



**THE
DUKE
DIVINITY SCHOOL
REVIEW**

Spring 1977

THE DUKE DIVINITY SCHOOL REVIEW

*The Ministry
of the Church
in Higher Education*

CONTENTS

Foreword	67
<i>by Robert L. Johnson</i>	
Campus Ministry: The Next Step	69
<i>by Robert L. Johnson</i>	
Women in Campus Ministry in the South: A Survey Report	78
<i>by Nancy Rosebaugh</i>	
Campus Ministers and the Movement for Social Change	87
<i>by Bernard LaFayette, Jr.</i>	
The Spiritual Nurture of Campus Ministers	93
<i>by J. R. McSpadden</i>	
The Ministry of the Whole Church to a Learning Society	101
<i>by Clyde O. Robinson</i>	
The Sacrament of Particularity: University Ministry through the Local Parish	112
<i>by Peter James Lee</i>	
Book Reviews	121

Editor: Creighton Lacy; Associate Editors: Lloyd Bailey, Donn Michael Farris, Terry Matthews, Roland Murphy, Helen Neinast, Charles Robinson, William Willimon.

Published three times a year (Winter, Spring, Fall)
by the Divinity School of Duke University

Postage paid at Durham, North Carolina, 27706

Foreword

When people ask me, "What is happening in campus ministry?" I cannot respond without first limiting the context. Because different things are happening in the Roman Catholic community than in the mainline Protestant community. Evangelicals and Jews are in quite distinctive situations. Institutional chaplaincies, such as Duke, Yale, Vanderbilt, are in quite another boat.

So, after two years of work with the National Institute for Campus Ministries, I have at least learned to be leary of generalizations about campus ministry from those who do not specify the context of their remarks. For instance, to characterize the student Christian movement as "dead" ignores the remarkable vitality of both the Southern Baptist and Lutheran student movements, not to mention the stunning statistics of para-church groups such as Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship and Campus Crusade.

The patterns of ministry in higher education are very diverse. Forms of funding, staffing, ecclesial relationships, emphasis on students over faculty, are all handled differently according to tradition and the demands of the local situation. In general, funding sources for campus ministry have moved from the national and regional level to the immediate area, diocese, conference, and presbytery. Thus, the local parish has assumed a more direct role in campus ministry.

In inviting persons to participate in this issue of THE DUKE DIVINITY SCHOOL REVIEW I have tried to cover some of the gaps in our present understanding of the Church's presence in the arena of higher education. My own introductory piece tries to rehearse the brief history of campus ministry and suggest something of the problems left by the tumultuous sixties. My associate, Nancy Rosebaugh, contributes a survey of the role of women in campus ministry in the Southeast with some pointed clues for the future. My colleague in NICM, Bernard LaFayette, writes of what campus ministers can learn from the civil rights struggle and how we can keep the claims of justice on our agenda. J. R. (Randy) McSpadden, Presbyterian Chaplain at Winthrop College in South Carolina, wrestles with a problem too long ignored—the spiritual care of

those engaged in campus ministry. Marginality from the center of both the Church and the Academy demands that those who minister be centered and nurtured. Clyde O. Robinson, Chairperson of the Southeastern team for United Ministries, pursues the question of the church's strategy in dealing with a constantly changing higher education scene. Lastly, Peter Lee, Episcopal Rector of the Chapel of the Cross in Chapel Hill, probes the rationale for a local parish assuming prime responsibility in sponsoring staff and program focused on the life of our first state university.

Much is missing from this fresh look at the prospects for ministry in this specialized arena. Nonetheless, these contributions fill some of the major gaps evident in the Danforth-Underwood study of campus ministry (1969) and affirm directions for the future.

Since virtually every paper I have read in the past twenty-five years on the Church and education included Tertullian's quote: "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem? What the Academy with the Church?"—and this collection has not—let me close by noting the context of Tertullian's remarks, which is seldom given. It is significant that this African, non-Greek apologist, in exhorting the faithful regarding heresies and pagan gods, refused to accept "Christianism" as a philosophy. Tertullian was cognizant of the peril of the Christian life and community being absorbed into the framework of Greek, rational systems. The peril remains, though the Academy has moved from *paideia* to servicing the demands of a technocratic society. Tertullian's question still resonates with us today because he knew that Athens and Jerusalem meet honestly when they are communities of commitment rather than intellectual points of view. I believe these papers point toward such a meeting.

ROBERT L. JOHNSON, *Guest Editor*

Campus Ministry: The Next Step

by ROBERT L. JOHNSON

The enterprise known as campus ministry bears many names: "student work," "ministries in higher education" (now "postsecondary"), "fellowships," "foundations," "chapels," "Crusades," "movements," "Bible chairs," YM-YWCA's, and faculty roundtables. It embraces students, faculty, administrators, janitors, and secretaries. It is and has been a frail instrument, a changing means of relating Athens and Jerusalem.

From its emergence as an expression of the evangelical missionary impetus of the late 19th century to the present, the character of ministry in higher education has become more diffuse and less subject to a common pattern—theological *or* sociological! For example, many today would resist the term "campus ministry," since it suggests ministry to a residential *campus* whereas large urban institutions and community colleges in high rise settings scarcely occupy a campus, and students and faculty are dispersed. Hence, the slogans of the moment: "Ministry in a Learning Society," "networking," etc. (Ed Newman forgive us!)

From 1957 to 1975, I served as Methodist campus minister at Chapel Hill and found myself in and out of the many circles relating the Church and higher education: *motive* and the quadrennials at Lawrence and Urbana, the YMCA and the UCM, the Nashville bureaucracy and the Faculty Christian Fellowship, the National Campus Ministry Association and, finally, my current employer, the National Institute for Campus Ministries. Now, with over two years' distance from the front lines, I find myself mulling over our brief history and asking what the future holds.

