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FOREWORD

IN COMMON WITH institutions of higher education, the form and function of religious institutions are very much in flux in our times. We have seen the forms of campus religious programs drastically restructured in recent years. We have seen religious ministries on campuses (as will be described in more detail in this monograph) move from primarily student organizations, through a period of concern with faith and learning issues in the 50's, to a wide variety of strategies in the 60's whose intent was to make religion a dimensional aspect of the student's total life and a major facet of the community of higher education.

The decline of familiar religious institutional forms has been accompanied by a wide diversity of religious initiative involving new concepts of ministry often not understood and occasionally disapproved of by those not privy to the internal dynamics of the religious communions. The possibilities of a gap in communication are enhanced by the absence (except in some instances on the local campus) of close collaboration of the professional societies involved and the relative scarcity of interprofessional involvement. The dearth of recent published materials at this interprofessional level is a symptom of the problem.

Now the decade of the 70's presents to all those concerned with higher education the challenge of reassessing basic philosophy and ethical commitments. It is the thesis of this author that the religious traditions of our heritage ought to be actively represented in that reassessment.

This monograph is presented in the hope that it may contribute to (a) describing briefly the development of the expressions of religious life on the campus; (b) advancing understanding about this significant dimension of university life, particularly on the part of those in student personnel; and (c) suggesting some guidelines for development of mutual study and action. In addition to interesting individual readers, both laymen and clergy, in the student personnel field, it is hoped that staff discussion on campuses and in the American College Personnel Association will be stimulated and, indeed, that staff operations on some campuses may be broadened to include religious dimensions and the religious staff. The monograph may also serve as an instructional aid in the study of higher
education and as an introduction to university religious programs for college administrators who may face unfamiliar problems in this field.

The author wishes to record his appreciation for the sympathetic interest of the ACPA Monograph Editorial Board, William D. Martinson, Chairman; and especially to the editorial subcommittee, comprised of Louis C. Stamatakos and Jack Sorrells, who were assigned to monitor the preparation of this particular monograph. Their suggestions and criticism at various stages of the editorial process were most helpful.

Portions of an early draft of part of this material were submitted to and incorporated in the report of a Religious Life Study Committee at Boston University, and the author is grateful for the comments and discussion in that committee, chaired by William Perry.

The author is also indebted to the campus ministers who agreed to contribute or permit reproduction of their statements on styles of campus ministry that constitute the bulk of Chapter 6. Individual credit is noted for each of those statements.

Finally, thanks are due in heaping measure to the secretarial labors of Penny Stanley and Della Marek who patiently and skillfully prepared the manuscript.

William A. Overholt
CHAPTER 1

The Historic Relationship Between Religion and the University

In the fortuitous circumstances of the Middle Ages, jurisdictional jealousies between local church authority and the state authority in Paris resulted in a Papal Charter to the University of Paris that gave the university a relative autonomy vis-à-vis the two other local institutions. This status as a third estate has been a valued heritage of the university and contained perhaps the original germ of the concept of academic freedom. But for historical accuracy, the qualification of relative autonomy should be noted. Since both the Cathedral Chancellor and the King in Paris were loyal to the Pope, the Papal Charter did not set the University free from the Weltanschauung of the Church; it only provided freedom to operate within the universe of Christian thought.

The community of intellect was not considered the Kingdom of God, but it could be a significant commonwealth of that Kingdom. The liberation of the rational capacities of the individual is not salvation in its fullest dimensions as understood in the Christian faith, but it is no mean salvation either. The man who is liberated from ignorance, from isolation in the time and space in which he lives, from bondage to the custom and tradition of the past, and from clumsiness in using the technology of his civilization—such a man has taken a significant step toward being more completely human, toward living more abundantly.

In the responsible university we can learn to think God’s thoughts after him; we can seek the way to being more fully human; we can be open and humble to the ground of our being: we can build up the fabric of our values and our ethics. Once we have glimpsed such a vision, we cannot help being dissatisfied with anything less!

Religion was established in both university and Western society in integral, even organic ways difficult for modern man to reconstruct sympathetically. Where God’s creative and governing action was presupposed as a pervasive aspect of every experience, religion was not the compartmentalized “spiritual” part of life; it was instead an indigenous strain in all human experience—educational, political, or domestic.

The Christian churches (Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, or Reformed) nurtured the medieval universities even while some scholars such as Bruno, Galileo, and Copernicus were persecuted. When state-supported universities emerged, they appeared in nations where religion was established; hence religion was also an integral feature of the state universities. (Even in France, the University of Paris was not “secularized” until 1902.)

Nevertheless, the freedom of the medieval university system was significant and proved to be a seed that has matured and multiplied. The ambiguity of freedom and responsibility, however, remains. To what extent is higher learning free and to what extent is it obligated to serve the needs of the society that sustains it?

Froyd has pointed out that this educational problem found its clear definition in the experience of the Greeks when the training of their young advanced from merely conserving the mores, myths, and traditions of the society and proceeded momentously

... to do the job of criticizing that heritage, baring its foundations, disclosing its weakness, exposing its shame and immorality, and pointing to better, freer, more meaningful ways of life for both the individual and society.1

Froyd goes on to note that the liberal arts, i.e., those studies that freed a man to apprehend the nature of reality more adequately than did the folk tradition, were defined by the Greeks as involving “the Trivium, composed of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric; and the Quadrivium composed of music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy.”2 When the Christian Church confronted the problem of its relation to education in the third century, Froyd
notes, Origen led the way by adopting the same liberal arts as the core of Christian education. It is instructive to observe that with the possible exception of music, each of the other six arts dealt with a fixed structure of reality with which the student was confronted and which he mastered only by acknowledging the objective validity of the structure of reality. Essentially, although there was some evolution of the disciplines involved (especially by the addition of religion, philosophy, and ethics), this classic principle of confronting students with a reality "out there" to which they adjusted was the foundation of classical education well into the nineteenth century. By and large this system liberated the persons involved from the ignorance, superstition, mythology, and folkways, and the brutality and vulgarity of the times. There were enough aspects of salvation about the whole enterprise that the Christian community remained convinced through the centuries that education was a Christian task, not just a secular one.³

A second observation would have to be the elitist character of this classical educational system. It was elitist both with respect to persons and to the substance of what was taught. By and large, collegiate education was available only to youth from the upper classes, and the subjects they were taught had an ivory-towerish cast. Higher learning did not attempt to reach a wide spectrum nor did it attempt to concern itself with the immediate, practical concerns of the majority. Yet, for a hierarchically organized society, this system was not as irrelevant or irresponsible as it might seem. As a matter of fact, it did train a cadre of leaders in Western Europe who served church and state with distinction.⁴

All of the colleges and universities founded in America prior to the Revolutionary War owed their beginnings to the initiatives of Christian churches. These colleges were for the most part modeled on the British college (an intimate, residential community of scholars) rather than on the continental, diffuse, urban universities. As often pointed to in the charter of Harvard College, one of the purposes of colonial institutions was to insure an educated clergy. This was not, as Rudolph and other historians of American higher education have shown, just a narrow ecclesiastical concern; rather it was a concern that this group of influential community leaders educate men.⁵ Furthermore, not until the nineteenth century was any special provision made for training the clergy; in the colonial colleges, the would-be pastors, lawyers, or teachers all got exactly the same curriculum. That the colonial colleges served their society well can scarcely be denied on the basis of the leadership they helped to train.

Even more fundamentally, however, in the classical world—where metaphysics was stable, truth perennially valid, and the quintessential truth conveyed by God's own revelation—the curricular program was relatively simple and fixed. Christian theology dealt with revelation; Christianized philosophy and ethics gave structure to most of the other disciplines. While the exact relation between theology and philosophy (to say nothing of language, logic, and mathematics) was imprecise, the operating assumption was that they were not incompatible. In God's providence they were all ultimately coherent.

Scientific Liberalism

This comfortable and pleasant intellectual worldview was rudely shattered by the industrial and scientific revolutions. The industrial revolution put a premium on practical training and skills that became increasingly sophisticated and almost totally beyond the pale of the classical college education. As a consequence, collegiate education was increasingly bypassed by ambitious American youth in the mid-nineteenth century.⁶ Rensselaer, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the military service academies, and especially the land grant universities revolutionized American higher learning to incorporate training in practical, professional skills.

The scientific revolution took shape slowly in the nineteenth century. There were pioneer experimentalists inspired by the German universities even before the Civil War, but the classical ethos and world-view were too restrictive to allow the empiricists really to assert themselves. Two breakthroughs prepared the way for a radical reformation of the curriculum of American colleges. First, President Eliot of Harvard introduced the elective system, which shattered the rationale for the unity of the classical curriculum. Secondly, John Hopkins, Cornell, and, later, Chicago launched vigorous specialized graduate programs borrowing heavily from the research and seminar methods of the German universities.

Obviously the historical role of religion in the university depended upon the whole classical, intellectual world-view. In that view, religion was appropriately conservative. In the strange new world of empirical, specialized, and technological studies, conservatism seemed reactionary, and the whole classical system became the enemy.

While it is impossible here to chronicle the movement in any detail, it is indeed ironic that the patron churches that were stalwart champions of education in pre-Civil War America were transmuted into one of the forces of anti-intellectualism by the beginning of the twentieth century.
The situation within the churches themselves contributed to the difficulty. First of all, there was a shift from a coherent and systematic concept of religion to individualized religious experience, chiefly evidenced by emotional revivalism. Pietism, sentiment, and emotion came together to emphasize subjective and personalized religion at the expense of its public and community functions. Furthermore, the extreme fragmentation of denominationalism in this country was self-defeating. It is ironic that those who were urging unity and integration of life were so fragmented among themselves. Then, too, classical theology depended on the authority of scripture while the intellectual dimensions of faith and morals likewise were derived from authority—again primarily scripture and private experience. The empirical, pragmatic, pluralistic, relativistic characteristics of the scientific and technological age inevitably came into confrontation with that kind of religion. And, of course, there were substantive intellectual issues involved in Darwin’s, Comte’s, and Freud’s theories (to say nothing of criticism of Biblical texts) to challenge the dogmatic certitudes.

The academic revolution was carried through by Eliot; the elective system by Gilman; and the German model for graduate education by increasing specialization and departmentalization of the universities, by the ascendancy of state universities over church colleges, and by the educationists’ increasing concern for individual differences and their crusading efforts to substitute a scientific (empirical, open, and emergent) world-view for the classical values of perennial, universal, and rationalist truth.

From the perspective of history, one might easily say that the educationists too easily mistook religious form for religious essence, and religionists failed to do their own homework; nevertheless, religion was in trouble in the intellectual and academic world for a long time—roughly from the latter decades of the nineteenth century to World War II. Whether one can say that there was an end to the “time of trouble” is debatable.

From the perspective of historical distance one also must acknowledge that while the academic revolution was in progress the vast bulk of American higher education did not produce very distinguished results. It was the age of collegiate “rah-rah” culture when what one did in extracurricular affairs (whether fraternities or football or clubs of all kinds) was more significant than what one studied. And the religious community participated in this same trend: The primary edge of Christianity on the American campus was a Student Christian Association movement pioneered by the Young Men’s and Young Women’s Christian Associations but joined by denominational church movements after World War I. The teaching of religion sank drastically in the first third of the twentieth century; worship languished; civic conscience eroded.

In place of a humanistic, compassionate, and reasonable criterion of what was true, the academic world substituted a physical science-derived model that came to be labeled objectivity. Veblen defined it this way:

In the off-hand apprehension of modern men, “reality” comes near being identified with mechanical fact, and “verification” is taken to mean a formulation in mechanical terms. But the final test of this reality about which the inquirers of modern men so turn is not the test of mechanical serviceability for human use, but only of mechanistically effectual matter-of-fact.

Far from decrying such a conception, Veblen endorsed it as the proper and primary function of the university. The “liberal” learning in America was guided by this “cult of objectivity” which depersonalized what was true and substituted what was publicly observable, mathematically describable, and mechanically operable. Freely licensed laissez-faire in academia was called “liberal.” In the name of academic objectivity, deference was given on a wide scale to the doctrine that scholars should be neutral in all value questions.

Incomplete as this analysis is, it clearly points to major problems in the contemporary situation. First, the introduction of electives, specialized departments, and proliferated disciplines leaves no place in American higher education for a student systematically to confront a body of material that leads him to a conscious articulation of a concept of reality. He gets bits and pieces of usually correct and useful information but no suggestion that these bits and pieces fit into any conceivable pattern. With the decline of religious education as a formative factor in youthful experience, one has to acknowledge that most young people, at the conclusion of their formal education, are left intellectually and spiritually disoriented with the universe in which they exist. Evidence otherwise is surely coincidental, not the result of any educational planning.

Second, the transformation of the university in the past century has brought to academia great interest in the practical, vocational, and professional concerns of the world of work. Every university is likely to have schools of business, nursing, engineering, etc. A National Council of Churches’ letter to churches about higher education says, “The basic problem is the inability of many institutions to move students beyond self-centered vocational aims to deeper and more exciting social vision and life commitment.” This vocationalism contrasts
sharply with the basic concept of a liberating education.

Vocationalism is both symptom and cause of the transformation of the university from an elitist institution in American society to an egalitarian institution open to all who are qualified. While one applauds the switch, one is immediately confronted with the way in which it tends to lock the university into the prevailing culture. Any attempt to liberate the college community from conformity to the mores and values of contemporary culture is made more difficult just because the constituency is so deeply imbedded in the culture itself.

Obviously the vocationalized character of the subject matter dominating the curriculum of the universities is a reflection of the mercantile and technological character of the society; the university’s possibility for emancipation from the status quo is limited indeed. Since education itself has become such big business, and since graduate studies in the arts and sciences have become so oriented toward employment in the educational establishment, ironically the “liberal arts and sciences” are actually becoming more and more vocational.

The widespread cry from students against being locked into a vocationally oriented system serving the status quo society and their need for education that frees them to be responsible agents in modern times are clear evidence that for one articulate group — whose size is difficult to estimate — a thorough reexamination of what genuinely constitutes a liberal education is required.

Critical Reformulation

Both the vocationalism and the populism of the university have severely crippled its attempt to provide liberating experiences related to a systematic view of reality. Higher learning is now locked to the mercantile-technological-professional establishment and by default to the middle (and increasingly the lower middle) class value system. Goodman calls this system “processing” for the military-industrial complex, and a good many students agree with him. The same phenomenon is called “certification” by Jencks and Riesman and indicates that, rather than having the initiative in setting professional standards, universities merely administer the professional standards established outside the academic walls. Naturally, the critical and revisional functions of higher education are not operating very strongly within such a process.

Recent experience with activist demonstrations across the country shows that the erosion of the independent social status of the university and its increasing identification with the governmental—technological-mercantile establishment is an uneasy alliance. It violates the scholar’s historic expectation of academic freedom — especially for the young scholar who feels he is being processed and certified to fill slots in the social order, manipulated and used in ways that confront his conscience. It stands to reason that student disenchantment with the policies of a social order which hardly recognizes the freedom and integrity of the scholar immediately puts sparks to the tinder. Civil rights, the Vietnam War, the draft, and similar issues disturb and, to a degree, disrupt the nation, but they disrupt the university communities in a peculiarly explosive way. And the explosiveness is understandable when one recognizes the foundation that has been laid.

Complicating further this volatile invitation to disaster is the university’s increasing dependence on state and federal financing. In the early 1900’s about 80 percent of all college-level students were enrolled in private (including church-related) colleges, about 20 percent in state-supported schools. At present, however, nearly 80 percent attend state-supported colleges and universities, and even private colleges and universities get substantial funding from government agencies for both facilities and instruction. Direct governmental interference in the academic process has been limited, but subtle influence in the form of encouraging science and technology or certain social sciences and educational projects has not been inconsequential. The hostile mood that develops in a university about grantsmanship and “where the money is” again are cautionary factors.

The perversion of the German universities (the best in the world before 1930) through the infection of Nazism is warning enough against university dependence on the public treasury in direct grants. Similarly, the ways in which the universities of Eastern Europe operate as instrumentality of an authoritarian system give additional documentation to the actual, not merely conjectural possibility of universities becoming mouthpieces of an indoctrinated ideology.

In the midst of fragmented disciplines and relativistic methodologies, the university by itself is not very well equipped to withstand seduction by a powerful funding state. It may be the unique role of religious communities from the Judeo-Christian tradition — standing on their freedom of conscience, institutional autonomy, and transcendental perspective — to defend the freedom and integrity of the universities in this dangerous period. Some educators have insisted that one of the important roles of the religious community is to help the universities be the best they are capable of being.
The university needs to be free within its social setting for at least two very important functions: (a) to assist young scholars in achieving a reasonable and coherent account of reality that they freely accept as valid; and (b) to serve as critic and reforming agency in the social order. There is no question that, in some ultimate sense, the university must contribute to social good in all that it does. Mechanisms for preserving autonomy in deciding what is in the best interest of social good are almost nonexistent on the current scene. There is not even a grants committee, à la British practice, to serve as a buffer between the government and the individual institution, so that the latter cannot be badgered by budgetary recriminations from pursuing an unpopular course. And, on the other hand, there are almost no mechanisms inside the scholarly community to assess the ultimate social good and the allocation of resources.

The churches and synagogues of our nation have an important responsibility to assist in clarifying the cluster of issues surrounding what constitutes the ultimate social good; a responsibility for renewing the vision of what a good society should be. But again the tactics of dialog and involvement have been neglected in recent decades. There is much homework to do, and one senses that the hour is late.

Religion, unfortunately, has not been without its anti-intellectual strain, but the Judeo-Christian tradition has more consistently patronized and demonstrated authentic concern for education. This tradition could be encouraged to give support for the integrity of the educational enterprise. During the past few years campus ministers have shown substantial interest in reformulating the university and reforming public life in an attempt to meet the moral demands of a more humane society more adequately. Considerable clarification of methods and goals is needed and is discernable amid the profusion of initiatives being undertaken. This exploration at least indicates the possibility of a broad area of legitimate common concern between the agencies of higher education and the agencies of religion on the campus.

The contemporary university has proved itself enormously productive in information, knowledge, and technical processes, but frighteningly barren in nurturing a sense of community. The hard knocks of history have revealed the paucity of its vision. Two world wars, depression, cold war, racism, and sundry other warning signals have impressed upon thoughtful persons that the counting-house mentality of Veblen’s “matters-of-fact” is not only unworthy of human beings but dangerously irrelevant and distracting. The nightmare of the German universities’ easy capitulation to Nazism and the American universities’ panic in the face of McCarthyism are spectres that haunt the liberal university’s world of objectivity and neutrality.

While the enthronement of objectivity and the neglect of humanism have proceeded to dominate the American scene, there have been considerable critical reassessment and reconstruction, especially since World War II. The emergence of general education, the rebirth of religious teaching, the focusing of campus ministry away from peripheral, pastoral, and programmatic emphasis toward addressing human concerns, the “change agent” role of the ministry—these are merely examples of voices for reformation of the university.

In spite of the risk such prophecy entails, the trend of the times seems to indicate that the idea of the liberal university is as obsolete in the 1970’s as Newman’s idea of the classical university was in the 1860’s. It is not yet clear what the future in academia will produce, but it will be far more profound than the so-called revolution described by Jencks and Riesman in their otherwise profoundly informed work. The needed revolution will find a way through the current impasse to affirm a humanistic criterion of what is true and good, beautiful and holy. It will affirm a value structure within the community of scholars that identifies the academic virtues in no-nonsense terms and will strive in the larger society for those values that make it possible for universities to exist with freedom and responsibility. Even from this brief sketch, it is clear that the forces of religion will be much affected by the quest and ferment involved in re-formulating the role and mission of the university.

Summary

Discussion of the relationships of church, university, and society indicates that the contemporary situation requires common concern over the following problems:

1. Specialized, departmentalized curricula commonly provide the student no coherent concept of reality. Without this ideological resource for a mature identity, students suffer handicaps in choosing life styles, purposes, and vocations.

2. Vocationalism, one attempt at relevance, is dysfunctional when it detracts from the achievement of general insight, wisdom, and understanding, as well as when it trains for technical obsolescence.

3. Egalitarianism has brought cultural shock and disorientation to academia without building up a social ethos of cherished cultural pluralism.

4. Both vocationalism and egalitarianism find functional common ground in students’ striving for upward economic mobility characterized by a com-
petitive mercantile-technological model of social relationships.

5. Vocationalism, egalitarianism, and mercantile technology tend to lock the university into the status quo instead of providing continuing objective, critical evaluation. Academic entrepreneurship is emphasized at the expense of academic independence.

6. Structured-in identification with the social order makes the university particularly exposed and vulnerable when the social order is viewed as inadequately serving human needs and aspirations. The idealism and impatience of youth aggravate the vulnerability in any political crisis.

