GRAND&TOY LIMITED   PERMAX REVERSIBLE • **F14-0331-22**

D0041

RELIGION, THE YOUNG AMERICAN AND THE UNIVERSITY

Robert Doran, S.J.

August 16 -- Afternoon

1971 ?

Introduction: Method

I. The Young American *see American Scholar, Fall, 1970* { adolescence & "youth" & adult
   A Kenneth Keniston
      1. Themes of consciousness — *10 diffones*
      2. Transformations of thought and behavior
         a. Interpersonal and affective
         b. Moral
         c. Intellectual
      3. Implications regarding the Gospel — *This period of "youth"*
   B. Relation of youth to time and history — "now" *generation fertile for Xtianity + its values*
   C. Characteristics of explicit religiosity
      1. Eastern orientation *cf/Rozak, The Making of a Counter Culture*
      2. The "Jesus Cult"
   Gospel → D. Search for Authenticity and Authentic Community
      + "unconditional acceptance"

II. Configurations of Church Ministry to the University and Consequent Implications Regarding Religion and Social Responsibility in America
    A. The Danforth Model for Campus Ministry
       1. The context: changing roles of higher education and religious institutions
       2. Priestly ministry
       3. Pastoral ministry
       4. Prophetic ministry
       5. Ministry of governance
    B. Application of the model to institutional realities

III The Campus Minister
    A. Noower vs. Devor: The Minister and Students *change the climate of the Univ.*
       1. Climate-word-home vs. thermostat-appropriation-tent
       2. The spirituality of the campus minister
    B. The Minister within the Institution

RELIGION, THE YOUNG AMERICAN, AND THE UNIVERSITY

Robert Doran, S.J.

There are three areas of investigation which I would like to consider in this paper: some characteristics of American youth; the configurations of Church ministry to the University, along with consequent implications regarding religion and social responsibility in contemporary American society; and the qualities of the campus minister. The considerations under these headings will by nature overlap but, I hope, not be repetitious. The realities with which we are dealing here are complicated and polymorphous; hopefully the treatment accorded them will be somewhat congruent with their complexity.

Preliminary to the paper proper I wish to say a few words about the method which was followed in assembling these reflections. I will not attempt to present a number of statistical surveys and analyses. This approach, valuable as it may be when the statistical analyses are properly interpreted and used to feed the content side of serious social-scientific work, provides in fact relatively little material when one is attempting to deal with the central functions of religion in human life. Pastoral theology and pastoral practice are first of all hermeneutical tasks, involving a threefold interpretation: first, an analysis of the mentality to which one is attempting to preach the Gospel; secondly, an analysis of the Gospel itself in relation to this mentality; and thirdly, an analysis of the effects which could be achieved in this mentality if religion were to become an operative factor in the fabric of human life.

Thus, since the paper will deal largely with the relationship of religion to meaning, responsibility and cultural values, the analysis can, I believe, properly be called existential, or horizon analysis. Everybody lives his life within the

confines of a given horizon. A horizon is the extent of what can be seen from a determinate point of view. A horizon determines a man's world of meaning and the interpretation he gives to his own experience. A horizon determines the question he is capable of asking. Beyond a given horizon, certain questions are meaningless. A horizon, then, is the ambit of meanings within which a man lives his life. Horizons are historically, culturally, and symbolically determined and conditioned frames of reference for the interpretation of existence. Horizon analysis is the attempt to understand the "worlds" in which people live from an analysis of their frames of reference.

To clarify this notion of horizon, a few words about the function of meaning in human life are in order. The human world is mediated and constituted by meaning. As Bernard Lonergan indicates, when we say that we live in a world brought to us through the memories of other men, through the common sense of the community, through the pages of literature, through the labors of scholars, through the investigations of scientists, through the thoughts of philosophers and theologians, we are saying that we live in a world mediated and constituted by meaning. This world mediated and constituted by meaning is the "real world."

Through meaning, nature and human community are transformed. Change in an individual and transformation of a community are both, in their roots, changes in meaning: a change in experience leading to a change in ideas or concepts, in judgments and evaluations, in symbols that incarnate meaning. Because meaning is constitutive of life-style and community, my freedom and responsibility to decide for myself what I am to make of myself is essentially a freedom, a responsibility, a decision with regard to meaning, with regard to the horizon within which I live my life. In accordance with what understanding of myself am I to interpret my experience? What will be the central principle of interpretation and evaluation for

all of my experience? How will I define my life? The question of meaning is a question of who I am, of my deepest identity as a free and responsible subject. It is also, as Michael Novak has emphasized in his latest book, the religious question as this question is asked today.

Since this type of analysis is done most precisely under conditions in which individual persons are attempting with some extraneous help to come to greater self-knowledge and self-appropriation--e.g., in spiritual direction, in existential psychoanalysis, or in the exercise in self-knowledge to which one subjects himself when reading genuinely such a book as Lonergan's Insight--such an analysis when applied to a sociological class may seem to lack a certain amount of precision. On the other hand, one of the difficulties with some sociological work is that "classes" are not always determined in terms of such factors as meaning and horizon but rather by much more extraneous factors such as age, geography, etc., which have at times little to offer to the task of explanation and interpretation. Given our type of analysis, then, we may presume from the outset that the categories used to characterize the horizons of American college students are by no means limited to this segment of the population. We will probably recognize ourselves in some of them.

I. The Young American

A. Keniston's Article

Tremendous assistance in defining the group of people with whom we are here concerned, in terms of characteristics of consciousness, is provided in a fascinating and essential article by Kenneth Keniston, "Youth: a 'New' Stage of Life" (The American Scholar, Autumn, 1970, pp. 631-654). I will begin, then, by summarizing Keniston's findings and will then attempt to develop further some important characteristics of the mentality of youth.

Keniston has arrived at the unique and, I believe, quite valid conclusion that, just as it was recognized at the end of the nineteenth century that a new stage of human development, i.e., adolescence, a stage intermediate between childhood and adulthood, had been introduced into society by the changes resulting from the emerging industrialism of America and Europe, so today a further new stage, which Keniston calls "youth," has emerged. This stage, intermediate between adolescence and adulthood, has emerged because of altered social, economic and historical conditions.

Keniston deals first with the major themes or issues that dominate consciousness, development and behavior during this stage; and then with the transformations of thought and behavior which occur at this time. He specifies ten dominating themes:

a) The tension between self and society, in which the awareness of actual or potential conflict, disparity, lack of congruence between one's identity, values, integrity and the resources and demands of the existing society increases. "...the adolescent is struggling to define who he is; the youth begins to sense who he is and thus to recognize the possibility of conflict and disparity between his emerging selfhood and his social order." (p. 636)

b) A pervasive ambivalence toward both self and society because of the question of how the two can be made more congruent. The problem can be expressed in negative reactions to society, in self-rejection, in efforts at self-transformation (some healthy, some not), or in a combination and alternation of these. The experience is one of conflict between autonomous selfhood and social involvement, between the maintenance of personal integrity and the achievement of effectiveness in society.

c) A consequent stance toward self and world which Keniston calls the "wary probee" "...the youthful relationship to the social order consists not merely in the experimentation more characteristic of adolescence, but with now more serious

forays into the adult world, through which its vulnerability, strength, integrity,

and possibilities are assayed. Adolescent experimentation is more concerned with

self-definition than are the probes of youth, which may lead to more lasting commitm

ments. This testing, exacting, challenging attitude may be applied to all

representatives and aspects of the existing social order, sometimes in anger and

expectation of disappointment, sometimes in the urgent hope of finding honor,

fidelity, and decency in society, and often in both anger and hope. With regard to

the self, too, there is constant self-probing in search of strength, weakness,

vulnerability and resiliency, constant self-scrutiny designed to test the individual's

capacity to withstand or use what his society would make of him, ask of him, and

allow him." (p. 637)

d) Alternating estrangement and omnipotentiality. Young people feel at times

an isolation, a sense of unreality, absurdity, and disconnectedness from the world

of people and phenomena. On the other hand, at times they feel absolutely free,

able to change or achieve anything. Complete self-transformation or the malleability

of the nonself may both be experienced as possibilities. It is this same sense of

freedom and possibility discovered in the discarding of old inhibitions, values

and constraints that may also lead to a feeling of absurdity, disconnectedness and

estrangement.

e) The refusal of socialization and acculturation. The individual during this

period becomes very much aware of the deep effects which his society and his culture

have had on his personality. His earlier socialization and acculturation is self-

critically analyzed. Efforts may be made to deny one's social membership and

culture.

f) The emergence of youth-specific identities and roles, which may either

provide the foundations for later commitments or may simply be experiments that

failed or probes of society that permitted the individual to move in other directions.

g) The value placed upon change, transformation, and movement and the consequent abhorrence of stasis; the valued transformation may be self-transformation, social and political transformation (usually pursued with single-minded determination), or geographic restlessness and social mobility.

h) The specific form assumed by the fear of death, expressed in the sense of losing one's vitality, of stopping, of "being forever trapped in an unmoving present" (p. 640).

i) The identification of adulthood with stasis, and its unconscious equation with death or non-being; hence the desire to prolong youth indefinitely.

j) The tendency to band with other youths in youthful counter-cultures. The transformations which may occur during this period are affective and interpersonal, moral, and intellectual. The first thing to be noted in interpersonal change is the shifting of the focus of the self-society conflict from the family to the broader society as a whole. This conflict may be resolved in a way in which both self and society are affirmed, by establishing the autonomous reality, relatedness, yet separateness of both; this occurs through a process similar to Jung's "individuation," in which a man comes to acknowledge and cope with social reality, either by accepting it or opposing it, while still preserving a sense of himself as intact, whole, and distinct from society.

