



9-1-1998

A Lesson From a Sarcastic Jesus

Dawn Nothwehr
Quincy University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/ce>

Recommended Citation

Nothwehr, D. (1998). A Lesson From a Sarcastic Jesus. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 2 (1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.15365/joce.0201092013>

This Focus Section Article is brought to you for free with open access by the School of Education at Digital Commons at Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. It has been accepted for publication in *Journal of Catholic Education* by the journal's editorial board and has been published on the web by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons at Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. For more information about Digital Commons, please contact digitalcommons@lmu.edu. To contact the editorial board of *Journal of Catholic Education*, please email JCE@nd.edu.

A LESSON FROM A SARCASTIC JESUS

SR. DAWN NOTHWEHR, OSF
Quincy University

Mutuality is a salient feature of any spirituality that is authentically Catholic. While there are at least four different forms of mutuality, a comprehensive view of its various forms establishes mutuality as a formal moral norm for Christian conduct. As such, mutuality proves to be a vital incarnational principle that can assist Catholic educators in critically evaluating their ministry.

"Oh, but this is not happening among you!" (Mk. 10:43)

The "sarcastic Jesus" is no doubt far from the model most Catholic educators would hold up as exemplary for leadership. Needless to say, however, when Jesus made this comment, he was doing more than typifying bad behavior. A close examination of Mk. 10:35-45 reveals an important lesson for Catholic educators who would lead with an authentically Christ-like vision of power and authority. The lesson Jesus teaches is that anyone who wishes to lead within the Christian community must be one who serves. Clearly, if one is to serve the other in a manner that leaves the dignity of both parties intact, one must exercise the power of mutuality. Mutuality is "a sharing of 'power-with' by and among all parties in a relationship in a way that recognizes the wholeness and particular experience of each participant toward the end of the optimum flourishing of all" (Nothwehr, 1998, p. 233). My purpose here is to show the relevance of the formal norm, mutuality, for leadership in the field of Catholic education.

"Power-with" is a technical term that dates back to the early feminist writer Follett (1942). The term was reintroduced into the Christian feminist conversation by Heyward. According to Heyward (1989b):

Power is the ability to move, effect, make a difference; the energy to create or destroy; call forth or put down. Outside a particular context, power bears

neither positive or negative connotations. Power can be used for good or for ill. Using power-with others is good. Using power-over others is evil. (p. 191)

Mutuality has been defined and proven to be a formal norm which stands as a corrective category and controlling assumption along with love and justice and as foundational for the Christian social ethics framework (Nothwehr, 1998). As a formal norm, mutuality requires Christians to consider the radical interdependency of all in the cosmos when assessing the ethics and praxis of power. So what do we mean by mutuality and of what consequence is it for leaders in Catholic education?

Because the notion is complex and foreign to our usual vocabulary, it may be easier to understand what mutuality is if first it is defined by what it is not. This negative definition is easily accomplished by contrasting our understanding of mutuality with similar notions.

MUTUALITY: WHAT IT IS NOT

Some authors tend to use “equality,” “solidarity,” and “reciprocity” synonymously with mutuality. However, these terms represent distinct notions, bearing significant nuances that differentiate them from mutuality (Nothwehr, 1998). Each person bears a set of boundary lines that demarcates him/her from the environment. To cross those lines represents a harmful violation of personal integrity. For our purposes, it is important to see how each of the terms refers to distinct realities in relation to these boundaries.

Equality is distinguished by definite boundaries and a marked one-to-one correspondence in the relationship or the exchange between the parties of an affiliation; an exchange of like for like. Where equality is static, mutuality is dynamic, ever pressing toward the maximum flourishing of all.

In a relationship characterized by reciprocity, there are clearly designated boundaries between the parties involved, and any action, influence, or giving/receiving is conditioned by the expectation by the other party(ies) that what is received is of equal value to what is given.

In the case of solidarity, boundary lines are distinct, yet there is a desire to be with the other that strains boundary lines between persons toward one another. Each person's desire exceeds his/her ability to participate fully in the act or experience to be undergone by the other. The straining toward the other, however, does not break individual boundaries.

By contrast, in the case of mutuality, boundaries are distinct, but as Heyward (1989b) claims, the critical difference is that they are determined with the other(s) and thus, they are more flexible and fluid. The means and the end of exchange must be geared to the common flourishing of all parties involved. Having reviewed the meaning of mutuality from the negative side, let us now turn to a positive definition.