7. The dominance of federal and state-funded education contributes further to the perception of the university as necessarily obedient to political domination in favor of the status quo and invites political manipulation.

8. While the state’s involvement in higher education has often been rationalized as the instrument by which the social good is served, academic history shows how universities have been corrupted to self-serving ends rather than authentic and ultimate public good.

All these issues involve technical, educational, political, and economic considerations, but they also involve fundamental priorities, values, and statesmanlike ethical choices reflecting the doctrine of man and the vision of what a good society is.

The list of problems seems to point to four priority tasks in American higher education needing the attention of all who can contribute to their fulfillment:

1. The intellectual centers of our society need to develop a humanistic criterion of what is true and good and beautiful and holy.

2. They need to reconstruct a sense of community around commonly affirmed scholarly values which authenticate qualitative productivity and supportive social systems.

3. Scholars need to rediscover a liberating process of achieving identity, vocation, ideology, and integration—literally a modern doctrine of man to escape from alienation, paralysis of purpose, intellectual dilettantism, and prejudice.

4. Scholars need to reopen the dialog on the nature of the Good Society.

These are at once technical, ethical, and religious tasks. No claim is made to blueprint answers. But the thesis is affirmed that all our best resources must be brought to bear on these profound matters and that high religion has been inadequately represented in such consultations in our recent history. Before pursuing this line further, some attention should be focused on the religious needs and interests of students and how these have been served in American colleges and universities.
CHAPTER 2

Religious Needs of College Students

Research into the religious attitudes, interests, and needs of American college students is at best fragmentary and almost completely useless if one wants more than superficial observations.

Reliable estimates of student participation in religious activities on campus are difficult to make. In the 1950’s, when opinion was somewhat more favorable to organized religious groups, this author hazarded the guess that participation in such groups reached “not more than fifteen percent,” and that assessment was not seriously challenged. A Jewish observer, Alfred Jospe, has written, “Only a small minority of the students who populate our campuses are religious in any meaningful sense of the term.” Early in 1969, a conference of rabbis declared the American university a “disaster area” for Judaism in this country. And Whalen submits that, “Unfortunately the percentage of Catholics across the country who do join and pay dues to the Newman Clubs is not particularly high—about one out of five Catholic students.” At least in this moment of history, however, participation in religious groups is not a satisfactory index of the religious interests or needs of the university student.

Brief Survey of Research

A study at Cornell conducted by Goldsen et al. reported that 95 percent of the students said they had some kind of belief in God or a Supreme Being. Most also reported “a need to believe in some sort of religious faith or philosophy”; McConnell and Heist point out, however, that the intensity of religious commitment reported in this study is rather low.

A longitudinal study of recipients of Merit Scholarships by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley indicates “a decreasing need for religious faith, especially among men, and a lessened belief that colleges should teach religious values. Changes appear to be related both to academic major and to the sex of the respondents.” In the same article, the authors call for additional research on changes in religious values “which are at best poorly understood in varying cultural contexts.”

The time-honored proposition that college experience is the occasion for far-reaching changes in the attitudinal and valutational patterns of young people was effectively challenged by Jacob’s study, Changing Values in College. With respect to religion, he noted that while students express a need for religion, it is not an operating guide for decisions in everyday life. The impressive new compilation by Feldman and Newcomb, The Impact of College on Students, reports some of the research compiled on the religion of college students. Although only eight studies are listed to document the description in Volume I, a number of others are summarized in Volume II. Feldman and Newcomb note that they generally find more change in values than Jacobs reported in 1957.

After noting the decline of religious values relative to other values reported in the Allport study (1948), Feldman and Newcomb note that the changes pointed to in other studies seem to indicate less orthodoxy and less favor toward religious institutions but conclude that the statistical data indicating such trends are not significant. Further analysis by the authors, however, points to their most important discovery: Small net changes conceal a much more substantial internal shifting, leading to the conclusion that religious change during college is believed by students to be widespread.

In nine other studies related to moral and attitudinal change, the authors found stronger evidence of trends toward more liberal and consistent patterns.
Finally, they cite the Ferman study at Cornell (1966) to indicate that change in the direction of religious skepticism was highest among Jewish students, lowest among Catholics; Protestants took second place.\footnote{30}

Hoge's doctoral dissertation, "College Students' Religion: A Study of Trends in Attitudes and Behavior,"\footnote{30} broke significant new ground in its research. As part of that study, he replicated studies in 12 colleges and universities that had given data on students over a period of five decades. These data show a periodic ebb and flow of factors such as autonomy and individualism, politicization and liberalism.\footnote{31} He concludes that this ebb and flow of student religious attitudes cannot be tied just to college experience, intergenerational conflict, or urbanization or economic experience; it is positively correlated with the general pattern of American society which in turn is seen to vary with threats to cherished values, or desire for change, or importance of private family life.\footnote{32}

Hoge stresses the importance of the economy of commitments: Within a relatively fixed universe there is variation of priority. Traditional religious commitments therefore compete with other institutionalized (e.g., political) commitments. He acknowledges a variety of attempts to identify religion with ultimate commitment and noninstitutionalized loyalties but is obliged to maintain the traditional categories (in which religion is equated with the traditional dogma, liturgy, scripture, and institutions) in order to compare current data with the data of earlier studies.

Demerath and Lutterman's extensive study, \textit{Campus Religion and Student Values: Radical Rhetoric and Traditional Reality}, examined a population of 1,141 members of religious groups and 1,288 students of a general sample at the University of Wisconsin.\footnote{33} Substantial differences on theological issues were discovered among the 15 organized groups studied. When compared to the general sample, those in religious groups appeared more conservative on political and university issues, less intellectual, and more happily adjusted to the social life on campus. The total group of ministries is reaching a very small segment, and neither religious groups nor college life in general seems to have much impact on student values.\footnote{34} The radical stance of campus ministers \textit{vis-à-vis} political or campus issues has not transferred to the constituency.\footnote{35} The authors identify a trend over the four years of college toward a decline in "orthodoxy and ritual compliance," but the decline is not severe.\footnote{36}

This sobering analysis of the Wisconsin scene reflects the hunches of a good many campus ministers that the present student generation is not very enthusiastic about what they see in institutionalized ministries.

\section*{Definitions of Religion}

Certainly one of the most difficult aspects of the problem lies in defining religion. Belief in God, membership and participation in church or synagogue, or commitment to certain moral or ethical principles are in some ways symptomatic but often frankly misleading. Philosopher of religion Edgar S. Brightman proposed that religion was belief in a source of values, cultic practice in relation to that belief, and acceptance of moral obligations resulting from such belief.\footnote{37} Tillich says at one point in his systematic theology: "Religion is not only a function of life; it is also the place where life receives the conqueror of the ambiguities of life, the divine Spirit."\footnote{38} Tillich characteristically referred to God as "the ground of being." Hocking said that religion was the principle of wholeness in life.\footnote{39} The variety of definitions could be extended indefinitely.\footnote{40}

From the examples cited above, however, the nature of religion expressed by philosophers and theologians appears to be at considerable odds with religious behavior or attitudes expressed by the casual respondent. A thoughtful and sensitive man's stance in relation to what he believes to be the ultimate source (or ground) of value or to what gives a sense of wholeness and integrity to his life may be quite different from what he says when asked his religion or how often he goes to church.

Both among persons in the historic institutions of religion and among those who would not ordinarily define their ultimate loyalty in classical religious terms, the facts of individual differences point to the complexity of factors inside the traditions or inside the loyalties that are especially significant. At least six factors indicative of individual differences can be cited:

1. In some individuals and groups the \textit{conceptual} or \textit{rational factor} is dominant, and, therefore, a set of ideas (doctrine or dogma) is most significant. Tillich noted that the experience of the divine was one in which the ambiguities of life were transcended. In a prescientific era, rational theology could claim to achieve that kind of certainty, or it might defer to revelation at crucial points. The rational man of the present age finds it much more difficult either to achieve certainty or to defer honestly; the contemporary age is one of tentativeness and ambiguity. It is more existential than metaphysical.

2. For others, the obligation to \textit{culvic practice} (prayer, Bible-reading, confession, mass) is the key
to their religious positions. Contrastingly, realistic, functional, direct action is the preeminent form of acting-out in our society. Both the symbolic pageness of formal religion and the passive/meditative roles of pietism are by and large strange to the modern idiom. Neither the classical oratorios nor the drama of the mass is now as revelatory of the *mysterium tremendum*, the numinous holy, as both apparently were in other times. Whatever else it was, the "death of God" controversy was testimony to the ineffectiveness of the customary channels of confronting the holy.

3. In mature societies, the religious man may find his identity in a particular lifestyle (e.g., Puritan) or cultural tradition (e.g., certain types of Judaism) with or without specific transcendental or theological references. Ideologies and cultural traditions (the "American way of life") have emerged to compensate for the decline of the liturgies, but their inadequacy precisely at the points of parochialism and ambiguity sets them at odds with the criteria of universality and reconciliation.

4. For still others, religious vitality stems from an intensive, subjective, experienced commitment of the will (conversion) or the outbreak of enthusiasm accomplished in the midst of considerable emotional ferment. American society is extraordinarily "uplift" about its rejection or acceptance of emotion. Since Freud's revelations in psychiatry, few intelligent people can trust their fate as persons to a staged, intense emotional experience—which is what the old-time religious revival certainly was. In spite of certain permissive stances with respect to children, the whole educational establishment (along with the community in general) is firmly arrayed against the involvement or expression of emotions. School spirit is ridiculed; patriotic fervor is embarrassingly gauche. The intimate ties of family life and community involvement have been seriously eroded by an urbanized and highly mobile society. The affectional life of many of our people is arid, sterile, obstructed, frustrated.

5. There are a good many who would define their own religious gestalt primarily as their dedication to certain values or ethical ideals. Where other religious characteristics have declined, moral fervor has been renewed and revitalized in this decade. The crusades for human rights, justice, human dignity, and peace all testify to a new ethical concern whose religious heritage has been demonstrated again and again in the thick of civil rights demonstrations, Peace Corps recruitment, or anti-war protest.

6. For still others, the fellowship of a caring and supportive community is the most important aspect of their religious experience. As irrelevant as much of the substance of the life of churches sometimes has become, the redeeming factor has been (again sometimes) a sense of intimate fellowship amid a very impersonal and utilitarian set of relationships. The activists referred to above have always rediscovered that the by-product of strong mutual commitment to high causes is a wonderfully deep relationship with one's fellows.

In few persons, apparently, does any one of these aspects of religious life come pure or stand for long in isolation. (Hocking's insight about religion as the principle of wholeness seems to acquire empirical validation in this respect.) Nor is there necessarily any permanent categorization: The emotional teenager may become a doctrinaire rationalist in middle age. For many, however, one or the other of these factors stands at the focal point, with the others in various combinations toward the periphery. Religion, or its functional equivalents, is important to make men more fully human and life more abundant, but a viable religious enterprise is exceedingly difficult, complex, and delicate in our age. (The claims inherent in that contention offer a challenge worthy of the serious attention of the community of scholars in the university.)

Only when one acknowledges the varieties of religious experience and understanding (all too briefly and incompletely referred to above) does he sense the complexity and scope of attempting to deal with the religious needs and interests of students in American colleges. Except for explicit personal private devotions or cultic observance, there is no universal acceptance of any of the six limited areas of human experience distinctively as being religious. But wherever one's central values are at stake, or one's integrity as a person threatened, the loyalty of one's spirit compromised—at that point is his religion in jeopardy. This is not to say that every experience or every life problem is a religious experience; at least theoretically, however, any crucial experience may be also a religious experience in the life of that individual. As in so many similar situations, the great regularities and rhythms of life pose critical problems in death, justice, choosing a vocation, a mate, etc.; these common critical situations mark at least clusters of religious experiences of any population.

**Religion and the Developmental Life Tasks of Students**

Inasmuch as the college and university years are especially significant points for life-determining choices, one would have to acknowledge that, from
the perspective of this study, these years are full of potential and actual religious interests and needs:

1. The quest for a sense of unity in the intellectual life.
2. The search for a personal identity.
3. The choice of an occupation in which life goals are achieved.
4. The selection of a life purpose, vocation, or lifestyle.
5. The choice of a mate.
6. The achievement of a discipline that provides satisfaction, accomplishment, and mastery.
7. The resolution of judgments on justice, freedom, and human rights, etc.
8. The discovery of a community of trust and intimacy.
9. Access to a transcendent perspective—universal in time and space and inclusive of all peoples.
10. Seeking a concept of reality that includes self-acceptance and openness toward the future.
11. Engaging in the social process as a responsible change agent.

The fragmentation of the disciplines of academia and the specialization of the bureaus and departments of student services make it almost impossible for the contemporary university to deal with students as whole persons. This fragmentation and specialization make it extraordinarily difficult for a college or university experience to contribute to students' developing a mature and adequate religion. From the basis on which this monograph has developed, the contention at this point must be clear: The person who fails to find his principle of wholeness or ultimate loyalty is handicapped. The depersonalized university that rarely deals with the whole person (the comprehensive catalog of services merely covers up the fact that at each contact point the individual is treated from a specialist point of view) contributes to the dissolution of his religion and contributes to his not reaching his potential as a human being.

A common observation that the college student is of the age group that has the least involvement in organized religious communities does not impair the parallel observation that he is engaged in reappraisal and restless search for guidelines toward a religious position. Nor does the present withdrawal of the young adult from religious institutions necessarily bode ill for the future of those institutions; this withdrawal has been typical of American youth for at least half a century. However, with urbanization, enormous expansion of college populations, varied standards of performance with accompanying pressures and strains, and specialization and fragmentation reaching new proportions during the past decade, there has certainly been an intensification of alienation, hostility, and conspiratorial attributions that may be symptomatic of a new, critical level in the erosion of functional religion for this generation. The extensive studies of Vassar women are striking at this point:

A consistent trend is for seniors to be higher than freshmen on the following scales [from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory]: Hypochondriasis, Depression, Hysteria, Psychopathic Deviate, Schizophrenia, and Mania. . . . In short, seniors subscribed more frequently than freshmen to statements indicating psychological or physical disturbances and instability.41

In this same chapter the authors note the variety of college climates, student pre-college experiences, and differentiated subcultures in major institutions and conclude that all too little is known about the effects of various combinations of environments. The hints that have come from the little research available and current student unrest and disaffection would seem to underline the plea for prompt additional studies and the need to use the results of such studies to develop models of healthy environments for certain major groups of students.

We have been advancing the notion that religion becomes functional with students in the university as they struggle to systematize their value claims, integrate their life styles, and achieve a sense of wholeness, purpose, and integrity in their lives. The religious needs of students and other members of the academic community are substantially important and persistent. Evidence that conscious religious interest is reported declining by students does not invalidate that claim. Part of the decline is attributable to the reappraisal of life commitments that characterizes the young adult in our society. Part of the decline may be credited to the gap between churches and pietist concepts of religion and the vital quest in the psyche of individuals. But there is also a strong presumption that the educational experience and the cultural context at this period of history combine to deprecate, erode, and frustrate the vital attempt of youth to find a sense of purpose, a cause to serve, and an identity with integrity. There is reason to believe that the values of neutrality and objectivity have been used not to liberate from prejudice or narrow partisanship but to obstruct and attack those high commitments that make life more humane. To whatever degree the latter has been the case—and especially in light of the obvious alienation, hostility and unreasonably passionate explosions among students—the system needs reformation. A responsible university concerned for the well-being of whole persons within the academic community must provide in some reasonable fashion for what has been defined herein as religion.

If we were able to agree that the morale of community (academic or otherwise), its values and
ethical commitments, and the quality of the personhood of the constituents were bound up with (indeed, part and parcel of) the religious life of the community, then, indeed, there would be a new and broader effort to improve our performance in this respect. Both the defensiveness of religious forces who have often claimed sole jurisdiction and the irresponsibility of other forces on campus who attempt to deny basic human need in this area must share the blame for the current predicament. A dialog between the two must be of critical priority. As just one obvious example, the guilt between the American College Personnel Association and the National Campus Ministry Association ought to be promptly reduced.

Reducing the gap between professional societies is not merely (nor even primarily) an organizational question. Any such attempt involves a careful inquiry into a possible criterion for the purpose of the respective associations. While that may be difficult enough (even given an ultimate concern for human growth), the real distinctions between the social science-oriented society for student personnel workers and the humanistically oriented campus ministers pose the most difficult barriers to communication. It is in methodology that the concerns of professionals are identified and by the criteria of effectiveness that strategies are created. In these methodological criteria there are few points of common acceptance.
CHAPTER 3

Serving the Religious Needs and Interests of Students

Discharging the responsibility for providing for the religious needs of college and university students is, understandably, a complex undertaking. In the first place, while extremely rigid, passionately held exclusivist claims about religion have been tempered, they have not died out completely. A watchful guard, therefore, is kept against any group or position being favored above another. Attempts to delegate responsibility through "chosen instruments" have had only limited and local success in recent years.42

When the Student YMCA and YWCA had a virtual monopoly in the field, they could and did address their programs and services to the whole campus. In doing a survey for the University of Wisconsin YMCA, for example, this author found that:

In the history of the YMCA, the pioneer religious agency on the campus of the University, there have been important contributions to University life which were originated by the YMCA and later taken up by the administration itself.
1. The YMCA was the site of the first Men's Union.
2. The YMCA operated the first mens' dormitory and first cafeteria on the campus.
3. The YMCA initiated the Student Housing Directory and the Student Employment Bureau.
4. The YMCA developed the idea of freshman orientation programs.
5. The YMCA stimulated the Good Will Fund.
6. The YMCA did the pioneer work in personal counseling, how-to-study programs, etc.43

The recognition by churches that substantial numbers of their young people were attending public universities instead of church-related colleges resulted in the initiation (beginning about 1900 but especially after World War I) of many denominationally sponsored campus ministries.44 By and large these campus ministries unabashedly attempted to maintain the denominational identifications and loyalties of their students. Undoubtedly, pastoral services to students and the range of student participation were expanded. At the same time, proliferation of groups and competition for attention did not contribute to concern for the condition of the campus as a whole and tended to draw distinctions between those in different organized groups, and between those who belonged to any such group and those who did not. In the collegiate culture of the first decades of the century, being identified with student activity groups was the "in" thing.

During the post-World War II period, however, when academic and vocational pressures increased, collegiate culture declined and the tendency for students to stand apart from organizational commitments emerged. Religious services identified with church loyalties came to be addressed to progressively smaller circles. (Needless to say, addressing the "in" group was contrary to the principle and intent that supported the various ministries, but it took many years for them to acknowledge that their fragmented approach to the campus undercut their aims.) One must also report that characteristic of the limited circles of the church groups was an intensive and persistent attempt to expand the circle and break down the fences, especially with respect to racial and national origin and to economic class. In the early 1950's the emergence of a dynamic ecumenical movement broke through some of the barriers separating these groups but did not break through what separated those who were willing to make a conscious commitment to a religious group on campus from those who were exploring new commitments or reassessing old ones.

Both the increasing priority given to academic work and the tendency to restrict religious ministries to those in religious activity groups helped to increase the attractiveness of more open-ended alternatives.
One of the earliest attempts at providing a ministry to meet the needs of the college constituency was the appointment of chaplains. Naturally this option was open almost exclusively to church-related or private colleges—not to state-supported institutions. The college chaplain at an institution with a relatively homogeneous religious population had ready access to the religious life of the campus; the chaplain on the typically diverse and cosmopolitan campus had a more difficult task. In the latter case, both worship and pastoral care were heavily dependent upon the personality of the individual chaplain; such a chaplain often found his teaching role his best access to a broad section of the campus. While growing ecumenical spirit has enabled the chaplain to serve a diverse constituency, obviously the anti-establishment mood of recent years has tended to classify the college-employed chaplain with the “enemy”—the administration. Nevertheless, the college and university chaplaincy represents a strong effort in American higher education to provide religious leadership and counsel to the whole campus, not just to a particular segment.

A second alternative to emerge was the teaching of religion. In a field where it is difficult to make accurate observations, there appears to be little doubt that the most rapidly growing phase of religion on campus in the last decade has been the introduction of credit courses in religion into the regular curriculum. Only slowly did faculties realize that religious tradition, history, and theories could be taught while adhering to the same criteria of scholarship observed in the other humanities. Discrimination against religious tradition and experience ran counter to the university’s claim of being inclusive in its scope of attention. A group of scholars such as Niebuhr, Tillich, Maritain, and Buber challenged fellow scholars to face the gaps in their fields of inquiry and to face the religious dimensions of the crises of human events in the twentieth century. Finally, the rigid position that constitutional provision against an establishment of religion prohibited consideration of religion in a state university was also slowly reassessed and found to be an excessive interpretation of the separation intended. For at least these reasons, the teaching of religion has become (in the stricter organizational sense) academically respectable in the universities for the first time in American history. Though many of the faculty would deplore the implication, the teaching of religion affords an opportunity to examine the history, tradition, and claims of religion without being exhorted to make a personal decision about nor an organizational commitment to a religious activity group on campus.

