

## **The Isaac Armitage Lecture 2009 Is there such a thing as Anglican Education?**

### **An Agnostic educates an Anglican**

My agnostic friend who is a geologist took me out walking along the coast. A born teacher, he described to me what our surrounds in geological terms. He was able to name the type of rock and point out structures, crevices and folds that up until then I had merely observed so to speak with an aesthetic eye as things of beauty and delight. He explained their history and their interrelationship – how river and island and rock and cliff had come into existence as they were; how tremendous unimaginable forces had forced them into being and into place. He did not lecture me; he stood beside me and showed me the significance of what we were looking at.

As I looked and listened, I had an experience akin to an attack of vertigo. My natural sense of things was of order and permanence. The rocks and the mountains stood for the eternal, the unshakeable, the immovable. As a scientist, he was also an historian, as a student of what used rightly to be called natural history. He was revealing to me that this stable world was not stable at all; that it is my puny grasp of time which had deceived me; that we exist within a giant slow-moving but inexorable washing machine, ever churning and ever creating further, far reaching changes.

Of course I knew these things in theory. But the tutorial had changed me. My imagination was transformed. My grasp on order was shaken. I could never see things quite the same way again. It was a sort of revelation followed by mini-conversion. It was magnificent.

### **Asking a sharp question**

Does Anglican education exist? Well, I have just given you the story of an Anglican being educated. I will return to it in due course. But first to the apparently mundane question which is the title of this lecture: Is there such a thing as Anglican education? A proper answer would range over vast tracts of theology, philosophy and history. But I intend to be very specific and indeed local about this, for I understand it to be a question which we ourselves can no longer defer, no longer avoid. We are dealing with one of the most important and urgent issues before us as a Diocese. The significance of this matter for our local situation demands that I speak directly in and to the Diocese of Sydney and most directly about our own schools.

Well, then, Is there such a thing as Anglican education in our Diocese?

Obviously the answer is 'yes'. We have scores of Anglican schools. We have actively Anglican teachers, actively Anglican Heads, we have actively Anglican students being taught by Anglicans. Indeed, we have made significant progress in all these areas. More, we have pre-schools, Sunday Schools and extensive school scripture being taught in State schools. We have Moore College and Youthworks to name but two of our other local efforts at education. We have the great and ancient schools, the Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation, the Anglican Education Commission. Put it all together and we have thousands and thousands of people, especially children, under Anglican instruction. Furthermore, we do not have to doubt the quality of so much that is being done. We have thoughtful and skilled educators involved at every level and there is much to be proud of. Personally, I am very pleased with so much of what is done in our name.

But we must also ask some disturbing questions about all this activity and especially our schools. We can even ask whether in fact what we are looking at is Anglican education. That is, what marks our educational philosophy and practices out from any other group? What is distinctive about it? Could it equally be called Christian education? Could it even be called worldly education with a veneer of Christianity? According to one harsh critic of our schools, they vary from those which teach a Christianity calculated not to offend the respectable, to those which imbibe a thoughtless and unworldly piety. You may think that the criticism is particularly unfair. For myself, I am not as troubled by it, as I am about something true which is at the heart of it: It is self-evident that we have never seriously given ourselves to the task of creating an Anglican education. As a Diocese, we do not support our schools at this crucial point. There is an absence of coherent thought about education by Sydney Anglicans as such. This is scandalous.

My concern about Sydney Anglican education is that at a formal level it does not exist. There is no literature devoted to discussing it. There is no faculty whose business it is to research it. There are no courses devoted to explaining it. There is no philosophy which encapsulates it. There is no accessible theological discussion of it. There are no chaplains being inducted into it. There are no Christian studies teachers being trained to instruct in it. There is no induction for teachers into Anglican schools as such. There is no fellowship of Anglican teachers. There is no special place for new Heads to

think about the issues raised by leading an Anglican school. There is no sustained discussion between or even within School Councils. There is no such thing as Anglican education as such in our midst.

I am aware, of course that we do have fine Christian thinkers in our schools, and naturally I am delighted with the progress of the Anglican Education Commission. But the small resources which we have allotted to these works only serve to confirm what I say. Our Diocese is guilty of neglect when it comes to its schools and indeed to the issues involved with education generally.