MUTUALITY: WHAT IT IS

The broad challenge for every Christian in society is to live as God lives; to “be perfect as the Father in Heaven is perfect.” Christian feminist theologians Ruether (1983, 1992), Johnson (1992, 1993), Heyward (1982, 1989b), and Harrison (1981, 1985) have shown that classical notions of love and justice (the traditional kingpins of the Christian social ethical framework) do not adequately accommodate the kinds and degrees of relationship that emerge as imperative when Christians are faithful to the transcendent and immanent egalitarian realities that characterize the Divine. Christian feminist ethicists have reclaimed mutuality as a foundational moral principle or formal norm and as a corrective and complement to the traditional construal of the norms of love and justice.

Deeply grounded in biblical tradition and in the work of their intellectual ancestors—Aelred of Rievaulx, Hugh of St. Victor, Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, Martin Buber, H. Richard Niebuhr—Ruether (1989, 1992), Johnson (1992, 1993), Heyward (1989b), and Harrison (1982, 1983a) suggest to us that mutuality is a foundational moral principle similar in its complexity to the notion of justice. Analogous to those theories of justice which ascribe to it a tripartite nature, there is evidence in the writings of these feminists of four forms of mutuality. These forms identify four areas in which classical theology (Johnson, 1992) has failed to provide adequate grounding to support an ethic that serves the maximum flourishing of humanity—cosmology, divine-human co-generativity, gender relationships, human sociality—because to do so required serious consideration of “things female” or qualities regarded “feminine” in a theological system biased against women.

FOUR FORMS OF MUTUALITY

COSMIC MUTUALITY

As defined by Nothwehr (1998), cosmic mutuality is “the sharing of power-with by and among the Creator, human beings, all earth elements, and the entire cosmos in a way that recognizes their interdependence and reverences all” (p. 233). Here mutuality is seen as recognition of interdependence among, and a reverence for, all things and all beings in the cosmos. This is suggested in Buber's understanding of the relationship of all elements of creation to one another in that all bear the mark of the same Creator. This form is also indicated in Ruether's (1992) “ecological ethic.” In this form, all in creation is potentially both subject and object.

GENDER MUTUALITY

Gender mutuality is “the sharing of power-with by and among women and men in a way that recognizes the full participation of each in the *imago Dei*,

embodied in daily life and through egalitarian relationships” (Nothwehr, 1998, p. 233). In this form, mutuality is seen as undergirding egalitarian relationships between women and men. Harrison (1985), Ruether (1992), and Bianchi and Ruether (1976) demonstrate the grounds for equal and embodied participation of both male and female human beings in the *imago Dei*. Ruether's work contrasting mutuality and machismo is particularly relevant here. Harrison stresses the notion of embodiment as a way of being and doing, seen particularly in sexual relationships, as giving expression to the *imago Dei*. Johnson (1992) demonstrates how the Trinitarian relationships stand as a paradigm for the relationships between women and men. Pointing to the fact that the persons of the Trinity are “persons precisely as mutual relations” and that “there is no subordination, no before, or after, no first, second, and third, no dominant and marginalized,” she infers the necessity of mutuality in human relations (Johnson, 1992). Human beings, male and female, are both subjects and objects in mutual relation.

GENERATIVE MUTUALITY

The third form of mutuality, generative mutuality, is “the sharing of power-with by and among the Divine, human persons, and all creation in the on-going co-creation and redemption of the world” (Nothwehr, 1998, p. 233). This aspect of mutuality is understood as relationship to the divine and participation in the on-going co-creation/redemption of the world. Heyward points to this form in her explication of the Incarnation and the covenant relationship between God and Israel (Heyward, 1982). Here the focal subjects and objects of mutuality are God and human persons. However, because of the delicate balance of the ecosystem necessary to sustain maximum human flourishing, the entire cosmos is also included in Heyward's notions of redemption/creation.

SOCIAL MUTUALITY

Nothwehr (1998) defines social mutuality as “the sharing of power-with by and among members of society in a way that recognizes the fundamental dignity of each and the obligation to attain and maintain for each what is necessary to sustain that dignity” (p. 233). In this case, mutuality is described as radical solidarity, reciprocity, and identification with the least ones of the world. This form is implicit in Harrison's (1981) expansion upon Niebuhr's notion of responsibility, which poses Jesus' suffering and death as embodied power of mutuality as the central moral goal of the Christian life. All human persons are both subjects and objects for mutuality in Harrison's understanding. All human persons are in some way both oppressed and oppressor. However, Christians have a particular obligation to work toward the empowerment of the economically poor (Harrison, 1981, 1983b; Heyward, 1982,

1984, 1989a, 1995; Johnson, 1992; Ruether, 1992).

Even if we agree that mutuality entails this kind of shared power, is there any way that considering it as a formal norm makes any tangible difference in the lives of real people, especially as leaders in Catholic education?