A third major alternative to the confinement of religious activities resulted from the groups of newly activist students emerging from the civil rights, poverty, campus protest, and Vietnam issues. While major attention of religious leadership in the 50’s had been on faith and learning issues and on an educational approach to ministry in general, that attention shifted toward activist, nonconformist challenges to the status quo in the 60’s. Seldom is any major issue of public life dressed in clearly religious or nonreligious garb. Notable exceptions are the dramatic pageantries of grief following the assassinations of John and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr. But it would be reckless to ignore the religious aspects or the religious leaders who helped shape the way in which civil rights, Vietnam, the war against poverty, and, indeed, the demands to reform the universities have been defined and pursued. The openness and ambiguity of the relation of religious commitment to social justice (along with the fascinating opportunity to engage in dialog with conscientious and highly motivated persons outside the churches) drew many campus ministers away from preoccupation with those inside the fold and toward the new activists.

One of the nagging and persistent problems inside religious communities is the poor showing churchmen make (even in attitude) with respect to public policies that seem to be directly drawn from religious ethics. For example, Harshorne and May discovered in their classic study in 1928 that the peer group had a much greater influence on behavior in such matters as cheating and stealing than did Sunday School. As a result, churches attempted to arrange pupils in more natural peer groupings rather than in artificial classroom groupings. When Gordon Allport made his study of race, he discovered that neither church membership nor participation was significantly correlated with acceptance of persons of color. Alfred Hero has studied the churches and foreign affairs and he, too, finds no substantial correlation between religion and concern for peoples of other lands. At worst, such gaps have been called hypocrisy; at best they indicate a serious, if not tragic, failure to transfer learning from the basic ethical positions of religious groups to public affairs. The possibility for exploring new media to close the gap between ethical precept and ethical behavior encouraged campus ministers to become involved in student activist movements.

After a long, quiet era, the activist generation was an exciting and heady change. The judgment of the New Left on the social ills of our times was often correct, and their moral passion usually far exceeded that of typical academic or church types.
The fact that there was a new and valid morality here, though, quickly became entangled with disdain for aspects of conventional morality which also had continuing validity and with a kind of idolatrous euphoria that seemed to insist that the New Left could do no wrong. Here is where the action is; God is where the action is; ergo, the New Left is the New Church. Not all campus ministers chose this way to exercise their ministry, of course, and some who identified with the activist movements were more able to avoid their idolatries than others. But after all is said and done there was (and is) a valid and legitimate reason for religious leaders from the Judeo-Christian tradition to support much of what the New Left was attempting, on or off campus. They have found it difficult to maintain communications with the more traditional church constituencies and now, after a few years, this focus of ministry is again becoming isolated from large segments of the campus or community. This would seem to indicate that ministries focused on public issues can continue to minister to a broad spectrum of the campus only if the issues keep changing and keep drawing together different constellations of persons; otherwise, the righteous rebels distill into a new, narrow clique.

Campus ministries have tended to be just as faddish as campus styles in America. They have swung wildly from one focus to another, and any one focus has a life expectancy of about five years. In a way, this inconsistency and slavish conformity to campus styles is not unexpected; widespread modification of academia has been the rule in the past 40 years. One has only to look at what happened to campuses through depression, World War II, cold war, the Sputnik impetus to technological research, the increased demand for college education, etc., to recognize that campus ministries had to change just to keep up with the volatile character of the colleges and universities.

It is also true that one of the continuing difficulties is the uncertainty and anxiety relating to the definition and function of religion in modern society. The ferment within many local community churches is almost as faddish and discontinuous as it is in campus religious groups. But it is also true that one of the probable indices of the instability of campus professional religious services is the failure to stem the parading turnover of personnel in this field. Since World War II, the typical minister or priest spends three to five years in campus ministry positions and then moves on to local churches or into church bureaucracies.

The discussion in this section indicates the fragility of attempts to characterize in operational terms the functions of religious ministry on campus.

In some respects, the variety overwhelms the helpfulness of classification. But if one remembers the enormously broad concept of the religious dimension of life for the young adult, the problem is no surprise.

From a consultation on the church’s ministry in higher education held at Michigan State University in 1964, three illustrative sets of functions may be cited. Parker Rossman, Yale Divinity School, provided the first two. First, he noted the different styles campus ministry has taken across the country:

- The chaplain who conducts chapel services under official sponsorship of the college.
- The youth activities director of the college town church.
- The teacher of Bible or religion courses, credit or noncredit.
- The YMCA secretary, essentially a volunteer group worker.
- The pastor of an essentially student or student-faculty congregation.
- The college-employed director of religious activities.
- The denominational foundation director.
- The specialized minister to faculty, graduate students, foreign students, or to a medical school.
- The director of a residential community, or “Christian Faith and Life Community,” etc.

This list of types of approaches to the campus suggests the different philosophies of work involved in the variety of experimental ministries undertaken by religious groups in higher education. Rossman briefly noted seven types of philosophies:

- The voluntary association, often centered in social action.
- The disciplined “covenant community,” sometimes residential.
- The ecumenical council on campus.
- The team ministry, somewhat informed by experiments like the East Harlem Protestant Parish.
- The new institutes and academies, suggested by the Evangelical Academies of Germany and the Ecumenical Institute.
- The student church, like the Missouri Synod Lutheran pattern of organizing a congregation of students within the university.
- The denominational foundation.

Lester L. Dobyns, Director, Association for Ecumenical Ministries, Ann Arbor, described the situation very differently:

Mr. Dobyns suggested four functions or modes of ministry. The first three are designated by biblical terms. “Didache” is the church exercising its pastoral and teaching responsibilities for its members. This function includes the concern for worship and developing the common life of the faithful. The second is “kerygmatic” as the church exercises its mission toward the world. This mode understands “the gospel as the contribution of the church to the university.” The third is the “diaconate.” This is the role of the church as the servant in and to the
university. It is found in the desire of the church to be identified with all areas of human need discovered in the life of the university. The fourth function is the direction of "incarnational and sacramental theology" which understands the university as an important part of the created and redeemed world. "It is preoccupied with the secular and seeks to focus upon what is happening in that place. It seeks to listen and to understand the issues, problems and questions that are central to the life of the university. It attempts to relate the insights of the Christian faith in the language and 'life style' of the university itself."49

For a statement of Jewish perspective on the functions of B'nai B'rith Hillel we summarize the discussion by Albert Jospe in his *Judaism on the Campus*.50

He quotes Benjamin Frankel, who organized the first Hillel Foundation at the University of Illinois in 1928, setting forth the following original objectives:

1. To seek to give the education and the contacts necessary for interesting the college youth in Judaism.
2. To send back to the communities more intelligent, better equipped, spiritually finer Jews and Jewesses.
3. To work through the method of student-planned activities.
4. To include all theological and ideological branches of Judaism.
5. To provide permanent professional direction.
6. The leaders should be rabbis.51

Jospe indicates that these original objectives have been broadened to include the following: programs that appeal both to the intellectuals and the non-intellectuals on campus; include community welfare projects; provide opportunity for warm, friendly, personal relationships; provide opportunity for interfaith and intergroup participation; and that are concerned not only with training for future responsibility but also with present situations on campus.52

Jospe affirms the centrality of the religious task of Hillel 53 and its simultaneous concern "to guide and encourage the Jewish student to intensify his involvement and informed participation in Jewish life in every possible way and area."54 He also notes that while responsible participation is sought, Hillel is not a Jewish student movement; it is "maintained by the adult community for Jewish students. . . . It is the adult community that defines the nature and purposes of the agency, appoints its professional leadership, and determines its educational, administrative and fiscal policies. Nor do students have the power to establish or abolish a Hillel Foundation."55

Finally (for our purposes), Jospe rejects standardized uniformity of program and affirms the principle of flexibility of program and structure in the particular college.56

A representative Roman Catholic position begins:

Catholics are expected to attend Catholic schools—grade, high school, and college—unless they can present a good reason for not doing so. They have the strictest obligation in conscience to acquire a Catholic education—no matter what institution they attend.57

To provide for the spiritual development of Catholics on non-Catholic campuses, the Newman Club Federation has long been the primary agency of ministry.58 This purpose of "spiritual development" is described by Whalen, addressing himself to prospective students in this way:

Catholics at the larger state universities can build their personal spiritual programs around a complete schedule of religious, educational, cultural, and social activities sponsored by the Catholic student center or Newman Club. It will, however, be up to you alone to decide if you will avail yourself of daily Mass, confessions, rosary devotions, Lenten Stations of the Cross, special lectures, credit or non-credit courses.59

Whether the kinds of services, programs, personnel, and facilities furnished by churches and synagogues, or by colleges themselves have effectively served the real interests and needs of college students is impossible to determine in any general way. On the other hand, testimonials abound from participants, from church officials, and from college faculty and administrators asserting that persons have found their sense of identity and purpose in life; have been trained for leadership in school, church, and society; have received crucial counsel; have pioneered important social service; and have discovered more profound worship and more responsible ethic, etc. The observation often has been made that one who sees a body such as the World Council of Churches in Assembly is struck by the large number who are alumni of various student Christian movements.

Even this brief sketch indicates that significant progress has been made in campus ministries so that the teaching of religion is at the highest level of qualitative presentation and of popular participation at any time in history; that the moral and ethical concerns about justice and dignity and humaneness have been freed from the special jurisdiction of church groups and are now highly visible and audible in general university debate; that both chaplains and religiously dedicated students are given wider scope for their concerns than the little club or foundation group to which they were often confined; and that there is a new openness about scholarly criteria which admits the possibility of a humanistic value in place of a mathematically objective model.
CHAPTER 4

Religious Life and Student Personnel Services

In what is probably still a basic document in the field—The Student Personnel Point of View—\( \text{60} \)—the basic objectives of student personnel work were seen as helping the student to:

1. Achieve orientation to his college environment.
2. Succeed in his studies.
3. Find satisfactory living facilities.
4. Achieve a sense of belonging to the college.
5. Learn balanced use of his physical capacities.
6. Progressively understand himself.
7. Understand and use his emotions.
8. Develop lively and significant interests.
9. Achieve understanding and control of his financial resources.
10. Progress toward appropriate vocational goals.
11. Develop individuality and responsibility.
12. Discover ethical and spiritual meaning in life.
13. Learn to live with others.
14. Progress toward satisfying and socially acceptable sexual adjustments.
15. Prepare for satisfying, constructive post-college activity.

The philosophy represented in such a list is highly functional and pragmatic, apparently assuming fairly clear models of socialization and aiming to equip students with understanding, attitudes, and skills to progress toward responsible and mature autonomy. Now 20 years later, the neutral, passive, adjective tone of these objectives is strikingly apparent. The factors that comprise a sense of healthy identity (e.g., ideology, sense of mastery, productive involvement in the culture) are scarcely hinted. In the understanding of the years just after World War II (when this declaration was prepared), the provision for "ethical spiritual meaning" was assumed to be delegated to chaplains and institutions of religion because (a) the church-state separation issue prevented any civic university from direct involvement in religion; and (b) the model for academic respectability was the objective matter-of-fact; vital and urgent issues of will or morality or motivation were irrelevant to the academic mission. In such a context, religious counselors could then be coordinated administratively, but the substance of their 'gospel' (i.e., a style of life that chose models of identity and vocation, of ideology and integration) was carefully excluded from the university proper.

E. G. Williamson

Typical of the post-World War II era, Williamson's primary reference to religious programs is the following:

Staff officers coordinate and stimulate interfaith programs and various denominational religious programs which are not legally a part of the institution but are of great importance in the total development of individual students.\(^ \text{62} \)

Williamson fervently pleads for an anthropological approach to the student in higher education that would overcome the apparent lack of intellectual character in the extracurricular activities.\(^ \text{63} \) He never does, however, embrace religion as a partner or (perhaps a better word) as a dimension of operation (see note below).\(^ \text{64} \) His main concern is to raise the intellectual level of the programs and projects of the student personnel offices. The measure of that task is reflected in Williamson's comment that the obligation to "become somewhat competent in

NOTE: Williamson was instrumental in having a Coordinator of Religious Activities appointed on his staff at the University of Minnesota. In the course of national conferences held at Minnesota on "Religion in the State University," it was discovered that there was more legal flexibility \( \text{vis-à-vis} \) religion than most state universities perceived. Furthermore, the insight was registered that one did not escape a value system by refusing to teach or recognize religion; one only substituted a secular value system. Far from achieving neutrality, one taught a negative judgment about the validity and relevance of religion. Cf. Allen, H., Religion and the state university. 1950.
suggesting and initiating intellectual activity... perhaps will dislocate temporarily some workers, since they had not anticipated, or even imagined, that they had such a role to play.”

In historical perspective it is relatively easy to discern that the church-state issue and the cult of objectivity as a scholarly criterion effectively collaborated to veto consideration of religious data and experience in higher education—particularly in the state universities. Contrary to their own professed criterion of including all the evidence, the aggressively secular university censoriously excluded religious experience but assigned it a marginal administrative place to be managed by institutional coordination.

This hang-up in state-supported higher education has been unravelled somewhat in the last decade by the rapid expansion of departments of religion in state-supported schools. A decline in the rule of objectivity made it more possible to meet the need expressed by Esther Lloyd-Jones and Margaret Smith in 1938 for:

... reappraising and reaffirming the intellectual and philosophical basis of religion, for emphasizing the relation of religion to ethical action... for emphasizing the place of religion in government, citizenship and education, and for worship and disciplines expressive of new concepts and new social practices in religion.

Dugald S. Arbuckle

In contrast to Williamson’s departmentalized coordination, Arbuckle took Lloyd-Jones and Smith seriously and, in his book Student Personnel Services in Higher Education, began the task of spelling out the implications of integrating religious services into the universe of student personnel administration.

Arbuckle clearly affirms that “religion is an important factor in the lives of many students, and it cannot be ignored as if it did not exist.” This acknowledged validity is typical of Arbuckle’s gingersly defensive treatment of religion. He constantly warns against dogmatism, conversionist proselytizing, indoctrination, and elements of compulsion in religious programs. He says:

Religion is a controversial issue, but it is controversial only because of the immaturity and the inability of man to live by his own religion. Religion can be rational and it can be taught in a rational and intellectual manner. Whether faith is rational is another matter, and it is extremely difficult to present a faith in an intellectual manner.

Arbuckle traces the secularization of the American college and reports that in his opinion secularization reached its peak around World War I. Religious program has a valid place because of its significance in the lives of persons and its relation to character and morals, but it probably cannot be justified in terms of the expressed interests of students. Religion has a part to play as the college helps the students find meaning for their lives, understanding of various faith traditions, and clarification of their philosophies of life.

Organized religious programs are criticized severely for their assumption that they have the answers in their own dogma. Arbuckle is so critical of chapel that he misreports Cuninggim’s study (The College Seeks Religion) and then adds, “There is no indication here, of course, of the extent to which many of these ‘chapels’ are more than a handy place to make announcements.” While urging interfaith understanding and interfaith activities he charges that too often denominational programs are weak and divisive.

Arbuckle includes a section on the teaching of religion. (In the preceding chapter, he had stated his case for a college teacher not only being a subject-matter specialist, but also a person with an orientation to assist the student in achieving maturity.) After the usual reservations against biased moralism, he urges that students should confront the strength of conviction in other traditions, not merely intellectual descriptions of them. “The religion instructor needs to be a combination of a religion scholar, a psychologist, and a teacher.”

Arbuckle’s discussion of religious counseling leads him to a detailed consideration of whether counseling imposes a belief system and is, hence, judgmental toward the client, or whether the religious counselor can also be a client-centered counselor. He concludes that there is in the Judeo-Christian doctrine of acceptance of others a point of beginning in religious counseling that recognizes the relative autonomy of the client and the necessity for internal strengthening of the client’s ability to make the decisions and choices for his own life. That acceptance does not imply isolation from the social context; nor does it endorse self-centeredness in the client; nor does the value system of the counselor become irrelevant to the dialog. He points out that the counselor’s concept of God is crucial: The God of wrath and vengeance is of little use in the counseling situation, but... on the other hand, there are millions of happy people, Christians and non-Christians, who feel that they too know God, but One who is a much gentler, a much more loving, a much humbler, and a more stable God. For people who feel that they have lived with such a God, the process of client-centered therapy is very much akin to the process by means of which we may come to live a more godly life.
When he shifts to discussing administration, Ar- buckle notes that the system will be different ac- cording to the kind of college and who has charge of the personnel program. He contends that the re- ligious life program should be integrated into the student personnel program, urges the appointment of professional leadership, insists that religious workers cooperate, and demands that substantial responsibility be left in the hands of students.76

Arbleckle acknowledges that the “hard-headed businessman” will have difficulty justifying the exist- ence of this office “in a scientifically empirical man- ner.”76 Thus, the difficulty in funding religious leadership.

Along with a number of others in student per- sonnel, academic teaching, and religious circles, Arbbiekle says that a university dominated almost exclusively by fact-collection and dissemination would quickly become an impersonal factory. Long before Berkeley and Columbia, these people were calling for the teaching faculty to renew their concern for students as persons and for student personnel staff to begin to expose themselves to the controversial value claims of culture, life style, philosophy, and religion. They were groping vaguely for ways to transcend the impersonal cult of objectivity; they understood that the good life must be envisioned whole. Somehow both the aca- demic and the extracurricular aspects of higher education had to come clear in this vision.

They saw religion as a necessary and valuable potential ally in the cause but were discouraged by the unhappy record of divisiveness, obscurantism, and institutional self-interest so often displayed by organized religion.

Kate H. Mueller

By the time Mueller produced her text,77 the situation in American higher education had changed enormously from that of the early 50’s: The wooden separation of church and state had relaxed; the post-Sputnik age was centering heavily on qualita- tive academic performance; college registration set new records each year; research and consultant grants infused a new entrepreneurship, detachment, and affluence among research-minded faculty.

In the new sophistication, Mueller stated objec- tives for student personnel at the university level in more philosophical terms: (a) preserving, transmit- ting, and enriching the culture; (b) developing all aspects of the personality; (c) training for citi- zenship; and (d) training for leadership.78

The validity of religion on campus is grounded in the need of the young adult for “an intellectually tenable value structure for personal and social liv-
agencies to initiate and staff religious program operations. Increasingly, Mueller notes, even the state campuses are providing for teaching of religion. In summary, universities have accepted the responsibility of: (a) confirming students in their faith; (b) sensitizing students to the different religious traditions of others; and (c) nurturing a positive and missionary spirit and developing acceptable social methods.

Along with this positive statement of religious contributions and university responsibilities, Mueller acknowledges some problems in the general rubrics of administration and content.

The problems she lists under administration are: coordination of a complex variety of traditions and convictions, recruitment and appointment of adequately prepared staff and selection of qualified student leaders, and difficulties in financing college religious programs.

With respect to content, Mueller pleads for balance among intellectual, social, action, and worship aspects of programming. She warns against expedient promoters of popular fads (e.g., peace of mind or popular success) which ignore the "great, historical, central theme" of religion.

When she turns to the role of the student personnel worker in relation to religion, Mueller makes three general points:

1. "The personnel administrator cannot afford to be religiously illiterate because there are too many points in the life problems of young adults where religious insight on the part of the counselor will be needed to understand adequately the dynamics of the situation or at least where such insight on the part of the counselor could contribute to the achievement of growth on the part of the client."

2. The personnel administrator needs to be able to disentangle the religious, psychological, and sociological languages of discourse. The point is not elaborated clearly, but the implication seems to be that the language appropriate to the personnel professional is the lay language of psychology and sociology, though the value and ethical import may be similar or even exactly the same as religious language.

3. Mueller is reserved in endorsing a single kind of counseling (compared with Arbuckle's client-centered approach). She quotes approvingly from Goodwin Watson on the feasibility of sharing the experience of the counselor in the interview, concluding with, "On the pretense that we are making no moral choice, we would actually have made a very debatable one." The admission of the possibility of engaging the counselor and the counselor's experience in the client's quest for identity and value realization seems to be gaining acceptance, possibly because, in an age unhappy with impersonality, engagement is seen as evidence of the counselor's readiness to enter the dialog with an investment of himself. But such an engagement suffers the complications of reopening all the difficult questions of authenticity, respect, and qualitative judgment in the new context.