### **The issue of culture**

The superficial criticism that we are either respectably conformist or brainlessly pious can be translated into something far more telling. Every Christian theology and every Christian work has to come to terms with the culture which surrounds it, has to take up an attitude to the world. The really harsh critic could say this: that the respectable amongst us have come to terms with our culture, have found a comfortable place within it, have never considered whether the demands of the curriculum conflict in any way with the revelation of God in scripture. We accept the current understanding of human beings as being true and engage with pupils on the basis of it; we accept that the habits of reading demanded by the English department are to be embraced and not critiqued; we are never even troubled by the theory of evolution taught in science classes, or ask ourselves whether the impact of the schools education will make it harder or easier to be a Christian father or mother. We specialize in producing successful professional people who move comfortably in the surrounding culture.

On the other hand the same really harsh critic could say this: that the best of the super-pious among us maintain a distance from the surrounding culture. They can see nothing good in it and wish to separate from it. The students are being invited to leave the culture around them and together join a counter-culture. The practice of education has to be re-thought from the ground up, presuppositionally. Everything in the school must be guarded against the world's thought patterns, and even subjects such as Mathematics and French must be taught in a Christian way. The theory of evolution cannot be taught as true. We are self-consciously trying to produce Christian men and women capable of being in the world but not of it. What we do produce is people who are either suspicious of the world or gullible about it.

Of course these are caricatures and exaggerations. Indeed, I fear that for some we are neither respectable nor super-pious: it is simply a matter of thinking that if you place Christian teachers in schools and give lessons directed mainly at converting students, that this is the same as Christian education. My point is not in the first place to criticize the reality which lies behind my distorted descriptions, but to say that I do not have the intellectual knowledge base or the conversation partners to have this discussion. We seem to assume that just starting a school and calling it 'Anglican' is sufficient. We assume that when we appoint a Principal he or she will know what to do and will employ the right teachers who will be miraculously provided by the state system and given no induction into whatever it is that an Anglican education practice may be. What is our relationship with culture? My problem is not that we have the wrong one, but that we have never examined the question at depth. And if we have not done that, we do not have the beginnings of an education which is Anglican.

At one stage it was possible to argue with some force that Anglican education in this sense did not need to exist. For a long time the community was basically protestant, especially in higher education. Or, at least, higher education was not notably non-Christian. The training of teachers could safely be left to the State teacher training colleges, where in any case many of the instructors were committed Christians. The products of such colleges could be relied on to occupy a broadly Christian position on most things and the schools were similarly Christian in the sense that they did not offend against the protestant moral code. As long as the chapel was Anglican there was no need for thought to be given to Anglican education as such. The general community was sufficiently protestant and by majority Anglican.

We may thank God that we passed through this phase many years ago. The intellectual and moral demands of Christianity are now so much more in stark contrast to the prevailing culture that we can no longer make the blithe assumption that whoever teaches will be broadly Christian or at least not anti-Christian. The contest for the gospel must now be fought out in the realm of ideas and at a fundamental level. If this engagement is avoided in the sphere of education and not least in the training of teachers and in curriculum matters, we may as well not run schools at all. Indeed, although I have caricatured the super pious, please note that I do not do so on the grounds that they are in fact unintelligent. On the contrary, they have understood the need for an education which is philosophically Christian and often their publications and teaching are well thought out and aware. At least

they take the issue of culture with great seriousness. But although our schools have improved from the point of view of Christian education, especially through Christian Heads, better trained chaplains and more aware Councils, you cannot say that as a denomination we have offered much support in the contest for the gospel. That work remains to be done.

### **An Anglican approach**

Having asserted that there is an absence of philosophical support for our schooling, I now accept that I must spend some time endeavoring to begin a discussion. Should there be an Anglican approach to education? Would we not just say that there is a Christian approach or perhaps a protestant approach or more narrowly an evangelical approach and simply collaborate with others in providing an education based on such principles?

At one level, this is so. Indeed you could say that there is a secular approach to education (though not a secularist approach) which we could also share. But significant differences exist; I would not be happy to see us merely using the Catholic University to train teachers, for example. Nor would I like to see our schools embracing a Pentecostal ethos. My instinct is that the work done by other protestant groups will not exactly match what we would want to see from our theological perspective. At the very least, we need to do our own thinking in order to see whether the differences are significant. We need conversation partners; but we need to have the conversation and not simply assume that there will be nothing to discuss.