WHAT A DIFFERENCE MUTUALITY MAKES

WHAT MUTUALITY ILLUMINATES/DELIMITS

When utilized in moral discernment, mutuality makes a great deal of difference in the moral outcome of any situation. However, the limits of this article allow only a minimal exploration of the significance of mutuality for one aspect of educational leadership to be addressed. I have thus chosen to focus primarily on teaching. Mutuality is significant for Catholic education because it illuminates and delimits what we teach, how we teach, and what it means to be a teacher. As defined by many, mutuality is a dynamic process and not a static situation. Set within a dynamic world view, an emerging feminist ethic of mutuality has implications first of all for a Catholic educator's appreciation of truth and truth claims.

All parties in mutual relation (Swidler, 1985) are moral agents and are oriented to the needs of the other and maintain an intentionality directed to the well-being of the other(s). Mutuality then requires a "praxis view of truth" in which the truth is conditioned by the intentions of the relationship. What is true is related to the action-oriented intention of the speaker (Swidler, 1985).

Mutuality is a relationship in which each party has a distinctive particularity and history. Sustaining the relationship requires a "perspectival view of truth" in which all standpoints determined by culture, gender, history, economics, or politics are taken into account. For mutual relations it is necessary to recognize that language is limited in the meaning it can bear. As Wittgenstein has argued, human language can bear only one or two perspectives at once (Swidler, 1985). What is true needs to be understood in a context.

From Gadamer and Ricoeur, there is evidence that knowledge of any text is also an interpretation of the text. In sustaining a mutual relation, this "interpretive view of the truth" needs to be acknowledged lest there be false absolutizing of unintended information or action (Swidler, 1985).

Another kind of truth is "dialogic truth." As one acts, speaks, and interprets with another there are moments when the "I" and the "Thou" combine to form the "We." It is in those moments that mutuality reaches its apex. If we are not open and ready for these kinds of truth and the moment of true mutuality that happens in the "between" of dialogue, we live in a false reality, assuming what are indeed only elements of truth to be the full truth (Swidler, 1985).

Mutuality shifts ethics' understanding of the moral subject by focusing on the sociality of the human person. Moral actions are considered in light of culture, history, and the social context of the situation. As Niebuhr (1978) so forcefully argued, we are always in a situation of response to others. Our actions make sense only in relationship to others. The structure of a relationship is key to its moral value. How Catholic educators understand themselves as well as their students as moral agents greatly affects the educators' self-understanding as well as their understanding of colleagues and students.

Mutuality also expands the idea of the moral subject from one bearing an abstract status to one who develops, experiences, and transforms value and who is, in turn, developed and transformed by valuing. The moral capacity of the self, the motivation for sacrifice and justice, is best understood in terms of mutuality in relationships.

Further, mutuality focuses on reciprocity in moral agency. In mutuality, the moral subject constantly exchanges valuing and being valued. As Smith (1987) states, we are enabled "to grasp our dependence on each other and our social institutions and relations for our moral self-regard and moral power" (p. 279). Viewing the pupil/teacher or collegial relationship as mutual brings greater realism and empowerment to those in the relationship. Students and colleagues are freed to share their insights, knowledge, and intuition—even to become the teacher at moments—and educators are liberated to admit the reality of their needs and limitations—the fact that they don't know all the answers.

Mutuality modifies what is understood as the "good," and thus, influences what content is taught. According to several feminists (Harrison, Heyward, Johnson, Ruether), mutuality moves the starting point for ethical reflection to a radically inclusive place, where literally everyone and everything is included. The moral horizon is the vision of the "new heavens/new earth" as it is drawn from Christian sources. The history and the future shape the twofold context for the vision. Goods based on atomistic individualism and patterns of competition, adversarial relations, exploitation, authoritarianism, or paternalism are ruled out because they diminish or deny the fundamental mutual relation that exists between God and humans and that needs to exist between humans and with all of creation.

Human good needs to fit in with all other goods in the cosmos with an eye toward the maximum flourishing, not just human thriving, of all. This means mutuality requires an integration of independent and responsible acts as well as interdependent and relational activities. It means that in achieving the good what must be overcome is whatever isolates, separates, and arouses disinterest and atomistic individualism. There is one good that permeates both private and public spheres; mutuality empowers by including everything and everyone in the social/political/economic equation (Smith, 1987).

It could be argued that mutuality disempowers one because human fini-

tude does not allow any one person to deal with everything and everyone. While humans are indeed limited, the purposeful creation and maintenance of community, solidarity, friendship, and ecological and spiritual relationships can assist one in staying focused on the goal of a perfect praxis of mutuality. In the Jewish and Christian contexts, it is understood that God's grace undergirds all efforts toward perfect mutuality. In the case of non-believers, human reason concerning a course toward basic survival and a high quality of life can provide the impetus for striving toward a more perfect praxis of mutuality. Like the formal norms of love and justice, mutuality provides a standard and source of motivation, inspiration, vision, and instruction. Not to consider mutuality, however, is to neglect a whole realm of moral responsibility and possibility.