There is an alternative possibility, however, and it is that of alienation from either self or society; alienation from self involves abject submission to society, "joining the rat race," "selling out." Alienation from society leads to its existence being ignored, denied, blocked out in self-absorption, enforced interiority and subjectivity, which grants live reality only to the self and its extensions. These alienations may become the basis for life-long adaptations: "the self-alienation of

marketing personality, the social alienation of the perpetual drop-out." (p.643).

In sexual development there is a major shift from masturbation and sexual fantasy to interpersonal sexual behavior, including the gradual integration of sexual feelings with intimacy with a real person; further, there is a working-through of vestigial fears of sexual inferiority and prohibitions against sex with one's closest intimates; thus we notice the development of a capacity for mutually satisfying sexual relationship with another whom one loves.

We can cite also a more general pattern of interpersonal development, beginning with the adolescent assumption that the interpersonal world is divided into only two categories--myself and those identical to me on the one hand, all others on the other hand--and leading through gradual stages to a phase of mutuality, in which there emerges an overriding concern with the other precisely as other. In this phase, one is aware of the ways in which others are identical to oneself, the ways in which they are similar and dissimilar, and the ways in which they are absolutely unique. At this stage the world becomes a human universe of unique and irreplaceable selves.

This development involves a change in one's relationships with elders, consisting of several sub-stages: psychological apprenticeship, a more complex mentorship, sponsorship, peership. The older person becomes progressively more real and multidimensional to the younger one, whose individuality is appreciated, validated and confirmed by the elder.

There is a comparable change in one's relationship to parents, in which the complexity of parents as historical personages is discovered, a complexity which was not appreciated during adolescence. "In the end, the youth may learn to see himself and his parents as multidimensional persons, to view them with compassion and understanding, to feel less threatened by their fate and failings, and to be able , if he chooses, to move beyond them" (p. 645).

b)   Keniston next discusses moral development. In general, this development is a matter of the movement from egocentric concepts of right and wrong (childhood), through conventional morality (determined by the standards of the community), to post-conventional moral development, where moral reasoning may lead the individual into conflict with conventional morality. For Keniston this stage has two levels: first, the assumption that concepts of right and wrong result from a social contract which is in principle open to revision; and a further level in which the individual becomes devoted to personal principles which may transcend even the social contract: e.g., the golden rule, the sanctity of life, the categorical imperative, the concept of justice, the promotion of human development. (These are, incidentally precisely the type of principles found in almost all requests made for conscientious objector status). The achievement of this level, if it occurs at all, almost always occurs during this period of "youth." In fact, unless one has begun to question the absolutism of conventional moral judgments, he does not begin to experience the tension between self and society and thus has not truly entered the period characterized by Keniston as "youth." On the other hand, the questioning of moral absolutism is also often the source of initial difficulties with religion, particularly where religion is associated with moralistic insistence on certain acts as right or wrong, irrespective of context or consequences.

c)   Finally, Keniston cites the intellectual transformations occurring during this period: the movement from an epistemological naivete concerning notions of truth and falsehood, through an awareness of multiplicity, to the realization of cultural relativism and pluralism and the ability to make a commitment within pluralism. Involved in this transition is the development of the capacity for "thinking about thinking," involving a hyperawareness of inner process, a focus upon states of consciousness as objects to be controlled and altered.

It is important to emphasize that these various developments do not occur in perfect synchronicity. "One young woman may be at a truly adolescent level in her relationship with her parents, but a a much later level of moral development; a young man may be capable of extraordinary mutuality with his peers, but still be struggling intellectually with the dim awareness of relativism. Analysis of any one person in terms of specific sectors of development will generally show a simultaneous mixture of adolescent, youthful and adult features...The concept of youth...is an ideal type, a model that may help understand real experience but can never fully describe or capture it" (p. 648). Not all college students are in this stage of life at all; some, especially in their earlier years, are psychological adolescents, while others are apprentices to the existing society and so, phenomenologically, are considered adults, irrespective of their level of maturity or their capacity for reflective living.

Thus what Keniston has presented is an admittedly undeveloped, preliminary scheme or rough outline of a stage of life which, he believes, characterizes a growing but still small set of young men and women. The concept of youth as he defines it is an ideal type, an abstraction from the concrete experience of many different individuals. Nevertheless, I believe he is correct in his recognition of a postadolescent stage of life. The vast majority of our citizens, says Keniston, have not transcended a conventional morality or an epistemological naivete which accepts as absolute and universal their own culture's ways of knowing. But, he concludes, the growing number of postconventional, postrelativistic youths need not threaten the stability of society. Rather, as new developmental stages emerge that lead growing minorities to more autonomous positions vis-a-vis society, the result could be, given adequate political, social, and economic conditions, the possibility of new forms of social organization and community based less upon

unreflective acceptance of the status quo and more upon thoughtful and self-conscious loyalty and cooperation. We will return later to the relationship between such cultural communities and the prevailing institutions of American life and the Church's role within these institutions. Here I would simply add that it is my own thesis, drawing out the implications of Keniston's article, that, if the Gospel is ever to take a firm hold in educated society, if a sophisticated radical Christianity is to come to characterize people's lives, it will be during this period in which conventional morality, moral criteria, and intellectual dualism are called into question. The word of God has a fertile soil upon which to be cast in those who are passing through this psychological stage. In psychological adolescents and in apprentices to existing society, the word is more apt to be blocked, choked by the cares of everydayness, unable to take root, even when one goes through the external motions of explicit religious adherence. The minister on campus must, then, be one who encourages entry into the period of youth, who displays his fidelity as friend and confidante to those engaged in this period of life; it is here and perhaps only here that the Gospel may become a determining factor in the emerging cultural communities of American life. With the achievement of this stage of development a horizon or frame of reference is present to give rise in a unique way to the questions to which the Gospel is an answer.

B. __Relation to time and history.__

I would like now to proceed to a discussion of an important aspect of youth consciousness which Keniston touches on only incidentally but which I believe merits a great deal of consideration: namely, youth's relation to time and history. Briefly, we may say that, with respect to the past, many college students tend, at least initially, to be amnesiac; with respect to the future, they tend to be doubtful and, at times, hopeless. To call them the "now generation," then, says more,

I believe, about the quality of their reference to past and future than it does of their relation to the present, which, while generally intense in one way or another, is variously differentiated.

The amnesiac is the man who acts out of the resources of this or that moment, without any tradition to draw upon, without what Daniel Berrigan has called, with no reference, I am sure,to the Catonsville incident, the "blood resources of the tribe." One of the meanings of student alienation is surely that students find their resources of meaning and value cut off in many directions: family, religion, trust in the forms of secular authority, trust in the university as a vehicle of human development. Many students seem to have little nostalgia for our civic or religious traditions. They find themselves caught in the chaos of contradictory human passions. In this situation, says Berrigan, reflecting on his experiences with students while engaged in campus ministry work at Cornell," ... a man is no longer capable of possessing his soul, of declaring for himself what his form of life is going to be. Rather, from here and there, from whatever current is loud and persuasive at the moment, he slaps together the latest 'thing' and calls it manhood. The forms of alienation around him are forming what he would like to call his consciousness. But such a life is nothing more ... than a scrapbook of violence, despair, and alienation. And since the project has been slapped together in an hour, it isn't going to last much more than the hour."

Students are affected by a number of cutoffs in which the person can no longer remember his past or anticipate his future. As we will see, the nuclear situation of our globe affects the view of the future. But this whole process of alienation must be seen as a spiritual occurrence--the absence of nurtured, gradualist social change in which a young person emerges organically from the nest into the world. Their emergence is not organic, integrated, unified, but catastrophic, sudden, premature,

and often disastrous. Institutions which ought to help the young remember the past in various forms of anamnesis--the Church, the University, and political institutions-- are frequently experienced instead as having given up on the young. Only because of this sense of subtle rejection have young people given up on these institutions. Even the University is experienced as another factory, not a place where new worlds of meaning and possibility are opened up. The reason for this--true also for our Jesuit Universities--is that the University has ceased to be a genuine community in which questions and concerns that can honestly be called "spiritual" are adequately supported and dealt with. In this request, it can be legitimately asserted, as John Thomas has frequently insisted, that Jesuits have failed to redefine their roles in their Universities, a task that was demanded by the expansion, differentiation, and bureaucratization of the institutions.