After all, 'Christian' and even 'evangelical' are not precise enough for what needs to occur in building an ethos in an Anglican school. The Christian faith comes to us in concrete ways. Through a history, a set of traditions, a way of doing things, and most important through a theological way of looking at the world. A mere 'common' or eclectic faith is not easily sustainable. It will not be sufficiently robust to delineate itself from others. I would not think that an Anglican and a Pentecostal school would operate on the same principles, and an Anglican school needs to be sufficiently self-aware not to simply embrace Pentecostalism or pietism as though the faith they teach will be in common with our faith so that it does not matter. There is such a thing as Anglican identity, but we have insufficiently explored and taught it in recent years. We have lost confidence in what is a good thing.

Of course we do not need to be or want to be exclusive of others. Mere loyalty to denomination is unhelpful to say the least. But the Anglican theological tradition is worth owning. In fact we are not the same as Catholics, Baptists, or Pentecostals or even the Reformed, and will not run a school or any other institution in the same way. At the moment we have (to some extent) assumed what we needed to appropriate, and that is a loss for all. Furthermore, I would say that ‘Anglican’ both still has a market value in the general culture – it stands for something recognizably worth preserving and exploiting – and also a constituency worth preserving and exploiting. Or to put it another way, we have an experience of how Christ and culture relate which is still significant.

The best way into the necessary discussion is through three great theological themes which have some broad implications for Anglican education. These themes intersect with education precisely through the issue of knowledge, namely, knowing God.

## **Knowing God**

As Anglican Christians we believe that the first obligation of every human being is to know God, that is to say, to enter into a relationship with God based on his merciful invitation to do so through Jesus Christ. This has always been the aim of human existence and it involves the recognition that God is God, and that we human beings are mere creatures and therefore are to live our lives and to spend eternity in his service. We believe that the students in our schools are not merely animals destined for a short existence and then the doom of extinction. We believe that every student is an immortal – destined by God to exist for all eternity with him, or without him. We believe that each person is infinitely precious; that we are not merely interested in those who achieve or those destined for worldly success. We believe that their best interest is served, no matter what other gifts the school may give, in helping them to come to know God.

If this is truly our belief, it will create a revolution in the way we view education. We will not be satisfied with our work unless the best work we do is pastoral, is caring for every individual. Furthermore we, indeed all teachers surely, will be thoroughly aware of the way in which the knowledge of God comes and make sure that we order our school life to ensure that the knowledge of God is available to all.

The establishment of a proper relationship with God is a matter of revelation, investigation and illumination. In the first place it is a matter of revelation. We do not prove our way to God – we study his revelation of himself. Christians broadly speaking honour Christian tradition, human reason, spiritual experience and the Bible as elements of apprehending God's revelation. But we differ in the emphasis and role we give to each. Anglican Christians believe in the centrality, sufficiency and importance of the Bible in God's revelation of himself. In particular we believe that the Bible will be used to reveal God to us if we see that the central message of the Bible concerns Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour. This means that we will not be satisfied that we have provided an Anglican education unless every student knows the Bible – its stories, its sayings, its doctrine and especially its God. It also means that we are not constantly seeking God's revelation of himself in engineered experiments in experiential spirituality.

But God's revelation is a personal and not only a factual matter. Human sin means that we cannot of our own selves turn to God as we should. God has revealed himself to us through his word, the scriptures which centre on the

gospel and we come to know him by the effect work of his Holy Spirit persuading us of the truth and enabling us to trust it. That is to say, although the teaching of the scriptures and the gospel which is the central message of the scriptures is fundamental to Anglican education, we acknowledge that in the end people come to know the living God through regeneration by God's Spirit and not by mere human effort. We cannot educate people into being Christian, and receiving a Christian education is not the same thing as being Christian. There are distinct limits. We sometimes think that if only we could get our schools right we would have lots more Christian graduates. This may not be true at all. The teaching of the scriptures is an indispensable part of an Anglican education, but it is not by any means a guarantee of acceptance.

In fact there are two things about which we need to have carefully worked out ideas. The first is the impact that conversion has in a school community and on parents who may send their children to our schools in the mere hope that they may be moral. If we run our schools in such a way as to discourage young people from the boisterous embrace of Christ in conversion we will not be Anglican, we will merely be respectable. If young people are allowed to fall in love with each other, with sport, with drama, with English, they must also be encouraged to come to know God. We need to be utterly convinced that this is the goal of human life, or we will falter and prefer the quiet life of an ordered community and parents who are satisfied.