Every human is born in need of relationships. When needs and rights are not met and honored, injustice accompanied by self-doubt, mistrust, or resentment occurs. The practice of justice in society also needs to include mutual practices of reconciliation as Cotroneo (1983) holds:

The dialogue context requires that each partner be able to state his or her needs and expectations to the other in terms of the present. It is a process of mutual accountability. Reestablishing a dialogue on this basis in an injured relationship is a form of giving. By asking for something, a person says he or she continues to care enough about the relationship to risk rejection. It is the extending of trust in order to open up the possibility of rebalancing the "ledger" of exploitative or unjust relation through the reciprocal giving of the other. Giving through asking is a claim on the other for reciprocal consideration of one's own needs and expectations. Because the claim is in the form of asking, it is an acknowledgment of the other's capacity for trustworthy giving. (p. 248)

When mutuality is not recognized by both parties, and an impasse results, praxis of an ethic of care does not abandon the effort. Rather, it moves to confront the deeper social-psychological blockages and tries again and again. An ethic of mutuality may then knowingly choose to love sacrificially in order to act-the-other-into-life, moving toward greater mutuality.

MUTUALITY, LOVE, AND JUSTICE

Though mutuality is a foundational moral principle, it does not replace, but rather complements and corrects, the influence of the norms of love and justice within the moral framework. Love and justice have traditionally been viewed as foundational for all Christian ethics. While at times either love or justice has been more heavily stressed, both have been perennially presented as measures of Christian morality. As Maguire (1983) points out, it is significant that throughout the canon of Scripture love and justice are viewed as coordinates of the same plane. He states:

... “Sow for yourselves justice and reap the fruit of steadfast love” (Hos. 10:12). The dichotomy between love and justice is spurious. The two are naturally related. Justice goes before love, insisting on the minimal prerequisites for survival. But then it makes common cause with love upon discovering that surviving without thriving is not surviving at all. (Maguire, 1983, p. 77)

It is precisely in the consideration of what constitutes thriving that the need arises for mutuality as a formal norm to complement and correct love and justice in the Christian social ethical framework. In relation to love and justice, mutuality is the prior recognition of the common power, in all of creation and in relation to the divine, to make reciprocal claims on one another.

CRITIQUE OF LOVE

At many points in Christian history, sacrificial love has been stressed to the neglect of mutual love. In a number of Christian traditions (Nygren, 1953), any love of self was suspect and agape at times came to be understood as void of a healthy self-love, pride in one's own goodness or any self-interest. In Catholicism, it seems that the tendency to understand love as nearly exclusively sacrificial is a bequest of some forms of medieval passion mysticism (Gudorf, 1985). As Gudorf (1985) claims, Christian love must not be presumed to be disinterested or set apart from other love as self-sacrificing. “All love involves sacrifice and aims at mutuality.... Much love is mutual; all love is directed at mutuality. It could not be any other way, for we find love rewarding” (Gudorf, 1985, pp. 182, 185). Most feminists see value in sacrificial love that is chosen freely, consciously, and with the full integrity of the lover intact which moves the relationship toward greater mutuality or has mutuality as its goal. Mutuality functions as a corrective to a one-sided emphasis on sacrificial love.

CRITIQUE OF JUSTICE

Justice has long been considered a complex, multifaceted reality (Outka, 1972). The influential Aristotelian and Thomistic theories of justice state that justice has a tripartite nature—commutative, social, and distributive (Maguire, 1980; Maguire & Fagnoli, 1991). Some contemporary ethicists' renderings of that theory assume reciprocal influence of varying degrees in each form of justice. For example, Maguire (1980) clearly assumes mutuality as part of the notion of justice. There is a burgeoning movement among feminist scholars, however, toward considering mutuality as an absolute criterion for Christian social ethical behavior. Increasingly, feminist ethicists are drawing mutuality to the foreground to stand as a distinct and normative consideration in the ethical process.

Generally, theories of justice can be classified in three categories: rationalist and natural law theories, analytical and positivist theories, and utilitarian and other theories (Paul, 1967). Mutuality functions as a complement and challenge to natural law theories in that it requires a more critical view of hierarchy than is commonly found in natural law traditions, entailing the elimination of relationships of unilateral submission and subjugation. Mutuality functions as a corrective to the positivists in that it shifts the criterion for justice from pure legalism to include the concrete and dynamic needs of the other as basic to thriving. Mutuality functions as a corrective to utilitarianism in that it requires consideration of the good/needs of all beings and elements of the universe in relation to one another, not merely the greatest good for the greatest number.