At any rate, the most spiritually impoverished persons are those who have only contemporary resources to draw upon, those for whom other avenues of meaning and value have been shut off. When a criterion of meaning, a frame of reference, is present in life, we are provided with sanctions and safeguards for responding to social and cultural change. If there is meaning to existence other than what we can fashion by rebellion, defiance, or even constructive effort, then we gain a sense of movement and change to which we can respond without having the world collapse if we choose improperly. Meaning gives us a sense of perspective for the continuing changes of existence. Meaning must be indulged by memory if it is to be lasting and dependable. For the amnesiac, the present has no resources other than his ability to find sustenance and kindly-disposed fellow humans. Memory links the present to signposts from the past. When memory is present, life is prepared for change and abides in movement.

We turn now to students in their relationship to the future. It has been remarked that the present generation of students is the first in history to be unsure that it has

a future. The world's capacity for global destruction, reinforced by the plight of cultures and the profound contradictions in American society are part of what lie behind this attitude. More concretely, we can cite our country's posture in Southeast Asia, which students sense to be indefensible yet which they are called upon to defend; racial injustice which seems out of control; the tempo of social change; the population explosion; ecological problems; the manipulation and demeaning of the individual by the institutions of technological society; the removal of the individual from the seats of crucial decision-making; developments in automation leading to unemployment; the possibilities of genetic manipulation, psychological conditioning, and systems engineering; and, in general, the loss of the sense for the sacredness of individuality and personhood.

This is a large part of the explanation of the existential emphasis of contemporary youth on the present, on that omnipresent now which denies our culture's central and historic orientation toward the future. Thus feeling and affect come to outweigh cognition by virtue of their sheer immediacy. The logic of experience and involvement takes precedence over that of tradition and history. Contemporary youth have correctly sensed that the essence of barbarism lies in an imbalance among the inherent qualities of human life. In their case they have experienced that intellect has been enhanced at the expense of spirit and affect. The danger is that they will fail to distinguish between manipulative, technological intellect and intelligent subjectivity, and, denying intelligence completely, will establish a counter-barbarism which will become caught in the whirlpool of biological immediacy and self-destructive gratification. Even their experience in universities has made it clear to them that the technical and managerial complexities of our age make the ordinary man feel helpless, no longer the captain of his destiny. And so at times they must assert their identity in order to find it, upset the workings of the machine in order to

discover their individuality, their strength, their humanity. The responses of both the New Left and the turned-off segment of this generation are rooted in what Gibson Winter has called the "crisis" of soul," the theme of man vs. machine. In education as well as in communal life, we have exalted intellectual efficiency over emotional development and the cultivation of the resources of the human spirit.

O   Henri Nouwen has presented some acute descriptions of this "generation without fathers." When Nouwen looks into the eyes of those on the border of adulthood, he finds there the children of David Riesman's lonely crowd. He discovers three important characteristics: inwardness, fatherlessness, and convulsiveness. Today's college generation is, first of all, a generation which gives absolute priority to the personal and tends in a remarkable way to withdraw into the self. In this regard, Kierkegaard and Nietzsche both foresaw the arrival of an age of infinite reflection, in which everything is interpretation, in which no outside concrete reality would have the power to call men out of their anxiety and loneliness and make them free. Perhaps, says Nouwen, there is something to discover in the depth of the most personal self which holds the mystery which can give the experience of meaning, freedom, and unity. Certainly the modern mind, as revealed in modern and contemporary philosophy and in the various forms of psychoanalytic theory now so familiar to us, is attempting to penetrate deeper and deeper into the core of its own individuality. While subscribing to the Socratic dictum that the unexamined life is not worth living, we must also add, however, that intense self-reflection is not an unmixed blessing. For, as Nouwen indicates, it can be either a step toward becoming a more sensitive and honest person or it may reflect an indecisiveness devoid of responsibility or a mystique of novelty unbridled by social norms and traditions, especially when the norms themselves are ambiguous or hypocritical and the traditions forgotten or abandoned because they have become inauthentic. This

inwardness can lead just as well to a higher level of hypocrisy as to the discovery

of the reality of the unseen which can make for a better world.

For this generation, everyone who claims to have authority is suspect from

the very beginning. Because the whole adult, fatherly world stands helpless before

the threat of an atomic war, the eroding poverty of many in our country and the hunger-

death of millions in a few months in Biafra, because our nation's government has been

caught so obviously in recent years in embarrassing displays of childish quests for

power, because the spoken word has become so meaningless that Richard Nixon

can call himself a "pacifist," the young see that no father has anything to tell

them simply because he has lived longer than they. Prior to the differentiation in

relationships with elders spoken of by Keniston, many find that they can only try it

alone, neither with pride nor, at first, with contempt, but with a deep-seated fear of

complete failure. They are, in the famous phrase, strangers afraid in a world they

never made. The danger faced by this authority-rejecting generation, says Nouwen,

is that they may become captives of themselves. "As adult authority disintegrates,

the young are more and more the captives of each other ....When adult control

disappears, the young's control of each other intensifies. Peers become normative.

Such captivity holds the further danger of the death of a future-oriented culture, the

end even of an eschatology."

The young thus become perpetrators of a single-generational politics.

Generational conflict is natural, normally healthy, and ordinarily occurs in a context

of generational balance and intergenerational respect. Today, however, it may be

a symptom of serious social disorganization, not a question for suitable solutions

but an additional source of difficulty. Even in a University, those against extremism

feel they must conform to the norms of generational hostility or suspicion and be

prevented from making common cause with professors or administrators. Identification

by generation can come to outweigh identification by common ideas or common

values. Then the acceptability of an older person depends upon his agreement with

the peer group on a given issue. Any other identification with an older person is

made at the risk of peer group ridicule or ostracism. This tendency is thus in conflict

with, and sometimes retards, the previously mentioned tendency to arrive at a more

sophisticated awareness of the multidimensionality of older persons and to respond

to them in their unique otherness. And yet there is also a deep-seated unhappiness

with the society in which man finds himself, "an all-pervading feeling in many young

people that there is something basically wrong with the world in which they live

and that cooperation with existing models of living would be a betrayal of the self."

(Nouwen) As Tom Wicker has put it, "...the generation gap really exists between

those who are in search of, and perhaps in their own hearts have even developed,

a new sense of ethics, and the old institutions of power that haven't changed."

If no workable alternatives manifest themselves the result is sometimes the adoption

of an undirected violence as a means of expressing frustration, or a suicidal with-

drawal from the world as a sign of protest. In either case, "when the notion that the

end justifies the means is coupled with the concept that social righteousness (must

be) instantly attainable, the seeds of (some type of) fanaticism have begun to sprout."

But many in power do not recognize the tremendous ambivalence behind much of this

convulsive behavior and instead of offering creative channels they tend to polarize

the situation and fanaticize those who are only trying to find out what is right and

what is not. The various forms of expression of campus discontent entail at times

a constant search for issues to which frustrations, anxieties, and feelings of

powerlessness can become attached. At times we witness an intense concern to

fuse a sense of generational identity with the great issues of our day. This tendency

plus the recourse to drugs leads one to wonder whether personal problems or public

issues are paramount in their concerns. The answer to this question is probably that their personal problems are themselves the reflection of the public issue of our day, the hegemony of manipulative, technological, bureaucratic intellect, the primacy of bureaucracy over community.

Contrary to much popular opinion, this one-generational politics is not heavily Marxist or Maoist in influence, except in certain rare instances. In general, the Marxist work ethic is challenged, and no subjugation of self to a Party machine would be tolerated. Unfortunately, until recently there has also frequently been lacking the tendency of Marxists as well as many others to look toward alternative institutional configurations. The basic common denominator of much, though certainly not all, of this politics is still anarchy, though there is now a noticeable shift toward a concern for institutional reformation, including the willingness to put in the hard work of learning that is a prerequisite for such a task. Anarchy, though, is not rooted in ideology or in a revolutionary tradition as much as in the social psychology of our time. It is based not on a revolutionary program but on an intense and bitter reaction, expressed in ad hoc forms, against the perceived establishment.

In this area two types of questions must be faced by universities. One is that of educational reform, the other that of the relation of the university to the larger social order. The latter is the more important question in the long run, but the former is intensely important and intimately bound up with the morality of knowledge, the social uses to which knowledge can be put. If educational reform is undertaken, the extremist leader will find a reduced base of disaffection and disappointment on which to build his constituency, particularly if the quality of student life is made an intrinsic part of the educational reform. But the University must also regain the position of offering symbolic hope for the future which it once had; and this will come, it seems to me, partly from dealing with the question of institutional

responsibility to the larger social order, while still remaining a University. The answer to this question may even dictate whether there is or can be a meaningful collegial community in the modern American scene.