The second matter is this - the place of prayer in our schools. For if the goal of human life is for people to come to know God, and if the knowledge of God depends on the work of the Spirit taking the scriptures and opening their truth to the learner, then the Anglican school must be a pastoral community in which every child is prayed for constantly by her teachers – and not just by the Christian Studies teachers, but by the teachers of art and English and history. In selecting staff we need to ask ourselves is this person a man or woman who will help create this pastoral community especially a community of quiet intercession for and love for the students? If this is not a feature of an Anglican school, why are we involved in people's lives at all?

### **Knowing God the Creator**

Who is this God that we expect students to come to know? Even more important, who is this God whom we expect teachers to know? The answer to that question will have profound impact on what we teach and why we

teach it. The Christian view of the created order and the non-Christian view of the created order are different and if we do not acknowledge the difference and understand where it lies, we will not be delivering an Anglican education.

Let me clumsily put it this way. If you were an animist, you would view the world as the daily product of spiritual forces beyond your vision. You would think that everything which happens has a reason – that even when you fall over or lose money or become sick, there is a Why question and Who question to ask. Why has this happened to me? Who has caused it to happen? You may answer both questions together, for if you find some human agent who has been able to harness the spiritual forces around us by the use of magic, you may find out why they have combined to do this to you. You may then make peace with your enemy or try to use even greater magic to defeat him. All this constitutes a very natural understanding of the world and an extremely common one.

Now of course it is not ours. By a distortion of Biblical Christianity, secularists have emptied the world of spirit and spirit forces. For them, it is entirely fruitless to look for causes of this nature. Accidents are accidents, the world has no meaning beyond itself; indeed you could say that it has no inherent meaning at all. Their questions arise from a sadly reductionist view of the world: they are only, What? How? When? The secularist will point to the immense success of modern science, based on the idea that the world must be looked at in its own terms and not as the product of persons and examined rationally. Strangely, however, the culture which has been so strongly influenced by this rationalistic approach has moved on. Post-modernity is a protest movement against such rationalism; it is the revolt of humanity seeking still to fill the spiritual vacuum left by the rationalists; a revolt which however wrong headedly is testifying to the human longing for meaning and purpose, for the Who? and the Why?, even if it is a meaning and purpose which arises from our own brains and hearts and so is confused and illogical. Post-modernism is both an evasion of and an opportunity for the gospel.

But there is another way of looking at the created order. It is to say that the animist is right to ask for the Why and the Who – but wrong to think that there are many competing forces behind the phenomena and that we can control them by magic. It is to say that the secularist is right to think that we must look at the world in its own terms and not to be continually rushing to

personal and teleological explanations for every effect. The What and the How and the When really matter. As Christians we are committed to discovering the truth of these things. It is the biblical view, that this is a good world, that is created by the one true and living God, that he sovereignly controls every element of it all the time, that he is the Who and he provides the Why. It is the biblical view which was a key contributor to the rise of modern science in that it rid the world of magic and opened it up for rational and empirical inspection, for attention to the What and the How and the When. That is why we share so much with the secularists, for the secularist epistemology takes advantage of our non-magical view of the world and does great work on behalf of human reason. But that is why the secularist worship of reason is so unstable and unsatisfying – in banishing the God it has denied the possibility of the Who and Why questions which most human being regard as the most important of all.

In the end it is not the teaching of evolution or not which matters. My own view is that the account of evolution given in modern science is plausible and constitutes the best account of the evidence so far. I do not see it as being in opposition to my faith in God's word, though nor do I regard it as the last word in the doctrine of creation. And when it is worshiped I see that it is a horrible idolatry. Thus it was perfectly proper for me to learn from my agnostic friend, whose exercise of science is thoroughly consistent with the methods favoured by a Christian approach to the world, in which, banishing the spurious teleology of the animist we may seek the truth yielded to experiment and observation and reason. But I do so because God has created the world and sustains it by his logos, his reason and so gives it form and shape and order and even more important, a purpose and a meaning which cannot be read off from the creation but which is the route into our understanding of the creation. If we did not know the Who and the Why, we would not ultimately know the What and the How and the When. That is why the impact of knowledge, of being a learner, is personal, objective and revelatory all at the same time. That is why I experienced a mini-conversion when I saw the world through the eyes of another, even though he himself does not as yet see the Who and the Why of things.