Where We Come From

It is important to examine the morphology of campus ministry and to note those elements present in our early history which now appear to be re-asserting themselves. Let me quickly recapitulate four stages of that history as a means of suggesting the major forma-

tive elements in a span of roughly 100 years. Needless to say, my angle of vision is that of a mainline Protestant, educated in a liberal seminary (Union), of gender male, of race slightly pale, of region proudly Southern.

I see four periods that have distinctive focus and accent. The *first* would be a *Ministry of Committed Persons*, initially volunteers and then the paid professionals of the YMCA. These "secretaries" were heroes to several generations of college youth. They led the way to a student movement and an ecumenical Christian community through the leadership of charismatic individuals such as John R. Mott. I once visited Mott in Florida near his 90th birthday and he proudly pointed to framed pictures of J. E. K. Studd and Dwight Moody as the two most important influences on his life.

This evangelical rootage of campus ministry is forgotten, if ever known, by many contemporaries. As George Williams (the founder of the YMCA) was inspired by the Finney revivals, so did the Student Christian Movement in Britain have its beginnings in the Moody-Sankey revivals. There appeared to be no fatal conflict between ecumenical unity and evangelical purity for such as John R. Mott.

In the Southern region, the first collegiate YMCA appeared at Charlottesville, soon followed by one at Chapel Hill in the 1860's. These pioneering Y secretaries, often denigrated as Tom Swifitian advocates of "muscular Christianity," included the late Frank Porter Graham and left behind a program ranging from Bible study to sex education, from the first intramural athletics to work with international students. Evangelical, ecumenical, international, innovative: these were the marks of the first campus ministers. It is worth noting that these marks were also determinative of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, which has its roots in the British student movement of the 1870's (chiefly at Cambridge) and is now an international body with a strong missionary commitment.¹

1. United Methodists may be startled to discover that the "purposes of the Methodist Student Movement" were defined in the 1960 *Discipline* as closely parallel to those of Inter-Varsity today. The Methodist statement of purpose:

- a) To lead all members of the college and university community to accept the Christian faith in God according to the Scriptures, to live as true disciples of Jesus Christ, and to become members of Christ's Church.
- b) To deepen, enrich, and mature the Christian faith of college and university men and women through commitment to Jesus Christ and his Church, and to prepare them for active lives of service and leadership in and through the Church during and after their student years.
- c) To witness in the campus community to the mission, message, and life of the Church. (Par. 1369.2, 1960 *Discipline*)

The *second* phase saw the growth of the denominational structures as *ministry was focused in religious organizations and buildings*. The first Newman Club appeared in 1894 at the University of Pennsylvania, the first Wesley Foundation at the University of Illinois in 1913. In quick order there followed the Westminster Fellowship, the Baptist Student Union, the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, and the Canterbury Club. Clarence Shedd of Yale chronicled this period in his book *The Church Follows Its Students*. This phase extended from roughly 1900 through the 1950's and saw the construction of impressive centers for worship, study and fellowship; the establishment of "Bible chairs" (especially in the South and Southwest), which were often the forerunners of departments of religion in state schools; the great quadrennial conferences which wrestled with the issues of pacifism, race, neo-orthodoxy, existentialism, and modern art. There was the enormous contribution of *motive* magazine under the United Methodists in bringing together aesthetic expression, theological insight and political probing. Unfortunately, these elements could not be held together through the 1960's, and *motive* died out of radical "ad hoc" and theological anemia.

This period also saw the rise of the Church Society for College Work, originally under the initiative of the Protestant Episcopal Church but guided into a wider ecumenical character by leaders such as James Pike and later Myron Bloy. And the evangelicals began to appear as an almost "guerrilla" type operation in dormitories and classrooms, with Bill Bright's Campus Crusade for Christ out of U.C.L.A. and the Navigators out of Colorado. Recent college graduates with minimal theological training were employed with funding from local churches and area businessmen to nurture cells of prayer, Bible study and Christian witness, as evangelicals stressed the foundational elements and generally avoided the established structures of the mainline campus ministries.

My own memories of this period are the richest, as we were immersed in the theological renewal of the Niebuhrs, Barth and Tillich; and there was a lively, visible body known as "the University Christian Movement." While many would snipe at the denominational phase as "a home away from home" ministry in retreat from the central issues of learning, I felt that the denominations were responsibly intent on moving away from mere celebration of piety on the fringes of the academic process.

Perhaps the next phase confirmed that as we found ourselves focusing on *a ministry of ideas in the academic marketplace*. Begun

by Arnold Nash's *The University and the Modern World* (1943) out of the British SCM and elaborated by Walter Moberly's *The Crisis in the University* (1949), the "University Question" exposed the pretensions of academic objectivity and asked Christians how the Christian faith could be presented as a viable option among the various worldviews represented in Western universities. Nash called for "a movement of lay theologians conscious of their aim and purpose as Christian intelligentsia to bring unity with freedom to an intellectual world which has gone adrift."²

The response was far-reaching. SCM study books and Hazen Foundation pamphlets explored the connections between religious commitment and the academic disciplines; the National Council of Churches sponsored the Faculty Christian Fellowship and published *The Christian Scholar*; faculties were employed by major state universities in religious studies; and the revival of neo-orthodox theology had its impact on many disciplines within the university.

It was a time of great ferment and achievement. I remember it as a time when Methodists were encouraged to move into ecumenical patterns of ministry, when our *Discipline* dropped the phrase "student work" in favor of "campus ministry," when theology could indeed facilitate interdisciplinary conversations. But it was also a deceptively quiet plateau that scarcely prepared us for the sixties.

