



Religious Diversity and Cooperation on Campus

Eboo Patel

To cite this article: Eboo Patel (2007) Religious Diversity and Cooperation on Campus, Journal of College and Character, 9:2, , DOI: [10.2202/1940-1639.1120](https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1120)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1120>



© 2007 The Authors



Published online: 01 Nov 2007.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 548



Citing articles: 3 [View citing articles](#) [↗](#)

Religious Diversity and Cooperation on Campus

Eboo Patel, Interfaith Youth Core ¹

Abstract

This article addresses the issue of religious diversity and cooperation on college campuses. Nowhere is America's religious diversity more apparent than on college campuses. College campuses have done much to engage issues of race, gender, and other important markers of identity. Religion has typically been left out of this conversation. It is a critical time for higher education to engage religious diversity seriously. The American campus is a unique space which encourages both identity commitment and pluralist community; it values both individual freedom and contribution to the common good. Successfully promoting pluralism and inter-religious engagement on college campuses could impact not only individual campuses, and the broader system of higher education, but even the country in which we live, and perhaps the world. The Interfaith Youth Core employs a unique methodology which combines service learning and interfaith dialogue. IFYC provides young people and the institutions that support them with leadership training, project resources, and a connection to a broader movement of interfaith cooperation.

When my friend Cassie was a teenager, she devoted her life to Christ. She started going to a conservative Evangelical church outside of Seattle, where she was raised. She lost herself in praise songs, learned about the importance of saving people, went on church retreats, and spent as much of her free time as possible with the other kids in the youth group.

When she graduated from high school, Cassie went to a liberal arts college in Wisconsin. There were only enough Christians there to form a single student group. It included mainline Protestants and Evangelicals, people who were accustomed to smells and bells rituals and speaking in tongues. It also included Catholics. This was something of a challenge for Cassie. Where she came from, Catholics were not Christian.

Soon, Catholics became the least of Cassie's theological worries. During her time as an undergraduate, Cassie became friends with Ahmed, a young Muslim from Bangladesh. She found him to be righteous, pious, and kind, many of the qualities that she had at one point associated only with Evangelical Christians. As she watched him slip away from social occasions to perform one of his five daily prayers, she even began admiring his discipline and focus on God. Moreover, Cassie realized that just as Ahmed presented her with the challenge of engaging with and relating to somebody from a different religion, she represented the same for Ahmed.

One evening, he asked Cassie if he could interview her. Cassie said sure, and asked why. Ahmed was doing a project for an anthropology class, he told her. He had seen Cassie's Bible and cross, had observed her Wednesday night prayer song circle, had

¹ Eboo Patel is the founder and Executive Director of the Interfaith Youth Core. He is the author of [Acts of Faith](#). Eboo holds a doctorate in the sociology of religion from Oxford University, where he studied with a Rhodes scholarship.

watched her go to church on Sunday mornings, had paid attention to the distinct language with which she talked to her brothers and sisters in faith, and had chosen to make an ethnographic inquiry into the exotic life of the American Evangelical Christian.

Although perhaps funnier than most, this story is not particularly unique. College campuses are, after all, a place of awakening and encounter. When I was an undergraduate at the University of Illinois in the mid-1990s, most of those awakenings and encounters were around the issue of race. Multiculturalism was all the rage. I remember my own awakening to the fact that I was not white and what that meant. I remember meeting Black people who did not believe that Thomas Jefferson was only a great democrat. I remember meeting Native Americans who did not believe that Columbus was a great discoverer. I remember the countless hours discussing nomenclature: Black or African-American, Hispanic or Latino, Native American or Indigenous Person.

What I do not remember is much talk about religious identity. It was my father who pointed out the complete absence of religion in the identity and diversity discussion. I would return home for Thanksgiving or winter break and regale him about how we had to deepen into our identity as people of color. Mostly, he ignored me, grumbling about how his hard-earned money was going to pay my tuition only so I could fill my head with radical spangles. But, one day, he turned to me and said: "If you want to talk about identity, ask why there is a systemic killing of Muslims in the Balkans and the West does nothing."

Something occurred to me. In all the sociology courses I took on the topic of identity, in all the late night conversations we had at Allen Hall on the subject, the issue of religion rarely came up. We were always talking about freedom for women or Latinos or lesbians. Identity was always defined as race, class, gender, and, occasionally, sexual orientation. When I became a resident advisor, half of our training focused on dealing with issues around those particular identities. I had been to many programs at the Office of Multicultural Student Affairs, and they also always focused on the same things. We talked about the limited roles for Black actors, the discrimination that kept gay politicians in the closet, the burden of the second shift for women, and the cultural capital that accrued to middle class kids because of the circumstances of their birth. We extolled bell hooks and Gloria Anzaldua for their ability to write about these various identities in an integrated way and filled hours debating whether the oppressions associated with each identity *added* together or *multiplied* together. But right then, as we griped about Denzel Washington getting passed over for an Oscar for *Malcolm X*, an interreligious war was raging in the Balkans and tens of thousands of people were dying, and *religion was nowhere to be found in the diversity discussion*.

