(ACOUSTIC GUITAR THEME MUSIC)

JONATHAN ROGERS, HOST: Welcome to The Habit Podcast: Conversations with Writers about Writing. I'm Jonathan Rogers, your host.

(THEME MUSIC CONTINUES)

JR: Lee Camp is a man of many talents and varied interests. He's a theology professor at Lipscomb University in Nashville. He is also the executive producer and host of The Tokens Show, a philosophical and theological variety show. Imagine Prairie Home Companion went to seminary and moved south. Lee's most recent book book is *Scandalous Witness: A Little Political Manifesto for Christians*.

(THEME MUSIC FADES OUT)

JR: Lee Camp, thank you so much for being on The Habit podcast today.

LEE CAMP: Thank you, Jonathan!

JR: This is great.

LC: Great to be here with you!

JR: I'm in your stompin' grounds, aren't I?

LC: You are in my neck of the woods, yes. Very pleased to have you here.

JR: Well, thank you.

LC: (laughs)

JR: Yeah, who's the host here?

LC: (laughs)

JR: I'm at Lipscomb! Oh well. Ummmm… so, this podcast is gonna release, like, the day before your new book releases?

LC: Oh, great! Yes.

JR: *Scandalous Witness*. What's your subtitle?

LC: My subtitle is "A Little Political Manifesto for Christians."

JR: Okay. And this manifesto consists of fifteen statements.

LC: Fifteen propositions.

JR: Fifteen propositions.

LC: That I humbly say can change the nature of Christian witness in America.

JR: Okay! Good!

LC: (laughs)

JR: Here's hopin' it works!

LC: Lord knows we need something to work!

JR: And you… you say in your introduction these are fifteen proportions that shouldn't be controversial.

LC: Yes. I do say that.

JR: Um… well…. (pause) They're gonna be controversial. (laughs)

LC: (laughs) Which one do you think's gonna be controversial? Or which ones do you think might be controversial?

JR: Um… I think… (pause) Oh shoot, now you're putting me on the spot. I'm supposed to put you on the spot in this format.

LC: (laughs)

JR: No, but… when you… well, let's see. Some of the more provocative ones — let's see — are um, I think — there's no reason for this to be. I think anybody who thinks about this would agree. But one of your propositions is "America is Not the Hope of the World."

LC: "America's Not the Hope of the World." Yes, that is one of them.

JR: Which… true enough.

LC: Well, it is true enough from a Christian perspective.

JR: Sure.

LC: From basic Christian orthodoxy. But there is a great deal of political discourse and rhetoric in American history that presumes to the contrary.

JR: Right.

LC: So we have — one of the things I try to do in the book is, um… I think David Gushee in one of his endorsements that I sort of kill sacred cows on both the left and the right. And I do try to be an equal opportunity debunker, but you see that especially in the language of hope, right? You have people on both the right and the left who will talk about, literally this quote I guess from Jefferson, "America's the last great hope of the earth." Um, or Lincoln will say that, and you have Republicans and Democrats

who have used that sort of language to make the claim that if America's going to be saved, it's gonna be saved through America. And they use Messianic language — "saved" — or even with Woodrow Wilson, you know, very explicit Messianic language used about America. So it ought not be controversial, but when set in its context, it's highly controversial.

JR: Yeah, and there's also… it feels to me that you're being intentionally provocative in some of these statements, and you can confirm or deny. Um… what was the one about, um, the way we talk about the Bible and Christian values is… not antithetical…

LC: Yeah, I think it's uh, how Christian values and the Bible subvert Christianity.

JR: Yeah. That seems like you're asking for trouble.

LC: Well, but again, I think it's true. And I think it's a matter of basic Christian orthodoxy. You know, when you look at, say, the Creed, the Apostle's Creed for example, what you're basically getting is the outline of a narrative. It's a narrative, right? It's not a list of values. It's not a list of moralistic statements. And a lot of people have reduced what it means to be Christian in public to upholding certain moral values or moral commitments.