The sixties initiated a new phase and completely re-shaped the form and direction of campus ministry. The focus was on *ministry in a secularized world through the People of God in dispersion*. That is awkwardly said, but it suggests the impetus of books like Peter Berger's *The Noise of Solemn Assemblies* (written for the last national assembly of mainline Protestant students) and Harvey Cox's *The Secular City*. The Ecumenical Institute of Chicago was another expression of this recovery of the laity and the drive to lay aside the banners of Christian particularity, embrace the world and its rhythms, and infiltrate the structures of society. The cognate fields of sociology, psychology and political theory became primary tools in ministry, and the basically pastoral image of campus ministry was shaken.

We learned to move beyond the individualistic care of the pastor in exploring systemic causes and solutions—whether dealing with problem pregnancies or draft-counseling. We were pushed to engage both priestly and prophetic energies in shaping public policy. Campus ministers were in the vanguard of the war resistance efforts

2. *The Intercollegian*, March, 1955, p. 15.

to our Indo-China policy. (Who will easily forget the contributions of Daniel Berrigan at Cornell or William Coffin at Yale?) Again and again, we found ourselves embroiled in our societal hurting points: racial justice, abortion counseling, working with organized labor in the state with the lowest industrial wage in the nation, initiating peace studies curricula, facing the ambiguities of homosexuals, helping women out of the *Kirche-Küche-Kinder* syndrome. The issues kept snowballing, and they always surfaced first on the campus, and the campus ministers were caught up in multiple pressures from parents, students and ecclesiastical superiors. The energy drain from the fractures of trust and the necessity of rear-guard actions was enormous, as we had to justify our perilous pastoral-prophetic tightrope act.

In the middle of this cultural upheaval the Danforth Foundation came forth with a major study of campus ministry. It was shaped by Kenneth Underwood, a social ethicist trained under H. Richard Niebuhr. To capsule Underwood's conclusions, I would say that Underwood provided the historic and imaginative models for extricating us from a debilitating individualism. He called us to be politically responsible to the institutions before us and behind us (both University and Church) and to yoke a sophisticated understanding of the social sciences with a historic grounding in theology. He urged us to be conscious of the four historic modes of Christian ministry:

the pastoral (the capacity to listen, to work through conflict and mediate forgiveness)

the priestly (sharing the resources of the sacraments and the mythic-imaginative treasures of liturgy)

the prophetic (the necessity of solidarity with the oppressed and the powerless, the responsible questioning of the structures of power)

governance (making moral sense of managerial and administrative skills, knowing where we are grounded—both faithfully and politically).

While much of the data in the Underwood study was gathered before the sixties broke open (there's precious little there about Blacks or women and no serious critique of the university as but one more of the principalities and powers), campus ministers were given substantial aid in Underwood's use of the historic modes and his exhortation to pursue "prophetic inquiry" in social policy study and action. Unfortunately, some received "prophetic inquiry" as but the latest of a series of slogans informing the image of campus

ministry. Like the earlier slogans ("The Church follows its students," "Ministry of Presence," "Ministry to a Learning Society") this one did not provide an adequate grounding for the Church's mission in higher education.

So the sixties were our time of testing, and a lot of brothers and sisters got lost along the way. I have written elsewhere of the manifold temptations of that time and the false roles we assumed. *The Lone Ranger*, shooting from the hip, fighting the enemies of darkness singlehandedly with all the weapons of a modern Manichaeism. Or *Peter Pan*, identifying at all costs with the young, fearful of betraying the least possibility that age might possess wisdom or that history might illumine the future. Or the worst kind of *cultural chameleons*, jumping on and off the cultural merry-go-round, from fun-and-games to existential theology to transactional analysis.

Let me make my point more boldly. For many campus ministers in the sixties, true community was found in those evanescent, *ad hoc*, task-oriented groups related to the issues of the moment. They were rich and potent communities. But as they evaporated one by one, many were left uncertain as to where home base was. Where is Square One? For some, it became yoga, personal growth groups, and Eastern religion. For others (notably the Roman Catholics and Southern Baptists) home base was in a visible, disciplined community rooted in worship.

The peril in having such a clear institutional, liturgical grounding is that the groups become turned in on themselves and scarcely aware of the university across the way. Their fellowship may be narcissistic; their mission may be only to get new recruits inside the nurturing circle. But the opposite peril is in having no sense of "center" in the classical marks of the Church. A loose kind of liberation or existential theology can justify a broad range of activities as "ministry" (reform politics, value clarification, TA groups, counseling), but they simply do not add up to the People of God in mission without a center. As Martin Buber knew, you cannot measure authentic community at the periphery but at the radius, the relation of the individuals in the community to a common center. Those of us in the mainline campus ministries in the last decade have not spoken convincingly about where that center is.

The evangelicals *have*, and the time is upon us when we must put away our defensive reactions to these para-church movements and be more discriminating in our judgments. Each of us can

rightly resist those elements that make a simplistic, imperialistic, obscurantist appeal. But there is no denying that these movements have filled a vacuum created by the demise of the mainline university student movement and are now channelling students into seminaries and mission programs that were once nurtured by the ecumenical church ministries.

In the last two years of work with a broad spectrum of campus ministry groups I have found it impossible to generalize about these evangelical movements. I have found Campus Crusade and Navigator workers who were as irenic and cooperative as any mainliner I know. (And I have often been put off by liberal fundamentalists with little sense of mission or theological discrimination!) All in all, I salute the evangelicals for bringing to campus ministry a sense of legitimating authority, a transforming experience that affords critical distance from the world, and a sustaining community.

One generalization I would risk is that the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship impresses me as in the forefront of those groups that keep a careful tension between a critical Biblical commitment and a pursuit of social responsibility. Their Christmas conference in Urbana, '76, brought almost 18,000 students together to do a high level of Bible study along with reflection on the problems of hunger, poverty and racism. I know of no comparable movement in mainline campus ministries. The death of the University Christian Movement in 1967 marked the end of that possibility, although Lutherans and Southern Baptists have maintained a viable student movement up to the present. My strong suspicion is that large numbers of mainline students are being nurtured through the Inter-Varsity groups, and this probability will increase as Campus Crusade reduces its national campus staff by one-third in 1977. There are some moves underway to promote evangelical-ecumenical unity in national student conferences.