Controversy around both the promise and the unhappiness of religion in the university intensified in the late 60's. Religious figures and groups who gave leadership in civil rights and peace movements helped mobilize the moral conscience on campuses often with university staff and faculty support. Derivative confrontations and other tactics proved later to be deeply divisive of university stability and seriously strained relationships between the erstwhile allies. When there were eruptions against the university itself in the name of student power or in support of the charge that the university was implicated by the Establishment, the alliance of church and university was further strained. The most poignant soul-searching occurred among those who had sought so long to find common cause between the university (represented in this case by student personnel staff) and the church (represented by church-appointed chaplains). The last two decades, then, have shifted from wary caution about divisive, sectarian proselytism but have revealed new areas in which the relationship of university and church is far from completely harmonious.

Comment on Other Sources

The tendency to neglect religious ministries in discussions of the student personnel field is exemplified in the monograph College Student Personnel Work in the Years Ahead. In the first chapter, Shaffer notes that one of the needs of colleges and universities is, "Developing those values that undergird American society without compromising that objectivity and freedom that is an important characteristic of education in a democracy." But neither he nor any of the other authors in the monograph suggest that campus ministries or religious tradition might be a resource for tackling the value and ethical dilemmas of the campus.

During 1964 and 1965, a group of deans of students and campus ministers met in New York State to explore roles and concerns. The seminar was funded by church groups and resulted in the preparation of several papers compiled and distributed by the Buffalo Council of Churches. While a wide range of topics was explored, the major concentration was on sharing perspectives on the context of
higher education and the situation of the student in the current scene. This intercollegiate, interdenominational, interprofessional seminar would seem to offer a useful model for similar exploration of mutual concerns.94

A different sort of effort but one important in maintaining some sense of coherence with respect to the whole topic under consideration is Riggs’s *College Student Personnel Work in a Christian Context.*95 In this little book Riggs sets out to describe the meaning of Christian faith for the staff member in a church college who has an appointment in the student personnel field. In a helpful way Riggs articulates some of the theological bases for the Christian ethic of “caring” for persons and goes on to point out the relation of that ethic to the responsibilities of student affairs staff. The book is addressed particularly to the church college structure but would be helpful to the Christian on any campus.

### Summary

It would appear that the student personnel staff of a college or university will need to steer its way in the field of religion with respect to at least the following guidelines:

1. The student personnel professional, as Mueller says, cannot afford to be religiously illiterate. As students strive for maturity, for identity and life style, or for self-realization, they need to have available to them the best religious insights of the historical traditions. Furthermore, as persons seek to understand, cope with, and plan for change in the cultural scene, they need (a) to appreciate the extent to which religion has put its marks on culture, ethos, and mores; and (b) to ponder the visions and dreams about the good society toward which the sacred literature points.

2. In a dynamic and pluralistic society on campus as well as off, the student personnel professional needs to develop as much competence as he can in the fields of motivation for individuals and groups, planning for the training of change agents in society, and developing the skills of reconciliation, accommodation, and mutual respect among a variety of groups. In each of these areas, classical and contemporary religion has considerable impact, e.g., the experience with commitment and conversion, the tradition of prophetic change within the church and synagogue, and the experience of the ecumenical movement in uniting (with genuine respect for differences) various ecclesiastical traditions.

3. The direct responsibility of the university’s student personnel division to provide for a religious dimension in the extracurricular life of the university does not abrogate the basic prior responsibility of the university to provide qualitative academic offerings in the field of religion. Unless the university recognizes the intellectual respectability of religion as an aspect of history, culture, and personal quest for meaning, the extracurricular efforts are doomed to deal constantly with stereotypes and immature caricatures of the religious phenomenon.

4. The student personnel professional must strive to understand and communicate his “gospel” in a secular language. Identity and self-realization, change agent, and respectful pluralistic society are merely examples of secular terms attempting to express not peripheral but central religious concerns in contemporary language. The student personnel worker who would attempt to enlist the cooperation of a staff of religious workers in the total personnel mission on the campus needs some proficiency in translating the languages, even as it would be reasonable to expect that the ministerial staff increasingly would develop some of the same proficiency.

5. In the activist climate of this age, any attempt to escape from the controversies of race, politics, peace, and depersonalization is both futile and irresponsible. If it ever was true that student personnel work was a quiet nook in which one could perform good works without engaging in the abrasive contentions of public issues, it is no longer. The iniquity of pragmatic, expedient efficiency as norms of judgment has been exposed. There is in this new climate a renewed sense of urgency to find roots and systems of priorities that give a sense of direction and stability in turbulent times. The student personnel professional thus finds himself needing to renew his philosophy of education—indeed to reassess his basic civic philosophy and to what he gives ultimate allegiance or faith.

6. Integration, dialog, and mutual support in student personnel services will require desegregation and integration of the campus ministry. If there is to be effective referral and coordination of the counseling services on a campus, at least a representative of the campus ministry needs to be included in the Counselor’s Roundtable or policy committee. If the activities of religious groups are to be related to the activities of other groups on campus, some structural provision for that needs to be made in the Student Activities Board. And so on with international student programs, freshman orientation, etc. The customary device of a religious adviser’s council carefully segregated from all the points of decision-making with respect to student life is unsatisfactory.
A Typology of Campus Religious Activities and Ministries

Rossman's first list of styles of campus ministry presented in Chapter 3 largely dealt with the professional roles of employed staff. A second list, which he called philosophies of campus ministry, directly referred to types of structure on the campus. The principle noted by Jospe that programs and services should emerge on a particular campus in response to its distinctive needs is widely observed by Protestants and Catholics as well as by Jews. The result is a bewildering variety of structures, program emphases, and constituency definitions. Nevertheless, some general types can be identified if we keep in mind that almost never does a "philosophy" appear in its pure form; local programs usually use modifications or combinations of several types. The existence of lay movements such as the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations and Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship brings to mind a further aspect of typology: In most types there exist non-denominational as well as denominational and inter-denominational expressions. (The major agencies at work on the campus or sponsoring work on the campus are identified in the Appendix.)

List of Types of Ministry

1. *The College Church* is the presence on or near the campus of the structure of a local congregation. It may be college-sponsored, as at Yale or Claremont, and may be either denominational (Yale) or non-denominational (Claremont). On the other hand, it may be organized directly by a church. (The Student Church at the University of Wisconsin, for example, is Presbyterian.) The church may be just for students, or it may be for the whole campus. The college church is an attempt to bring the whole church—not just an activity group or club—into action on the campus. Worship is usually central to what it does.

2. *Student Christian Movements*. The models for this type of religious ministry are the student YMCA and YWCA in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and the World Student Christian Federation. These movements are essentially student-organized and student-directed. They are voluntary associations of persons who come together around a common statement of purpose and objectives. The student Christian movements that have endured have had to institutionalize themselves (e.g., Inter-Varsity; World Student Christian Federation) or operate under the wing of a broader-based organization (e.g., the YMCA or a church or group of churches). In either case, actual student control often becomes jeopardized at some point. On a hypothetical scale, the campus organization shifts into another category where it becomes an agency of the non-campus-centered institution.

3. **The Foundation or Student Center** may have some characteristics of the student Christian movements described above but is more directly the instrumentality of an off-campus sponsor. Thus most student branches of metropolitan YMCA's belong in this category rather than in the student movement type. Churches and synagogues are the primary sponsoring agencies for student foundations. Rather than establishing full-fledged local churches, they have historically opted for more informal and flexible patterns of student fellowship or sponsored student movements. In the period just before and just after World War II many of these points of ministry were the recipients of funds for extensive buildings that were often multipurpose facilities for a variety of worship, study, social, and counseling activities.

4. **The Teaching Ministry and the School of Religion.**
   a. The teaching ministry attracts laymen and clergy who find it rewarding to teach not only religion but also many other disciplines.
sofar as teaching objectives include concern for personal fulfillment, integration, discovery of purpose and vocation, etc., such teaching may be validly conceived both as qualitative education and religious vocation.

b. A school of religion is customarily an organizational arrangement, to some extent outside the structure of a state university, that provides college credit courses in religion acceptable to the university on a transfer basis. A principal example is the School of Religion at the State University of Iowa,\textsuperscript{102} where for nearly 40 years churches and synagogues have provided the funding for teachers. Increasing acceptance of the legality of teaching religion in state-supported schools in recent years has resulted in the establishment of many departments of religion on the same basis as other departments in the humanities.\textsuperscript{103}

5. The Free-Lance or Specialist Ministry. While student movements, churches, and foundations all imply that professional staff have a special responsibility to their given constituencies, there has been a rapidly growing tendency for churches to appoint campus ministers who are free to choose the style of ministry they prefer and the groups or themes on which they want to concentrate. Closely related to this, some employing churches make the decision in the job description of the style, method, and target of their missions and employ someone with the qualifications for that job.

There are at least four recognizable subtypes of these ministries:

a. The pastoral counselor makes his services available primarily to individuals but sometimes to couples or small groups for counsel with respect to a whole range of personal problems. He may see students by appointment in an office or he may meet most of his clients more casually—at the snack bar in the Student Union, for example.

b. The resident scholar sometimes becomes a theologian-in-residence dealing with questions of faith and learning or more directly theological questions. He may be consultant, teach formal courses, or conduct informal seminars.

c. The specialist may select (or be selected for) ministry to foreign students, faculty, or medical school, etc. Ordinarily he would be a member of a team ministry (see number 8).

d. The activist makes a point of getting to know the individuals and the groups on campus who are trying to enlist their colleagues in various causes. University reform, civil rights, racism, Vietnam and the draft, the crisis in the cities, and the New Left in student politics are concerns of the volatile groups of students and faculty with which an activist minister might be identified. He would seek to be present in order to symbolize the church's concern for all persons (whether that concern is a measure of support for or in spite of the particular activities in which they are engaged). Presence, of course, is not enough for many who choose to enter the lists of organizing, recruiting, and attempting to influence the direction of some of these movements and the persons in them.

6. An Ecumenical Council is an attempt to expand the experience of groups within a religious tradition to embrace the denominational or sectarian divisions within that tradition. While many nondenominational Christian groups and Hillel attempt also to bridge the divisive partisan boundaries, the council concept refers to an organizational polity of a federative principle that gives mutual recognition and equal status to the constituting parties.

7. An Interfaith Council is an attempt to expand the understanding, respect, and acceptance of differing religious traditions. Many interfaith councils on campus admit representatives of all religious groups. Because of the pluralism of American Protestantism, such councils nearly always give a predominant representation to Protestant Christianity. On some campuses a more equal representation of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish traditions is sought.

8. The Team Ministry is sometimes merely a staff council; it is conceived as a more organically united enterprise, pooling the talent and resources of various groups so that the field of mission can be covered and served more adequately. Customarily, a team ministry develops assignments to its staff that encourage its members to become specialists in one or more fields of work.

9. The Local Church and Its Student Fellowship. Only a shortsighted survey of campus ministry would restrict itself to the work done on the campus by those whose special concern is the college or university. The vast majority of American college students and faculty do not live on campus, nor do they find their primary religious identification with the religious agencies on the campus.\textsuperscript{104} Even many students in residence halls prefer for one reason or other to take their place in a local church. Historically, campus ministries were established partly because local churches ordinarily did not have adequate specialized programs for young adults and because many colleges were isolated from adequate church services. Nevertheless, local churches, even without specialized young adult groups or services, still do provide religious services to many students and to most staff and faculty.
10. *The Covenanted Community* is an attempt on the part of some campus ministries to overcome the superficiality of fellowship groups and the impossibility of systematic study or protracted personal dialog on subjects of concern. A notable example of efforts along this line was the Faith and Life Community at the University of Texas that combined residential living with a curriculum of study, a schedule of discussion, and regular worship. It was thus an intensive and extensive experience in which students "covenanted" together to engage in the program for an academic year. A number of variations have been attempted, most of them not involving quite as extensive a commitment—focusing perhaps on a program of studies or a program of worship.

11. *The Ministry to the Whole University*. Long ago, religious strategists recognized that ministry to individuals alone was an ineffective way to change the quality of a community. Inevitably there would be structures of community life, institutional rigidities, and entrenched interests that had to be faced and changed as well. The comparable application to the college and university has not been ignored, but implementing the insight has been difficult. By and large, the attention and energy of campus ministers has been and still is directed primarily to students, especially undergraduates.

As awareness of the problems of fragmentation, depersonalization, and "status quo-ism" have emerged, some campus ministers have attempted to explore ways by which the humanizing and integrating insights of religious concern for the worth and dignity of the person might be nurtured in the community of scholars. During the 1950's, the principle focus was on faculty and the problems of faith and learning. This focus had some results in the lowering of the status of the cult of objectivity, admitting that the presence of the scholar with presuppositions, value preferences, etc., did make a difference in the scholarly enterprise.

In the 60's, the focus shifted to concern over the depersonalized structure of the university as a social system that processes students for certification, herds them through mass lectures, huge dormitory complexes, etc. In addition to much internal negotiation and reconciling effort, many campus ministers have engaged in demonstrations and confrontation tactics to force universities to modify some of their impersonal procedures. Some campus ministers have been especially insistent on the needs of black students, freedom for speakers on unpopular topics, student freedom from unwarranted *in loco parentis* regulations, etc. Naturally such activities have met with varying responses by university administrators (and faculty and students, too, for that matter). The general intent (as stated in Chapter 3) was undoubtedly to help the university be the university at its best. Sometimes university people (administrators, faculty, or students) insist chaplains should mind their own store and care for souls in a more limited sense. Sometimes the university accepts the constructive criticism inherent in those ministers' actions as showing concern for the quality of education at the school.

The American tradition of separation of church and state carries with it a predisposition to departmentalize education and religion that makes collaboration and supplemental or complementary action between the two difficult at best.

In what appears to be one of the fruitful and effective goals of ministry (ministry to the whole university), certainly one of the prerequisites will be a professionalization of campus ministry to the point of really knowing the history, theory, and dynamics of higher education.

### Campus Ministry as a Profession

Campus ministry is a specialized ministry within the church or synagogue. Increasingly in recent years, appointment to such a job has carried explicitly or implicitly the charge to be concerned with the moral and spiritual welfare of the whole campus. In many cases, appointments are made in consultation with interdenominational or interfaith councils. Whether that is the case or not, however, most campus ministry job descriptions specify that the person must function ecumenically.

It is estimated that about 4,000 Protestants, 550 Roman Catholics, and 200 Jews are involved in the profession. These figures assume that the persons referred to give the major portion of their time to ministering to the campus. The figures do not include parish personnel who give a part of their time to a college constituency in a local church or synagogue.

There are three rough categories of appointments: (a) college or university chaplains appointed by the schools themselves; (b) church or synagogue appointees on either a denominational or a cooperative basis; and (c) nondenominational staff employed by lay religious groups such as the YMCA, YWCA, Intervarsity, etc.

Basic theological training (a seminary degree) is presupposed as the basic qualification for appointment by either college or church. The lay associations waive that requirement in many cases. The case for specialized training for the campus ministry has not been established. For about 25 years,
from the mid-30's to the early 60's, Yale Divinity School exercised primary leadership in this field but in recent years has joined other seminaries in resisting the notion of specialized training. At the present time only two seminaries attempt to offer a training program in campus ministry: Boston University School of Theology, and Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, California. The major training projects for campus ministry are the Seminary Internship program and the Campus Ministry Grant program administered by the Danforth Foundation.

There are four major associations for those in campus ministry. If one defines professional societies by their activities in establishing qualifications and training standards for admission to a profession, establishing standards of performance in the field, and sponsoring research and publication of results, then one has to admit that the present organizations are principally associations, not professional societies. The associations are:

1. The Association for Coordination of College and University Religious Affairs is for administratively appointed coordinators of or counselors to religious groups at state-supported institutions. These persons (as indicated by their locations) essentially are performing administrative and advisory rather than ecclesiastical functions with groups.

2. The National Association of College and University Chaplains is primarily for those persons appointed by colleges or universities who have responsibility for religious life in their institutions.

3. The National Campus Ministry Association is a society for persons professionally involved in ministry in higher education and has consisted primarily of church-appointed campus ministers.

4. The National Newman Chaplains' Association is concerned especially with the selection, training, and continuing education of Roman Catholic personnel for campus ministry.

Tenure in the campus ministry has characteristically been rather brief. Because of the rapid change in conception and role of the campus minister, because young clergymen eager and vital enough to choose campus work are also in demand in the church at large where status and rewards are higher, because there has been no real investment in training and hence no substantial individual commitment, because of the anxiety of being on the fringe of the campus and the church (as institutions) and the insecurity of this exposed location, because of the widespread opinion that only young campus clergy can function effectively—for all these reasons, few have chosen campus ministry as a career.

Effectiveness and stability in the campus ministry wait upon the development of standards among the professionals—standards of qualification, performance, and research and publication—and responsible links to the related specialized professions in both the church and the university world.
Religious Services on Campus: An Operational Perspective

The pluralism and fragmentation of church, university, and society have been mentioned in the preceding chapters. Chapter 5 reported the variety of styles of campus religious activities and ministries. But the obligation remains to describe from a practical and operational perspective some of the things that campus ministers and campus religious groups do.

It becomes uncomfortable to approach this task because in the minds of campus ministers there are few commonly accepted criteria for “successful” campus ministries these days; the temptation is great to slip into writing about types and styles. For the moment the author chooses to run quickly through another set of types and then to record some of the varieties of actual practice. An attempt will be made to keep in mind the perspectives of both the professional ministers and the student or faculty participants.

1. The traditional church pattern has involved: (a) priority of congregational worship; (b) a religious education plan; (c) pastoral counseling, comfort, and care for the “flock”; (d) community service of compassionate or charitable type; and (e) mission or outreach to other sectors of society at home and/or abroad. Some campus ministers continue to operate by this model, though it has increasingly come under criticism not only on campus but also in community churches.

2. The lay student movements characteristically have involved: (a) democratic participation in policy determination; (b) highly relevant discussions and projects with reference to the existential needs and intents of the participants; (c) involvement in the life of the campus rather than being on the periphery of the campus (psychologically as well as geographically); and (d) popularity or political effectiveness. The growth of anti-establishment attitudes and anti-organizational biases has severely limited the effectiveness of institutionalized lay movements while still leaving an opportunity for ad hoc spontaneous happenings. The collapse of the University Christian Movement during the spring of 1969 was merely further evidence of the decline of the attractiveness of this model.

3. The campus foundation or religious center model was an informal educational enterprise using group work methods combined with a social-educational institutional facility. More than the lay societies just mentioned, it was an agency of the church. For a period extending roughly from 1935 to 1960 it was the dominant organizational model on campus.

4. A missional or renewal model maintains a group or congregational identity, but its character focuses on being a change agent in its setting. The traditional elements of worship, pastoral care, and religious education are deployed to serve and reflect the primary goal-oriented purpose of social change. This model is probably the most attractive to most campus ministers at present, but there is enormous diversity within the generalized concept.

5. The free-agent missioner model has become increasingly popular. Some employing churches quite openly seek well-educated, personable, and innovative young ministers, saying, in effect, “We don’t know what the church ought to be doing on the campus but we want to be represented there. You are our representative and you should go and immerse yourself in that setting. When and as you find things that a Christian or a group of Christians (or even just honorable men, Christian or not) ought to do, go ahead and try it.”

One pervasive theme or trend in the church at large and especially on campus is the ecumenical movement. “Ecumenism” involves not only a rapprochement between distinct theological traditions but also includes a thrust of life and concern “unto the whole world.” This latter thrust has cast some doubts concerning the emphasis on the ingroup and has given priority to mission and engagement with the problems of the world outside
the church. Hence the modern church is much more involved in the here-and-now, much less interested in analysis of and concern for internal structure and institutionalism. One consequence for campus ministry has been a lessening emphasis on continuing membership in religiously identifiable groups.

A universal aspect of campus ministry that cannot be overlooked is the obligation it carries to be an administrator of an operation. Ubiquitous budget control is inescapable. Denominational funding may range from minimal to total. The lay associations (YMCA, YWCA, Intervarsity) usually require that the local group finance itself. Some ministries include managing substantial properties with all their accompanying custodial or program-allied staffs. One of the factors involved in the attraction of the missionial ministry is its conscious attempt to reduce purely administrative responsibilities.

All these models (whether obsolete or not, and with endless combinations and permutations) are present on the campus. Many large university staffs may well have a rough approximation of them all on their own campus.

Obviously a further set of variables is the presupposition the minister or religious layman holds about primary emphasis. For some it is cultic practice (e.g., the Roman Catholic mass), for some it is maintaining a cultural tradition (e.g., Judaism), or still others it is fidelity to Biblical teaching (conservative Protestants). Faithfulness to an ideal such as social justice or peace is still another criterion.

Presented below are descriptions of campus programs as examples of how some ministers view their tasks. The programs were not selected for representativeness or commendation; they should serve only as reports of ministers at work.