My own personal life was taking a turn toward the religious. I had become very involved in the Catholic Worker movement and was increasingly reading Buddhist spirituality. Ultimately, this exploration would lead me back to a deep engagement with the tradition of my birth, Islam. Somebody suggested I read Diana Eck's *Encountering God* (Eck, 1993; 2003), a wonderful memoir that articulates the intersection of faith and interfaith.

I loved Diana's description of life as a young Methodist in Montana, going through Sunday school and Bible camp, and then having her world opened up when she

moved East, first to Smith College, and then beyond the border to the land of my birth, India. She went there to study religion, and there may be no more a colorful carnival of faith anywhere in the world than India. She was astonished when Hindus poured yogurt on statues as a form of worship, and they returned the surprise when they saw her praying with her shoes on. Those twin experiences, growing up as a Methodist in Bozeman and doing a study abroad on Hinduism in Benares, shaped the career and commitments of one of our best known scholars of Indian religions.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, as Diana was teaching her courses on Indian religions at Harvard, she noticed more and more young Indian Hindus, Muslims, Jains, and Sikhs in her class. They would show up for office hours and tell her stories of the temples that their communities were building in places like Toledo and St. Louis. They would talk about the Hindu summer camps they attended in upstate New York or the Muslim faith intensives they attended on weekends.

It slowly began to dawn on Diana that religious diversity was not just a Far East phenomenon, but an East Coast one too. Diana did a little exploring and discovered that, in addition to Jewish and Christian groups on campus, there were thriving Hindu, Muslim, and Buddhist associations. Some of their programs drew hundreds of students. Questions began to emerge in her head: “What are the numbers on these religions in this country? How are they being changed by America? How are they, in turn, changing America?” Like people all over the country in the early and mid 1990s, Diana was involved in a whole set of diversity discussions taking place on college campuses. She noticed the same thing that my father pointed out: Religion was the missing “R” word in the diversity discussion.

The fact that religion had effectively been left out of the multicultural movement had very serious implications. College campuses effectively transformed themselves at every level to take race seriously. They implemented affirmative action policies in both student admissions and faculty/staff hiring, insuring that the campus had a broader range of racial and ethnic diversity present. Campuses encouraged their student services wing to take seriously the identities of these new student populations. At the University of Illinois, where I was an undergraduate, Black and Latino students had their own student councils in the residence halls and their own cultural houses. They invited high profile speakers to campus to address race issues. Jesse Jackson and Maya Angelou were two of the people that came to Illinois when I was there. Campuses opened up multicultural affairs offices that did trainings for students, staff, and faculty on issues relating to racial identity. Even the academic programs on campuses expanded to engage race and ethnic identity more seriously. The highest profile was Harvard’s Afro-American Studies Dept, led by Henry Louis Gates Jr., and counting, at one time, the leading African-American intellectuals in the country as members—Cornel West, Anthony Appiah, William Julius Wilson. I do not cite these changes as an argument about whether campuses did enough to deal with race, only to say that it was an issue that was proactively and seriously engaged.

I tell this story for two reasons. Number one, because I believe the rationale for colleges to take race seriously was not simply about the campus. I think this was an attempt by the institution of higher education to have a positive impact on the broader society. The thinking goes something like this:

We live in a segregated and racist society. Campuses are a unique place where people from different racial backgrounds can come together, commit themselves to an anti-racist agenda, develop an appreciation for cultural narratives that are poorly represented in high school textbooks and in the media, nurture relationships between people from different backgrounds, and perhaps even change attitudes. Because college graduates become the nation's leaders and often set a country's intellectual and cultural agenda, the attitudes and relationships nurtured on the American campus could have an impact on race relations in the broader society.

We can argue about whether it was enough or whether the strategy was correct or whether the intervention came too late, but I think that people would generally agree that we live in a less racist society than existed 30 years ago, and it is at least in part due to the attention that campuses gave to race.

Why has so little of this happened around the issue of religious identity? Why, when my friend Cassie was asking what it meant to encounter a Muslim, were there few professionals on her campus that could help her think intelligently about religious diversity and interfaith cooperation? Why was there so little talk of religious identity when I was an undergraduate, and so much of the news in the 1990s was dominated by conflicts between religious communities—Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland, Hindus and Muslims in India, Orthodox Christians and Muslims in the Balkans? Why, when Diana Eck started to explore religious diversity at Harvard, did she find so few resources or serious thought applied to that issue?