Where Are We Headed?

But what about the future? Given the emotional and financial back-lash against the sixties, the evangelical resurgence, the drive for accountability in Church and State, the burgeoning community college movement, and the threat to church-related colleges, what will be the next step in campus ministry? Will we seriously attempt to develop a ministry of the laity wherein faculty, administrators, and students are directly involved in leadership roles? Will we look to local parishes for ministry to the commuter schools virtually without a residential population? How equipped are we to pursue

specialized ministries to the professions—medicine, law, education, the arts?

My initial response is to back off a bit from these immediate decisions and ask the root question of the Church's presence in the realm of post-secondary education. Do we know why we are there and what we are about? In what way are we salt, light, leaven to the learning process? And why is it that mainline, liberal Protestants are so equivocal and disparate in their responses to these questions? Granted, we live in a time of shattering pluralism, but is there not some consensus out of which we move into a mission with clarity as to objectives, goals, and strategies?

If not, then all our slogans are pretentious cover-ups for a waste of the Church's shrinking dollars. We can no longer live with the luxury of being all things to all people, of shaping our ministry according to the reigning fashions. We need to be clear as to priorities for ministry to those populations within the learning institutions. Are students clearly first? (No doubt about this with the evangelicals and Southern Baptists!) Then how do we reach faculty, staff, and administrators? Do we have a strategy for using both local pastors, faculty in religious studies (often zealously anti-church), and theological faculty (in this regard, Aquinas, Luther, Calvin and Wesley were campus ministers)? These are only a few of the many questions presently unresolved in the mainline Protestant bodies, who spend an inordinate amount of time and energy wrestling with issues of survival and retreat. That preoccupation will not nurture the kind of fresh theological imagination that is necessary for a fresh venture in higher education ministries.

My own inclination would be to set forth a polemical slogan for the future. It would be something like "Confessing communities in mission to the learning communities." The key word here is communities—visible, disciplined and rooted in the historic memory and hope of Christian tradition. Out of a sure confessional identity, missional clarity can emerge and specialized ministries be supported.

Despite the projected decline in the populations of our academic institutions, the learning communities will continue to be the basic crucible within which the human future is shaped. A large part of our people will choose their vocations, their mates, their values in this setting. Social policy affecting the environment, medical ethics, the substance of law, the structure of family and government will be informed by the vitality of our learning institutions. So what

does it mean when churchpersons say they are more concerned about "evangelism" than about campus ministry? To turn our backs on this critical frontier of evangelism would leave the church without effective voice at those junctures where the moral use of knowledge will be determined.

Any next steps into future ministry in higher education must proceed on the basis of missional clarity. With that kind of soul-searching behind us, I believe we can once again put together:

evangelical commitment and social responsibility,
 confessional integrity and pluralistic tolerance,
 ecumenical integrity and denominational nurture,
 critical intelligence and faithful passion.

This brings us almost full-circle, back to the point in 1949 when Sir Walter Moberly wrote *The Crisis in the University* and advised: "Our first task (in the post-Christian university) must be to become a community of Christians."³ Like T. S. Eliot, Moberly knew that being a community of Christians was not the same thing as a "Christian community" or "Christian civilization." But the task is still before us.

3. *The Crisis in the University* (London: SCM Press, 1949), p. 261.

Women in Campus Ministry in the South: A Survey Report

by NANCY ROSEBAUGH

During the fall of 1975 and spring of 1976 the National Institute for Campus Ministries conducted a mail survey of women in campus ministry in the South with the intent of uncovering both women's reflections about their jobs (hiring process, responsibilities, handicaps) and attitudes of others toward women in ministry. (For a statistical profile of the respondent group, see Appendix.)

With 69 respondents from eight religious and denominational groups, the range of responses offers a sometimes bewildering variety. On the practical issues of employment opportunities and salary equity, however, there is a unified voice: women are underpaid, and there are too few women in the profession. Survival for women as persons in ministry depends to a great extent upon support systems, both personal and professional. This survey measured some areas of possible professional support and found several important gaps. A sense of what kind of personal support is available can be gathered from women's accounting of their own strengths and handicaps.

Financial Support and Equal Employment Opportunities

There was a resounding response to the survey question, "What would you like to see changed to improve the situation for women in campus ministry?": better salaries. The replies to this question were framed in a number of ways, but the message that women in campus ministry are underpaid did not vary. Many women see themselves doing essentially the same job as men and receiving less, sometimes considerably less, financial remuneration. There are a number of women who are unpaid volunteers—because there is no money to pay a full-time, or even part-time, person.

Several women who are working in campus ministries were originally hired for clerical jobs—the position was funded for secretarial staff—but employers wanted someone who also had counseling skills, or at least aptitude for counseling. Through her own initiative, or at the request of the campus minister, a

woman hired as secretary may become program assistant and counselor, in addition to doing clerical work. In these cases, pay is definitely not equitable for the work performed. One respondent suggested that her employers sought a woman for the job because they could not afford a full-time ordained man. Women religious may find themselves in a similar position; salaries for religious are lower than for priests anyway. Though the salary information is not precise, data from this survey indicate it may be considerably less expensive to have a woman on campus than to have a man in the same, or a similar, ministry position.

The situations described in responses to this survey suggest some important concerns. One is that more openings are needed for women who are professional ministers—not only in women's colleges—and not only as secretaries. One respondent suggested that the ministry on her campus could be improved by having another woman as professional minister and a man (or men) doing secretarial work to balance the present situation. Another need is that professional work be recognized and remunerated where it is found; employers whose salary scale depends solely on academic and ecclesiastic credentials may be discriminating against women who have acquired ministry skills in less formal ways.