That's not to say Christianity doesn't entail certain moral commitments. but when you reduce it in public to "Don't do X," or "We must do Y," or "We must reject A," or "We must embrace B," then what you've done is you have subverted Christianity. Because Christianity is a story about the way in which the creation and humans in the creation have gone astray, and the way in which God has acted in the world through Christ to save the world, and to save us, and to save the creation, to redeem the creation. And it's a story that points back to a particular way in which God has saved, and the power that God has wrought in the world.

And so Christianity is about that narrative and living out of that narrative.

It's not about Christian values, so called. And I do think that a lot of times those, in the name of trying to save Christianity in American public life, they're actually destroying Christianity because they're reducing it to something that it's not. And so I am trying to be intentionally provocative there, because I think we need to come to terms with the fact that a lot of what goes by the name "Christian" in public is not. Or maybe worse, has become some unwitting, subversive enemy to Christianity.

JR: Mmhmm. Yeah… (pause) Let's talk about hope.

LC: Yeah.

JR: You've already mentioned hope. Um… and I think hope is such — I'm now trying to steer things toward writing — I think hope is an important idea for a writer. Flannery O'Connor said people who don't have hope don't write novels. And, of course, we're not just about novels here.

LC: Yeah, they maybe don't write.

JR: But people who don't have hope don't write. And she also says people who don't have hope don't read.

LC: Hmmm…

JR: They don't… "people without hope not only don't write novels, but what is more to the point, they don't read them. They don't take long looks at anything because they lack the courage. The way to despair is to refuse to have any kind of experience, and a novel, of course, is a way to have experience."

LC: That's a brilliant quote.

JR: Yeah. So… you talk about hope a lot. And you've already talked about the false versions of hope that are offered to us. How does hope inform

your work as a writer?

LC: Yeah. Well, I do think that, um… hope is central, not merely to the work of writing, but to the work of being human in my mind.

JR: Mmhmm, yeah.

LC: Of course there are certain — as I understand, at least — certain forms of Buddhist practice… um… at least, as I understand it. And I'm no expert in this, but the way I understand some of it is that what it means to be at peace in the world or at peace with oneself is to divest oneself of hope, because it carries with it certain expectations. And um… even though I will say that meditation, certain forms of meditation, have been immensely helpful to me in growing as a person and learning to let go of anxiety… nonetheless, I can't find a way, I've not been able to find a way to go forward in life without having some sort of sense of hope. Because hope sets a horizon for possibility, and certainly in the Christian story, the Christian conviction, hope sets a horizon for where human history is headed. And, um…

JR: Hey, can I slow you down a minute?

LC: Yeah, mmhm.

JR: "Sets a horizon." That sounds… I know that means something, but I'm not sure what. What do you mean when you say "sets a horizon"?

LC: I guess what I'm trying to say is… I don't know, I just made that up.

JR: Oh, okay.

LC: I think it sounds kinda good.

JR: Yes, it sounds good, but…

LC: Yeah, but what does it mean?

JR: (laughs)

LC: I guess what I mean by it is that, you know, when you… where you look to off in the distance determines a lot about the way you see yourself in the world. If I'm always looking down, if I'm always looking at just the crap that's right around me, or the hardship that's right around me, and never look off to a new possibility off on the horizon, then… it oftentimes is not a very productive, fruitful, or joyous way to live, you know?

JR: Yeah. Reminds me of in *Paradise Lost*, before he was a fallen angel, Mammon, when he was a pre-fallen angel, couldn't enjoy heaven cause he kept looking down at the pavement. He couldn't believe there was gold…

LC: Ahhh…

JR: He couldn't look around, and so…

LC: That's pretty great.

JR: Because he was so interested in the bricks that the road was made out of.

LC: That is fascinating.