INTERRELATIONSHIP: LOVE, JUSTICE, MUTUALITY

Mutuality brings justice to love. It does so in two ways. First, it liberates and affirms the self in meeting her/his own needs. Indeed, mutuality requires that the partners in a relationship be whole, distinct individuals. Mutuality challenges everyone to integrity of character (see Lk. 18:10-17). For the Christian, the *imago Dei*, baptism in Christ, and the unconditional mutual relation with God lie at the heart of such integrity. From a stance of inner justice, a healthy self-esteem, the person is able to move outward to others within affection rooted in their common power. In maintaining personal integrity, justice plays the role of calling the person to honesty; to deal with her/himself as a whole embodied being—physical, emotional, spiritual, mental—in all its strengths and weaknesses. On this personal level, the challenge mutuality brings to love is similar to the dynamics that are at work in the love of one's enemies; only here, the “enemy” may be within. Those aspects of every person that bring alienation in any form and which militate against personal wholeness are challenged forth for confrontation and healing. The call of justice that mutuality positively brings to love is for the perfection of the self; for the self to embrace what one/it is (see Mt. 5:44-48).

A second way mutuality brings justice to love is in the way it requires one to love one's neighbor. In light of the statement above, the motivation for love of neighbor can be made more clear if one addresses this question: “Am I a neighbor?” The test of that question is honesty within one's self and the challenge to cease projecting outward what is not whole within. If one views oneself as like another, one must first see the common power and common limitations one shares with the other. Mutuality dictates that all humans share a common power in relationship by virtue of the *imago Dei*. By not being a neighbor, in a real way, I deny my own humanness. If this is so, I am not capable of a human love or an inner justice, and I am plagued with disease that requires healing. Only after healing takes place can I be free enough to

be influenced and motivated to be a neighbor. As a neighbor, I can give and receive mutual love and choose to serve others in dignity with integrity.

Justice tempered by mutuality saves love from condescension in that mutuality requires a reverence for the common dignity that is shared and/or an appreciation of the relatedness of all creation to the divine and to one another. Mutuality requires that the boundaries of any relationship be set together by all involved in the relationship. A noteworthy example of this dynamic can be seen in Jesus' approach to others in many of the healing stories (see Mk. 9:14-29; Mk. 10:46-52; Lk. 8:22-26).

We have seen how mutuality serves justice and love. Mutuality is also served by justice and love. Justice restrains mutuality from "value free" agreement (Rawls, 1976) that could point a relationship in a direction that detracts and harms the common good by failing to direct individual needs toward the well-being of all. Justice keeps mutuality real by holding forth concrete needs which must be filled in order to satisfy human dignity and the common good. Love prevents mutuality from regressing to a utilitarian exchange, a mere reciprocity by holding up *communio* as the standard of relationship.

In the functioning of love, justice, and mutuality, then, we have the foundational moral principles that create the value framework for Christian feminist social ethics.

CONCLUSIONS: THE PROBATIVE VALUE OF MUTUALITY

The probative value of the formal norm mutuality is multifaceted and significant for Catholic educators. First and foremost, it requires Catholic educators to deal concretely in all moral reflection and ethical decision-making. Specific and careful attention needs to be given to the reality-revealing questions: What? Why? How? Who? Where? When? What are the foreseeable effects? What are the viable alternatives—in the concrete, as well as in the abstract? Second, mutuality requires Catholic educators to probe the dynamics of power in an ethical dilemma and to seek out ways to shape those dynamics to serve power-with. Mutuality is a complement to and corrective of love and justice. Third, engaging the norm of mutuality presses the Catholic educator toward inclusivity, drawing concern for the thriving and flourishing of all involved into the process of moral reflection. Engaging the concerns of mutuality personalizes and concretizes the situation, blatantly reminding the educator that s/he is dealing with the relationships of real lives and real people. Such probing also raises the necessity of a historical perspective since relationships between humans, non-humans, the earth, and the cosmos have a history with a beginning, middle, and end. Since the probing of relationships reveals a cosmic interconnectedness, the norm of mutuality brings a wider world view into play that calls for radical inclusiveness.