The implication of all this is that the world has a right to be studied objectively, in its own right and that can be done when we have the right vantage point, namely the knowledge that the world is the good creation of a good God and that it bears the marks of his order, and that we as his image-bearers have the space and indeed the duty to investigate it. The fact that we

know that there is only one Who, and that we know his plans and purposes, liberates us from the ceaseless quest for power to rule the world or to fill it with gods made in our own image. Nor is what I am saying of relevance merely to the sciences; there are implications for history, economics, literature, sport, art; indeed for all which may engross us in a school. Anglicans do not bless material objects, or introduce superstition or New Age religion or self-focused spirituality. But nor are we those who say that there is a 'Christian' theory of everything. Because we know the God who rules all things and we know his purposes, we can study what we see from that vantage point and giving what we see the right to be itself. Or, to put it another way, the Christian theory of everything is that God has so ordered the world and entrusted to us the task of being his image-bearers, that we are free to investigate his creation to his glory, by faith in him. That is why authentic Anglican schooling will be excellent in terms of the disciplines it studies, even excellent for those who only ever see the What and not the Who.

As Anglicans we must have a deep interest in human culture and an understanding of our own place within it. Culture arises from our role as image-bearers of God within the world – we are constantly 'naming the animals', on God's behalf if I may put it like that. But the Tower of Babel reminds us that after the fall our names for the animals are all different, that human culture bears the marks of human corruption. This all means that the task of Anglican schooling should involve a marvellous intellectual adventure. We are not to reject human culture – indeed the enculturalisation of this world is part of the calling which God has laid upon us all. But nor are we to be dazzled and seduced by our culture, for that which innocent humans may produce to the glory of God – art, language, literature, work, engineering, medicine – all this and much more - is tarnished and corrupted by our sin and can become the god-substitute which our hearts long for. Or rather will express as well as our interaction with the creation our self-willed determination not to be ruled by God.

The Anglican teacher of history or of English has the calling both to embrace and to critique culture. We are not to accept the current theories which rule our profession and find their way into a syllabus designed mainly to help little immortals to find good jobs before they perish off the face of the earth. But, unless we plan to take our students out of their world, or unless we plan to declare that human culture is not only corrupt but completely and utterly corrupt, nor can we simply ignore current theories. In

my own sphere of the study of history I can see some wonderful gains in new approaches which have come to the fore in recent years. But they are not absolute and not beyond critique. Indeed the tendency in the arts to assume and purvey epistemological and moral relativism is profoundly non-Christian and culturally self-defeating. Merely to let it pass without criticism or comment is as vacuous as a secularist education and as dangerous as the flight from culture into an abstract and theoretical Christian world-view. As Anglicans, we can do better than this.

Anglicans must ask what is the goal of schooling, and must have an answer which differs from and is far better than the alternatives. For what we see so often is an unthinkingly instrumentalist account of education, sometimes put as crassly as the desire to make sure that students will get good jobs. Strangely, even this account will be self-defeating for the society which embraces it, for life is more than food as we were once famously reminded. The workers we produce will have to enter a society and if that society is to be sustained it is going to need more than workers – it is going to need men and women who will know what it is to parent a family, to write poetry, to speak honestly and fearlessly, to say no to a bribe, to be good prison officers.

Strangely the best of workers will not be those trained to work, but those who are motivated to work selflessly to the glory of God and to the good of others. It is no accident that the gospel produced the famous ‘protestant work ethic’, but please note that it was the gospel which did it, for the gospel tells us not just that we work to dominate the world and be successful and to show what we can do – it tells us that we work to please God and to bless others. More than that, it arises from the knowledge that this world is not all there is, that we are only beginning our lives here, that work itself is only a small part of who we are and what we are. Human self-identification is not based on positions we hold or work we do or wealth we accumulate, but on relationships we have and supremely our relationship with God. In other words, here as elsewhere, the reductionist account of human life and experience is impoverishing and self-defeating. Anglican schools need to stand for something far better than what our secularising culture is delivering.