The Phoenix Center
University of Delaware

The Phoenix pastor is a collaborator in the formation of program. The faculty adviser is a participant in the work of the Phoenix. The Phoenix seeks to be a bridge agency between the campus and the larger society, bringing politicians, artists, professional people, civic leaders, ethnic group representatives, labor leaders, spokesmen for overseas interests, and others into conversation with students and faculty. Over the years the Phoenix Center and its predecessor, the Westminster Foundation, have given focus and thrust to the conscience of the University of Delaware in such matters as exclusion of out of state black students, hiring of black staff members and faculty, provision of a full-time international student adviser and a better reception for international people in off-campus circles, labor union organization for such staff members as cafeteria workers and maintenance people, accurate and socially sensitive campus journalism, academic freedom of faculty and students for the pursuit of the educational adventure without sectarian censorship of that quest internally or externally, and organized graduate student activity. The coffeeshouse aspect of the Phoenix ministry has been an important place of informal interaction between faculty and students. The liturgical and Biblical and theological emphasis in the Phoenix Center has been a critical reminder to socially activist students that fundamental change in people and their institutions requires a sense of the vertical dimension as well as awareness of horizontal episodes. Well-intended actions have failed for want of careful analysis. The Phoenix as coffeeshouse has been an important laboratory for the artistic and social impulses of students under circumstances permitting them to learn by mistake and defeat as well as by success.

Physical facilities available to the Phoenix are located in a former family residence and provide a coffeeshouse area accommodating approximately 150 persons downstairs, a meeting room and lounge upstairs for as many as 60 persons, an office for the pastor, a work area for the secretary with reception space and kitchen equipment, rooming accommodations for five students, and auxiliary office space on the coffeeshouse level.

The Phoenix Center is officially related and accountable to the University Christian Movement, the various church structures, and the actual participants in its work. The Administrative Committee of the Phoenix Center, which conducts monthly meetings, is in a formal sense the ultimate decision-making body. The members of the Administrative Committee are elected in consultation with the various church bodies related to the Phoenix Center. They are professors, businessmen, housewives, students, clergymen of various denominations, research scientists for corporations, and members of various professions such as law and dentistry, etc.

Were there to be a change in the Phoenix pastorate, the successor would be chosen in a process involving the Administrative Committee, the United Ministries in Higher Education, and regional denominational structures related to the Center.

The Phoenix Center is financed by gifts from students, faculty, friends in the community beyond the University, contributions made by coffeeshouse patrons, and funding by the regional and local budgeting of denominational structures.

Motive, Tempo, Approach, Renewal, Student World, Christian Century, Commonwealth, and Christianity and Crisis are publications helpful for developing understanding of where the church stands within university circles. Details are available at the Phoenix office.

Hans Hoekendijk of the Union Theological Seminary faculty in New York has said: "The coming of Christ is a secular event. It is in the real world and for the world. And consequently this secular event and what was invited by it, the thing we usually call Christianity, cannot be anything else but a secular movement, a movement in the world and for the world. It will always be a dangerous perversion of the truth to make Christianity into some sort of religion. . . . And we have no business to make a Christian into a homo religiosus again, a religious man, a normal being plus something. The Christian is simply a man who is in the process of being restored to normal human manhood." In the light of such conviction, Christians recognize in Jesus Christ the Lord of history and welcome the coming of truth in all
the new forms it seems to take in our time. Our ministry as those who respond to this vision of truth is one respecting the university, or any other segment of the world, as an arena in which God’s struggle on the side of the humanization of man is pressed forward. We count ourselves as co-laborers in that enterprise.

The Eucharistic Service of worship celebrated weekly is an assembly of renewal for the core of the community to give thanks to the Lord of Life and history, to intercede for the needs of others, and to invoke divine leadership in their life on campus.

Ecumenical Involvement: Circumstances have found the most repeated relationship with another campus religious body to be with the Wesley Foundation. The term “ecumenical” as we understand it has reference to much more than organizational fraternization between religious structures. We take it to mean responding to the contrality of Christ across the whole human adventure. Our program specifics over the years reflect this understanding.

The offices of the international student adviser, counseling and testing, and student health services have worked with us frequently and congenially. The Phoenix pastor makes use of faculty dining-room privileges occasionally. Access to student preference lists, faculty directories, etc., has been sporadic. The Phoenix Center and its pastor understand their services to the university as a bridge between the campus and growing edges of our society often disengaged from contact with university personnel. The Phoenix Center in its autonomy from university or narrow sectarian control is free to be an exploratory institution in a state not widely reputed for flexibility and openness to new perspectives. The Phoenix Center has used this freedom to encourage the university to be a prophet and leader in the general society, rather than a ghetto of intellectuals and technicians residing in Olympian isolation. We welcome the insights underscored by recent student movements to the effect that there is no such thing as a disengaged and uncommitted life. The question is only which cause or thrust one’s life posture serves.

Robert Andrews

UNITED CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP
Emporia, Kansas

The United Christian Fellowship understands itself as an experimental ministry, a part of the church at work in a particular place under special circumstances. In the past three and a half years of this specialized, experimental ministry on the KSTC [Kansas State Teachers College] campus, certain patterns have developed in terms of procedure and program. Also, unconscious or conscious attitudes concerning the ministry and the world to which the ministry is directed have no doubt developed. Since the ministry is by nature flexible and experimental, there is a need to remain open for changes in both attitude and approach.

Basically, UCF has seen itself... as a helper or assistant to everyone on the campus who is a Christian (who therefore comprises the church of Jesus Christ), to the end that he may find in the United Christian Fellowship resources to help him become what Christ intends for His people. If this is to be our proper image, then we must be alert to the needs of people on the campus—students, faculty, and staff—as well as sensitive to the nature and mission of the church of Jesus Christ.

The strategy of the UCF in developing its ministry has focused on a two-fold emphasis. The first is the “priestly” ministry aimed at assisting the church, the people of Jesus on the campus, to understand God’s will for themselves, individually and collectively, and to form a koinonia or fellowship of learners or disciples. The second is the “prophetic” ministry which offers leadership as well as opportunities and channels for leadership by the whole people of God on campus to express their faith in mission, outreach, and evangelism to other people and the institutions of the academic community.

These two areas of ministry will obviously overlap in a single program. Also, there will be emphasis on one style of ministry over another from time to time, but a balance of emphasis should be maintained over the long haul. In the prophetic ministry, there will be such things as worship, counseling, administrative duties and committee planning, study classes and seminars, and retreats. In the prophetic area will be such things as campus lectures, guest speakers, open forums, cinema discussion, action groups, interfaith dialog, open conferences, informal discussion on campus or neutral ground.

Some of the activities of the past five months give an indication of the way we have been attempting to fulfill this ministry:

Orientation picnic for new students in September (approximately 100 in attendance)...
A monthly Sunday evening series of lecture forums, with faculty members participating, entitled “What Does It Mean To Be Human?” (approximately 65 in attendance)...
A weekly class in “Theology of the Laity” (noncredit)...
A weekly chapel service...
A weekly coffeehouse on Friday evenings from 9:00 to 12:00 with entertainment and discussion...
A group of five students sent to the Chicago Ecumenical Institute in October...
The formation of a new local unit of the National Student Christian Federation...
Fifteen students sent to the Ecumenical Conference in November...
A bimonthly tactical group in race relations...
Two special programs under joint sponsorship with the KSTC Union Activities Council: (a) one with a film on church and social change; (b) a speaker from the Committee To Abolish HUAC...
A weekly luncheon discussion for faculty, studying “Time for Christian Candor” and “Extremism”...
Several students to weekend work campus in Kansas City. Receipt for new local ministers...
Co-sponsor with Student Council a World University Service visitor on campus...
Sponsoring three campus people to United Nations-Washington seminar in New York and Washington, D.C. ...
Several students sent to Kansas Advisory Conference on Civil Rights, November...
Fifty students sent to mid-winter conference at Rock Springs under NSCF...
Co-host with college James Bevel of Southern Christian Leadership Conference...
Co-host with Wesley Foundation Frank Wilkinson of the Committee To Abolish HUAC, February...
Begin new series of Sunday evening interests groups, including “Face of American Poverty,” “Gospel Accord-
ing to Peanuts," "Unfolding Drama of the Bible," "Mission, the Christian's Calling."

Begin series of Tuesday classes on: (a) The Secular City; (b) The New Theology.

Join NSCF in sponsoring Universal Day of Prayer for Students.

Arrange and assist sponsorship of Lenten interfaith series of worship services on campus.

Co-sponsor with Wesley Foundation cinema discussion series. Monday evenings.

Originate and promote tutor volunteer project for Emporia school children.

Additional activities of the executive director include: sponsor of Jewish Student Association; daily hospital calling on behalf of college; preaching engagements at local churches; speaking to Synod Women's Group, Christian Youth Fellowship, Mission rally, Presbytery Women's Workshop; participation in Synod General Mission interpretation team to two Presbyteries; involvement in ministerial association; local ministers' bimonthly study group; meeting with dorm and fraternity-sorority house mothers; services at Emporia rest homes through MA; incorporator and member of United Council for Community Action; attendance at 12 meetings of judicial responsibility as chairman of Presbytery Committee on Ecumenical Relations, member of Ecumenical Relations Committee of Synod, and Chairman of Camp Site Committee of Synod; member of Presbytery General Council; attendance at four meetings of denominational campus ministry boards and one for campus ministry staff; not enumerated are local UCF committee meetings.

A weekly half-hour radio program over a local station plus a tri-weekly program over the campus station appears to be in the immediate offing in the category of prophetic ministry.

No specific mention is made in the above concerning the ministry of any other members of the UCF Board, other faculty, or students. It is the belief of the executive director, however, that an extensive ministry by these people is carried on and the above suggests some of the channels and resources that are used in this wider ministry. 110

Darrell Yeaney

The Campus Ministry in San Francisco

The United Campus Christian Ministry in San Francisco continues trying to be relevant to students, administration, and faculty in San Francisco. The campus pastors, Alfred Dale and John Jones, are committed to a collegiate ministry. Individual tasks are administered mutually at the discretion of the staff by their cooperative judgment. The following is a list of current involvements of the campus ministry.

Gateway, an information center for young adults in San Francisco, opened September 1, 1965, under the auspices of the Glide Foundation, is an organization concerned with involving the young adults in the city with community life. Information on housing, job opportunities, education, and social and community organizations is provided. The campus ministry has served as a consultant for Gateway. We have two EOA workers who coordinate some 80 volunteers (many now or recently students) in the various activities at Gateway.

Tutorial. One of the EOA workers is the coordinator of our tutorial program with many of the local churches. Some 55 students are currently recruited to work in six different church programs. Our worker also does counseling and training of the tutors and study hall volunteers.

Residence is a new campus publication that has just printed its fourth edition. "The publication without a policy, "as it calls itself, is a forum for student and faculty opinion on current issues and an announcement bulletin to let the students know "where the action is."

An EOA student who is a journalism major is in charge of the publication, which mails 658 copies and distributes 100 copies on campus.

International Students. In the International Student Project there are 50 international students and 25 friendship families. Our purpose is to establish sustained relationships between American families and those from other countries: relationships rather than ceremonial encounters, caring rather than exploitation, Christian fellowship rather than proselytizing. Each spring a training seminar is held to help the families with their new responsibilities. Last month a dinner was held at Lakeside Presbyterian Church to thank the friendship families for their remarkable concern. There were 60 in attendance.

A Student Lecture Series on Religion has been held this semester with the attendance from 60 to 500. Twenty students have submitted papers, each discussing his own perception of reality and faith. The presentation of the papers has been taped and all are in the process of being collated for local radio stations.

Friday Morning Worship is held at the Ecumenical House Chapel at 7:00 a.m. with 25 to 35 students present. It is followed by coffee before the eight o'clock classes. This is the core group. It is led by students from different denominations with staff cooperation. Experimental forms of worship have been used along with the more traditional.

The Ecumenical Council Lecture Series held on campus in the Education Building on Wednesday afternoons has covered such topics as the conscientious objector, Vietnam, birth control, homosexuality, Playboy Club, Costa Rica summer service, and voter registration in the South. These forums have been primarily a service project for the academic community and have dealt with the theological implications of the subject and the Christian Faith. As a direct result of these, other groups of the campus community have seen the need and taken responsibility to expand their topics and meetings using our campus ministry staff. Attendance has reached 130.

The Protestant-Jewish discussion group meets Wednesday evenings at 7:30 p.m. to discuss our common heritage.

Housing is one of the severe problems at San Francisco State College that the campus ministry has dealt with. We have housed approximately 75 students this past year, and the housing office has received more listings this year than ever before from the area churches.

The Ecumenical Council with two student representatives from each of the five sponsoring denominational and interdenominational groups meets on the first Tuesday of each month to outline and administer objectives and programs.

A Seminary Seminar was held in November with seven students discussing and planning enrollment next fall in a theological graduate school. Another three students are considering seminary in the years ahead. It is also
interesting to note that 14 students from San Francisco State College have enrolled in one of the Bay area seminaries in the past two years. These students have all had long-term contacts with the campus ministry.

DRAFT LAW. The campus ministry has done extensive counseling with groups and individuals about conscientious objection and the draft laws. Three group meetings, one with 90, one with 15, and one with 6 students in attendance were held. There has been extensive personal counseling in the coffee shop every day.

Classes. The campus ministry continues to be asked to various classes as to who and what the Faith is in relation to various subjects. Journalism, art, humanities, and nursing are specific areas where we have contacted some 250 students. "Hash Series" on premarital sex were held with dorm students in the fall and spring with about 150 to 200 students attending.

Faculty. One of the most interesting developments of our work has been the relationship with the faculty. Two men have made commitments to seek chairs at theological seminaries when their work at State is done. One is in physics and the other in political science.

Who We Reach. Our work is directed to the 16,500 students at San Francisco State College, the 2,500 students at California Medical School, the 100 students at Hastings Law School. Our work for the 10,000 students at City College is restricted to the level of consultant with the local churches who have college-age groups. We reach four groups with about 60 students involved. We are trying to be of help to assure that those students learn about motive, conferences, loans, etc.

Faculty Salaries. This past year 500 letters and telegrams were sent to Sacramento legislators and committees regarding the 1.8 percent faculty salary decrease. The campus ministry has coordinated many efforts on behalf of the faculty of the State College. In this case these communications plus well-timed phone conversations may have made the difference between the 7 percent and 10 percent salary increase.

Art Department. An interview survey of the faculty members of the art department at San Francisco State is being designed and will be conducted by the campus ministry to determine whether there is a San Francisco State "School," what the individual schools of the faculty are and what, if any, are the integrating factors in the school. We are also trying to determine whether there is some theme that unites the art historians, art educators, and studio and production artists within the faculty. We are asking if there is a philosophy of art as a discipline.

Newman Club. The Ecumenical Council and the Newman Club are developing programs together. This is the first attempt to have a truly unified ministry in the history of campus ministry at San Francisco State College.

Alfred S. Dale
John C. Jones

NEWMAN CENTER AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY

My image of the campus ministry, its goals and techniques, has undergone much change during the nearly 20 years I have been in the work. So I must give you my vision of it in autobiographical form.

I was asked to accept the post of Newman Club Chaplain at San Jose State College in 1950; I was the first to be assigned there full-time. I lived at a nearby parish church and had my weekdays free to serve the campus of 8,000 students, working out of an old but well-located building. I saw my work as one creating a Newman Club that would be an attractive and supportive group for Catholic students to join. I spent much time with the leaders of the group, seeking to promote good events, and to hold the interest and use the talents of the numerous students who came to the club.

I was concerned to meet and know as many Catholic students as possible, and to keep them near me, and it was a constant frustration to find that most of the lively mainstream students would not make their permanent social identification with the Newman Club. Meanwhile I achieved much personal satisfaction from theological and psychological counseling, and I accepted countless speaking and visiting engagements in living groups and in classrooms wherever the opportunity presented itself. The Newman building became a home away from home for a lot of students who were on the fringe of survival in the college. Within the Newman group was a solid nucleus of excellent people, whose development—vocal, religious, and marital—brought me deep and lasting satisfaction and permanent friendships.

My transfer to Stanford University in 1961 was entirely unexpected. It had many advantages, however; it returned me to my own and my parents' alma mater and to a supertaxingly interesting environment, a largely residential campus with a very high scholastic standard. The years I have spent at Stanford I have seen the University change with great speed from a rather provincial, elite atmosphere to one of great involvement in the issues of the day—ecumenism, peace, ecology, racial justice. The factor that has most deeply influenced my ministry in style and image, however, has been the possession of an independent, quasi-parochial chapel.

At San Jose there were few occasions on which I could celebrate the liturgy for the students. At Stanford, where the Sunday liturgy can be conducted for the university community with style, sermon, and music attuned to the spirit of the group, it has quickly become the center and focus of my work. The teaching that comes from the pulpit in the context of the Mass has deeper impact and wider influence than any other. And the community established around the altar is far more diverse and far more continuous than any that a club could establish.

As a result, my theology of "church" has developed—aided by Vatican II, of course, and by my close relationship with Robert McAfee Brown and other Protestant theologians here. I now feel keenly that "church" is wherever people are gathered together in God's name; institutional loyalties and demands are reduced to manageable dimensions by this changed perspective. As a result I have much less concern for holding onto the Catholics, or for converting unbelievers. I see them drifting in and out of this worshipping community with a freedom necessary for their development as persons.

I still have the desire, so much frustrated at San Jose, to know as many of my people as possible, but I am less anxious about it; indeed, I see now that a lot of this desire is not so much pastoral or professional as simply my personal love for people.

By the time I had been at Stanford two years I had entirely abandoned the notion of a club. The term Catholic community was generally used to designate what we did. Various events were developed to express and to deepen the community feeling, principally meals and outings. For us here in the West hikes and camping are
big, and they are especially so for me, personally. They are invariably successful in the social sense. The other facets of what I used to call Newman programs—lectures, seminars, social action projects—are generally promoted wherever they seem to be needed by the most appropriate agency (perhaps a campus political group, an ecumenical alliance, or an ad hoc committee).

Attempts to form a lasting and well-defined ecumenical body have failed over and over, to the puzzlement of the staff. My analysis of this is that the unity around the altar, which would be necessary for an ecclesial community, is lacking. Instead, students of various denominations coalesce into religious communities wherever the reality of church is present, principally at the Lutheran center and at my place.

In the last three or four years I have seen considerable dissatisfaction among members of the Stanford campus ministry about their roles; and at the same time there has been much discussion in Catholic circles about the viability of the parish as a unit of religious life. Both complaints arise, I think, from the lack of a true community. In one case the individual minister is alone in the secular milieu, seeking to bring his Christian insights to it; this begets a sense of futility and isolation which I, for one, could not live with. The typical Catholic parish at the other extreme is a tight structure in which freedom and the response to God's Spirit are stifled by the practical operations of an enterprise.

I believe that Newman work, as it has evolved here at Stanford, avoids these two perils. An identifiable community exists, supporting me and giving form to my life (and the lives of others involved); but its internal concerns are kept simple enough that the community can respond to new needs outside it, and to the changing personalities that make it up. I can still be a counselor to all who need my help. I can be a catalyst in religious discussions around the campus. I can simply be present as a friend and a Christian wherever things are going on: plays, dormitory life, married students' family problems, campus political life, and the various departments (especially the department of religious studies). But always there remains a firm point of reference in the Liturgy where a cross-section of students and faculty and others gathers to celebrate with me their faith and hope and commitment to God in Christ. And with this should be included the sacred events—weddings, baptisms, rites of penance, funerals—in the life of the community.

What am I trying to accomplish? How to achieve this goal? I believe I can summarize it thus: I wish the Christian community at Stanford to exemplify what the Kingdom of God should be, and I try to be a facilitator of that development in the way I am present to all members of the university world. This means encouraging every movement of the Spirit in the community and its members and providing the emotional and physical setting for good things to develop.

John S. Dureya

THE CAMPUS MINISTER AS AN "OCCASIONAL" MAN

State University College, Oneonta, New York

I would like to focus my attention on what it is I do as a campus minister and on what I am trying to accomplish. This, unfortunately, will preclude any discussion of why. It is unfortunate, because it simply extends the endless discussions which have engaged the time and energy of so many members of those organizations that convene men and women who make their living as ministers to (or is that of?) within for at the university. The scramble for programs, ideas that have worked, ways of attracting students, of being relevant, has left unanswered questions that seem to me much more basic. Why are we there in the first place? What is it about our own particular faith stance that makes us want to do anything on a university campus? Is it really because of our religious convictions that we are there?

One would like to assume that programs and goals are written only after those questions have been answered. And it is with a mixture of cynicism and condescending naïveté that I can begin a functional description of my own ministry at the State University College at Oneonta, New York.

