, ultimately, about whether or not one values some aspects of human society that are no longer dominant*.*

 I have personally, however, become a much more avid gardener, in large part of the result of that course. Intellectually as well, her emphasis on our biological inheritance has shaped my thinking. I remain a partisan of cities and civilization. I still argue that it is misleading to say that the future of the planet is at stake as we face our environmental challenges. What is at stake are the specific forms of life, including human civilization, that we find valuable. I believe the planet will be just fine and life in some form will continue; bacteria is quite resilient. Outside of human values, there does not seem to be much reason to prefer tigers to bacteria. But Smythe raised a complicating issue for me. She also rejected the wilderness ideal—whether she recognizes it or not-- but put in its place a fundamentally different vision of how humans should live. In part, her admiration for much older ways of life (hunting and gathering) is based on a humble view of humanity’s place in the biosphere as well as our own genetic inheritance. She underscored for me just how radical and potentially disruptive the experiment of civilization is.

 One of the more fruitful threads I picked up from the “green urbanism and urban gardening” experience concerns the fate of regionalism. Toward the end of the course, I began to explore the tension between Mumford’s vision of regionalism and the actual public policies that gave rise of urban disinvestment and mass suburbanization after. Superficially, Mumford’s vision and New Deal/postwar urban policy seemed on the same track. But as Mumford himself lived to point out, the suburbanized metropolis that emerged bore little resemblance to the regional civilization he had envisioned. I developed a course to explore this, “The Ecological City: Regionalism and Urban Sprawl Since 1932,” essentially an environmental history of U.S. cities and suburbs. As their practical engagement, the students partnered with a local green or environmental organizations as Cincinnati Waterworks, the Metropolitan Sewer District, Findlay Market (a public market in continuous operation since the 1850s), the Civic Garden Center, Enright Ridge Ecovillage, and the Millcreek Restoration Project. They wrote papers and created short videos about these organizations that became part of a website I constructed called “The Ecological City, Cincinnati, 1788-“.[[42]](#endnote-42)

 In the spring course in the PPP block that same academic year (2012-2013), I designed a course around weekly field trips to many of these organization. I took the students to the Cincinnati Waterworks, the Metropolitan Sewer District, the Port Authority of Cincinnati, on a tour of the Mill Creek (one named the nation’s most endangered urban stream), the community council of an impoverished neighborhood adjacent to Xavier, an urban farm, among other sites. That course reflected my fascination with Lewis Mumford’s proposal for a regional survey as a method for communal education, creating an informed and responsible citizenry engaged in regional planning. The regional survey would engage both experts and citizens in a systematic investigation of the region and an imaginative discussion of its potential. From school children to specialists, every citizen would be touched by the “moralizing forces” of the scientific method, cooperative inquiry, and mutual education, making the regional survey “a central core in a functional education for political life.” The course also reflected my interest in Michael B. Smith’s idea of ecological citizenship, a using the curriculum to make students aware of place, how it functions, its possibilities, its vulnerabilities, and some appreciation, some wonder, at the complexity of community building.[[43]](#endnote-43)

 As I brought more and more of my environmental concerns into PPP, I began to get some push-back from the students who did not share my concerns and asked what relevance ecology had to their interest in politics. My protest that we faced no more pressing political issue than environmental degradation did not allay their concerns. Fortunately, my experience in “green urbanism and urban gardening” had also created new avenues for my environmental interest. In the fall of 2011, I secured sustainability fellowship from Xavier’s Center for Teaching Excellence. As part of my proposal, I audited the two required courses in Xavier’s environmental science minor, an introductory course on ecology and a course on natural resource economics. As a direct result of that experience, I developed a course that examined the intersections, collisions, and synergies between “urban ecologies and economies.” The “urban ecologies, urban economies” course became an important part of the Masters of Art program in urban sustainability and resilience that I developed with Elizabeth Blume, director of Xavier’s Community Building Institute and former city planner in Dayton and Cincinnati (Blume had taught the “community organizing” component of the green urbanism and urban gardening course). The M.A. program began in the fall of 2014.[[44]](#endnote-44)

 The M.A. program has grown in each year since 2014. We have now graduated two cohorts and will welcome our largest (12-13) and perhaps most talented cohort in the fall of 2017. I have also continued to push environmental themes and issues in my PPP teaching (this past spring, one group of students choose anaerobic digestion as their legislative issue to pursue; anaerobic digestion is a means of producing energy and soil amendments from wastes that otherwise wind up in landfills). Meanwhile, our environmental troubles continue to mount. It is hard to avoid a feeling of futility but that brings us back to resilience. Just as Edwards and the Calvinists taught me “consent to being in general,” my recent trip to Loyola-Chicago’s annual conference on climate change introduced me to quite similar Catholic and Jesuit idea of “finding God in all things.” If we abandon the expectation that things will work out for us, we are left with the charge of making the best of things, of not succumbing to despair or cynicism. We do what we can and prepare for the challenges ahead.

 Michael Smith’s idea of ecological citizenship points to part of what we need. Smith wants to encourage in student four habit of mind and action. We must stand with our students in seeing ourselves as agents of change, while increasing our capacity for understanding and dealing with complexity and ambiguity. We need to develop in our students, as in ourselves, an understanding the citizenship entails obligations to the non-human parts of the planet, something that should come as part of our evolving sense of connection and commitment to place. We might add our students’ need—and our need—for a sense of wonder, awe, and gratitude for the beauty and complexity of the natural world and, whatever our species’ shortcomings, the capacities and accomplishments of humans.
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