I think the time is right for college campuses to engage religious diversity in a serious way. This engagement of religious identity makes sense for the central mission of higher education—which is to educate students and to create an environment conducive to that end. Moreover, I think that if the American campus engaged religious diversity seriously, it could have a powerful and positive impact on pressing social issues, both in our country and abroad. I want to talk about this at four levels: context, theory, methodology, and action.

Let's start with context. In 1966, Harvard theologian Harvey Cox began his book *The Secular City* with the following line: "The rise of urban civilization and the collapse of traditional religion are the two main hallmarks of our era and are closely related" (Cox, p. 1). He and many other scholars effectively predicted the end of religion. In the absence of religion as a guiding framework, science would provide our explanations, products would provide our comfort, and art would provide our meaning. It was only a matter of time before the Vatican would lose its religious significance and become Disneyland Rome. "Secularization theory," as this came to be known, died somewhere between the presidential election of 2000, when secular liberals discovered that Evangelical Americans could put one of their own in the Oval Office, and September 11, 2001, when people suddenly realized that religion had to be dealt with in foreign affairs as well.

To continue for a moment with the race analogy: one hundred years ago, the great African American scholar W.E.B. Du Bois wrote in the preface to *The Souls of Black*

Folk, “The problem of the 20th century is the problem of the color line.” (Du Bois, 1903: 1999). We are far from solving that problem. Yet even so, it appears that the issue of the 21st century will be the question of “the faith line.”

The United States is in a unique position to address the faith line. According to Harvard professor Diana Eck, we are the most religiously devout country in the West and the most religiously diverse nation in the world in an era of global religious conflict (Eck, 2001). The religious landscape of America has changed dramatically over the past half-century. Diana calls it the story of a Christian country becoming the most religiously diverse society on earth. There are approximately six million Jews in America, between three and four million Buddhists, nearly a million Hindus, and perhaps as many as six million Muslims.

The combination of our religious devotion and our religious diversity puts us at the crossroads of the most profound crisis currently facing humanity. Virtually every religious and ethnic community in the world is represented in America, including ones that are at war elsewhere. Thus far, the violence between Sunnis and Shias in Baghdad, Hindus and Muslims in Bombay, and Catholics and Protestants in Belfast has had no serious repercussions in Boston. But, in a world where tensions travel in nanoseconds over the internet, that scenario is not impossible.

I believe America can prevent those tensions from taking root here. But I think we have to be far more intentional about nurturing the alternative to interreligious conflict. This means that we have to take religious diversity seriously, and engage interreligious engagement in a very intentional way. I think if we get that right in America, the rest of the world may pay attention, and the model we build in Boston might have repercussions in Belfast, Bombay, and Baghdad.

The question is: Which institution is going to lead the way? I think the answer is obvious: higher education. The American campus is a unique space. It gathers people from small towns and big cities, superpower nations and countries who can barely feed their own population; it manages to encourage both identity commitment and pluralist community; it values both individual freedom and contribution to the common good. Its experience with addressing the issue of race, while far from a perfect parallel, might well provide some clues, and some mistakes to avoid, regarding how to engage religious diversity in a way that impacts individual campuses, the broader system of higher education, the country we live in, and perhaps even the world.

Any serious engagement with a new issue requires a theory. I think the theory that should guide our engagement with religious diversity is the theory of pluralism. Political philosopher Michael Walzer articulates the challenge of building pluralism in his book, *What it Means to be an American by addressing the question* “How are we, in the United States, to embrace difference and maintain a common life?” (Walzer, 1996). Effectively, he is saying that the cornerstone of a diverse society is positive relations between its different communities. Religious pluralists hold that people believing in different creeds and belonging to different communities need to learn to live together. It is therefore a sociological, not theological, pluralism. Religious pluralism is neither mere coexistence nor forced consensus. It is a form of proactive cooperation that affirms the identity of the constituent communities while emphasizing that the well-being of each,

and all depends on the health of the whole. It is the belief that the common good is best served when each community has a chance to make its unique contribution.

Anything less is a disaster waiting to happen. In his study of inter-religious violence in India, *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life*, University of Michigan political economist Ashutosh Varshney discovered that there was one significant difference between cities in India that remained relatively calm during times of interreligious tension and cities that exploded in sectarian violence. The cities that remained calm had what Varshney calls, “networks of engagement” (Varshney, 2003), basically civic organizations that brought people from different backgrounds together on a regular basis. When tensions flared, those people knew each other well enough not to want to kill each other. And they had basic tools—phone trees, for instance—to prevent tensions from escalating into violence.