The goals of my ministry can best be stated in terms of what I call my "occasional theory." The assumptions on which the theory is based are critical: that people directly involved in the university—students, faculty, administration—are of good will. More than that, they want many of the same things that campus ministers want, and they are willing to work and take risks to see that they are accomplished. They are also committed. They have some expertise in assessing university life today, and are aware of limitations and structures. But it is not the lack of a campus minister that will prevent them from accomplishing what they want to do: He is not the sine qua non for what Michael Novak has called (and what I use for its breadth) "the humanization of the university." But he can provide the occasion.

In many ways the campus minister has identified a whole new sociological phenomenon: the college problem. Not an expert in higher education, nor in psychotherapy, nor in community organization, he is (hopefully) an expert in the college problem. He has worked at developing an acute sensitivity to the problems of higher education, without pretending to know all the causes or even some of the solutions. He knows experientially the psychological havoc that has been wrought on students and others when they come in contact with the college scene; and he has found himself involved in some of the most exciting (and possibly devastating) mass movements ever organized. From his vantage point he has become aware of where the strictures are, and where they hurt most. If his ear is to the ground he can be in touch with what is happening on his campus, from plans to storm the administration building to whose contract is not going to be renewed next year. His office becomes a clearing-house for gossip, rumor, and the inside world. This is a vantage point shared by few in the university.

That is not to say, though, that individuals do not share all these concerns. The campus minister could find a partner in concern for any one of the particular issues brought to his attention daily. But the problem is that there are significantly few cases where all parties to a particular concern are aware of their communality. And even when they are aware that they are not alone, many times they lack ways of manifesting their concerns. It is my theory that the campus minister, sensitive as he is to the forces working in any particular area of concern within the university, can provide the occasion for something to be done.

At first glance this may seem like something he could do in his spare time. Having tried to live the theory for at least two years, I cannot verify this from my own experience. There are an incredible number of things
which, damned up within the well-defined institutional chains of command that bind the American university, do not have an occasion to happen. There are departments that do not speak to one another on common problems. Students engaged in religious activities are cut off from friends on the faculty; students who do not speak to an adult during the four years they spend on the campus; programs waiting to be put on; seminars waiting to be held; lectures dying to be heard; interdisciplinary curricula lying in unwritten handbooks. And there are people very interested in having these things happen on their campus; in some cases the majority would welcome them. But they do not happen. I want my ministry to provide occasions for them to happen. Moreover, I have found that I can succeed precisely because as campus minister I am marginal to both church and university.

As marginal to the university, the campus minister is free of many of the institutional bonds that keep things from happening. Not having to worry about tenure, policy ("the way we have always done it"), promotion, or graduation, he can take risks that others cannot. He can bring together people who have never met before. From his begged and borrowed bank account (the fruit in most cases of his other marginal relationship) he can provide resources for programs for which the most recent university budget has made no allocation. The guest lists for his parties can cross lines that are veritable walls between men with common hopes and insights and visions.

His marginality to the church is also an advantage. Besides its fiscal and physical resources, his relationship to the church can provide him a reason for being where he is. It legitimizes his interests. Most universities being fairly convinced that they no longer need fear the proselyte, the judge, or the watchdog, they need no other reason for the presence of the chaplain than the fact that a church group put him there.

In short, then, my program is to work myself out of a program. It is to rely on the assumed goodwill of those directly involved in the academic community to do those things that are important for the university, to provide the occasion, i.e., the support, the encouragement, the channels, and if necessary the place and funds available to the marginal minister.

A final note: It may seem strange that a Roman Catholic campus minister fails to mention his liturgical program. It is certainly the focal point of all that I do on campus. Liturgy, too, is an occasion, but it is one of peculiar significance only to Roman Catholics.

In this statement I have tried to describe my ministry as it bears on the university community at large. It is admittedly a general statement and a conscious effort to avoid an enumeration of specific things that I do. Perhaps feelings of inadequacy born of marginality direct this path. But I would prefer that it be considered a logical extension of the "occasional theory": that this statement, rather than pretend to give answers, merely provides the occasion for conversation among those with greater wisdom, insight, and vision.

John J. Kelilther

A JEWISH PERSPECTIVE ON CAMPUS MINISTRY
Brandeis University

The Jewish student is the object of much study and not a little panic! Surveys and studies seem to indicate that the overwhelming majority of Jews on the campus do not identify themselves actively as Jews, that Hillel fails to attract many of them, that estrangement, defection, and the rate of mixed marriage among Jewish students are rising, that disloyalty to Israel is not uncommon, and that, in all, Jewish continuity on the campus is in a state of crisis. Some analysts feel it questionable whether Jews on the campus will continue to identify at all as Jews within the next few years unless radical steps are taken to stem the tide of alienation.

In their concentration on the current opinions of students, many studies fail to put the late-adolescent or young adult stages into life perspective. The college years are precisely those years during which young people critically evaluate the cultural indoctrination of childhood and make some of their own independent judgments. Most studies indicate that many of these critical, independent thinkers will reorient voluntarily with the main characteristics of their cultural and religious tradition as they move into starting their own families and careers.

Many students come to the campus identified with, not alienated from, Jewish life. Many of them maintain this commitment throughout their college career. Such students have had good experiences and positive contact with Judaism in the past through imaginative rabbis, membership in strong youth groups, creative Jewish education, good summer camp or Israel experience. That there are not more of them is lamentable, but a sizeable group does exist. In Hillel, one of our major responsibilities is to attempt to provide effectively for the needs and interests of these students—to provide conventional but meaningful worship services for both the traditional and the nontraditional segments of our student population, to schedule lecture series, sponsor study groups, initiate Israel programs, recruit and stimulate interest in social action and service projects. These students constitute the core of dedicated Jews on the campus, and they must be provided with normative vehicles through which they may continue to express and deepen their commitment.

Our perspective must not, however, be limited to these students. I think we have an equally great responsibility to encounter those students who are alienated from Jewish life. I refer not to those who may be alienated for superficial reasons, for social and sociological factors, but to those who are ideologically estranged—young people on or sympathetic to the social and political left, students caught up in radical currents. According to most accounts on the subject of Jews, Israel, and the New Left, these students are apathetic or antagonistic to Judaism and sometimes indifferent or even hostile to Israel.

Confusion, then, is the leitmotif in the Jewish identification of most radical Jews, though it is especially true of the non-antagonistic. The following four sets of tensions are probably most consequential:

1. Dedication to achieving revolutionary change in our sick society on the one hand, and the passivity, conservatism, and irrelevance of many Jewish institutions and leaders on the other. In most cases the students' radicalism on this dichotomy is principled and courageous.

2. Humanism and universalism on the one hand, and a search for roots, meaning, and identity on the other. Many radical students do not necessarily reject the particular as a form of identity, except insofar as it conflicts with universal and humanistic concerns and perspective, which sometimes happens despite our glib dismissals.
(in our attitude towards mixed marriage, for instance, or when Jewish self-interest is invoked to prevent us from taking an unpopular stance).

3. Empathy in varying degrees for Israel, on the one hand, and involvement in radical currents on the other. Many Jewish radicals (most, I suspect) do identify and empathize in their own way with Israel. However, they are not convinced that Israel is completely blameless in the Middle East impasse or that Israel is doing all in her power to bring peace and reconciliation to the area.

4. Privatism in religious expression, on the one hand, and the desire for community on the other. I find that radical Jews are, generally, not attracted to the conventional and institutional options available to them on the Jewish scene. It is this tension between the search for privatized religious meaning and experience and for community that accounts, at least in part, for the frequency of "trippling" and the popularity of transcendental meditation and communes. Obviously, other factors are also involved.

The term "encounter" was used to distinguish between meeting a person where he is rather than insisting on his meeting where I am. The latter, it seems to me, involves an imposition and a proselytizing that is both unwarranted and ineffective.

In the encounter with students alienated from Jewish life, then, first the campus rabbi or his associates (student or professional) should attempt to make their sympathetic presence felt in the gatherings and causes of radicals. The rabbi's participation is important as an end in itself. He should also try to make his influence and his perspective felt. This may sometimes help prevent a radical approach from taking on a violent character. It may not be easy and will probably take a long time, because the suspicion and uneasiness on both sides may be profound and deep-seated: The rabbi may suspect he is being used by the radicals, and the radicals may suspect that an attempt is being made to drag them into the religious and other establishments.

Some potentially valuable programmatic possibilities suggest themselves:

1. With regard to the tension between activism and conservatism, attention should be given to the existence of Jewish activist and radical groups in ways that would not shrink from taking leftist, militant positions and actions on various matters, general and Jewish: the anti-war movement; forms of civil disobedience; resistance to racism, exploitation, oppression aimed at blacks and other minorities; criticism of slumlordship, general and Jewish; development of new priorities for the organized Jewish community; development of healthy black-Jewish relations (especially in its new campus aspect, touching on admissions and financial scholarship matters); study and discussion of nonviolence, radicalism, and Judaism, etc.

2. With regard to the tension between humanism and particularism we might, for example, experiment with new approaches to the problem of Soviet Jewry. Specifically, we might view the problem not as a particularly Jewish one in isolation from other problems but as one of a series of crises in human oppression and minority group suffering and persecution. This approach would view the problem of Soviet Jewry as a human problem on the moral level, whose practical implications affect the Jewish people in particular. It would take a similar sympathetic view toward the problems and crises of black Americans, Mexican Americans, Indians, and would, for educational and activist purposes, attempt to juxtapose and treat together all such crises—as a proper approach in its own right and as part of an effort at effecting minority coalitions on social and political problems.

We might attempt to inject a more humanistic and universalistic element in our annual Jewish fund drives, expressing concern for the general state of suffering in the Middle East, rather than Jewish suffering alone, soliciting for efforts in Israel aimed at Arab-Jewish rapprochement and for causes that benefit Jews and Arabs alike.

3. As for the tension between Israel and radicalism, some of the following approaches may prove fruitful:

a. Organization of campus cells, bringing together visiting Arabs, Israelis, local Jews, and others, in order to initiate an ongoing dialog on the Arab-Jewish impasse and to promote Arab-Jewish understanding, respect, and reconciliation.

b. Active support of the efforts of Jack Cohen, Bernard Och, Nina and Yechiel De-Nur, their associates, and their Israel Movement for Arab-Jewish Cooperation, and especially for its embryonic Peace Center for the study of the Arab-Jewish problem in the light of the lesson of the holocaust, to which will go all of the proceeds from De-Nur's (Katzenik 1559333) latest novel, Phoenix over the Galilee.

c. Education about and support for the Jewish-Arab peace research and study center at Givat Havivah, and other voluntary attempts at rapprochement in Israel.

d. Study and discussion groups based on the periodicals, New Outlook and The New Middle East (encouraging subscription to these).

e. Creation of and recruitment for Jewish-Arab summer work projects in Israel.

f. Stimulation of independent, open-ended, Israel-interest groups to explore controversial subjects such as binationalism, the grievances and aspirations of the Palestinian Arab people seriously and openly, avoiding propaganda as much as possible.

g. Efforts to bring Israeli pacifist and leftist personalities (Moshe Sneh, Joseph Abuleeh, and others) to the U.S. for campus tours, along with other speakers.

4. Finally, as to the tension between religious privatism and community: We ought to multiply our attempts to create informal religious fellowships, havurot, not necessarily in the campus synagogues but in more neutral, comfortable, and casual surroundings. Such havurot would be relatively free of structure and would allow for considerable private meditation and self-expression. In addition, we might consider innovative attempts with new liturgies, borrowing selectively from various traditions, religious and secular/radical, and perhaps adding new Jewish observances and celebrations, e.g., holydays or Sabbaths given over to specific religious virtuosi (Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hillel, Akiva, and, into our day, men like Iuber). Such an emphasis might also breathe new life into the sad world of Jewish education. It may also prove meaningful and valuable to reacquaint ourselves with and introduce our students to the religious writings and insights of Jewish mystics and Hasidim, one of the areas unfortunately blacked out of the rabbinic education many of us received.

We might also experiment with encampments or retreats for radical students that would be sensitive to the spirit rather than the letter of Jewish law and especially
to the activist and radical traditions within Judaism. (Encampments, too, I might add, could conceivably offer an experimental alternative to the part-time Hebrew and Sunday Schools, which seem to me born losers and whose floundering nature has in requites substantiation.)

What should be the primary role of the campus rabbi and of Hillel? Should we provide the normative values through which the already committed may continue and deepen their Jewish commitments, or should we seek to encounter the alienated, the radicals, the activists? I would not presume to answer this for all campus rabbis. The answer will hinge on each man's orientation and inclinations, on his understanding of Jewish imperatives, on his sense of Jewish needs, priorities, and future tendencies, and on the extent to which he himself is concerned about and sympathetic with Jewish radicals. Between the conventionally and traditionally religious on the one hand and the radicals on the other, there exists the big middle, the largest group of students. According to my experience, they are basically passive, lethargic, indifferent, yet often malleable persons whose interests are not quite as serious and intense as those of others, and whose main goals are to get on in college as successfully as possible, to get out, to avoid the draft, to marry, to go on to graduate or professional school, to have children, to settle in suburbia, and probably to join a temple and identify with Jewish life no less nominally than their parents. Students in this group can often be reached, and the nature of their Jewish commitment can be molded. The campus rabbi must decide for himself in which direction he would influence them, given the opportunity. They should be of paramount importance as individuals, rather than as potential converts for a particular program. If their best individual interests would be served by swaying them toward the conventional, traditional options—fine. If not, we owe them the responsibility of making them a part of our and our students' efforts at creating a radical Jewish life style. They should not be dissuaded by the absence of such an option in the adult Jewish community. To begin with, such options are developing (e.g., Haburot, Jews for Urban Justice, Jewish Liberation Project). Furthermore, young people have the resourcefulness, I am confident, to create the way. My own assessment of the state of Jewish life in America and the needs of young American Jews is such that I would place Jewish radicalism—which may include elements of the traditional but stresses activism, humanism, universalism, and religious experimentation—a notch above Jewish traditionalism in my own priority scale, without neglecting or neglecting the latter.

Albert S. Axelrad

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS CENTER

Purdue University

Presence is the term seen by the staff and students associated with Saint Thomas Aquinas Center at Purdue University as most descriptive of campus ministry here. Presence can be an active term in the sense that we go where things are happening, and it can also be passive in the sense that we are here to be used according to the needs of the one or the group that comes. We must exercise our ministry where we find it, so to speak. One day it may be simply pastoral and sacramental. One night it may mean losing sleep to be with students arrested for "lounging in" at the Union building. It might mean one-to-one counseling or having a bull session in the lounge of a residence hall or sorority or fraternity house. It could also mean discussing strategy of ministry with rabbis and Protestant ministers in a formal session or at a local beer hall, or at a Retreat House in an extended session. Presence means being with people for the sake of meeting their needs as they might arise. Presence is the witness of love.

Saint Tom's is the presence of the Church on campus at Purdue. The openness of our buildings is a symbol of the openness we hope will characterize our presence in every area. Saint Tom's is the only public building at Purdue that never closes, day or night, holiday or school day. Students, faculty, and townspeople of all faiths feel free and unthreatened about coming there, not only for educational events such as lectures or seminars but also for personal counseling or public and private worship and meditation. Group use of the facilities has included SDS, Moslems, foreign students, other Christian churches for worship, the Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship, etc. It's the place to go at Purdue if one cannot use University facilities because of restrictions related to food preparation, admission charges, fund-raising activities, or political activities.

A large staff is necessary to exercise presence effectively with the large numbers of students, faculty, and staff at Purdue.

1. Four priests, appointed by the bishop, comprise the pastoral staff. Each has some specialty, if not by talent, at least by interest or by acceptance. They serve in all the normal ways, as counselors, worship leaders, preachers, organizers; they are available.

2. A nun, bringing the dimension of a dedicated religious to ecumenical alliances and encounters, is also responsible for the religious education of the children of students as well as adult education at the Center and in the Diocese.

3. A lay woman, qualified by a master's degree in guidance and counseling, takes her place as an accepted campus minister with the specialty of serving the international student community, and as an officer of the University Ministers Organization.

4. A lay theologian, married and qualified with a doctorate in theology from an ecumenical theological institute, teaches transfer courses (he is technically a member of the staff of the theology department of the University of Notre Dame) in religious thought to students of all religious communions or from none. He is also available for much counseling in curriculum on an individual basis with students and is a popular lecturer.

This seven-person staff, operating as a team but also under the canonical structure of a parish, works together with elected student leaders to share the responsibility for programming in ministry, deliberating on action in ministry creatively and freely—even to the point of committing the student parish to a tithing program to the inner city and thereby risking fiscal solvency.

The program at Saint Tom's includes:

1. Ecumenical, current, and diversified lecture service, open to all in the community without charge, attracting a variety of individuals and groups who thereby identify with the center in some immeasurable way that is highly positive. It is probably the most important single factor in making St. Tom's a center of free intellectual inquiry, more free than most classrooms, a kind of neutral ground where dialog can abound.
2. Transfer credit courses (through the University of Notre Dame) witnessing to the state university for seven years that religious studies will be made by undergraduate students even at enormous sacrifice of time and money.

3. Noncredit courses and seminars, designed and constantly reviewed and revised to meet the felt needs of students for learning not available elsewhere in a group encounter.

Finally, Saint Tom's provides the opportunity for worship, reconciliation, creativity, forming community, faith enlightenment (from blindness to glimmer) for acceptance as persons, for the making of theology.

Leo A. Piguet

UP AGAINST THE WALL

(John F. Smith, Episcopal Chaplain at Boston University interviewed by John Black)

BLACK: How do you deal with the ambiguity of your position as a chaplain at Boston University? How do you see your role there?

SMITH: You face that when you start working in a place. You have to psych the place out in terms of what its needs are, and what role you can have. You become whatever is needed, depending on what your theology of the university is. To make the place more human, to help build the new society wherever the building is going on. Then you have to reevaluate your role and change it, depending on who your colleagues are and what's going on. With the civil rights movement, for instance, we were really organizers. But we don't have to any more with the student activists. They've taken over, even the sources of communication, so our role, even as enablers, is lessened.

BLACK: So if you went into the situation with a preconceived role, you'd be wondering what to do.

SMITH: You'd be out of your mind by now. If you go in as some kind of minister, it's all over. Any sort of authoritative, pastoral, fatherly role concerned with some religious, esoteric issue is a waste of time.

BLACK: Did you try that sort of approach yourself once?

SMITH: Sure. Back in 1961, it was perfectly possible to do that then, not that I was ever committed to the idea, even at E.T.S. and during my time in the parish. I began at B.U. by questioning the old ideas and roles of college chaplaincy and started on an experimental basis.

BLACK: How valuable has your training been for this position?

SMITH: My theological training has proved enormously valuable, especially Biblical theology, just in keeping my head together and giving me an understanding of history to work out of. But in terms of pastoral training, I've had to unlearn everything I was taught—counseling included, and adopt my own style. All that Rogerian stuff, all that professionalism I think is really destructive.

BLACK: Well then, how do you see the professional training of clergy now as it relates to the preparation of college chaplains?

SMITH: Something about the history of higher education is valuable I think. But you can’t train people, except perhaps in the style of the Urban Training Centre. Academic professional training has proven itself to be an abortion.

BLACK: You mentioned earlier a theology of the university. How would you describe this theology as it evolved for you?

SMITH: I'd use the terms that George Weber of the East Harlem Protestant Parish once used. He talked about the idea that you could bring Jesus onto the campus, understood in all sorts of neo-orthodox stages. Then the discovery comes that Jesus had been there for years, very actively, and what you had to do was join him in what he was doing. Joining him involved all sorts of mundane, everyday things related to building the Kingdom, a new life and deeper understandings. We used to think that college kids were terribly strange until we discovered that we were the strange ones. What was happening was that some sort of culture change was going on. We're going to try to be with this one, because I think the Spirit is speaking—not in any sort of absolute sense, but speaking in a way that Christians have to listen. More and more I see it as a situation like eight century Israel. The prophetic language has never been clearer. On the Ed Sullivan show last night Eddie Albert had this prayer that asked Yahweh to do his own thing: I couldn't help thinking of Amos. The Day of the Lord, the Day of the Lord. That's what they want. Fine. It'll be darkness for them. They complain and whine that Yahweh isn't doing anything. If Yahweh ever did, they'd be the first to go.

BLACK: The phrase that people use now for the new generation—"counter culture"—how do you see it?

SMITH: I think it's viable, more so than students realize. It's part of the revolution that I'm interested in. There is nothing ambiguous about it. I don't think it's the Kingdom in any way but it makes more sense to the people that live in the world I know.

BLACK: Now if you place the Gospel on the side of the counter culture, where does this leave you with Establishment Christianity?