A number of suggestions were made regarding the employment situation for women. The primary recommendation is that women be paid according to their abilities and experience, regardless of sex, marital status, ecclesiastical status, and suspected or expected term of employment.* Other recommendations include having more clearly defined job descriptions as one way to close the gap between work done and pay received. A job description flexible enough to be revised to match the actual work performed could be a bargaining tool for higher salary. Establishing a standard procedure for hiring and firing, with clear criteria for each, would prove beneficial, some respondents indicated.

Vocational Support Systems

It is not only financial support and job opportunities which are lacking. The women in campus ministry who responded to this survey are also concerned about inadequate support systems on the

* One notable exception to the feeling that job opportunities are limited by sex comes from respondents who work with Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship. They report that positions are offered to applicants on the basis of the person's abilities and gifts. Staff persons feel I.V. has a strong organization and the hiring process is a good one.

part of denominational or local church bodies, college and university administrators, and ministry colleagues.

A number of women include in their job responsibilities relating to a local church(es), and some are hired by committees of local pastors; many more are hired by regional denominational bodies. Yet many respondents feel that local churches and denominational offices fail to recognize campus ministry as an important and challenging work of the church. Evidence of this oversight is seen in different ways:

- 1) Financial support and other support services (such as secretary or office assistant) are often inadequate.
- 2) Few seminaries offer the courses in late adolescent development, programming with college students, and experimental (as well as traditional) modes of worship that are needed to prepare people of both sexes specifically for campus ministry.
- 3) There is a significant unmet need for in-service skills training (e.g., interpreting scripture and special counseling skills) and continuing education.

The need for continuing education could be somewhat alleviated by having encouragement from denominational bodies to continue study, financial aid for transportation to conferences, more skills-oriented and woman-oriented workshops in local areas, and more input (perhaps on a supervisory level?) from trained religious workers.

Another felt limitation in relation to church bodies is the restriction on ordination of women among Roman Catholics, which is a serious concern for women who minister on a campus, whether there are male colleagues in the area or not. In addition, one respondent listed as a major handicap in the employment of women in campus ministries "the unwillingness of denominations to allow a woman to be the only campus minister in a given situation; where there is only one, that person is almost always white male."

Though several respondents feel the lack of support from university administrators and faculty, there is little elaboration on that point in the survey results. It seems that the university seldom recognizes the importance of ministry on the campus, or is not interested in it.

Among their colleagues in ministry, women find too little professional recognition; there seems to be little respect for women's strengths on the part of the men with whom and for whom women are working. Men are often reluctant to accept a woman's leadership in any aspect of the job. One need that was mentioned re-

peatedly was consciousness-raising for the men, including some recognition in journals and other publications that women exist as campus ministers, e.g., not always referring to the campus minister as "he." Language that uses predominantly or only male pronouns and images and other forms of gender-based discrimination is a serious problem for many women in campus ministry. A related problem is ignorance and intolerance of religious traditions other than one's own, whether that be among Christian groups or between Christians and non-Christians. For instance, a woman who works as Hillel adviser finds that one of her most severe handicaps is the "lack of Jewish consciousness on the part of almost all of my potential community."

Approximately 62 per cent of the survey respondents work as part of a team, and approximately 45 per cent work alone (several people work in both kinds of circumstances). However, even among those who are part of a team, collegial support is often lacking. "It would be important to be able to work toward common strategies in ministry" with people on the same campus and with people on ministry staffs on other campuses, suggested one respondent. There is also a need for psychological and spiritual support—for people "to get together regularly to interact on and pray about common concerns."

Another need voiced by many of the survey respondents is for support systems related specifically to the disadvantages women face in campus ministry jobs and in society generally. The isolation many women feel could be addressed, to some extent, by "occasional woman-oriented workshops in the area." Support structures for women can be part of what happens at regional and national conferences—another reason for hiring bodies to provide financial assistance for travel to such events. There may be a need for some women to pursue assertiveness training for "skills in negotiating for financial contracts and structural changes in job descriptions." Other suggestions included an apprenticeship program for interns with women in campus ministry and an advocacy group, "which could do what AAUP does for its members when they are abused."

Strengths and Handicaps of Women in Campus Ministry

Responses on the question concerning the unique strengths and handicaps in being a woman campus minister varied widely. While some felt that a woman in ministry on a campus needs to maintain the image of friend, not mother, and may need to learn to keep a

professional distance, especially with male students, others felt that their strengths as women were in being a mother (or grandmother) image and providing students with a "home away from home" dimension to make adjustment to college life easier. Most respondents agreed that women do add sensitivity in human relationships to their ministry tasks, in listening, hearing, loving. They felt that women *tend* to be more compassionate than men, more understanding and patient, and may better enable students to discover their own gifts. One respondent described her strength as a woman and feminist as "my perspective on the importance of affective as well as task-oriented needs in individuals and groups." Those surveyed think that women tend to have greater endurance, finer attention to detail, and more flexibility in scheduling than men in the same type of job.

The survey respondents also described what they felt to be the unique strengths of women as counselors. In counseling situations where students live at home, are married, or are contemplating marriage, women may counsel with greater sensitivity to home situations and may be more open to helping students prepare for marriage. Women as counselors often relate more easily to both sexes; some respondents suggested that students and faculty and ministry colleagues seemed to be more comfortable with women than with men counselors, especially in talking about intimate situations.

"[Men] respect me, solicit my aid readily and take confidence in my presence."

"My relationship with the male students adds to their wholeness. There are times when the men come to get help in understanding the woman they date and/or love."

"I can help men students to learn about male-female relationships without my being an emotional threat."

The uniqueness of women as campus ministers is sometimes expressed in terms of an approach which is complementary to males in campus ministry. The complementary approach may embody qualities such as those described above; it may be simply that a woman's presence among campus ministry counseling personnel offers an alternative, "so that persons can choose male or female, depending on their needs and preferences." Women may assert alternative ways of valuing—alternative to the prevailing styles of campus ministry and alternative to the culture. Women may also bring a broad range of experiences and a larger understanding of the tasks of ministry to the campus.