Mutuality calls to account those exercises of power-over that fail to unite and nurture, but isolate and destroy the flourishing of living beings. Because mutuality assumes the wholeness of the individual parties in a relationship, it demands honesty and integrity from those involved. Without such integrity, relationships are destructive for all involved, including the perpetrators of force in any form. More than the norms of love and justice, mutuality places humanity in a perspective within the whole of creation. Attention to the foundational formal norm of mutuality promises to have a qualitative impact on the moral reasoning and thus, the praxis of power and authority by and among Catholic educators and their students. This is significant for Catholic educators because it determines what we teach, how we teach, and what it means to be a teacher. It is to these concerns we now turn.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION: MUTUALITY AND CONTENT, TEACHING, AND TEACHERS

MUTUALITY AND CONTENT

Catholic educators and leaders of Catholic educational enterprises ideally have as their purpose the establishment of the Reign of God in our midst. Attending to the signs of the times, as the Second Vatican Council challenges, requires that educators ask some pertinent questions: What are the pressing needs of this world? How might what we teach from the wealth of our religious tradition address these needs? And how do the needs of my students/teachers fit into the wider picture?

Viewing the signs of the times from a value-centered perspective linked to a Gospel vision of the Reign of God, one can readily see that much of the Catholic Christian world view stands in contrast with the prevailing world view of North American/U.S. culture. Where the Reign of God requires collaboration, cooperation, interdependence, respect, love, justice, and mutuality, the prevailing culture demands arbitrary control, competition, co-dependent relations, disdain, indifference, exploitation, and power-over relations of domination and subjugation.

The four foci of mutuality can serve as a guide to discovering the content we need to address in order adequately to bring the dynamics of power-with to bear on our world, for the flourishing of all. Limited space requires that content questions be examined from the perspective of only three of the four foci of mutuality. The ecological crisis, oppressive relations between genders, and social/political/economic oppression are three signs of the times that scream for our attention. I suggest that probing the dynamics of power involved in these issues, measuring them against the requirements of mutuality, will readily reveal the content for Catholic Christian educators today.

Content and Cosmic Mutuality

One aspect of the ecological crisis that is readily apparent to even the most casual observer is the presumption of human dominance or power-over all other members and elements of the cosmos. If crisis has resulted from human attitudes of dominance, then probing the power dynamics of mutuality holds the key toward resolution of the crisis. What does our tradition tell us about the role of the human in the order of creation? What are the implications of our bodily procreative and creative potentials? What is the potential of the entire creation to tell us about God? How do the virtues of frugality, guardianship, and sharing of the earth's resources link to our spirituality? How do our conceptualizations of rights lead to exploitation of people, animals, the earth, and space? I submit that these are among the questions we must ask and use to frame the content of what we teach.

Content and Gender Mutuality

In a culture where in the popular mind there is little or no separation between gender integrity and sexual exploitation, it is not difficult for the casual observer to conclude that a better state of affairs must be possible. What does our tradition hold that addresses the egotistical need to be a sex symbol? How do gender stereotypes play significant roles in what we teach men and women? What do we teach about the meaning of the *imago Dei* or the familial relationship of the baptized in Christ? What do we teach about being accountable to another? What do we teach about personal proprietorship? These too, are questions that will help determine what we need to teach.

Content and Social Mutuality

A cursory view of current statistics on the range of wealth of any nation or the world quickly reveals that the vast population lives in poverty. As Palmer (1990) has challenged, do we teach that the world is a place of plenty or a place of scarcity? Do we teach about poverty only as economic deprivation, or do we teach in the spirit of the Sermon on the Plain and Francis of Assisi that poverty is a spiritual attitude of non-possession and generous sharing of the gifts given by the Creator? What do we teach about professionalism in contrast to common labor and the value of work as co-creative and co-redemptive participation with God in shaping ourselves and our world? What do we teach about private property and the common good? Do we teach that the only things worth having are those which are state of the art? Do we teach the weaknesses as well as the strengths of the capitalist economic system, free enterprise, and competition? Do we teach the distinction between need and want? Social mutuality requires that the content we teach seeks to address these questions.

MUTUALITY AND HOW WE TEACH

It is no news to good teachers that actions speak louder than words. Yet often the very behavioral models and strategies we use in the classroom and in administration counter the claims we make in words. Some will recall the discussion by Hendley (1978) and Telfer (1971) concerning the seemingly contradictory claims made by Buber concerning mutual relations and helping relations, particularly the situation between teacher and student. Buber (1958) states: "whether the I-Thou relation comes to an end or assumes the all together different character of friendship, it becomes clear that the specifically educational relationship is incompatible with complete mutuality" (pp. 131-132). Though full mutuality is absent, the student and the teacher still relate as "I-Thou." Also, it is important to note that Buber finds degrees in the extent to which mutuality is necessarily absent in the student/teacher relationship, depending on the age and the maturity of the student. When it comes to adult education, Buber (1958) makes reciprocity a priority and holds that the goal of education is mutuality.