The solution to the problem of students' orientation to the future is thus obviously not so simple as "Ban the Bomb," as George Wald would seem to suggest. The horrors mentioned earlier endanger all of us, not just one generation. The great ethical issue raised by the general student temper is that of how to apply knowledge in ways that maximise man's growth and finest aspirations and that minimize his propensities for evil. How do we become men whose morality matches our creativity and whose forms of social organization facilitate our generosity toward each other while controlling and disciplining our acknowledged hostile impulses? The only way toward this, on a general scale, would seem to be through informed, persistent and cooperative intellectual searching combined with a humane pluralism based on an awareness that this is one world. Such a combination engenders respect for personal differences and a pattern of social arrangements wide enough to allow the broadest possible expression of the varied constructive potentials in man. No single generation can arrive at this combination--in principle! Upon the discovery of such a combination, the future of the university and indeed of civiliza- tion directly depends. The violent events of the past few years, I believe, have contributed to the number of students now ready to admit the need for such a search and to give themselves to its pursuit.

We have mentioned questions that deal with political overtones. It is well to add one further remark about these questions as college students face them. For many students, it is precisely in relation to these questions that the beginnings of authentic spirituality are possible. We must discern the groanings of the spirit within those situations in which students are making a decision as to their involve- ment in politics--whether they will resist the draft, whether they oppose the war in

Vietnam, what action they will take with respect to the poor and oppressed. It is precisely in relation to these questions that a man begins to grapple with himself, to find out who he is and what he will do. We must even be prepared to admit the validity and acceptability of some of those for whom public responsibility may have to be cut off completely from current forms of power and assumptions of authority and even go underground, those who emerge from this period with the conviction that perhaps a new geography in which to live the Gospel will be jail.

I would like to attempt briefly to relate the preceding comments to the characteristics of explicit reliogisity found among some college students. Theodore Roszak, whose The Making of a Counter Culture is still probably the best analysis of some aspects of student culture, has called attention to a certain, though not too widespread, fascination with questions of myth, religion, and even cult. For Roszak contemporary college students, who are so convinced that we so easily follow the ways of life of the loveless and fearful and spiritually stunted, are demonstrating that "...we may have been decidedly wrong in what we long expected to follow the death of the Christian God: namely, a thoroughly secularized, thoroughly positivistic culture, dismal and spiritless in its obsession with technological progress." Roszak's book, written before the present, unpredictable revival of interest in the person of Jesus--itself a religiously ambiguous phenomenon--focuses on the Eastern orientation of much of the renewed interest in religion. While youth are groping toward the forgotten truth that no society can live without mystery and ritual, their fascination with Eastern religious expression can be either productive of a deeper religious life or can also be another unhealthy sign of youth's deep alienation from its own roots. The source of this kind of alienation and some positive approaches to the uncovering of valid Christian religious expression will be treated in the final section of this paper. All religious expression is more or less authentic. For

Roszak the fascination with, for example, Zen Buddhism can become inauthentic for the reason that Zen dovetails remarkably with a number of adolescent and youthful traits. First, its commitment to a wise silence can easily ally with the moody inarticulateness of youth. Zen's commitment to paradox and randomness could be conveniently identified with the intellectual confusion of healthily restless, but still unformed minds. Finally, Zen's antinomianism could serve as a sanction for normless-ness, especially for those who experience a justified discomfort with "the competitive exactions and conformities of technocratic society."

Today it would be misleading to discuss the religious interest of youth solely in terms of its Eastern orientation. The popularity of the opera, Jesus Christ, Superstar, as well as the ambiguous but undeniable sudden rise of a "Jesus culture", both demonstrate that youth are by no means apathetic toward the person of Christ. The evangelical fundamentalism of the latter movement runs the risk of all evangelism, the lack of recognition of social responsibility and the need to relate cultural communities to institutional configurations in a humanly enriching way. Just as the evangelism of a Billy Graham tends to glorify the privatization of values that results in suburban bore-dom, comfortability, and political conservatism, so the evangelism of the Jesus movement tends to justify and lend strength to the already powerful impetus in many youth to withdraw from the seamy arena of social and public responsibility. Many of the devotees of the new Jesus cult are converts from the way of life in which opium had become the religion of the people but their newly found religion may be another dulling withdrawal from the world of communal responsibility in which man finds his dignity and into which every authentic experience of transcendence propels a man as an agent of transformation. It is at this point that the theology of Johannes Metz and his associates must be heeded. Despite the Germanic turgidness of much of the writing of the so-called "theologians of hope," they have repeatedly and correctly

called to our attention the truth that the Church must understand and verify herself in the systems of our society as the public witness to and bearer of a dangerous remembrance of freedom, of an anticipation of the future as a future for the hopeless, broken and oppressed.

C. The Search for Authenticity and Authentic Community

Technological intelligence values productivity and defines people in terms of function. Students, on the other hand, want desperately to have their lives taken seriously, the value of their lives to be independent of any function they might perform. They want to make decisions that have import, that do mean something as far as the future is concerned. It is precisely here that they experience the source of perhaps their greatest frustration. From a more positive point of view, contemporary college students frequently are characterized by an earnest search for authenticity and for integration into an authentic community. One of the primary ways in which religion can play an important role in their lives at this time is in relation to this call to authentic living. Most often, however, the notion of authenticity is present in a vague and undefined way. The role of the Church is to flesh out this empty notion, to give it substance and incarnation through providing symbols of new possibilities for living. Theologically viewed, authenticity consists primarily in the life that comes from the gift of God's love and the primary task of the pastor when dealing with college students on an individual basis is to mediate this gift, to be one through whom a new world of meaning, the world of transcendence, is disclosed. Time will not permit us to delve into the philosophical and theological anthropology necessary to substantiate this claim. But, since this particular task cannot be accomplished independently of the other tasks of the campus pastor, I

hope that the remainder of the paper, which deals with the configurations of Church ministry to the University, will help to fill out the dimensions of what must somehow be conveyed to college students concerning the operative role of religion in human life.

II. Configurations of Church Ministry to the University and Consequent Implications Regarding Religion and Social Responsibility in America

A. The Danforth Model For Campus Ministry

The first point to be made is that, since education and religion deal with the questions which are at the very center of human society and culture, they must be inextricably related. The second point, equally obvious, is that both are in trouble today. Not only does our whole society appear to be floundering in terms of the goals it seeks and the means to achieve them, but religious institutions and universities, by a convergence of diverse forces, are being pushed to go through a painful and controversial transition. The university used to be a peripheral institution but it has now moved from the periphery of society to the center and has become, in Kenneth Underwood's terms, the center of attempts by an entire people to know what is happening to them, to reflect critically on past actions, and to imagine policies that express enduring visions of the good life. At issue, then, is the reconsideration of the pertinence of the whole learning experience in its traditional setting and the reapplication of the knowledge explosion to the demands of contemporary society. Almost all contemporary epistemologies and theories of education recognize that knowledge is not divorced from aesthetic and ethical valuation nor from action within the structures of social life. Rather, together with valuation, knowledge is the indispensable ingredient in the formation of social policies which can humanize the quality of modern life. Increasingly, then, the knowledge pursued by the University must be a kind of policy research, which is obviously an interdisciplinary

venture. (Marquette's gradual movement toward an overarching emphasis on human values as object of academic research and teaching is a step in this essential direction.)

Religious institutions, on the other hand, were once the organizing and directing institutions of their respective cultures. But they have now become voluntary societies of only peripheral significance, despite the continued and even renewed interest in the modes and meaning of religious experience. This shift forces a search for the relationship of religious experience to its traditional embodiments in institutional configurations. Those involved in the ministry of the Church to the University find themselves affected by two unmistakable social transformation, both of which are only beginning: the transformation of higher education and that of religious organization. To relate Church to University today is an extremely complicated and difficult task.

A helpful model for Church ministry, not only within the University, but also within all of the large prevailing institutions of American society, is provided by the Danforth Study of Campus Ministries: <u>The Church, the University, and Social Policy</u>. I wish here to outline this model, to draw some theological conclusions concerning the ministry of the Church within institutional configurations and some conclusions relating to the area of social ethics and the quality of communal life. Finally, I will conclude with a delineation of the qualities which a man engaged in ministry to the University must strive to develop within himself.

According to the Danforth model, the historical and traditional modes of ministry--priestly, pastoral, prophetic, and administrative or governing--must be reconceived and reorganized in light of the central task of higher learning today. Priestly ministry, then, consists in the conducting of worship and the preaching of the word of God. It is essentially tied to the most important aspects of the task of building up the community of faith, precisely in its specific nature as a fellowship of faith, defined by the sacramental means through which it expresses itself and carries on its life. Christian ministry is radically, though not exclusively, cultic.

Every other service which the ordained minister performs derives from his

responsibility to make visible the basis of the community's fellowship in faith.