Another significant area in these reflections on the unique strengths of women in campus ministry is political sensitivity to changing roles of men and women and ways of relating to others which result from that sensitivity. The integration of this awareness was described by one respondent as "my commitment to surfacing the personal and political as inextricably intertwined." Some respondents find that being a woman has given them a base for ministry to minorities—a perspective from which to identify with oppressed groups. Some find that being a woman eases the way in coordinating activities with women's church groups and other community groups, and, for lay women, in relating to ministers in the community because there is no problem with clerical jealousy.

Many women see their position as important because they are independent women, female models in visible places to counteract societal models and to speak to other women (student and non-student), to men, to the university, and to the whole church. Women in campus ministry may be valuable because they understand women's needs, can work with women, and can serve as advocate for women within the university. They may also be instrumental in raising consciousness in both church and university and may be able to interpret what is happening in the woman movement to various groups and persons.

It seems the primary resistance women encounter in their ministries is that many people "still suffer from vestiges of the mentality that considers women second-rate citizens." This attitude is evident as women experience "not being taken seriously at times" and "skepticism about my place, capabilities, etc., as a woman campus staff member"; in addition, it is "difficult to be seen as a colleague by parish ministers (all male in this case) in the community."

Being treated as second-rate citizens is a serious hindrance for women in many business dealings ("people think men are the 'head' in all business matters") and in personal interactions within the university and among campus ministry staff. But this attitude has even more serious implications for women in ministry:

"Some people *refuse* to accept a woman as minister."

"Men don't tend to want to be led by a woman spiritually."

"Because I cannot be ordained, I can't offer mass or absolution."

Social-cultural conventions and expectations of women's roles, often reinforced by church structures (e.g., not admitting women to ordained ministry, inequitable salaries), prevent many women from

fully using their gifts in ministry, or make their work more difficult. "People expect women to make banners and play the guitar"—not lead worship.

In a male-dominated or male-clerical-dominated situation, as most universities and colleges are, a woman can easily be put on the defensive. She may be the only woman in her profession in the area and may be subjected to an "automatic discount"—women may have difficulty in being heard and in being considered of equal importance in groups of men.

"The major [handicap] in my experience is [not] being able to command the kind of attention that is sometimes needed in order to get things done. I have come to believe that this is not a personal problem. . . . It is a difficult adjustment to have to deal with and one reason why I think many women are learning assertiveness training."

Another part of this assertiveness dynamic is a woman's learning to say "no" to demands placed on her—this may be a difficult process. In addition, there is often low awareness in local churches, among campus ministry boards, and in the university in general of attitudes and structures which limit women's full participation. This lack of understanding and lack of support often leads to a sense of being "outnumbered," a sense of isolation, or aloneness in the profession.

Women who are living out feminist convictions face having to deal with the tension between the weight of societal expectations and integrity of self-expression: "It saps energy to have to deal with stereotypes and assumptions about women and appropriate roles." Because women in campus ministry have greater visibility than men (women in all-male, or mostly male, groups), they are sometimes subject to greater criticism. One respondent said she felt as a handicap "the sense of needing to prove oneself"—the reverse side of accepting the responsibility to do as competent a job as possible in order to improve opportunities for women in the field. Several respondents reported as a handicap "the sexist comments one learns to endure," and some found it difficult to realize "that it is impossible not to compromise myself"—to be in a situation where the system does not accommodate readily to individuals' sensitivities and to the growing awareness of social injustice.

Other disadvantages of being a woman serving as campus minister involve dimensions of the job. If a single person has infrequent interaction with other staff members, it is easy to feel lonely. Even if she doesn't work alone, student work tends to be "demand-

ing for the single woman—emotionally, psychologically, and socially.” Being single may be a disadvantage for participating in social events, especially married students’ activities. Women who have another full-time job and volunteer their time for ministry activities experience that volunteer status and lack of time as a significant handicap.

Women in campus ministry in the South have shared a variety of concerns and reflections in this survey. We hope that this survey and others like it may facilitate communication about the problems and needs of both women and men in campus ministry, in order to encourage and provide focus for the work ahead.

POSTSCRIPT

One critical problem with this survey is that it, like channels of financial and vocational support, failed to recognize and reach a number of women in campus ministry in the South. The number is unknown because these women are seldom listed on anyone’s payroll or directory. They are often black, often part-time, lay workers, primarily at small, rural-based, two-year colleges. The ministry these women do—and the problems they face—unfortunately cannot be reflected in this report.