JR: (laughs)

LC: Yeah, yeah. So that the same sort of idea of looking off. And so I think that for my own work then, as a human being, the indispensable nature of looking off or hopefulness. And then I also know that "hope" in a very practical, pragmatic sense about writing has been important to me in this most recent project. Because I grew pretty, um… (pause) What's the right

word? I grew… um… disillusioned, maybe? With writing after my second book. This one coming out will be my third book. After my second book I was pretty disillusioned with the whole process of publishing.

JR: Uh huh.

LC: And you know, you can pour yourself into a work, you put a lot of time into it, and then relatively nobody reads it. And it's just like, well, heck. Why do that? And so… in a very practical sense, I was kind of like, I don't know if I'll write another book or not. But I had been kind of working at this project for a while. And um, Trevor Thompson at Eerdmans came by my office one day, and said, hey we're looking for some projects that look kind of like this, and do you happen to have any interest in this? And so I said, well, I do have this one project I've been kind of thinking about. And he said, well, send it to me. And so we were off and running at that point. And then pretty quickly we took off.

JR: When would that have been?

LC: I think Trevor came to me probably about 20 months ago… yeah. And um…

JR: He was just kickin' around Lipscomb campus?

LC: He was on campus for a conference.

JR: Oh, yeah right.

LC: So that very concrete — somebody sidling up alongside you and helping foster some sort of concrete hope that this particular kind of work can be useful in the world has been important.

JR: Yeah, okay. I was about to ask you is that the same kind of hope we're talking about?

LC: I would say it's one specific… it's a very narrow form of hope. But it certainly correlates with a broader sense of hope as human being that um… not that we're gonna save the world. But that God's gonna save the world, and that we're called to the work of sowing seeds and bearing witness to that.

JR: Yeah.

LC: And that our bearing witness to it, um… through God's work can be used in the world.

JR: Yeah. Yeah. Um… (pause) So, in a recent blog post you wrote, you talked about the idea of a hermeneutic of love, which you got — you got it from Alan — or you're quoting or paraphrasing Alan Jacobs, I don't know where he got it.

LC: Yeah, I don't remember either.

JR: Let's talk about that. First of all, what does the word hermeneutic mean?

LC: Yeah, so "hermeneutic" is how one interprets texts.

JR: Okay.

LC: And typically, in Biblical studies for example, you make a distinction between exegesis and hermeneutics. And exegesis is the work of working on a text to try and figure out what it means in its original context, and what are the historical / cultural backgrounds to make sense of what that text could have meant then. And hermeneutics then is a move of trying to interpret the meaning of a text for oneself or one's community or one's own current setting. Yeah.

JR: Okay.

LC: But hermeneutic of love kind of points to this notion of… when you're trying to interpret one's experience, or trying to interpret the nature of another's — I'll put "text" in quotation marks here — or another speech act or whatever the case may be, a "hermeneutic of love" is this sort of move to try to interpret it lovingly. To interpret through the presumption of the possibility of goodwill rather than some other possible hermeneutic.

JR: Mmhm.

LC: Like, for example… you know the "hermeneutic of suspicion" is big in certain liberation sorts of movements. And a hermeneutic of suspicion can be terribly important to do, right? It might be— that might be a kind of classic example of Jesus saying "be wise as a serpent" might be a hermeneutic of suspicion. Don't be stupid. Don't be naive. Know that there's power at play here. So use a hermeneutic of suspicion. So that's important to do at various points.

But especially in our context, I think — our contemporary, cultural, political context — I think of a hermeneutic of love as something… as a choice being differentiated from, we might say, a "hermeneutic of shame."

JR: Okay.

LC: Or a hermeneutic of judgment. Because I think we just have such polarization going on right now in our context that people don't seem willing — a lot of people often don't seem willing — to try to take what a person says and assume the possibility of goodwill there. And so I think a hermeneutic of love kind of invites us to try to really understand another human being as another human being and not presuppose malice, or presuppose they're just corrupt, um, and try to see what might be there.

