

RESPONSE TO DR. KENT SEIBERT'S CRITIQUE OF "AUGUSTINE AND AQUINAS"

Dick Chewning
CBFA Emeritus Scholar

Were all the schools represented in the CBFA "family" led by deans or chairpersons as theologically knowledgeable and attuned to the issues that confront our membership, as Dr. Kent Seibert at Gordon College so obviously is, I would have never written the *Augustine / Aquinas* article.

The article was written from a basis of heartfelt concern, even worry. Let me explain.

First, at the 2010 CBFA Annual Conference there was a full plenary session devoted to the promotion of **Business As Mission**. Five speakers spoke and several, as perceived by this author, supported BAM as a means of advancing "discipleship and evangelism." One speaker even encouraged the schools participating in the conference to return home and consider creating a major in BAM. (I am personally convinced that Scott Quatro's excellent article in the 2012 *JBIB* was stimulated by his experience at the 2010 Annual Conference.)

Second, Dr. Sharon G. Johnson asked me soon after the plenary session mentioned above to write a serious theological analysis of what I had heard regarding BAM at the conference—an individual fully committed to BAM had asked Sharon to see if I would write such a piece. (The identity of the requestor has never been revealed to me.) I got my analysis to Sharon in the winter of 2011. By the summer of 2011, Sharon had yet to hear a word from the person asking for and receiving my analysis. And, the subject of BAM reappeared at the 2011 Annual Conference.

Dr. Seibert's critique is both kind and reflective. His perception that my analysis is *narrow* as it pertains to BAM is correct as it is presented in the article. It is intentionally narrow. It was written to raise serious ques-

tions about drawing *discipleship* and *evangelism* into undergraduate economic and business curriculums. I am, overall, very comfortable with the 2009 Wheaton Declaration.

Dr. Seibert's perception that I might have "A Narrow View Of Theology" is understandable in light of the specific quotes he uses from my presentation, but I reject his conclusion. He is correct to note Steve Vande Veen's 1997 paper regarding Kierkegaard, and Scott Quatro's paper noted above. Yes, these and other articles in the *JBIB* have contained theological content, but not content that sets the two predominate theological streams before the membership in a face to face manner and invites the reader to examine her or his belief in the face of the other perspective, *without providing the reader with the names of their beloved leaders*.

When Dr. Seibert asks, "What about the ideas of reformers like Calvin, Luther, Arminius, and Menno Simons?" he implies that they are not to be found under the wings of the two streams of theology set for in the article. They are *overwhelmingly* part of the two theological streams of thinking. The *application lifestyle* of their theology certainly differs, but their theological roots are deeply rooted in the two theological streams presented. I intentionally avoided the names of Calvin, Luther, Arminius, Menno Simons, and others in order to get the CBFA membership to think about their theological underpinnings apart from those they have learned or been taught to follow hermeneutically. The eight concluding questions were the final filters through which the readers were invited to test themselves to see the implications of their theological choices as they applied to *discipleship* and *evangelism*.