SMITH: On this sort of question I'm sort of liberal reformist I think the university can change its life, but more important, the college chaplain has to take a side. When he walks into a room with a bunch of freaky kids on one side and a bunch of uptight administrators on the other, he has to know which side to go to. I have no trouble deciding, partly because I know the administrators aren't going to be talking about anything except legalisms. The kids will be talking about something more real—though not much more so. I have no interest in breaking down the Establishment. It's already broken down. My job is to make the connections that will allow the new institutions to take over.

For example, in B.U. right now we have student government that parallels the administration. Students have their own lawyer, birth control and abortion service, their own counseling service with Rap, their own information service. So there's a real counter culture in the middle of the university. My job is to help them build that.

BLACK: You see no point in building a bridge between the old and the new?

SMITH: I think that's a cop-out. When you try to be a bridge you end up being made ineffectual, at least in my experience. Now if any one's interested in so-called reconciliation, then I want to see the color of their money first. I've lived with this more and more. The administration never wants to compromise. It just wants its own way—like a baby. I don't see the sense in talking about recon-
ciliation with a bunch of people who aren't interested in others, only in manipulating. They have to convince us that they really do want the students' best interests and not their own. And they're beginning to. Especially with things like the drug problem that they find they really can't handle. The administration has many natural interests that are inimical to the students. The same thing is happening with the faculty. Their interests simply aren't relevant to the students. And no one yet that I see is producing any sort of counter academic culture.

BLUCK: Do you find faculty support for the sort of stand you're taking?

SMITH: Oh sure. I go back nine years at B.U. Faculty once used to say to some chaplains: "You're on the student's side," as if it was a miracle. Now, of course, there's just a lot more understanding.

BLUCK: What about finance for your operation?

SMITH: The Episcopal Church. It's very generous and very good. I think kids are beginning to realize that the Church at its best is ready to do what must be done.

BLUCK: How do you see the business of worship? Do you see yourselves as a worshipping community?

SMITH: This is a real problem. I think it's important. We gather in very small groups, very informally, to sing songs, to talk to each other, to eat bread and drink wine. But it's hard to do. I used to have a regular Sunday morning service at 9:30. Then we moved over here and even now it's declining. I'm not sure what students want. The matter of worship is the lowest point of all. But we've got to do something. I still see myself as a priest and the president of the eucharist. The Church doesn't help much either. It's got to get a lot looser and move a lot faster. Already it runs out of young people. It's not committed to relevant celebration.

BLUCK: You could hardly be accused of being upright on this question, yet you say that it's still a problem.

SMITH: Well, I've got to work a lot harder, but I have the feeling that no matter how hard you worked you still wouldn't be successful and attract large numbers. The trouble is that the people who still don't want changes and innovation. Kids come to church for all kinds of immature reasons and convictions. Also there's the whole mystical interest right now that we could make more use of. But that can be very unfaithful.

BLUCK: In what way?

SMITH: Well, I'm not going to go round as some sort of astrology type and pretend it's part of the Christian faith.

BLUCK: Worship then is not a dead issue for you.

SMITH: No. That's too easy. I suffer on Sunday nights because I'm still in that success mold, but worship it still something I have to face.

BLUCK: As a chaplain, do you identify yourself with any political line?

SMITH: We're identified with the Left, and more specifically with the people working for social and political change. But I can't raise much interest in factionalism, in the SDS, for instance.

BLUCK: What is your contact with the SDS?

SMITH: They held a lot of their important meetings here last year. But a lot of my work now is supportive rather than specifically political. I think, though, our commitments are fairly clear. That does not mean that we don't talk to people like Young Americans for Freedom. But I don't believe that there's a silent majority on campus somewhere that we have a responsibility to, that we should be in between and not take sides or something like that. I believe that the silent majority are the people too depressed or too drugged to come out of their dormitories, to get in the march. I would think that 90 percent of the campus is behind the movement.

I don't believe in being actively a part of things like sit-ins. On campus, anyway, it's a student struggle—for their freedom. I can't give that to them. They have to get it themselves.

This is very funny. Some of the pictures that were used to identify the B.U. 21 last April included me. At the hearing they asked me if I was part of the demonstration. I said, "No. I was in the office talking to a friend of mine," I think they understood that. But I was there, for all kinds of reasons: to make sure that some people weren't so manic and panicked and high that they stopped thinking about what was really happening. I wanted to show that I was there with them. But it was perfectly clear that I wasn't occupying the building.

BLUCK: How do you compare the confrontations here with those at Harvard?

SMITH: The basic difference I think is that the kids here took the police seriously. They knew what would happen. At Harvard students thought the University would look after them. B.U. uses the police very freely, and I think we have to stand with the students on this.

BLUCK: Are there any other issues that should be raised?

SMITH: The whole question of what higher education is for and why people go to college is very important. At this point I see a lot of kids in university with no idea of why they're there and finding their education hopelessly irrelevant to the sort of life they're going to lead, outside the Establishment. I meet these kids in the teaching I do in the liberal arts college. For most of them the curriculum is just a drug.

BLUCK: By way of summary then, how do you see your task ahead?

SMITH: Mainly, it's a matter of identifying with subcultures and trying to work with them, being ready and open. I try to go out and talk to people in parishes about the situation here, but I'm increasingly pessimistic about that. Contact across the cultures is more and more difficult.
CHAPTER 7

Guidelines for Development

In 1965 the Danforth Foundation commissioned a major study of campus ministries in the United States. Kenneth Underwood was appointed director and initiated a complex battery of procedures to implement the undertaking. There were studies of colleges, studies of campus programs, studies of metropolitan areas, studies of campus ministries, comparison studies of parish ministers. The official report was delayed by the illness and death of Underwood, but the two volumes were finally released in the fall of 1969 with a summary statement by the Commission. (A number of the related studies have also been published; see references to Hammond's study of campus ministers and to Demuth and Luttermann's study of students at Wisconsin in this monograph.)

The Danforth Study must be viewed as the principal point of reference with respect to our subject. Whether or not it will finally be adjudged definitive, it is a substantial, complex, and provocative document supplying data related to nearly every issue that has been raised here.

Underwood was a committed churchman, a dedicated educator/scholar deeply concerned for the campus ministry. He appreciated the contributions campus ministry could make to evolving patterns of churches and universities but was at the same time highly critical of its ineffective, individualistic, ad hoc (hence unstrategic) impact on educational or religious or civic policy. He concludes his review of the campus ministries in the San Francisco Bay area with this:

What church leadership seems not to have learned in the Bay area is how the structures of pastoral caring are incorporated into the daily life of churches and universities, thus providing some balanced and integral experience of their deepest functions and services. They provide little islands of sympathetic and friendly meetings for 5 to 7 percent or so of the student population. But the approaches to specific functions—counseling, theological inquiry, and so on—are so varied and dependent on the interests of a particular minister (usually of short duration in his position) that the categories of profession or of social and religious policy can be applied only in terms of hopes for the future of the work.

Underwood reinforces this judgment with evaluations of work in Madison, New York, and Boston. (This is not, of course, a general condemnation of all that is being done or of all ministerial persons indiscriminately; but it is a judgment on general effectiveness.) Underwood also reported some model programs at Michigan State, Pittsburgh, and North Carolina that he thought offered considerable promise.

Some of the aspects of the Danforth study significant to our chapter here include the following:

1. There are enduring modes of ministry (on campus and off) that need to be balanced in any program: (a) the pastoral mode, the dimension of caring for persons in either personal, face-to-face contact or in the fellowship of social groupings; (b) the priestly mode, the channel for “proclamation of the faith and administration of the sacraments”; (c) the prophetic—teaching mode, the illumination of the values and choices involved in the events or material under study; and (d) governance, that mode which seeks to formulate policy and establish order within the ministry itself and within the other societal institutions.

2. A major task of those concerned with ministry (especially in the university) is to replace belief that depends on maintaining inherited, traditional doctrine with an epistemology of inquiry. The agent of religion must abandon the notion that he comes to the university with a fixed revelation, closed on doctrine; he must offer to share and inquire openly, expecting renewal and reform.

3. The primary lack in ministerial training and concern is the lack of competent strategic thinking with respect to governance of the enterprise and impact on social policy.

4. Churches must rediscover and reestablish the
ministry of the laity. In modern society the professional in the specialized secular occupations is the agent of social change in far more integral ways than is the professional minister; hence, ministry in the society and in the world is the ministry of a people, not just of a clergyman. Unhappily, there has been much too little emphasis on the role of the responsible layman and his ministry in society.121

5. The Wisconsin study confirmed the general observation that traditionally organized ministries attract traditionally-minded, conservative constituencies. Underwood insists that a new model of community-congregation appealing to those in the university who have or are congenial to an inquiring style of belief and commitment would attract substantial support. This new type of participant would free new initiatives and create new images in the university.122

6. Procedures for testing, evaluating, and reporting new or revised models of campus programs need to be established in the total economy of the churches as regional or national bodies. Experimentation that is merely a programmatic novelty indulged but never evaluated, reported, or followed through is distracting and unworthy. Research centers should furnish strategic leadership in allocating regional and national effort and resources.123 At the local level Underwood remarks:

To teach, to lead worship, to preach in such a way as to enhance the powers of others to participate in the formation of social policy, is seen as one of the most important aspects of being human and being Christian.124

7. Preparation for ministry of the kind he has urged, Underwood maintains, would require a significantly different experience than that presently provided by seminaries—which, he charges, are the "most isolated" of the professional schools from the life of the university.125 He gives qualified endorsement to the American Association of Theological Schools' proposals for reorganization of the nation's seminaries in clusters affiliated with universities;126 and he urges the addition of institutes for policy research.127 But he then proposes a much more sweeping reorganization that would place each seminary student in a residential internship for ministry to the university.128 His rationale for this is that the university, being a prototype of the emerging culture, offers internship at a relevant and strategically prevenient level. Such a policy would preempt specialized training for campus ministry, since all faculty and all students would be engaged in it.129

The range and comprehensiveness of the Danforth Commission report can only be hinted at in this brief review; that report will require careful and repeated study for a long time.

Criteria for Religious Life and Activities

Now it is time to formulate some of the guidelines that should be observed in planning and evaluating religious ministries related to colleges and universities.

Any effective campus ministry will attempt to live at the nexus where values and events intersect. Moral and spiritual nurture occur when sensitivity and discrimination of values develop; it should be characteristic of ministry (as distinct from academic study) that that experiential moment in its rich sensory, emotional, and rational content should be infused, transformed, or redirected as human and transcendent perspectives are brought to bear. Analysis of this experience shows at least the following components:

1. Throughout every occurrence in the university—and its applications and implications carried into the larger society—persons and agencies under religious auspices in the university are expected to stand resolutely for human dignity and the fullest development of persons and community. This involves a caring regard for all persons (administration, faculty, and clerical or grounds staff as well as students) and a cherishing of the rich diversity of life styles and cultures on campus. In ministerial terms this is pastoral care, but it is everybody's business, including especially college personnel staff. Specifically, it involves: (a) concern for human values amid all that is technological and professional in the university; (b) concern for all that is human among the political and economic aspects of the university; (c) conserving what is human and humane in the social structure; and (d) being responsible for seeing that all institutional structures give priority to human values.

2. Persons and agencies of religious life in the university must affirm the value of the scholarly enterprise and be committed to rational dialog and inquiry as the means for resolving the questions that arise within the university community. The university qua university has a prior responsibility to the academic study of religion; whatever it does to recognize or support other forms of religious life is secondary to the scholarly obligation to transmit the heritage of the various faiths and to search for discovery of new insights and methodologies.

3. Perhaps the most distinctive single criterion of religious life (the preceding are substantially incumbent upon all departments of the university)
is the way in which religious groups and their leaders persistently endeavor to conceive all they are and all they do in a transcendent and universal perspective. The assumption of a transcendent power that influences universal history is distinctively, though not uniquely, a theistic assumption; it leads to "God talk." In the university, this transcendent reference reduces denominationalism to irrelevance; it emphasizes the ecumenical and inclusive at the expense of the sectarian. But it is, as Underwood insisted, an inquiring rather than a dogmatic style that seeks a unifying and motivating vision of the Ultimate Power, the Good Life, and the Good Society.

4. Religious leadership on campus, as in the community, seeks to use the historic symbols and liturgies or create new ones that represent, identify, and dramatize the point on the pilgrimage of life and history at which a given community of persons has arrived. There are academic, fraternal, and civic liturgies and rituals, too, and the religious institutions have a constitutional responsibility to influence, invite, or goad them into lifting their level of symbolization to the highest and most humane this race has discovered.

Guidelines for Ministry with Students

Critical evaluation and outright protest against all institutional structures and processes are characteristic enough of this student generation to prevent comfortable assertions about the viability of our current relationship with today's youth. It may be that the rhetoric of revolution and student power will turn out to be mostly that, but the social upheavals of our times and the predictions of future social problems lends credence to the expectations of continued turbulence. Just as the cumulative exploitation of nature erodes the balance of ecological systems, so 30 years of crisis, depression, war, cold war, and war again are seriously eroding the human resources of compassion and community and security.

Although traditional religious agencies continue to define their roles and missions in the classical way, it would appear to this author from the evidence surveyed that the major functional religious tasks for young adults in our age are: (a) the developmental life tasks; and (b) the clarification of concepts of justice, peace, and order in society. The abstract, subjective ritual of American pietism is a dysfunctional stereotype that needs to be replaced by a functional, "Tillichian" definition of religion.

There is disturbing evidence that the contemporary university functions in a manner that disregar...
too must learn the art of substituting inquiry for proclamation.

The student Christian movements gave impetus to the ecumenical revolution in the twentieth century; certainly the university crucible has shown denominationalism to be absurd. An inquiring style and an ecumenical spirit will again open up the life of the churches to new discoveries, new moral insights, new lines of communications. The university prototype experience will be followed in the churches in a less formal and rigid structure. There will be, as indeed there already is, more freedom for innovation, more relativity and less dogmatic certainty, more acknowledgement of doubt but helpfulness in search.

Finally, the churches can be expected to rediscover the essentiality of teamwork rather than a "solo" approach to ministry. The branches of knowledge and experience are too diverse and too complex for much general mastery. The lay technical specialist must become the minister in his society if there is to be any effective minister there at all.

Implications for Research

Dramatic and exciting new perspectives on the life of the university in relation to its struggle with the critical problems of our times have revealed possibilities of transformed relationships to moral and religious perspectives. The possibilities of such changes uncover a wide range of questions on which research needs to be conducted:

1. The concept that religion deals with the ultimate commitments and primary loyalties of persons is more than a semantic exercise. Solid research is needed to identify those commitments and loyalties which would be thus defined as "new religions." Further, much study would be required by present institutions of religion to investigate to what extent they could shift their concepts and operations to reflect these newer understandings of commitment and loyalty.

2. Additional study is needed on the whole range of issues repeatedly referred to as the impact of college experience on young adults' attempts to master developmental tasks. There is no positive evidence that the present educational structures assist those attempts very effectively. Urgent study should be launched to discover if our current evaluation of this matter is accurate, and, if so, what must be done to make the college experience a positive and effective process in developing mature and competent persons.

3. Having discarded mechanistic, quantifiable matter-of-fact reasoning as the criterion of objective scholarship and having excluded moral and spiritual values as well, contemporary scholarship is morally naked and spiritually starving. All it has, when attacked by its activist critics, is an ad hoc pragmatism; no currency negotiable for food and clothing, and no budget-assessing priorities. A first step in redressing this plight would be an interdisciplinary study of the implicit value presuppositions in the academic enterprise itself. It might then be possible to examine the problems connected with when, how, and where is it necessary to articulate and insist upon those values being respected in research, in the teaching process, and in the governance of the university.

4. Medical transplants, genetic manipulation, programmed learning, and many other topics reveal that university research and spin-off applications have great moral significance. If the atomic bomb, DDT, and the pill may be cited as discoveries released before their consequences and implications were adequately understood, then it is highly essential to identify the points at which information, research, and teaching transactions have ethical implications for political, economic, technological, and untold other processes in society. What is the scholarly community's responsibility for safeguarding the ethical uses of scholarly discoveries?

5. Campus ministers, with such resource consultants as they can recruit, need to engage in extensive studies to discover activities that they might use to render assistance more effectively to individuals, universities, churches, and the social order. These models might include institutes and consultations, new liturgies, and new programmatic ideas (coffeehouses, sensitivity groups, community involvement, etc.).

Campus ministers are not in the habit of dealing with their task at this level. As one reads the literature from professionals in student personnel services (and as attested to by Williamson) they are not in the habit of dealing with problems at this level, either. We are on the verge of (if not already in the midst of) an academic revolution as profound as the transformation of the liberal arts college into a university in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Whether that revolution will be genuinely liberating and humanizing or whether it will become an ideological straitjacket is not just a scare question. All those on the university scene have a great stake in the way the tide turns. The agenda for those who work and struggle for a liberating humanism is prepared.
CHAPTER 8

Summary

It is easy to lose sight of the forest in the examination of a species of trees, and we could concede that the religious enterprise has often done just that. At this time there are few who would claim much success in campus religious programs, either on designated campuses or for the total enterprise. The world is out of joint and many of the familiar landmarks of human wisdom are being radically revised. It is not surprising then, for the religious situation to be unstable.

There is no time more important for the experimental and research effort represented by religion in the university to be supported. The fundamental challenge is to discover what gives human life dignity, integrity, and fulfillment in the perspective of history and the universe. We can at least hope that the present disarray in religious organizations will clear the way for more effective and inclusive involvement of the total community in clarifying the vision of the good life.

In the meantime, there will probably be more idiosyncratic probes, exploring and testing all manner of fresh styles and techniques. The diversity will continue to perplex college administrators and colleagues in student personnel services, for that free-wheeling devotion will defy the customary classification of services and responsibilities.

This built-in invitation to irritation could end in hostile impasse. That unfortunate situation can be avoided only by a recognition by both parties that valid links and overlapping jurisdictions make it essential to communicate and relate what each party is doing to the ultimate goal of human fulfillment. I must reiterate the importance of opening dialog between the humanistic tradition (in this case represented by religion) and the social science tradition (represented by student personnel practitioners and educational administrators). The expansion of that dialog is an important kind of research in itself. Beyond that, there is a vast unexplored field of social research that could discover what processes and influences make a person humane and experientially fulfilled in the context of history and destiny. The alienation in urban schools, the disaffection of college students with academic irrelevance and immorality, the charge that society is depersonalized—all seem to indicate sufficient reason for substantial dialog and substantial research effort in this whole field.

This inquiry into the roles, functions, and services present on American campuses in the name of religion has indicated, albeit sketchily, that new styles of ministry are being sought through a great deal of variety and experimentation. In comparison to primarily pastoral and worship-centered churches, the campus ministry is more akin to the experimental styles of ministry in the inner city. This searching is guided by the concept that religion is the ultimate loyalty of a full life, and that it attempts to take responsible account of human nature in the concrete historical situation, acknowledging a vital, transcendent, cosmic source.

Traditionally, the educational establishment has dealt with the human situation of students primarily by preparing them for future responsibilities. This detachment and postponement has been modified somewhat by progressive education in the elementary and secondary schools. Higher education has been slower to modify its relation to students, but colleges and universities have become more involved in research, consulting, and community service. For reasons that need not be explored here, the current student generation clearly has expressed its discontent with that perspective of detached postponement for the prolonged period of education. Campus ministers have generally validated the affirmation that life ought not to be postponed and are seeking to help students find a style of life which (while acknowledging the claim of the future) is valid here and now.

The momentous dream that guides religious ex-
perimentation, then, is still to find what makes our lives truly human; or, as psychologist Gordon Allport puts it, "what [we] regard as permanent or central in the nature of things." It is only slightly poetic to say that campus ministers are free-lance researchers in this field, funded by the churches and synagogues.

Human experience in the last third of the twentieth century is so changed by new technical, political, sociological, and intellectual factors that there is considerable justification for the researchers to be doing their own thing at this point. If chaos is to be avoided at the end of the human enterprise, the religious initiatives on campus will make their contribution to sorting out the significant verities, the new styles of life, and the new symbols that unify human community and undergird dignity and respect for persons.
APPENDIX

Directory of Agencies Concerned with Religion


American Baptist Convention. The Department of Campus Christian Life is a full participant in United Ministries in Higher Education (q.v.). The former Baptist Student Movement (q.v.) was one of the original groups founding the University Christian Movement (q.v.). A national university commission now exists to assist university-related people in participating in various Baptist affairs. In spite of the changes in national nomenclature, some local units may maintain their historic names. Denominational address: The Rev. Richard Tappan, Department of Campus Christian Life, Board of Education and Publication, American Baptist Convention, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19481.

American Bible Society. Sponsors a national campus ministry office to act as resource to already established local campus efforts. The aim is to assess, research, and promote the use and distribution of Scripture. Headquarters: Ivan H. Nothdurft, National Secretary for Campus Ministry, American Bible Society, 1865 Broadway, New York, New York 10023.