JR: Okay, so that… a hermeneutic of love is how I interpret what other people are saying or writing or whatever.

LC: Yeah.

JR: What does that mean for a writer who has been putting things out in the world?

LC: Yeah, I think… well, certainly in the kind of work I like to do, the kind of writing I like to do, is um… I've decided that, in my academic work… I got to do a PhD at Notre Dame. And I got to do a PhD among a lot of really, really smart people. And somewhere along the way I realized I don't want to spend my life doing high-end, rarefied academic work that only specialists are going to read. And I say that not to presume that it's not important work. I think it's terribly important work.

JR: Mmhm.

LC: Because especially those who have done that work well, they've helped change— changed significant parts of human history by doing that kind of work. It's really important work. But I didn't think that's what I was good at. I didn't think that I could contribute things. I didn't think I was smart enough to do that, frankly.

So, what I figured out that I thought I was pretty good at was… I can read, um… (pause) Well, I saw this in teaching as a graduate assistant. I was a graduate assistant to a professor who, years later — I won't say what his name is — but another professor who's also very well-known at Duke one day, we were walking, and he said, "oh, so-and-so" — who I was TA for — he said, "He's one of only two people I know that has a really big brain." He said, "You and I, we're smart, but this so-and-so is a big brain kind of guy." Right? And he was a big brain kind of guy. But I realized in being his TA that I could sometimes teach for him, and… I could teach his undergrad students better than he could, because he didn't know how to say it in a way that they could make sense of. And so it was like I could kind of translate what the big brain people could see.

JR: Yeah.

LC: I could understand ‘em. I couldn’t generate the stuff they generate.

JR: Right.

LC: But I could understand the stuff they generate and then try to communicate it another way. And so I’ve tried to look at my academic work as this sort of “bridge work” of saying, how can you engage some of this really high-end stuff and then try to communicate it in a way that’s helpful for “thoughtful” laypeople, but in quotation marks, you know?

JR: Yeah.

LC: Um… and so then, to bring in this notion of a hermeneutic of love — how can one say things in a way that truly facilitates the possibility of loving or looking at the world in a different way that makes love possible. How to do it sometimes in a provocative way, sometimes in a funny way, sometimes in a snarky way, but always for the possibility of making it possible for people to see things that they might not see otherwise, or to give them more than two options.

JR: Yeah! Right.

LC: Give ‘em a third way to look at something. I see that as a very loving kind of thing to try to do in the world.

JR: Yeah. The… in your new book, I wrote down something that I found very compelling. You said, “By choosing to tell different stories, to make different observations, and ask different questions, you have immense power to change the nature of political discourse in your community.” That’s a very hopeful statement. I hope it’s true.

LC: I hope so too.

JR: But I think it gets at why we even… I mean, we talked about the idea that you've got to have some hope to write.

LC: Mmhmm.

JR: And I think if you don't believe something along those lines, then why write at all?

LC: Yeah.

JR: Except there are also cynical reasons to write. You talk about telling different stories, and some of the ways we got into this mess is people telling bad stories, false stories, that appeal to people's worst imaginations.

LC: Right. Yep.

JR: And um… so anyway. I don't really think that's a question. The floor is now open for you to comment on your… (laugh)

LC: (laugh) I think that was a brilliant line, whoever wrote that.

JR: Yeah, right. (laugh)

LC: (laugh) I do. I mean, I do think that we should never fail to take seriously the immense power of storytelling and to seek to tell stories in such a way so that it breaks open the possibility of new ways of being in the world. And you know, the possibility of seeing life in a way we haven't seen before. And so we see all the great novelists doing that. We see the great nonfiction writers do that. Um, and… it's no small matter to learn to tell stories well. To sing stories well. To make it possible to do something different.

JR: Yeah. Um… I… the stories… they work on us at the level of desire. You know, they can change what we want in a way, a little more easily, I think, than sermons, lectures, those kinds of things can do.

LC: Right.