In what follows, I take some material from J.A. Appleyard, "The Priest on the

Campus," Thought, Winter, 1969, pp. 546-564, as well as expand on the implications

of the Danforth emphases. The most visible aspect of the Christian community's life

is the public expression of its faith through the symbolic and ritual actions of the

liturgy. The quality of the imagination and theological insight brought to the

structuring of the liturgy is crucial. The liturgy must be imaginative and substantial

in its content and shape if it is to be experienced by students as expressing their

own complicated attitudes toward religious commitment. When the attempt is made

to form a community around the liturgy, and the attempt is solidly grounded in sound

theological insight and articulated in meaningful symbolic actions (a very difficult

task today, by the way), and the means chosen are criticized sincerely by all parties

to the effort, the result is really a growth both of the kind of liturgy which works for

this community and of the community around this liturgy. It goes without saying

that a variety of liturgies will recommend themselves, depending upon the group

and circumstances. As Henri Nouwen puts it, "A good liturgy is a liturgy with full

participation without a pressure to participate, a liturgy with free expression and

dialogue without an urge to be too personal, a liturgy where man is free to move in

closer or to take more distance without feeling that he is offending people, and a

liturgy where physical contact is real but does not break through the symbolic

boundaries. I don't think there will ever be a single good liturgy. The personality

of the minister, the nature of the students, and the climate of the place ask for many

different forms. But much more important than the particular format, canon, language,

or gesture is the careful balance between closeness and distance which allows the

Christian community to be intimate and open, to be personal and hospitable, to

receive the daily core-group as well as the occasional visitors, to be nurturing as well as apostolic." (Intimacy, p. 148).

Worship and the preaching of the word of God today must occur within the context of the worshiper's place within the complex modern order. Worship is not the formation or expression of "covenant communities" immunized from the complexities of worldly responsibility. It is rather the expression and ongoing transformation of a community with a mission, precisely as community. And this mission is to a world characterized by complex social relationships, institutionalized services, technological expansion, and rapid change in the physical, economic, social, political, and religious factors which influence the quality of life. The community's expression must be flexible, while rooted firmly in the central action of blessing God and remembering the Lord Jesus in his death and victory. The preaching of the word must be a carefully honed expression of the believer's place and mission within the modern order. Social issues cannot be neglected; on the other hand, the pulpit (or its equivalent) cannot be turned into a political platform. The line to be walked here is thin and the preparation of homilies is a very difficult task precisely because of the necessary balance and precision demanded by the radical nature of the Gospel itself, which cannot be made the servant of any particular political program, rightist or leftist, but which must, at the same time, transform and penetrate all political movements moving them toward peace, justice, and integrity.

The term, pastoral ministry, refers largely to counseling, individual or group. Liturgy can go only so far in creating Christian fellowship and especially in assimilating the indifferent to this fellowship. There is a social dimension to the community's life in the university. The university is made up of groups defined by widely varying values and principles and interests. The work of creating a community out of them, even in a Christian sense, has other aspects besides the purely liturgical.

Thus, there is a dimension to the university pastoral ministry which is, for certain purposes, even more important than the liturgy as a means of creating the awareness of belonging to a community. The campus ministry is able to play a mediating role in bringing together those who might otherwise be strangers or even antagonists to one another. Crucial to this enterprise is a center for hospitable contact.

All individual and group counseling, and every effort to create an atmosphere of community, must recognize the problems of individuals and groups in the context of their struggle to find direction and relevance in their present or anticipated occupations, precisely as these are instruments of serving men in a complex urbanized world. If such a struggle is not conscious, the Church must strive to make it conscious, for it is only through such a struggle that individuals today come to be truly responsible and that groups become anything more than a comfortable haven from the strains and tensions of the social order. There is always a danger that the groups which form around the Church on campus become self-enclosed, perhaps even constituted mainly by people defensively moving away from the difficulties of other types of associations. Titanic programming by a campus ministry runs this risk of reaching only this segment of the student population. Individual, personal contact between the ministry and students or faculty members is far more important, I believe, than programs super-imposed upon them in artificial attempts to create communities. Community is a matter of shared meanings and values. Through individual contacts, communities can come to be formed around the Church without the effort to manipulate human relationships in an artificial manner. On the other hand, this is by no means to encourage an all too frequent tendency in the Church to emphasize private values to the exclusion of the responsibility of the Christian within an institutionalized world and the responsi-bility of institutions themselves to guarantee humaneness and to wield their power so as to effect justice. The experience of parish life does not even provide for the

private worlds and the nurturing of private values for many of today's youth, but

we cannot be content simply with providing a service which meets this need.

The prophetic ministry has always been engaged in an interpretation of history

from the standpoint of a value-orientation dictated by authentic religious experience.

Today the prophetic ministry must speak not only to symptoms of evil in history,

such as war, racial injustice, etc., but to the underlying institutional configurations

in today's world which are the contemporary embodiment of man's moral impotence--

the institutions of morally ambiguous quality which make war and injustice possible.

The prophetic ministry has always penetrated beneath symptoms to the evil inherent

in man's heart, but today, intermediate between the heart of man and the obvious

symptoms there stand institutions, complex social structures which perpetrate the

social absurdities confronting us every day. Any prophetic testimony in this world

must fuse technical knowledge of institutional realities with authentic religious

valuation. And any true response, preventative or curative of the symptoms, must

itself in most instances be institutional, i.e. complex and organized.

The prophetic ministry is obviously not the task of an isolated group of people,

known as the "campus ministry", alone. It is rather something which the Church

on campus must facilitate by providing an opportunity for those within the community,

largely faculty, to utilize their expertise in addressing themselves to institutional

complexities in our world. The Church's prophetic ministry on campus will consist

largely, though not exclusively, in facilitating opportunities for interdisciplinary

dialogue and education, directed at the entire University, of course, but helpful

also to the faculty members who choose to engage in such dialogue.

There has also always been a ministry of governance, of administration. Today

this ministry should be engaged in organizational and administrative work geared

toward the continual transformation of social structures. Within the University,

this ministry is exercised through the opportunities given to the Church to have a say in policy decisions. These opportunities are likely to increase as the Church demonstrates her capacity to perform the priestly, pastoral, and prophetic ministries of the Church in a professional manner.

The Danforth Study thus makes it quite obvious that reflection on campus ministry cannot be isolated from wider contexts: that of the churches today and their modes of ministry; the university and its structures of learning and teaching; the students and their aspirations and anxieties, the American culture and the basic trends, policies, and values of professional, technical and popular subcultures. The problems confronted by the Church within the university today are those which in another decade will be consciously those of all the Church, on account of the impact of ideas and techniques that originate in the university and change the whole culture. The Church within the university must be evaluated fundamentally in terms of its ability to provide religious meaning, to draw upon, to integrate and to refashion the traditional modes of ministry to others in a new and technical age.

The Danforth model can be applied in a very explicit way to the Church's role within the prevailing civic and educational institutions of America. Many factors of this age have given rise to the theological and pastoral problem of human liberation. Much of the theology on this problem has been done by the theologians of hope and by churchmen and theologians in Latin America. Some of the pertinent thinking on this problem is beginning to penetrate into American theological circles. It is not exaggeration to say that the Church's fulfillment of her historic role today will be in direct proportion to her participation in, and transformation of, the movement for human liberation. The word "liberation" has become a shibboleth today; this may be due largely, though, to the fact that the movement of liberation has yet to be explicitly and self-consciously informed by the transcendent faith that forbids

idolatry, by hope in the God who gives life to the dead, and by the self-transcending love of God and neighbor which renders one ready to die so that others may live.

Symbolically incarnated meaning is constitutive of community and of integral social institutions. In integral institutions, the sharing in symbolically incarnate meaning and value is differentiated, but it is still a true sharing, reflective of community. When the symbols are recognized and cherished, communities and social institutions are vibrant. When the symbols are broken or dead, hated or feared, forced or imposed, communities and social institutions--the family, the state, the religious order, the school--deteriorate as humane enterprises. Alienation has won the day. Renewal and revolution become the only alternatives to an ever-declining social situation, and the choice between them depends on the gravity of the inauthenticity to which the situation has sunk, the patience or impatience of the estranged, the visions and techniques of the leaders of the alienated. Whether renewal or revolution is the viable road to change, intelligent persuasion and informed, redemptive education must prevail, not physical or psychological violence. If the choice is revolution, revolution of the mind and heart--cultural, intellectual, moral and religious revolution--must precede political and structural revolution. Otherwise a new set of alienating symbols replaces the old. When both revolutions succeed, the process of liberation has been effected and new possibilities of integration and freedom are open.

In most of the major social institutions of our nation today, the symbols are broken and dead, hated and feared, forced and imposed. Certainly this is true of the state and of the university. Many citizens of our country--primarily but by no means exclusively the poor--are alienated from the symbols which dictate the policies of the powerful. Many constituents and employees of our educational institutions--students, faculty, and administrators--are alienated not only from

participation in the decision-making process (for such democracy is by no means the sure key to a university's success), but also and more fundamentally from the experiences, insights, judgments, and evaluations of the university's decision-makers, from the symbolically incarnated meanings and values which issue in policy which govern the constituents' academic, social, and personal lives. When this occurs, the institution has outrun the possibility of community, which cannot be built upon alienating symbolic incarnations of meaning and value. This is the central problem which the Church confronts in attempting to work at the building of a community atmosphere within a large educational institution. The institution can become an end in itself, dominating the lives of most concerned parties, even those with apparent power. The maintenance and preservation of the institution becomes an absolute value, instilling fear, resentment, and bitterness upon those whom it is intended to serve. From a religious perspective, the institution has become an idol. In a University, students can easily become means to the preservation and betterment of the institution, rather than those whom the institution was originally established to liberate and educate, for their own good and the good of the rest of society.