A Gallup Poll released in August 2006, shows that almost forty percent of Americans, asked to examine themselves honestly, say that they have some prejudice against Muslims (Saad, 2006). About the same number believe that Muslims should go through stricter security procedures at airports. Over one third of Americans believe that Islam is more likely than other religions to promote violence. In October of 2007, the David Horowitz Freedom Center organized “Islamofascism Awareness Week,” a calculating campus campaign that sought to portray the entirety of Islam as aligned with terrorism and antithetical to American values like freedom, equality, and liberty. These Americans may not know it, but they are talking about their neighbors. They are talking about their co-workers and their doctors. They are talking about people who play little league baseball with their children, bring food to neighborhood potlucks, pay taxes, serve in the armed forces, and vote.

The Holy Qur’an says that “God made us different nations and tribes that we may come to know one another” (Quran 49:13). The Varshney study exemplifies the importance of people knowing one another. A March 2006 Pew report also bears this out. It states that, of Americans who do not know a Muslim, only 50% have a positive view. But of respondents who said they did know a Muslim personally, 74% claim to have a positive view of the Muslim community (Pew Forum, 2006). Clearly, we need to provide more ways for Americans of different faiths to come to know one another.

That brings us to the question of methodology. It is important to avoid the Scylla and Charybdis of interfaith work. The Scylla is the notion that religions are so similar, the differences are all superficial. The Charybdis is the notion that we are so different, we cannot even talk. The middle path is learning that there are common values that all faiths share, but that each faith has its own approach to that value. These values include hospitality, compassion, service, and peace. We have to hold such universal values up for all to see, while we create the space for each community to articulate what the value means to them. I believe this methodology of engagement accomplishes Michael Walzer’s challenge of embracing difference while maintaining a common life.

In 1998, I started an organization called the [Interfaith Youth Core \(IFYC\)](#) that seeks to meet the above challenges through an interfaith service-learning methodology. Across the country, the [Interfaith Youth Core](#) provides young people and the institutions that support them with leadership training, project resources, and a connection to a broader movement. We provide these tools to young leaders by facilitating programs that

bring young people from different religious and moral perspectives together to volunteer—building houses, tutoring children—and then share what it is in their different traditions that inspire this work. In this way, young people have the opportunity to live out the service ethic in their own tradition and learn about the same in others. They build relationships with people from different traditions on the universal value of serving others, while having the space to talk about how service is unique in their own tradition. This methodological approach does not require that participants abandon their claims to absolute truth, nor even the call to proselytize. We leave the theological questions of heaven and hell off the table to work for a sociological pluralism that responds to the pragmatic realities of day to day life.

For eight years, the IFYC ran programs on five continents involving tens of thousands of young people. Today, we are largely a movement-building and a training organization that helps equip religious communities, universities, and civic institutions with the tools and resources to run their own programs. One avenue we provide for local organizers to do so is through participation in our Days of Interfaith Youth Service campaign. Since launching this campaign in the spring of 2004, nearly a hundred hometowns and college campuses have organized interfaith service-learning projects involving over 10,000 youth participants. [The Days of Interfaith Youth Service](#) campaign is the flagship activity of a growing movement of young people committed to building a world dominated by interreligious understanding and common action for the common good.

The ingredients for interfaith youth service programs clearly exist on college campuses: diverse religious student groups who want to have relationships and do service projects, recognition of the importance of building diverse communities on the part of administrations, and established volunteer programs and centers. Perhaps what is needed are the right types of partnerships. The volunteer center organizes a service program while the religious student leaders bring out their members; the administration provides some funding, and a group of student leaders is put together to run interfaith discussion. There is good reason to believe that if higher education invests in interfaith understanding with the same seriousness and intentionality with which it engaged other forms of diversity, then we may see a twenty-first century that realizes the prophetic call of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. “for a worldwide fellowship that lifts neighborly concern beyond one’s tribe, race, class, and nation” (King, p. 191).

References

- Cox, H. G. (1990). *The secular city: Secularization and urbanization in theological perspective* (25th anniversary ed.). New York: Collier Books.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of Black folk*. Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co.; [Cambridge]: University Press John Wilson and Son, Cambridge, U.S.A. Also at (1999). Bartleby.com Retrieved 2007, November 9 from www.bartleby.com/114/
- Eck, D. (1993; 2003). *Encountering God*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Eck, D. (2001). *A new religious America*. San Francisco: HarperCollins.
- King, Jr., M. L. (1967). *Where do we go from here: Chaos or Community?* New York: Harper & Row.
- Pew Forum, (2006, March 22). *Prospects for inter-religious understanding, will views towards Muslims and Islam follow historical trends?* Retrieved 2007, November 9, from <http://pewforum.org/publications/surveys/Inter-Religious-Understanding.pdf>
- Lydia Saad, (2006, August 8), Anti Muslim sentiments fairly commonplace. *Gallup Poll*. Retrieved 2007, November 9, from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/24073/AntiMuslim-Sentiments-Fairly-Commonplace.aspx>
- Varshney, A. (2003). *Ethnic conflict and civic life*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Walzer, M. (1996). *What it means to be an American*. New York: Marsilio Publishers.