In Catholic Christian settings, I suggest that we need to take the lead from our Jewish brother, as well as our brother Jesus. When teaching, we need to treat the other as a "Thou," recognizing we are also in the presence of the *imago Dei* and united in Christ. And if our teaching is to be credible and integral, whenever we are in the presence of another person, whether that person is our student or our colleague, we must act out of the most profound sense of mutuality. Without a doubt, this attitude requires student-centered models of teaching that focus on the values and abilities students need to create and sustain mutual relationships with God, self, others, and the cosmos. Mutuality requires that we engage students' participation in their education and provide them with guidance toward gaining and sustaining an understanding of education as a gift to be shared rather than a power to be flaunted.

MUTUALITY AND WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A TEACHER

St. Bonaventure provides the best source for understanding how mutuality would mold and shape the profile of a Catholic educator. Bonaventure teaches us first that exclusively human power is "sickly" and in need of the complement of Divine power. Second, in contrast to incomplete human power, the power of God and the power of Christ is full, whole, and useful to illumine and fulfill human limitations. Third, Bonaventure makes no recommendations for educators to seek after power, but rather, educators are advised to seek after truth. Finally, true authority comes only through Christ the Giver and Foundation of all authority.

In our age we are inclined to agree with Bacon's aphorism, "knowledge is power." His seems to be a logical way to think about knowledge as a means

toward achieving human progress and setting the course of history. With sufficient human knowledge, humanity believes itself capable of choosing the course of its own destiny. Our modern dilemmas of ecology, eugenics, medical ethics, governmental structures, and international economic relations are the results of the marriage of knowledge and unilateral power, or power-over. Bonaventure challenges modern scholarship in a way that, no doubt, most will quickly label naive. Yet, there seems to be wisdom for the Christian educator in moving the focus from human competition to the generous cooperation of the Divine in the creative efforts of scholarship.

The message of Bonaventure for the academy seems quite clear. Science and philosophy must be open to the corrective of faith, illumination by Christ. This implies a profound humility for scholarship generally, as well as for the individual scholar. Harking back to his Franciscan roots, Bonaventure might well express this requisite of humility by citing the Franciscan Rule of 1223, Chapter Ten, in which Francis exhorted the brothers not to be anxious to study, lest they become proud and lose their souls for lack of humility. Only when Catholic educators are firmly rooted in the integrity of their person in Christ can they avoid placing confidence in the false reality of an unconnected world view, rather than an ontology of relationship. We have one Master, Christ. When He, the Spirit of Truth, shall come He will teach truth. I do not hesitate to suggest that if Bonaventure were alive today, he would also acknowledge that mutual relationships must be ours because mutuality is a natural outcome of the praxis of true humility.

THE LESSON OF THE SARCASTIC JESUS

Just as Bonaventure criticized all sources of power other than that which comes from God or that which acknowledges God as its source, so too, in Mk. 10:42-43 Jesus condemns the power-over exercised by the Gentile rulers. In Mark's account, prior to this exhortation, Jesus had observed the various ways the disciples were scrambling to gain status and power-over. The occasion of the disciples' lack of understanding, shown by their blundering actions in Mk. 9:18, for example, became an opportunity for Jesus to punctuate his instruction on the use of power by leaders with a bit of sarcasm: "Oh, but this is not happening among you!" Meyers (1988) states: "The concluding comment is usually interpreted as an imperative, but the present indicative suggests that it should be read as (yet again) dry sarcasm..." (p. 279).

Jesus poses a paradoxical understanding of power as the norm for the community of disciples. He does not denounce leadership entirely, but he declares that those who wish to be "great" and have leadership status among the disciples, must serve others. That sense of service is rooted in an Eastern understanding that saw nothing unworthy in serving. Service to a great mas-

ter (especially to God) would, in fact, be understood as an honor (Beyer, 1964). Jesus blends this idea with the Greek understanding that views service as waiting on tables, a humble task frequently done by women. He moves the idea forward to include the notion that anyone desiring to be the first (greatest) within the community must be at the service of others in the manner of a slave (Beyer, 1964), and he sets himself as the model. The movement from the idea of equating being a servant to greatness to the notion of being a slave in order to be first, heightens the emphasis on the source of greatness. The one who serves could choose to do so because s/he was self-motivated, even self-interested. The slave, on the other hand, has no control over his/her movement; the will of the master/mistress rules (Rengstorf, 1964). Given this understanding of power, is there anything going on in our Catholic educational enterprises, in our classrooms, or among colleagues that would provide Jesus with a similar opportunity to challenge us?

A potential effect of this change in the norm of what it means to be a leader among Christians is that the mutual status of all disciples is found in community by the recognition of God as the only source of power. Jesus himself provides the model: He, the Son of Man, who is greater, is one who came to serve. If within the community all strive for the ideal of greatness, all would become servants and slaves to one another. In short, there would be "a sharing of 'power-with' by and among all parties in a relationship in a way that recognizes the wholeness and particular experience of each participant toward the end of the optimum flourishing of all," mutuality (Nothwehr, 1988, p. 233).