JR: And also, somewhere I saw you talking about the idea of seeking first to understand before we seek to be understood.

LC: Yeah.

JR: Which in some ways it's kind of counter-intuitive to a writer, because it seems like my whole job is to make myself understood. But readers are habitual understanders, right? I mean, you learn what it's — you get to try out another way of thinking about the world, another way of seeing the world.

LC: Right. Yep.

JR: Which brings us to this idea — again, I got this from your most recent blog post — Miroslav Volf's — this idea of double vision. Being able to see in stereo. Not just your own view of things, but — that's such an important role of reading and writing is giving people the opportunity to see things with a double vision. but as you say, this is different from "fuzzy vision," and this is different from straight up relativism. So can you talk about that for a minute?

LC: Sure. Yeah, um… so, you know, Miroslav, he developed this idea in his book *Exclusion and Embrace*. And that, um… Miroslav's family background and his own experience is very much coming out of the Soviet downfall in the 80s, and what happens in the Serbian conflicts and so forth, and the horrors of the war there in Yugoslavia. So when he talks about trying to practice double vision and see it from the other perspective, he's not naive as to how difficult this may be. And so he's talking about, you're actually trying to see the world from the perspective

of your enemy. And a very challenging task he sets before us.

And he says, you know, the point is not that all of a sudden your notion of justice becomes relative, and if you see it from the perspective of the enemy, then all of a sudden your notion of justice goes out the window. He said you may still hold justice firmly, if not more firmly with your notion of what justice would entail in this situation. But you're trying, at least, to take on the possibility that you could understand something better or your own vision might be transformed or your own life habits and practices and convictions might be deeply challenged in some important way they need to be challenged.

JR: Yeah.

LC: And then, out of that practice of double vision, of trying to see it from the other's perspective and still taking seriously my own perspective, maybe some new possibility might arise for reconciliation or the possibility of some sort of embrace, in some sort of metaphorical sense.

And I think again that's a sort of way of, um… that really stands in parallel with this notion of a hermeneutic of love, where you're trying to interpret the things in such a way so that you try to take seriously the other person. You seek first to understand, and then only to be understood.

JR: Mmhm.

LC: Now from a writing perspective, you know, we teach this in elementary — you know, as a graduate assistant, I would teach intro to writing courses to college students, you know — one of the basic writing skills you teach is to anticipate counter-arguments.

JR: Right.

LC: Right? So it's nothing particularly novel from that perspective. In one way, all you're doing is seeking to anticipate counter-arguments. But it

does require a sort of existential move where you, um… you know, I've heard this quoted from a lot of people now, but I think where I first read it was from Woodrow Wilson, who in my mind said a lot of crazy things, as a Christian. But one of the things he said that I liked was, he said, "If you don't know in the back of your mind somewhere that you might be wrong, then you're a fool."

JR: Yeah.

LC: Something like that. And I think that's right! You know. So I really need to hold on to the possibility that I really may be wrong about my most cherished assumptions. And so the one theologian I like, Jim McClendon, speaks about the principle of fallibility being at the root of doing good theological practice.

JR: Huh.

LC: He says you test everything. And you're always testing it in light of new experiences and new data, and in light of the tradition you've received and the Scriptures and tradition you've received in the Christian tradition. Test everything, holding on to the principle of fallibility. And so it's just this sort of way to be in the world, that, um… it feels risky. It does require — going back to the quote from Flannery O'Connor — it requires a lot of courage to be this attentive to something. But it seems to be a more true way to live, it seems like.

JR: The kind of single vision that assumes I can't be wrong… the only way I can not be wrong is if I'm the one who originates the truth.

LC: Yeah.

JR: And it seems to me the double vision Miroslav Volf is talking about is less relative than a vision that says… it's so hard to distinguish between my sense of justice and my sense of what I want for myself.

LC: Yeah. Right.