The Church's role in social institutions, whether they be authentic or inauthentic, liberating or alienating, is manifold. Whether the institution is the servant of a community of love and support or has become an idolatrous substitute or dominating machine, worship of the one true God remains a command written on the human heart, and so the Church's ministry must be priestly. Whether the institution fosters human growth or inhibits sustained development, individuals will still have their fears and groups will still discover inauthenticity easy, forgiveness and reconciliation difficult, and so the Church's ministry must be pastoral. Whether the institution is an embodiment of liberating cultural achievements and correct religious orientations or an oppressive and inhumane incarnation of dead, broken, yet dominating symbols, moral impotence remains a fact and thus social decline and fanaticism, if not realities,

are always possibilities. And so the Church's ministry within civic, educational,
and other institutions must be prophetic. Finally, whether the institution is truly
a servant of man or has become a force of alienation, the authentic humanity of the
institution must either be preserved, achieved, or transferred to alternative
institutions, and so the Church's ministry must be a catalytic force in governance,
i.e., it must be political. Incidentally, many have referred--at times rightly--to
the Church's symbolic incarnations of meaning and value as themselves dead or
broken, hated or feared, forced or imposed, and so alienating. I would submit
that the solution to this real difficulty is to be sought, not through direct introspective
attention to the symbols by which the Church defines herself (except the symbol of
the Crucified, which leads beyond introspection), but by engaging in a priestly,
pastoral, prophetic, and humanely political way in the institutions and communities
of man and by this involvement creating new symbols of herself--but always as
Church, not as vindicator of the status quo through some compromising concordat
with secular power, rightist or leftist. When induced to such compromise, the
Church must say "no," even at the apparent price of having to return to the catacombs
or the prisons.

When an institution is the servant of a true community, the Church's priestly
ministry will be a celebration, on the part of the entire community, of God's call
to servanthood as recognized in the remembrance of the death of the Lord and his
victory. When an institution is a dominating, alienating machine, a false god,
the Church's priestly ministry must be a concrete exhortation, through the preaching
of the Word of God, to all involved to return to the one true God, to forgive one
another from their hearts, and to break the chains that bind them, restoring community
in the institution or abandoning the institution in a search for alternative forms.

When an institution is the servant of a true community, the Church's priestly ministry will be a celebration, on the part of the entire community, of God's call to servanthood as recognized in the remembrance of the death of the Lord and his victory. When an institution is a dominating, alienating machine, a false god, the Church's priestly ministry must be a concrete exhortation, through the preaching of the Word of God, to all involved to return to the one true God, to forgive one another from their hearts, and to break the chains that bind them, restoring community in the institution or abandoning the institution in a search for alternative forms.

When an institution fosters human growth and shared participation in meaning and value, the Church's pastoral ministry must still comfort the fearful, bind the wounds of those hurt elsewhere, direct the community outside itself, guard against the ever-present danger of inauthenticity. When an institution inhibits sustained development and alienates those dependent upon it, the Church's pastoral ministry becomes crucial. For then the Church must free the spirits of broken men, manifest forgiveness as a human possibility, preach the message of life to those whose life is endangered, rescue as many of the victimized as human energy finds possible.

When an institution is an embodiment of liberating cultural achievements and correct religious orientations, the Church's prophetic ministry will concentrate on the institution's responsibility to be, as Israel was meant to be, a "light to the nations," a servant of broken communities beyond its own borders, while never forgetting the ever-present possibility of corrosion from within. When an institution is an oppressive and inhumane incarnation of dead, broken, yet dominating and alienating symbols, the Church's prophetic ministry must choose between the avenue of renewal and that of revolution. If renewal is a possibility, prophetic ministry will exhort to dialogue, forgiveness, and reconciliation, with minor consequences for prevalent symbols. If revolution is demanded, old meanings and values will be explicitly

discredited and discarded, new symbols will be found, and the institution will either be converted from its inhumanity and alienation to a new freedom and harmony or it will be abandoned in favor of alternative, liberating institutions.

When an institution is truly a servant of man, the Church's political ministry will be concerned with preserving this servanthood, by constantly reminding those in governance of the task of the servant, by assisting them in their performance of their functional responsibilities, and by interpreting their service to others in the light of the Gospel. When an institution is an alienating force, the Church's political ministry, informed by its priestly, pastoral, and prophetic understanding of itself, must be concerned either with restoring authentic humanity to the institution and thus risking the charge of intrusion into others' well-delineated administrative areas or with eventually declaring the whole situation anathema and issuing both an invitation to the creation of alternative, humane institutional forms and an expression of willingness to be a catalytic force in the development of these non-violent alternatives.

III. The Campus Minister

A. Nouwen vs. Devor: The Minister and Students

Despite the necessary insistence on the institutional ramifications of the work of the campus ministry, I believe that Henri Nouwen is correct in maintaining that the main pastoral concern of the campus minister is the student. In the following section, I would like to attempt to create a synthesis between the view of campus ministry presented by Nouwen ("Training for Campus Ministry," in Intimacy, pp. 140-164) and that of Richard C. Devor ("Training for Campus Ministry: Another View", paper furnished through National Association of College and University Chaplains). Nouwen's paper is written from a pastoral psychological, and thus somewhat individualistic,

viewpoint, whereas Devor's emphasizes the interaction of the campus ministry with other "departments" of the University. Only a fusion of the two perspectives, I believe, can offset the individualism of the one and the disembodied liberalism of the other, and create the type of approach called for by the Danforth Study.

Both would admit, I believe, in Nouwen's words, that "...the familiar channels through which we could function and reach thousands of students, are leaking or completely broken down." Nouwen's description of the fundamental problem of students is the following: "Being away from home, without strong anchors in the family tradition, and without a clear goal on the horizon, the student starts drifting. Familiar answers do not work anymore, long cherished beliefs lose their obviousness, and carefully built structures crumble, sometimes suddenly, sometimes gradually. And in this new milieu where science sets the tone, where research is the main approach and hypothesis the main model, certainty becomes the most suspected attitude and the question-mark, the most respected symbol. But asking questions is a fearful thing. The answer might be No. Do I have anything to hope for in my future? Yes or No? Is love a real human possibility? Yes or No? Is there anybody who cares for anybody except himself? Yes or No? Asking these questions is a dangerous thing to do. Many may prefer to stay away from them and do their daily business because it seems much safer to hold to 'the way they think and act at home' than to rock the boat in such a stormy sea. But if the student used to the microscope, familiar with Skinner boxes and proud of his computer techniques, avoids asking these questions about the core values which give meaning to any tool at all, he takes the risk of becoming an unhappy genius, a man who knows everything except why he lives."

In this milieu, then, Nouwen situates the task of the campus pastor. In this milieu, the pastor should be able to offer to the student three things: a climate in

which these questions can be asked without fear, a word which is carefully honed to the needs of the particular student with whom one is dealing, and a home where some degree of intimate sharing can be experienced.

Student depression, for Nouwen the most common form of mental suffering on campuses today, is, he says, caused mainly by the fact that these questions cannot be asked and thus are swallowed and inverted into guilt experiences. The priest must thus allow a climate in which these basic doubts can be expressed without fear, where agnosticism can be expressed without threat, where Christianity is not accepted as a panacea for every doubt, ignorance, and impotence. Such a climate will permit the student to be happy without a cure-all and safe without a playpen. Religion must allow searching without fear and questioning without shame, a fearless climate in which belief and unbelief, doubt and faith, hope and despair can exist together.

With respect to the word, Nouwen calls for the development of diagnostic skills, the ability to be clinical in pastoral contact and pastoral conversation, to offer a word which is an honest response to the unique and highly individual needs of the students, not an attempt to sell the whole church as a package at once to everyone whom the pastor happens to meet. "Much pastoral phoniness is related to the inability to be clinical in pastoral contact and pastoral conversation."

Because of the stresses of modern academic life, Nouwen finds that many students find intimacy nearly impossible, despite the presence of a heightened desire for warmth, tenderness, and disarmed relaxation. In response to this need, Nouwen delineates the pastor's responsibility for the creation of a community where the student can experience some sense of belonging. "If the years of free search are not surrounded by some form of intimacy and lived in some form of community, the search may be bitter instead of mild, narrow-minded instead of mature, cold and calculated instead of open and receptive." Crucial to all the ways in which we try to form

these communities, he says, is the creation of a healthy balance between closeness and distance. The need for intimacy cannot be satisfied by a suffocating embrace. Communities cannot become cliques. Freedom cannot be realized in an atmosphere of stickiness. A look must be taken at the extent to which various experiences will offer in the long run the freedom and maturity the student is looking for.

To Nouwen's image of climate Devor counterposes that of thermostat, i.e., of that instrument which changes the climate in the room or the house. He finds the cause of student depression not so much in the suppression of questions, or having no one to talk to, but in the plethora of answers and the impossibility of implementing some or most of them. He is perhaps overly generous in describing the availability of faculty and others for personal contact with students, at least from my experience. Nevertheless he is quite correct in locating another source of student anxiety in a lack of meaningful commitments on the part of students, due largely to the sense of powerlessness against the perceived established orders. He is also correct in emphasizing that the Christian community which merely exists marginally on campus, helplessly acknowledging that the university is a battleground, and aiming at nothing more than providing a refuge in the midst of it, is not doing its job, is in fact betraying its cultural role as reformer.