APPENDIX

STATISTICAL PROFILE

<i>Relig./Denom. Affiliation</i>	<i>S. Baptist</i>	<i>R.C.</i>	<i>U.Meth.</i>	<i>CCC</i>	<i>IVCF/ (PCUS)</i>	<i>Presby.</i>	<i>UCC</i>	<i>Jewish</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Per- centage</i>
<i># Respondents</i>	24	17	11	8	7	1	1	69	%	
<i>AGE</i>										
Under 25	5	—	1	3	—	—	—	9	13	
25-34	4	3	3	4	3	1	1	19	27	
35-44	7	7	3	1	2	—	—	20	30	
45-54	5	7	2	—	2	—	—	16	23	
55 and over	3	—	2	—	—	—	—	5	7	
<i>DEGREE OF EDUCATION</i>										
BA, BS	10	3	3	8	2	—	—	26	39	
MA, MRE	9	10	3	—	2	—	1	25	36	
MDiv, BD, MTh	1	2	4	—	2	1	—	10	15	
PhD (EdD)	2	2	1	—	1	—	—	6	9	
<i>MARITAL STATUS</i>										
Single	10	15	8	2	2	—	—	37	53	
Married	14	2	3	6	5	1	1	32	47	
<i>ECCLESIASTICAL STATUS</i>										
Ordained	2	—	4	—	2	1	—	9	13	
Lay	20	4	5	8	3	—	1	41	59	
Vowed Religious	—	13	—	—	—	—	—	13	19	
Deacon (M-B) or Elder (P)	2	—	2	—	2	—	—	6	9	
<i>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</i>										
Full-time	16	13	8	7	3	1	—	48	70	
Part-time	5	4	3	—	3	—	1	16	23	
Volunteer	3	—	—	1	1	—	—	5	7	
<i>NUMBER OF YEARS IN CAMPUS MINISTRY</i>										
Less than 1	4	2	—	—	2	—	—	8	12	
1-2 years	5	1	4	—	—	—	—	10	15	
3-4 years	4	2	1	3	2	1	—	13	20	
5-9 years	4	9	2	4	2	—	1	22	33	
10 or more years	6	2	4	1	—	—	—	13	20	
<i>NUMBER OF YEARS IN PRESENT POSITION</i>										
Less than 1	6	3	—	3	2	—	—	14	21	
1-2 years	6	2	5	1	1	—	1	16	24	
3-4 years	4	6	2	3	1	1	—	17	25	
5-9 years	4	5	2	1	2	—	—	14	21	
10 or more years	3	1	2	—	—	—	—	6	9	

Campus Ministers and the Movement for Social Change

by BERNARD LAFAYETTE, JR.

This article is focused on the problems of a select group of campus ministers and their dilemmas during the struggle for social change during the 60's and early 70's, and the impact of those dilemmas on ministry in higher education today. The content is based on my personal observation and feedback which I have gotten from a number of campus ministers serving campuses during this period. When this article refers to campus ministers, it should be understood to refer to this select group of campus ministers. This select group would be those campus ministers who experienced student unrest, student protests or revolts during the 60's and early 70's, especially those related to civil rights, anti-war and governance issues, and as a result of experienced disillusionment.

As a student during the 60's and a leader in the student protest movement, I can deeply appreciate the dilemmas of the campus ministers in such a traumatic period. However, I feel compelled to respond to the often-heard interpretation that it was a mistake for campus ministers to have become involved with movements for social change, because such involvement undermined their role and mission in higher education.

I hope this is a minority position; nevertheless, I have heard it stated often enough to feel the need to make a brief response.

The 60's and early 70's is a period often referred to as a time of great disillusionment for a significant number of campus ministers. As a result of this, some people feel that these campus ministers were victims of the times. Many observers claim that campus ministry lost its identity, and more than a few mainline campus ministers still remain unclearly focused on their role and mission in higher education.

The jolts of the civil rights campaigns, the anti-war protests, and the campus revolts related to governance issues, many times left campus ministers emotionally divided. Often there was sym-

pathy with the administration's and civil authority's call for law and order, on one hand, and the students' demands for racial justice, an end to an unpopular war, and the right to participate in decision making policies affecting campus life, on the other.

While on one hand campus ministers found it easier to share the sentiments of the students, on the other hand they were unsure, if not greatly disturbed by the methods students employed to dramatize their issues and demonstrate their discontent. The rock throwing at helmeted policemen, the burning and bombing of buildings, the trashing, "smoking" and choking on obscenities, made it difficult for "the cloth" to find a non-controversial position. Some stuck their collars out in hopes that their presence would temper the outraged spirits on either side, preventing further injury and bloodshed. Others sought a distant perch to gain a panoramic view of the paralyzing conflict, simply to collect data as passive observers.

It was not uncommon to find a campus minister caught in the eye of the human hurricane and left spent like rubble, scooped up and thrown into the can. Notable example, Ben Chavis of the Wilmington Ten. I suspect some brothers and sisters found untimely emergencies which carried them away from the embattled scene. Others found refuge in the security of their offices, where perhaps they pondered the following thoughts:

What is the role of campus ministry in such a time as this? Why should I go out there in that riotous situation and risk my life? You never know what those students will do. You could get yourself killed out there with those radicals and militants. They don't care anything about the church anyhow. What good could I do in such a volatile situation? Is not *my* responsibility to the faithful students who regularly participate in my campus ministry program?

Deep down within, campus ministers know that, had it not been for the direct action campaigns and protest demonstrations during this period, important changes otherwise would not have taken place. Campus ministers felt that there were other ways for the students to make their point and accomplish their goals. But of course no one had taken any leadership in trying to help students learn about those "other ways." In fact, no one had thought about it until it was too late, or as the saying goes, "the die was cast."

In a desperate effort to be relevant some campus ministers went out and put themselves in the line of fire with the students. They wanted the students to have some adults in whom they had con-

fidence. They wanted to show the students that there were some people over thirty who could be trusted. Because in many cases the students were outraged with the national government, distrustful of the president of the college or university, and suspicious of older adults in general, including their parents in some cases, they conclusively isolated themselves in a youth ghetto. Under these circumstances campus ministers realized how important it was to maintain some kind of communication with the students, in spite of the risks involved. The risks to campus ministers were not simply physical, but perhaps more disturbing was the thought of being identified with a cause which was antithetical to his or her basic beliefs and orientation.

During this period students were outspokenly condemning the total society, and many times their claims were legitimate, but couched in the radical rhetoric of the "far left." Campus ministers in this situation did not feel comfortable publicly disagreeing with the rhetoric for fear that the students would attack them for being conservative or even reactionary. So they quietly went along, half-heartedly involved, while they pondered their own personal dilemma.

Another issue for campus ministers had to do with the question of power and leadership. After all, they represented spiritual, ethical and moral leadership on campuses; why shouldn't they be leading the movement? But of course to take leadership meant to take responsibility, sometimes full responsibility. It was not clear to many campus ministers whether they should be leaders or whether they should properly be followers, since it was in essence a student movement and therefore should be student led.