JR: And it seems to me that… I was just thinking, as you were describing Volf's position, it sounds to me like what we're saying is there's a truth that's outside of— that originated outside my head, also outside my enemy's head. And by trying to see things from my enemy's perspective, I'm triangulating all of this truth that neither one of us made up. Which seems to me less relative than my saying I couldn't possibly consider that I'm wrong.

LC: Yeah. Yeah, you know, I grew up, um… George Marsen, a church historian, pointed to the ways that fundamentalism and American evangelicalism was the flip side of the modernists, you know? Marsden made the argument that fundamentalism is just one flip side of the modernist coin. And so Protestant liberalism and Protestant fundamentalism are just the heads and tails of the coin of modernism in American culture. And so I grew up kind of—

JR: Could you say just one more sentimental about that?

LC: Yeah, so that for both of them — both the liberals and the fundamentalists — the criterion for truth was based on some modern, Enlightenment notions of truth. So I grew up on the kind of fundamentalist side of that coin, and with very strong notions about objectivity and rationality, and strong suspicions of subjectivity. And um, I would quickly want to nuance this and say — I can do lectures on this — I'm not suggesting we jump into the sort of celebration of mere subjectivity and cultural relativism and so forth, because none of those people really believe what they say anyway.

JR: (laughs) Yeah…

LC: They just don't! But I discovered when I was a young— my wife and I were living in Nairobi for half a year. We were working at this school in a slum in Nairobi. And one day we were coming home — we were staying at

this missionary's home — and we were stopped in traffic. And I looked over to my left, and I saw this guy walking down the sidewalk, and he was just buck naked.

JR: (laughs)

LC: He didn't have a stitch of clothes on. He just had socks and dress shoes on.

JR: Okay.

LC: And his clothes were in a bundle underneath his arm. And he was walking just free to the wind down this sidewalk. And so I do this double take, and I asked the man driving the car, William, who had become a friend, I said, "William, what's up with this dude?" And he looks back — and he's very nonplussed, you know — and he just says, "Oh you know, he's mad." And I said, "What?" And he said, "He's mad. He's crazy." And he does the fingers around his ear. "He's crazy."

And so I was just so confused by that, because he knew that that meant this guy is mentally ill. And so that night at dinner I asked the missionaries — "You know, William said…" And they said yeah, that's how people show mental illness here, is they walk around naked.

JR: (laughs)

LC: And sure enough, we saw this other guy — who had very distinctive biology that I should not describe on a family friendly podcast — um, but sure enough, we saw him several times walking through the neighborhood buck naked. And so it just struck me as incredible that we cannot escape the cultural norms of even mental illness. Even when you're being the least, quote, "rational," even your cultural context determines the way that gets made manifest. And so it forced me to take seriously what some call the "social location," or the social manner of our knowing, our social epistemology.

Any of our knowing is always socially located. Any of our claims to know is always socially located. And so subjectivity and objectivity are always sort of inseparable from each other. There's some sort of truth that's outside of me. There's a reality outside of my. But anything I say about it is always mediated through me and / or through my cultural context. It's inescapable.

JR: Yeah.

LC: And that fact itself ought to engender a certain humility, I think, in us.

JR: Has it worked on you?

LC: I think so. I wanna believe so… umm… (pause) But you know, the temptation to pride is always a perennial human temptation. But I wanna believe it's helped me.

JR: Yeah. (pause) Um, alright. Last question. Who are the writers who make you want to write?

LC: Now see, I knew you were gonna ask me that question.

JR: Yeah.

LC: I don't like that question, because I don't think of myself as a particularly literate person the way you are a literate person. Um, that being said though, I can point to some of the people that have moved me.

JR: That have moved you to go sit down and write something?

LC: Uh, no. I can't point to anyone who has moved me to sit down and write.

JR: What makes you sit down and write?

LC: Umm… (pause) Joy. And hope. (pause) Sometimes anger.

JR: Is there any writer who engenders joy and hope in you?