To Nouwen's insistence on the minister's theological and counseling expertise directed toward individual students, Devor adds the importance of enabling the community to appropriate the educational gifts of the university in a theologically discerning way, by gathering the community together for study, for what Underwood calls "prophetic inquiry," theological reflection which analyzes the campus and the world in the light of the Word and leads the community to utilize these insights in action.

He replaces Nouwen's image of home with that of tent, not because of any opposition to the notion of forming a community, but rather because he insists that the formation of a campus community is an end in itself. Personally, I believe that

community is an end in itself, but that community is frequently misunderstood as a shelter from life, from issues, from world and campus problems. If community is understood as a place only for fun and games, play and frolic, then obviously it is not an end in itself. But if it is understood as the achievement of common meaning and the common pursuit of value in action, then it is in itself desirable and not a means to anything else. Reconciliation, redemption, brotherhood, overcoming manifest alienation--these are ends in themselves. Only when they have been achieved are men free to go elsewhere and do likewise, but the achievement of these qualities cannot be viewed as mere means. The Church center on campus must, it is true, be mobile and subservient to broader needs, but precisely in this task of service, a sense of belonging evolves and develops which itself can be the greatest sign of its meaning and mission.

In speaking of the spirituality of the campus minister, Nouwen first gives, I believe, an acute description of the problems of the priest on campus, the demands placed upon him. "...How much questioning can a man take? Can he allow people to ask him all the time: Why are you a priest? Why do you believe in God? Why do you pray? Can he allow himself to be flexible all the time and willing to shift gears, to incorporate new ideas, to scrutinize new criticism and to question again his basic convictions? But this is exactly what happens, when students ask questions because every question about the meaning of life is, at the same time, a question about the meaning of the ministry. The question, 'Why do I live?' is at the same time the question, 'Why are you a priest?' It is obvious that not only the student but also, and perhaps even more, the minister realizes that his own existence is at stake." The priest must watch his own emotional life very carefully.

Nouwen discusses the problems of the campus pastor under three aspects: silence, friendship, and insight. Nouwen is completely correct in emphasizing

the difficulty of remaining in communication with the realities which are transcendent to one's own mind, in stressing the need for rest of body and mind, "in which we become available for Him whose heart is greater than ours." "Is it so amazing," he asks, "that we are so often tired and exhausted, trying to be masters of ourselves, wanting to grasp the ultimate meaning of our existence, struggling with our identity?... Without silence the Spirit will die in us and the creative energy of our life will float away and leave us alone, cold, and tired. Without silence we will lose our center and become the victim of the many who constantly demand our attention." Devor makes a false dichotomy between this silence and the need for supportive association with others engaged on the same pastoral team. The latter is no substitute for the former, essential as it may be.

In discussing friendship, Nouwen correctly emphasizes that the minister cannot depend on students for friendship without feeding his own neuroses, and paralyzing the possibility of being their pastor. Rather, "the campus minister needs privacy, a home where he is not with students, and where he is free for himself." On the other hand, Devor's corrective at this point is helpful, and in a later article, "Generation Without Fathers," Nouwen seems to have incorporated something of the necessary balance. Devor says, "...To pull down a curtain of privacy around his own problems and perplexities seems...to be an unnecessary limitation of healthy interchange. There is a place for participation, with faculty and with other students, for a dialogical relationship in which the problems attendant to Christian life can be shared in a personal way. ...A one-sided pastor-student relationship in which the pastor rigidly maintains his distance, preserving for friendship a selected few, is outmoded therapy for the student, and an unnecessary denial of the gifts of friendship which students or faculty alike can bring to the campus minister." Devor emphasizes the assistance which the pastor can bring in enabling students to accept

their emerging role as leaders in effecting atmospheric change. But, he adds, "He cannot succeed in this without risk and exposure of his own life, in the absence of mutual friendships between himself and his community. ...His ministry...is...a two-way thoroughfare of shared inter-relationships in which both he as minister and his colleagues among students and faculty learn together." Perhaps the best criterion as to whether one's friendships with students are healthy or not is the willingness one shows in permitting to develop the tendency spoken of by Keniston, in which the relationship between a student and an elder changes from psychological apprenticeship to mentorship to sponsorship to peership. If the minister is not allowing this tendency to develop, if he is fighting it, if he does not want it to develop, then he is unquestionably using student "friendship" to feed his own neuroses, perhaps his unconscious desire for domination in somebody else's life.

By "insight" Nouwen means "a sound perspective of the minister on the significance of his own priesthood." Many priests, he finds, have a distorted theological outlook on their own existence. "If the campus minister thinks that he is responsible for the faith on campus, if he thinks that it is his task to bring as many students as possible to the sacraments, and if he thinks that the students' way to heaven is somehow related to their membership in the church, he can be sure that the campus is going to be his purgatory.... In the mind of a priest for whom sacramentality is, in practice, identical with the reception of the sacraments, the growing unpopularity of confession and communion must create a considerable amount of anxiety and perhaps even self-reproach. ...If the satisfaction of the campus minister is dependent on a growing conversion of students to his creed and belief, his work can hardly be more than suffocating." We must ask ourselves if our tendency to panic is really pastorally motivated, or whether it rather is a sign of little faith. We must ask ourselves whether we are not caught in the narrowness of our own theological insights, which can make us anxious instead of free, unbelievers

instead of faithful, suspicious instead of trustful. Are we comfortable with a free-moving spirit which blows where it will or do we prefer a limitation and control?

To this freedom, Devor adds, correctly I believe, the responsibility of the campus pastor in another dimension. The campus pastor does assume responsibility for the life of his institution and of the people within that institution. There must be found some middle ground between absolute paternalistic control and manipulation on the one hand and moral indifference to crucial issues on the other. "Issues on campus are issues of pastoral concern. ... And the minister on campus who decides to ignore them ignores his responsibility. Fortunately, he does not have to battle alone. In corporateness with his fellow ministers, and with his colleagues among the students and faculty engaged in the necessary struggle to learn what it means to be the church, he can discover and rediscover again and again his own spirituality and the meaning and joy of his mission as 'apostolate of hope to the world.' In terms of his own life, too, ... he may discover time and again that to be a whole and integrated man has something to do with death and resurrection."

Perhaps the best delineation of the qualities which the campus pastor must try to develop within himself is given in Nouwen's more recent article, "Generation Without Fathers." These qualities are the same qualities which respond to the student tendencies of inwardness, fatherlessness, and convulsiveness, and which these tendencies open up as future possibilities for today's students. Nouwen lists these qualities as: capability as articulator of the inner events; a man of compassion; a contemplative critic. Those engaged in the work of campus ministry must view their responsibility in terms of facilitating such future leadership; in order to do so, they must strive to develop precisely these characteristics in themselves.

The inward man is challenged, perhaps as never before, to come to grips with the God within, with the inner movements of the spirit. Perhaps the most basic task

of the Church is that of offering man creative ways of communicating with the source of his own life. If we are to facilitate the presence in the future of those who are capable of articulating the inner events, we must ourselves enter into the center of our existence and articulate the different movements of our own inner life. "... only he who is able to articulate his own experience can offer himself to his fellowman as a source of clarification. The Christian leader is, therefore, first of all, the man who is willing to put his own articulated faith at the disposal of those who ask his help. In this sense he is a servant of servants, because he is the first to enter the promised, but dangerous land to tell those who are afraid what he has seen, heard, and touched." In the future, the emphasis in pastoral work will very much be that of helping people recognize the work of God in them and around them. Pastoral conversation cannot be manipulative; rather it must be "a deep human encounter in which one man is willing to put his own faith and doubt, his own hope and despair, his own light and darkness at the disposal of him who wants to find a way in his confusion and touch the solid core of life." Preaching thus becomes "the careful and sensitive formulation of what is happening in the community," capable of ready acknowledgment by the listeners. When the listeners know that the minister recognizes their condition, the ground is broken to receive the word of God and understand it, not as a word from a strange and unfamiliar world, but as a word which opens up one's own world and clarifies it. Liturgy becomes "a real celebration" in which "the liturgical leader is able to give a name to the space where joy and sorrow touch each other as the ground on which it is possible to celebrate life and death as well."

The campus pastor must not be afraid to stand in the midst of his people with an utmost visibility. He must be able to exercise the authority of compassion, the only kind of authority which will any longer make any sense. He must make the

compassion of God with man credible in his own world. "A fatherless generation looks for brothers who are able to take away their fear and anxiety, who can open the doors of their narrowmindedness and show them that forgiveness is a possibility which dawns upon the horizon of humanity."