### **Knowing God Redeemer**

But of course God is not merely our Creator, he is our redeemer through Jesus Christ a fact testified to by a crucifix in every Roman Catholic classroom. As an Anglican I would never suggest that we do that: but I am

interested in every child knowing that the most important moment in human history was the death of Jesus and understanding why it occurred and what that tells us about God and ourselves. Indeed, let me put it this way, it is that which should shape our whole school experience, for if the cross of Christ means anything to you, it must mean everything.

Let us think of some of the implications.

First it tells us that the one God who rules all things is a God of justice and the one to whom all are answerable. The running of a school does not devolve into the survival of the fittest, into power games or bullying or into mere rule keeping, As God is just, so too is the school to be a community committed to justice; as God is love, so too is the school to be committed to compassion and grace for the staff as well as the students. For the staff the school is a work place, but if it a mere work place it has ceased to be the community which God wills, it falls beneath what we may rightly expect of an Anglican school. For the Head, and for parents of the family, it obvious to all that he or she knows that they are not the ultimate force or power. Even the youngest may appeal to God, to whom the Head, too is accountable. Even the youngest may judge the leadership by the standards revealed in God's word.

Second it reminds us of the objective and infinitely painful reality of sin and guilt. The culture around us bears many testimonies to the way in which people believe still in sin and guilt – we blame and curse each other vociferously. But there is also a tendency and especially a professional tendency, to turn sin into error and guilt into subjective states and hence to turn to a therapeutic model of dealing with sin. As we know encouragement is worth far more than criticism and management is more effective than mindless punishment; we all know that discipline which is merely negative becomes brutality; but there is an irreducible sinfulness in human behaviour and an actual guilt which accrues and this too needs to be acknowledged and dealt with or we will rob people of their humanity and the cross of its meaning.

Third it tells us that we do not belong to ourselves but to another and through him to the rest of the redeemed. If Anglican schooling does not encourage the experience of fellowship, support young men and women as they make a painful and counter-cultural stand for Christ; if it does not

support Christian families; if it does not support local churches, it is failing to be useful. For life is more than school. The education of young people, especially today makes us keenly interested in the very things which church and Christian fellowship will give them and draw forth from them. Here they will have lessons in socialisation, in service, in self-discipline, in family life which are desperately needed. Here to they will learn Christ which is the chief goal of life itself.

## **Conclusion**

There is so much more to talk about – the goals of education, a definition of education, the family and education, anthropology, the exercise of criticism, educational philosophy, why we don't teach church history...the list is endless.

And that is my point.

I am not saying for a moment that I know all the things which should engage us, theologically, philosophically, practically. I do not. Nor as you can tell from the rough and ready thoughts I have just give you that I know much about the subjects which need consideration. I know that we need controversy and argument and discussion and agreement and unity.

I am saying that there are a huge number of really important issues which we have not given any sustained thought to as a Diocese and we have not provided any forum where the work can be done. In saying this, let me say that I think that the Anglican Education Commission could be the beginning of this work. Certainly it has contributed to it already. But I am saying that unless we are knowingly theological and consciously Anglican, we will not succeed in being any different from secular schools, especially after one or two generations. Furthermore there is little point in planting more Anglican schools – indeed I am opposed to planting more Anglican Schools - until we begin to see more progress in this area. We have a come a long way in being Christian but we will lose it all if we cannot find the human and other resources to work on these issues. We need the best theologians and we need the best educationists to cooperate. Each has their own sphere of expertise and interest – but they must work joyfully together for the good of the gospel, our students, their families and for Australian society.

In my view it is going to require an institution of some sort to fulfil this aim. But don't get me wrong. I am not talking about bricks and mortar, at least not in the first instance. I am talking about a faculty, a fellowship of men and women, part time and full time which will constitute the thinkers, researchers, writers, practitioners and strategists capable of carrying this vision forward. I dream of an exciting, vigorous and youthful Anglican Educational Institute, supported by all, capable of providing the theology and the philosophy and the practical understanding and the in-service training and the leadership mentoring and all the other things which our schools will need.

I will do all I can to bring this to pass. But I need your help in the doing of it – I need you to allow this great vision to find its place in your thinking alongside the proper but narrower vision of what your school or network of schools is doing. I need your energy and your joy put at the disposal of a vision for Anglican education in this part of God's world. It is a great calling. I cannot think that we are going to have better chance of bringing it to pass than the present moment. Will you help me?