REFERENCES

- Beyer, H. W. (1964). *Theological dictionary of the new testament*. (Vol. II. pp. 81-93). (G. W. Bromiley, Trans. & Ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Bianchi, E. C. & Ruether, R. R. (1976). *From machismo to mutuality: Essays on sexism and man-woman liberation*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Buber, M. (1958). *I and thou*. (R. G. Smith, Trans.). New York: Scribner.
- Cotroneo, M. (1983). *A contextual Catholic ethics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia.
- Follett, M. P. (1942). *Dynamic administration*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Gudorf, C. (1985). Parenting, mutual love and sacrifice. In B. H. Andolsen, C. Gudorf, M. D. Pallauer (Eds.), *Women's consciousness, women's conscience: A reader in feminist ethics* (pp. 275-291). Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press.
- Harrison, B. W. (1981). The power of anger in the works of love: Christian ethics for women and other strangers. *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, 36 (1981 Suppl.), 41-57.
- Harrison, B. W. (1982). Misogyny and homophobia: Unexplored connections. *Church and Society*, 73, 20-33.
- Harrison, B. W. (1983a). Human sexuality and mutuality: A fresh paradigm. *Journal of Presbyterian History*, 6, 142-161.
- Harrison, B. W. (1983b). *Our right to choose: Toward a new ethic of abortion*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Harrison, B. W. (1985). *Making the connections: Essays in feminist social ethics*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hendley, B. (1978). Martin Buber on the teacher/student relationship: A critical appraisal.

- Journal of Philosophy of Education* 12, 141-48.
- Heyward, C. (1982). *The redemption of God: A theology of mutual relation*. New York: University Press of America.
- Heyward, C. (1984). *Our passion for justice: Images of power, sexuality and liberation*. Cleveland, OH: The Pilgrim Press.
- Heyward, C. (1989a). *Speaking of Christ: A lesbian feminist voice*. New York: The Pilgrim Press.
- Heyward, C. (1989b). *Touching our strength: The erotic and the love of God*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Heyward, C. (1995). *Staying power: Reflections on gender, justice and compassion*. Cleveland, OH: The Pilgrim Press.
- Johnson, E. A. (1992). *She who is: The mystery of God in feminist discourse*. New York: Crossroad.
- Johnson, E. A. (1993). *Women, earth, creator spirit*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Maguire, D. C. (1980). *A new American justice*. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press.
- Maguire, D. C. (1983). The primacy of justice in moral theology. *Horizons* 10, 72-85.
- Maguire, D. C., & Fagnoli, A. N. (1991). *On moral grounds: The art/science of ethics*. New York: Crossroad.
- Meyers, C. (1988). *Binding the strong man: A political reading of Mark's story of Jesus*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Niebuhr, H. R. (1978). *The responsible self: An essay in Christian moral philosophy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Nothwehr, D. M. (1998). *Mutuality: A formal norm for Christian social ethics*. San Francisco: Catholic Scholars Press.
- Nygren, A. (1953). *Agape and eros*. (P. S. Watson, Trans.). Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press.
- Outka, G. (1972). *Agape: An ethical analysis*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Palmer, P. (1990). Scarcity, abundance, and the gift of community. *Occasional Paper Series*, 1(3). Chicago: Community Renewal Press.
- Paul, E. (Ed.). (1967) *The encyclopedia of philosophy*. New York: Macmillan Co.
- Rawls, J. (1976). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rengstorf, K. H. (1964). *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*. (Vol. II, pp. 261-280). (G. W. Bromiley, Trans. & Ed.) Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Ruether, R. R. (1983) *Sexism and God-talk: Toward a feminist theology*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ruether, R. R. (1989). *To change the world: Christology and cultural criticism*. New York: Crossroad.
- Ruether, R. R. (1992). *Gaia and God: An ecofeminist theology of earth and healing*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Smith, R. L. (1987). Morality and perspectives of society: The limits of self-interest. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 26, 279-93.
- Swidler, L. (1985). Mutuality the matrix for mature living: Some philosophical and Christian theological reflections. *Religion and Intellectual Life*, 3, 105-119.
- Telfer, E. (1971). Friendship. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 244-251.

Sr. Dawn M. Nothwehr, OSF, Ph.D., is an assistant professor of religious studies at Quincy University. She has recently authored *Mutuality: A Formal Norm for Christian Social Ethics* (Catholic Scholars Press, 1998). Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Sr. Dawn M. Nothwehr, OSF, Quincy University, 1806 College Avenue, Quincy, IL 62301-2699.

Copyright of *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice* is the property of Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.