Finally, the campus pastor must be contemplative. "It is not the task of the Christian leader to go around nervously trying to redeem people, to save them at the last minute, to put them on the right track. Man is redeemed, once and for all. The call of the Christian leader is to help man to affirm this great news, and to make visible in the daily events, the fact that behind the dirty curtain of his painful symptoms, there is something great to be seen: the face of Him in Whose image he is shaped. In this way the contemplative can be a leader for a convulsive generation because he can break through the vicious circle of immediate needs, asking for immediate satisfaction and can direct the eyes of those who want to look at what is beyond their impulses and lead their erratic energy into creative channels." The campus minister must be a revolutionary in the most real sense; he must test everything he sees, hears and touches on its evangelical authenticity, and in this way, must prepare the way for those who will change the course of history and lead their people away from panic-stricken convulsion to the creative action which will make for a better world. He will look for signs of hope and promise, and will notice the mustard seed. He knows that now he is seeing as through a glass, darkly, but that one day he will see face to face. He believes that the convulsive generation will not choose death as the ultimate desperate form of protest, but instead the new life of which he is attempting to make visible the first hopeful signs. The campus pastor must be, above all, a man of prayer, a man who has to pray and who has to pray always. "The man of prayer is a leader exactly because through the articulation of God's work with him, he can lead his fellow man out of confusion to clarification,

through his compassion, he can guide him out of the closed circuit of his in-group to the wide world of humanity, and through his critical contemplation, he can convert his convulsive destructiveness into creative work for the new world to come."

B. The Minister Within the Institution

In conclusion, I wish to stress the insights given to us by the contemporary apostles of non-violence and to add that non-violence is not so much a tactic to be used in the pursuit of our goals in the ministry or within the University as it is an end in itself, a way of living.

The present unexpected quiet among college students can be interpreted not as a return to the apathy, opportunism, and unabashed nonsense of the 1950's, but rather as a symptom of frustration. As we talk of the quiet on the campuses, let us not forget that many college students are by no means quiet and complacent within, that the bodies and psyches of some are being permanently destroyed by drugs, that insecurity and self-doubt haunt many more, that the American ethos is not accepted in its most significant details by most, and that serious questions with revolutionary implications cannot be authentically avoided by any--though the obscurantist tendencies which reside in all of us certainly prevail in too many instances.

Even those college students--and they are still in the majority--who reject and have always rejected the hippie culture and the equally ineffective resort to revolutionary violence find themselves deeply disturbed by the poverty, militarism, and exploitativeness that are the air we breathe. They are not content with the way things are in their country or in their schools. But they are also deeply frustrated at their inability to find a viable and effective solution to a number of apparently disparate but fundamentally inter-related problems, inter-related by considerations of the satisfactoriness of meanings and the priority of values. Some of them are already beginning to discover that the solution of their questions involves the stupendous task

of the redemption of the prevailing civic, educational, and other institutions or, barring that, the creation of alternative institutions.

It is precisely here that the Church has a more significant role to play than any other force. For the Church exists only because there is a divinely originated solution to man's problem of evil, a solution conceived, begun, and sustained by the will of God but calling for human collaboration. This divinely originated and sustained solution to man's problem of evil is fundamentally a non-violent solution, symbolized in the images of the crucified and risen Lord and Victim of human history.

In order to avoid the connotations of complacency, passivity, and spinelessness which sometimes accompany the word "non-violence," some prefer Dom Helder Camara's paradoxical phrase, "the violence of the peacemaker," but that too is obviously open to misunderstanding and misappropriation. (If Richard Nixon can call himself a pacifist, we might imagine him using this phrase to describe his policies in the Indochinese War!)

Non-violent solutions today involve liberation from alienating symbols in the creation of authentic cultural communities and humane institutions, in rendering possible the freedom that comes from dynamic, willing, creative participation in authentic communities, as opposed to the prefabricated mass culture of elitist technicians designed for their own or for the commercial, social, or political interests of the groups they serve, a culture in which competition (a form of violence) is nurtured, in which the hero is the aggressive, self-assertive, lonely individual, in which security is identified with possession, gratification with consumption. Healthy communities, through their social institutions, enhance the dignity and creativity of their members, disdain any manifestation that violates the dignity of any person, and are built upon the necessity of providing love and support for all their members, and indeed for all human beings. The members of these communities will be aware

that fear, hate and insecurity are the chief blocks to creativity and human communication. Thus, particularly in an educational community, they will so organize their relations to one another as to reduce as far as possible these destructive and violent thrusts. In this way, a healthy social institution will be non-violent. It will attempt to create structures of expression and communication, and of organized life, that do not violate the dignity of anyone, that provide support and acceptance for everyone. It will be built upon the ethic of solidarity and cooperation rather than that of competition, of non-violence and love rather than of coercion and pressure.

The tragic mistake of liberalism, as it is reflected in both civic and educational institutions, is that it came to endow the administrative and political functions and structures of life with the overall meaning of existence and thus to allow these structures to dominate cultural communities rather than serve them. The young in our country intuitively reject the bureaucratic ethos and seek integration into a healthy community. They reflect a major drama of our time, the struggle for primacy between the bureaucratic and communitarian ways of life, between alienation and at least relatively liberated human existence. Tragically, religion has all too often fallen either into irrelevance or dependence upon prevailing institutions--or both-- and thus failed to exercise its authentically freeing role. The central challenge facing most American institutions today, and certainly universities, is that of inventing a form of governance and a style of life that will give precedence to community over bureaucracy and relate community to administration in a healthy and integral way. Authentic religion may have an extremely salvific, redemptive, liberating role to play in this process.

The principal task of the Church in this process is not to overthrow oppressive systems by regimenting the masses against the masters, but to help the people-- all alienated people, including men of power who will admit their need of liberation--

to prepare themselves for freedom. She does this by enabling them to form communities of meaning and value, enhanced by effective institutions which help them to discover their own dignity. The Church will do this through the emergence within her ranks of symbolic men who embody the limits and possibilities of human existence, the hopes and aspirations of the people, who dare to be what all can be by daring to be free. The final description of what the campus minister should try to be can be given in terms of this notion of a "symbolic man." These men will move consciously, intelligently, and skillfully across a stage of history, aware of the meaning of their lives, and seeking to explain it and make it apparent in symbols that bespeak the values of the people. They will destroy the myths of the culture that blinds people to the possibility of true freedom and will create new symbols and myths, images of hope, that will awaken a people numbed by a false and oppressive systems of values. They will be as human as anybody else, thus discouraging all attempts by others to put them on a pedestal, but they will be free. They will recognize that attempts to put them on a pedestal are subconscious flights from freedom and integrity, seeking freedom and integrity in a vicarous way. Thus they will share their weaknesses with the people they meet. When their own freedom and integrity is compromised for the sake of a share in the power and fearful security of the dominant few, they will, indeed must, recognize their responsibility to God and man and utter an unequivocal "No." They will understand that the prejudices, fears, and competitiveness of the people (students, faculty, administrators) are largely the results of an alienated culture imposed on them. They will fight only with the weapons of dramatic truth and suffering love, weapons which awaken despairing people to a sense of their own dignity and an awareness of their potentials and take away the false sense of worthlessness and powerlessness which is left by an imposed set of cultural symbols. They will use non-violent pedagogical methods to awaken others to the meaning of

human dignity and freedom for all and they will preach a message of non-violent, redemptive suffering and love in the midst of a violent and militaristic society. They will try to bring a communal life of shared values and personal relations based on mutual respect and dignity to transcend and orient the impersonal bureaucracies which tend to dominate societies with their own ethos. (For the source of the preceding paragraphs in much longer form, see Brady Tyson, "The Freedom Movement and Conscientization," IDOC International, North American edition, February 13, 1971, pp. 2-15).

None of us can claim that he is this type of symbolic person now; on the other hand, none of us can afford to claim that we might not be called and challenged by the situation which confronts us to become precisely this type of person. We cannot be discouraged by the fact that some symbolic men in our age have been assassinated, others imprisoned. One of these symbolic men, Dan Berrigan, in his letter to the Jesuits, reminds us of the price to be paid for this type of authenticity. The task of forming an authentically better world will be animated by a passion for moral change, a passion that can be measured only against the sacrifice of what lies closest to our hearts--our good name, our comfort, our security, our professional status. In small ways and in big ways, in ways known to others and in ways known only to ourselves and to God, the transformation of this world will demand that we place all of these things in jeopardy. Unless the cry of the world reaches our ears and we measure our lives and deaths against those of others, nothing changes. Least of all ourselves: we stand like sticks and stones, impervious to the meaning of history or the cry of its Lord and Victim.

The spiritual drama of our age can be summed up in the words of Christopher Fry, in The Sleep of Prisoners:

The human heart can go the lengths of God.
Dark and cold we may be, but this
Is no winter now. The frozen misery
Of centuries breaks, cracks, begins to move,
The thunder is the thunder of the floes,
The thaw, the flood, the upstart Spring.
Thank God our time is now when wrong
Comes up to face us everywhere,
Never to leave us till we take
The longest stride of soul men ever took.
Affairs are now soul size.
The enterprise
Is exploration into God.
Where are you going? It takes
So many thousand years to wake,
But will you wake, for pity's sake,
Pete's sake, Dave or one of you,
Wake up, will you?