LC: Yeah, I mean… one of the ones I had thought of, knowing you were gonna ask that question, I think… well, somebody like Thomas Merton. Um… (pause) you know, some of Merton's stuff I've gone back and reread numerous times. Or somebody — another person that I've reread numerous times, Will Campbell's memoir *Brother to a Dragonfly*. I think I've read that four times.

JR: Really? I have that book, but I just haven't read it.

LC: Have you not? Yeah, I mean, I've read it I think four times, and I've cried every time I read it. And I got to know Will Campbell, which was very dear to me.

JR: He lived in Hohenwald? Is that right?

LC: No, he lived out in Mt. Juliet. But being a Southerner, and… um… (pause) I could just relate to so much of the stories he told and how he told those stories and… the brokenness and beauty of Southern culture just moved me. I do like — I haven't read her more than once, but I've read two of Marilynne Robinson's, of her trilogy. And those… those are kind of like the Flannery O'Connor quote. You know, you have to be prepared to go slow. Because she wrote it — the pace of the books are very slow.

JR: Yeah, incredibly slow.

LC: but they're so beautiful once you give yourself to them.

JR: Those seem like books that would mean a lot to you, from what I know

of you. It feels like something that—

LC: Yeah, there's a sort of pace to it that's beautiful. Or I think, you know, Wendell Berry's… um… um… (pause) Oh, Wendell Berr—

JR: *Jayber Crow*?

LC: *Jayber Crow*. Is another one that I found beautiful and moving and I liked.

JR: Now Wendell Berry, do you prefer his fiction or his essays or his poetry?

LC: Well, I have liked all of them. I have had my students read for quite a few years his book of essays on *Sex, Economy, Community and Freedom*.

JR: Yeah.

LC: I've read three of his novels I guess. I've read — and I've memorized — some of, a good num — well, not a good number. Maybe three of his poems. I did memorize — I can't recite it all now, and you wouldn't want me to, but the Mad Farmer Liberation Manifesto. You know, that's just a fantastic poem that's worth getting in your brain and chewing on again and again and again.

JR: Yep. I think I could've guessed several of your writers, just from knowing you.

LC: Yeah.

JR: Alright, Lee. Well thank you.

LC: It's been great to be here.

JR: And I hope good things happen with this book.

LC: Yeah, thank you. Yeah, I'm hopeful about it. And would love for everybody to go out and buy a copy.

(THEME MUSIC FADES UP)

LC: *Scandalous Witness*.

JR: *Scandalous Witness*.

LC: A Little Political Manifesto for Christians.

JR: Alright.

LC: Thanks very much for having me.

JR: Yeah. Let's do it again soon.

(THEME MUSIC)

DREW MILLER: The Rabbit Room is partnered with Lipscomb University to make this podcast possible. Lipscomb has graciously given us access to their recording studio in the Center for Entertainment and Arts Building. We're so grateful for their sponsorship, their encouragement, and the good work they do in Nashville.

Special shout-out as well to Jess Ray for letting us use her song "Too Good" as part of this podcast. Visit jessraymusic.com to hear more of her beautiful songs.

JR: The Habit Membership is a library of resources for writers by me, Jonathan Rogers. More importantly, The Habit is a hub of community where like-minded writers gather to discuss their work and give each other

a little more courage. Find out more at TheHabit.co.

DM: This podcast was produced by The Rabbit Room, where art nourishes community and community nourishes art. All our podcasts are made possible by the generous support of our members. To learn more about us, visit rabbitroom.com, and to become a member, rabbitroom.com/donate.

(THEME MUSIC OUT)

DM: Translating the Bible requires a delicate blend of accuracy and readability. The Christian Standard Bible pursues that blend, upholding fidelity to the original languages and presenting Scripture compellingly for our modern English context. Accurate. Readable. Sharable. The Christian Standard Bible. Visit csbible.com/rabbitroom to learn more. That's csbible.com/rabbitroom.