The American Catholic Sociological Society. The Society stimulates concerted study and research among Catholics working in the field of sociology, promotes solidarity among Catholic sociologists, presents the sociological implications of Catholic thought, and encourages its members to recognize their professional responsibilities as sociologists. Publishes Sociological Analysis. Address: The American Catholic Sociological Society, 1403 North St. Mary's Street, San Antonio, Texas 78215.

American Lutheran Church. Sponsor of the Division of Educational Services, Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. (q.v.), along with the Lutheran Church in America and the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod. Informally related to Lutheran Student Movement in America (q.v.).

The American Society of Christian Ethics. The Society promotes scholarly work in the field of Christian ethics, and in the relation of Christian ethics to social, economic, political, and cultural problems; encourages the improvement of teaching Christian ethics in colleges, universities, and theological schools; and provides a fellowship of discourse and debate for those engaged professionally within the general field of Christian ethics and social policy. Address: Professor Douglas Sturm, Executive Secretary, The American Society of Christian Ethics, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania 17837.

American Society of Church History. Furthers study and research in all aspects and periods of the history of the Christian Church with a particular responsibility for American church history. Affiliated with the American Historical Association; publishes a quarterly journal, Church History. Treasurer: Mr. Buy S. Klett, 321 Mill Road, Oreland, Pennsylvania 19075.


Baptist Student Movement. The student movement of the American Baptist Convention (q.v.), which was one of the founders of the University Christian Movement (q.v.).

Baptist Student Union. A student movement of Baptists, organized in 1922, related to the Southern Baptist Convention (q.v.). The same name is also used by the Student Movement of the National Baptist Church. Local chapters of the Union are served by both state and national office resources.
Headquarters (for Southern Baptist BSU): Mr. Charles M. Roselle, Department of Student Work, Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 127 Ninth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

*B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation*. An agency of the American Jewish community that provides a program of cultural, religious, educational, social, and counseling content to Jewish college and university students in the United States, Australia, Canada, England, Israel, the Netherlands, South Africa, Switzerland, and Venezuela. Hillel units seek to function as the all-inclusive Jewish community on campus and to serve all Jewish college students regardless of their background or denominational preferences. International Director: Rabbi Benjamin M. Kahn, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

*Campus Commission of the Standing Conference of the Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas*. The Campus Commission is a working commission, established in 1965 and composed of faculty, students, priests, and staff. The office of the Commission is an information bureau, a program source, organizer of an annual North American conference of students, and the administrative and coordinating center for the presence of the Orthodox Church in the campus community. The staff includes regional secretaries in Chicago, San Francisco, and Montreal. Executive Secretary: James Couchell, Orthodox Campus Commission, 10 East 79th Street, New York, New York 10021.

*Campus Crusade for Christ International, Inc.* This highly conservative and evangelical, nondenominational organization's stated purpose is "to win men, build men, and send men for Christ . . . to help evangelize the collegians, laymen and military of the world—the leaders of today and tomorrow." Headquarters: Arrowhead Springs, San Bernadino, California.

*Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).* The Board of Education is a full participant in United Ministries in Higher Education (q.v.). Also sponsored the former Disciples Student Movement (q.v.). Address: Board of Education, Disciples of Christ, 222 Downey Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46219.

*Christian Faith and Higher Education Institute*. The Institute, established in 1962, has the task of exploring higher education to the end that resources may be developed for both the church and higher education. Supported by United Ministries in Higher Education (q.v.). Director: Jack Harri-son, 1405 South Harrison Road, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

*Church of Christ, Scientist*. Christian Science Organizations on college and university campuses are democratically self-governed. The College Organization section assists through correspondence, visits, and a biennial meeting in Boston. Denominational Address: College Organization Section, Youth Division, Department of Branches and Practitioners, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, 107 Falmouth Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02115.

*Church of the Brethren*. A sponsor of United Ministries in Higher Education (q.v.). Denominational Address: Parish Ministries Commission, Church of the Brethren, 1451 Dundee Avenue, Elgin, Illinois 61020.

*The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints*. Sponsors chapters on some college campuses. There are two national groups: first, as above, with headquarters at Salt Lake City, Utah; second, the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, with headquarters in Independence, Missouri.

*Church Society for College Work*. Founded by a group of Episcopalians in 1935, is now an ecumenical, independent society with the following purposes: to provide intellectual resources for Christian presence in higher education, to help the Church use higher education's knowledge for more effective ministry, and to encourage university and church collaboration on social and cultural issues. Executive Director: The Rev. Myron B. Bloy, 2 Brewer Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

*College Theology Society*. Organized in 1954–55 as the Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine; name changed in 1967. Aims to improve the quality of teaching in sacred doctrine, chiefly through influencing graduate training and professional discourse of those engaged in such teaching. Headquarters: Catholic Theology Society, Caldwell College for Women, Caldwell, New Jersey 07006.

*Commission on Youth Service Projects*. A coordinating and consultative council of 114 private, North American organizations which sponsor or support youth service projects in any part of the world. Publishes an annual directory entitled *Invest Yourself*. For similar projects sponsored by other groups, consult the Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service, UNESCO, 6 rue Franklin, Paris 16e, France. Headquarters: Commission on Youth
Service Projects, 475 Riverside Drive, Room 832, New York, New York 10027.

Congregational-Christian Church. (See United Church of Christ.)


Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities. A voluntary association of private colleges and universities, represented by their duly authorized officers, which believe that their responsibilities as institutions of higher learning can best be accomplished by striving constantly for academic excellence in an environment consciously expressive of the Protestant Christian faith with its commitment to the primacy of truth and its concern for human values, the spiritual growth of each individual, and the interrelationships of faith. The Council is related to the Department of Higher Education of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA. President: Dr. Samuel H. Magill, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20009.

Department of Higher Education, National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA. Has responsibility, within the Division of Christian Education, for giving leadership to the cooperative efforts of the churches in relation to higher education. Is the center for study of issues in relation to colleges and universities and is the link to the NCC for the Council for Protestant Colleges and Universities (q.v.). Executive Director: Dr. William N. Lovell, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027.

Disciples Student Fellowship. The Disciples Student Fellowship was formerly sponsored by the International Convention of Christian Churches Disciples of Christ. Joined in the union negotiations which resulted in the United Campus Christian Fellowship (q.v.), which later merged into the University Christian Movement (q.v.). In spite of the changes of national nomenclature, some local units may maintain their historic names. Denominational Address: Dr. William L. Miller, President, Board of Education, Disciples of Christ, 222 Downey Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46219.

Division of Educational Services, Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. A newly founded agency (1969) for the support of Lutheran-affiliated colleges and seminaries and the campus ministries of the American Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Church in America, and the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod. Executive Secretary: Dr. Donald W. Herb, 315 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10010.

Episcopal Church. Sponsor of the National Canterbury Association (q.v.) and of United Ministries of Higher Education (q.v.). Denominational Address: Executive Council The Episcopal Church, 815 Second Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

Evangelical and Reformed Church. (See United Church of Christ.)

Evangelical United Brethren Church. (See United Methodist Church.)

Faculty Christian Fellowship. A national movement of Christian faculty related to the Department of Campus Christian Life, National Council of Churches (now, the Department of Higher Education). The Faculty Christian Fellowship functioned from 1952 to 1965.

Fellowship of Christian Athletes. Purpose: To confront athletes and coaches, and through the youth of our nation, with the challenge and adventure of following Christ, participating in His Church, and serving Him through our vocations. Headquarters: Traders National Bank Building, 1125 Grand, Suite 812, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Gamma Delta. A semi-autonomous student movement historically operated within the context of the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod. Cooperates with the Lutheran Student Movement (q.v.).

International Student Service. Organized in 1911 as the Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students by the YMCA, the Committee now functions on behalf of religious, educational, and governmental groups to assist incoming international students to enrich their experience in America. Especially involved in reception and orientation of overseas students. Executive Secretary: Mr. Delmar Wedel, 291 Broadway, New York, New York 10007.

The Interseminary Movement. Organized in 1898 under the auspices of the Student YMCA, the Interseminary Movement attempted to build understanding and common concerns among students in various theological seminaries. It joined the National Student Christian Federation (q.v.) in 1959.
Intervarsity Christian Fellowship. The American branch of the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students. It is very conservative in theological position, emphasizes Bible study, personal evangelism, prayer groups, and missions. Ordinarily does not collaborate with other campus religious groups. Executive: Intervarsity Christian Fellowship, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois.

Lutheran Church in America. Sponsor (along with the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod) of the Division of Educational Services, Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. (q.v.). Informally related to Lutheran Student Movement (q.v.).

The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. Sponsor (along with the American Lutheran Church and Lutheran Church in America) of the Division of Educational Services, Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. (q.v.). Formally related to Gamma Delta (q.v.).

Lutheran Student Association of America. An autonomous student movement composed of college and university students affiliated mainly with the Lutheran Church in America (q.v.) and the American Lutheran Church (q.v.). Dissolved in 1969 and succeeded by the Lutheran Student Movement (q.v.).

Lutheran Student Movement. An autonomous student movement, formed in 1969, informally related to the Division of Educational Services, Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. (q.v.). As such, it is officially approved by the American Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Church in America, and the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

Methodist Student Movement. The Movement (including Wesley Foundations, q.v.) formerly sponsored by the Methodist Church. In 1966, merged with the University Christian Movement (q.v.). In spite of the changes of national nomenclature, some local units may maintain their historic names.

Moravian Church in America, Northern Province. A sponsor of United Ministries in Higher Education (q.v.). Denominational Address: The Rev. Thorlief Harberg, General Secretary, Board of Christian Education, Moravian Church in America, Northern Province, 5 West Market Street, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18018.

National Association of College and University Chaplains and Directors of Religious Life. An association for administratively appointed chaplains with responsibility for campus religious life. NACUC attempts to (a) provide means for more responsible and effective participation in religion in higher education by college chaplains and persons with similar functions; (b) provide a continuing professional fellowship for chaplains; (c) provide for expression of convictions relative to the vital religious concerns of students, faculties, and administrations; (d) share mutual interests and search for solutions to common problems in the religious life of colleges and universities; and (e) engage in such organizational functions as are necessary to achieve these purposes. Address changes with officers.

National Board of YMCA’s. Sponsor of the National Student Caucus of the YMCA (q.v.). Provides support services for local YMCA groups. Address: National Board of the YMCA, 291 Broadway, New York, New York 10007.

National Campus Ministry Association. A professional association of those especially engaged in ministry in higher education, funded by its members, grants from United Ministries in Higher Education (q.v.), and gifts from agencies supporting higher education projects. Constituted by campus ministers representing approximately 20 denominations. It seeks to serve five basic purposes: (a) fostering the educational development of its members; (b) facilitating approaches with other individuals and agencies of the church to ministry and mission in higher education; (c) listening to and speaking to the churches and to the university on these matters; (d) advancing ecumenical understanding; and (e) providing a supportive fellowship for its members. Address: P.O. Box 82, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406.

National Canterbury Association. An association sponsored by the College Work Department of the Episcopal Church. Also a sponsor of the University Christian Movement (q.v.). Headquarters: Dr. Edwin G. Bennett, Executive Council, The Episcopal Church, 815 Second Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

National Council on Religion in Higher Education. Changed its name in 1962 to Society for Religion in Higher Education (q.v.).

National Federation of Catholic College Students. A federation of college religious groups at Roman Catholic colleges. The Federation disbanding in 1966 as it became one of the charter national members of the University Christian Movement (q.v.). The successor office in the Roman Catholic Church is the Newman Apostolate (q.v.). In spite of the changes of national nomenclature, some local units may maintain their historic names.
National Lutheran Campus Ministry. The agency of the Lutheran Church in America and the American Lutheran Church for the support of the ministries of these churches in non-Lutheran colleges and universities. Regional offices are in Philadelphia, Chapel Hill, Kansas City, Minneapolis, Chicago, and Palo Alto. Executive Secretary: The Rev. Donald F. Hetzler, 130 North Wells, Chicago, Illinois 60605.

National Newman Chaplains Association. An independent professional association of approximately 400 priests and sisters in the Catholic campus ministry with similar concerns, as the National Campus Ministry Association, for mutual assistance and cooperation, with a special interest in the training and continuing education of campus ministers.

National Newman Student Federation. A federation of Newman Clubs organized in secular or non-Catholic institutions of higher education. The Federation disbanded in 1967 as a result of a nationwide student and chaplain reevaluation and subsequent restructuring on a local and regional level. Emphasis today is on student, faculty, and chaplain mission to the total university.

National Student Caucus of the YMCA. The continuing nondenominational movement within the National Council of YMCA's. Address: 291 Broadway, New York, New York 10007.

National Student Council of the YMCA. A nondenominational student movement organized in 1877. Had area or regional offices conforming to the administrative pattern of the National Council of YMCA's. Succeeded by the National Student Caucus (q.v.).

National Student Christian Federation. The NSCF was created in 1959 by the federation of the United Student Christian Council (q.v.), the Student Volunteer Movement (q.v.), and the Interseminary Movement (q.v.). The NSCF was succeeded in 1966 by the University Christian Movement (q.v.).

National Student Council of the YWCA. A nondenominational student movement guided by a representative National Student Council. Has regional offices according to the determination of the National Student Council and the National Board. Headquarters: Miss Frances Janes, Executive, National Student YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York.


Orthodox Churches in the Americas. The Standing Conference of the Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas is sponsor of the Campus Commission (q.v.). Address: 777 United Nations Plaza, New York, New York 10017.

Presbyterian Church in U.S. Formerly sponsor of the "southern" Presbyterians' student movement, Westminster Foundation (q.v.). Currently sponsor of United Ministries in Higher Education (q.v.). Denominational address: Dr. John Evans, Secretary, Division of Higher Education, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, U.S., Box 1176, Richmond, Virginia 23209.

Reformed Church in America. Sponsor of United Ministries in Higher Education (q.v.). Denominational Address: Dr. John Hiebstra, Board of Higher Education, Reformed Church in America, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027.


Society for Religion in Higher Education. Founded in 1922 by Professor Charles Foster Kent of Yale to stimulate and assist American colleges and universities to make more adequate provision for religion. Members are generally elected as Kent Fellows at the time of their graduate work. In 1962, the Society took its present name: prior to that it was the National Council on Religion in Higher Education. Also in 1962 the selection and administration of the Kent Fellowships were transferred to the Danforth Foundation while the Society expanded its membership to include Danforth Fellows. Executive Director: Mr. Harry E. Smith, 400 Prospect Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06511.

Society for the Scientific Study of Religion. The Society was founded in 1949 by students of religion and social science. Its purpose is to stimulate research and communicate significant scientific research on religious institutions and religious experience. Publishes the Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, a Newsletter, and occasional research papers. Address: Society for the Scientific
Study of Religion, 3812 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104.

Southern Baptist Convention. Sponsor of the Baptist Student Union (q.v.), a student movement, and its state and national programs through the Department of Student Work. Denominational Address: Mr. Charles M. Roselle, Department of Student Work, Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 127 Ninth Avenue North, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

Student Christian Movements. A generic name for local, regional, national, and international campus Christian societies. For a period between World War I and World War II, the Student YMCA and the Student YWCA movements were often referred to as the Student Christian Association Movement. In three eastern regions of the United States, during the 1930’s and 1940’s, the regional organizations of Y’s and churches in Middle Atlantic, New York, and New England were named Student Christian Movements. In Middle Atlantic the movement was dissolved in the late 50’s; in New York and New England the regions renamed themselves University Christian Movements.

Student Religious Liberals. A student-created organization affiliated with the Unitarian–Universalist Association, the Unitarian–Universalist Service Committee, and the International Religious Fellowship. SRL emphasizes individual search for sources of meaning and value in life, and community as means of mutual support; a continental organization which seeks to unite liberal religious students throughout North America. Headquarters: Student Religious Liberals, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02108.


United Campus Christian Fellowship. UCCEF was created by the merger in 1960 of the student groups of the United Church of Christ (created by the merger of the Congregational Christian Church and the Evangelical and Reformed Church), the Disciples of Christ, the Evangelical United Brethren, and the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. The aims of UCCEF can be summarized in their attempt to establish a stronger and more ecumenical church-sponsored organization on the American campus. (UCCEF provided for faculty and clergy participa-

tion, as well as students.) UCCEF was merged into the University Christian Movement (q.v.) in 1968.

United Church of Christ. Sponsor of United Ministries in Higher Education (q.v.). Formerly a sponsor of United Campus Christian Fellowship (q.v.). Denominational Address: Dr. Wesley Hotchikiss, General Secretary, Division of Higher Education, United Church of Christ, 287 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10010.

The United Methodist Church. Sponsor of United Ministries in Higher Education (q.v.). Formerly a sponsor of the Methodist Student Movement (q.v.). The United Methodist Church was formed by the merger of the Methodist Church and the Evangelical United Brethren Church in 1968. Denominational Address: Dr. Eugene Ransom, Director, Department of Campus Ministry, Board of Education, The United Methodist Church, Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee.

United Ministries in Higher Education. An agency of several Protestant churches embracing a new concept of the churches working together in a specialized ministry, seeking to approach contemporary problems in a relevant way. Participating communions covenant to plan and to serve together through a structure that is integrally a part of each communion and intentionally open to creating alliances and coalitions with and the participation of nonchurch individuals, groups, and organizations who share the purposes of UMHE. Participating communions include: American Baptist Convention, Church of the Brethren, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the Episcopal Church, Moravian Church in America (Northern Province), Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Reformed Church in America, United Church of Christ, United Methodist Church, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. National Address: The Rev. A. Myrvin DeLapp, Administration Secretary, United Ministries in Higher Education, 825 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107.

Rev. William E. Hallman, Room 340, Pittock Block, 921 S.W. Washington Street, Portland, Oregon 97205.

United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Sponsor of United Ministries in Higher Education (q.v.). Formerly sponsor of United Campus Christian Fellowship (q.v.). Denominational address: Dr. Harold H. Viehman, Secretary, General Division of Higher Education, United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., 825 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107.

United Student Fellowship. A student movement sponsored by the Congregational Christian Church and the Evangelical and Reformed Church. Later was merged into the United Campus Christian Fellowship (q.v.). In spite of changes in national terminology, some local units may retain their historic names.

University Christian Mission. Organized in 1938 in the Evangelism Department of the Federal Council of Churches, it continued until late in the 1960's to serve campus evangelism. Its principal project was Religious Emphasis Week at state university campuses.

University Christian Movement. A student movement committed to changing society through the reformulation of the goals and institutions of higher education while conscious of its Christian heritage and seeking new forms of mission. Organized in 1966. Charter national members were: the Baptist Student Movement, the Campus Commission of the Standing Conference of Orthodox Bishops in the Americas, the Lutheran Student Association of America, the Methodist Student Movement, the National Canterbury Committee, the National Federation of Catholic College Students, the National Newman Student Federation, the National Student Young Women's Christian Association, the United Campus Christian Fellowship, Westminster Fellowship, and the Young Friends of North America. The University Christian Movement succeeded the National Student Christian Federation (q.v.), and was a related movement to the Department of Higher Education, National Council of Churches. Voted to disband as of June 30, 1969.

Wesley Foundation. The agency of the United Methodist Church for ministry at secular campuses. The National Methodist Student Movement merged with the University Christian Movement (q.v.). In spite of changes of national nomenclature, some local units may maintain their historic names.

Westminster Student Fellowship. Two student movements of this name were sponsored, one each by the (northern) United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the (southern) Presbyterian Church in the U.S. Both movements have been merged into (first) the United Campus Christian Fellowship (q.v.) and (later) the University Christian Movement (q.v.).

World University Service. An agency of international student relief growing out of the student-to-student fund campaigns of the Student YMCA and YWCA, first in China in the mid-1930's, and later in Europe during and after World War II. Has assisted in medical, food, and housing relief activities for war and disaster relief; also academic supplies for institutional rehabilitation. Since the early 50's sponsorship in the U.S. has been shared by Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish student movements and the National Student Association. The international program is developed in consultation with similar WUS committees in other nations. Regional offices are in Chicago, Philadelphia, Atlanta, and San Francisco. Executive Secretary: Mr. Leon O. Marion, 20 West 40th Street, New York, New York 10118.

Young Christian Students. A Roman Catholic movement represented on some campuses from World War II to 1968. It found its identity in the New Left after a mushrooming growth in the early 60's stimulated by Vatican II and the civil rights movement.

Young Men's Christian Association. (See National Board of YMCA.)

Young Women's Christian Association. Sponsor of the National Student Council of the YWCA (q.v.). Headquarters: National Board of YWCA's, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York.

Young Friends of North America. An independent association of groups of Quaker students and non-students. A charter member of the University Christian Movement (q.v.). National Office: Box 447, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana 47374.
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