If campus ministers were ambiguous about what role they should play in the unfolding drama of the 60's and early 70's, many grass roots church leaders and some tree top leaders were more ambiguous about the role campus ministers should play.

During public demonstrations and protests TV and press cameras were careful to focus on the Roman collars and habits and the faces in them. When many fellow churchmen and women saw their church leaders in the midst of a demonstration (for them it was interpreted as a riot), they were stunned and angered. This precipitated thunder bolts of criticism and a wave of threats to withdraw support for their ministry.

Some people, including other campus ministers, questioned whether that type of involvement was *real* ministry or was actually the typical behavior of some publicity hound, off on the latest

political fad, marching under the church's banner, claiming some new-founded self-styled ministry. In a few cases this was probably true. It is also true that some campus ministers were naive about their involvement in social change movements, in that they were unaware of the sometimes heavy politics operating in the background.

Many of the campus ministers who got involved were aware of the possibility that they could be attacked by their peers and superiors in the church. But in spite of that knowledge they consciously chose to get involved.

When the movement of the 60's and early 70's is raised in campus ministry circles, more often than not one gets the feeling that that period was not a satisfying or fulfilling period for campus ministry. It was indeed a traumatic experience for many. I often hear campus ministers express regrets about their own involvement in movements for social change and casually blame the movement for the resulting pain they experienced.

From my observations I get the distinct impression that many of the campus ministers who leapt into the movements for social change left their theology behind. They temporarily abandoned their churches and became political activists rather than spiritual leaders. They were neither prophetic to the cause nor pastoral to those involved. They were embarrassed to be identified with Christ and the church because the church was so far behind on social issues. They often hid their identity to avoid taking criticism for the status quo racist practices of the church.

It was easier for campus ministers to disassociate themselves temporarily from church identity. In many cases they too shared the criticism of the students and joined in the wholesale condemnation of the church, but spent very little time patiently ministering to their church and helping it through this difficult period. Just as many students wrote off their parents and older adults, some campus ministers wrote off the church and its leaders. Here is where President Carter offers a better model for dealing with this kind of problem. As I recall, his position was that he realized that his church was not perfect, but it was his church. While he had a different opinion from some of the other members on the racial question, he was not yet prepared to condemn his church and abandon it. Instead he used his patience and persuasion to exert his moral position within his church community in hope that enough members of his spiritual community would either change their hearts or change their votes (or both).

Martin Luther King, Jr., was no doubt the best example of a Christian whose spirituality was rooted in the church and whose social action was rooted in his spirituality. King carried his theology with him into social action campaigns. He conducted prayer meetings on the streets of Albany, Georgia; he preached in the Birmingham jail; he held choir rehearsal on the highway between Selma and Montgomery. His mass meetings were not political rallies, they were church services. But not only did King take the church with him wherever he went, he also went to church.

The reason King was not leading the march across the Edmond Pettus Bridge in Selma on that infamous Bloody Sunday when the marchers were beaten and trampled with horses was that he was leading worship services at Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta. He was co-pastor with his father, Daddy King, and it was Martin, Jr.'s Sunday to preach. His congregation was a part of his Beloved Community. (He was in Selma the next day to continue the march.)

It is urgent to be involved in relevant action for social change, but it is important to be rooted deeply in a spiritual community if that involvement is to be sustained.

Myron Bloy writes in a recent issue of the *NICM Journal* on Community-Making, "Those whose drive is only for deepening the experience and enlarging the number of here-and-now faith communities as ends in themselves, who fail to recognize such proximate communities as signs of and gateways into deeper and broader dimensions of community, open themselves to despair . . ." ¹ ". . . Those whose drive is only for the community of mankind, for Justice with a capital 'J,' who fail to recognize that the just imagination is necessarily rooted in the experience of historic and proximate community, open themselves to despair . . ." ²

Our passion for a closer relationship with God must ultimately bring us to recognize that to understand God on the simplest level is to understand a divine love for all of God's children. To love God is to understand God's passion for justice, a concern for the poor, the hungry, the needy, "the least of these."

The problem today is not the threat of disillusionment on the part of campus ministers because of their involvement in social action movements; on the contrary, the campus ministers are being lulled to sleep by the peace and calm of the college campuses. It

1. Myron Bloy, "Community-Making as Ministry," *NICM Journal*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Winter 1977), p. 9.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

would not be surprising to learn later that this calm is the "calm before the storm."

I can see from my many visits to college and university campuses that very little integration has resulted from desegregation. The polarization, isolation, and lack of communication between black and white students, the racism reported to me by black faculty, staff and administrators, all indicate that there is little or no honest dialogue taking place on campuses today.

Martin Luther King, Jr., spoke to this problem when he said, "Desegregation will break down the legal barriers and bring men together physically, but something must touch the hearts and souls of men so that they will come together spiritually because it is natural and right."³

In spite of the fact that blacks are on a majority of the predominantly white campuses and have been for the past nine years, white campus ministers still bemoan the problem that they don't know how to provide an effective ministry which includes blacks. Some campus ministers are so deeply involved in "spiritual development" and their "white" campus ministry program, they hardly know that there are blacks on campus. Spiritual indebtedness must not blind us to the urgent issues of black oppression, justice, hunger, capital punishment, disarmament, women's rights and the crisis of unconcernedness about the problems of the children, the elderly and poor in our nation.

Spiritual indebtedness must be that enlivening force which enlightens us to these problems and helps us find the way to make our ministries more prophetic, more open to God's calling, more open to the cries of the oppressed, more prepared to challenge evil in high places.

It must now be said that another key contributing factor to the disillusionment of many campus ministers during the 60's and early 70's was the lack of skill in dealing with the tough problems of organizing, of mediating, of managing conflict, analyzing disasters, and developing more effective strategies for social change. The will is no greater than the skill.

Campus ministers must be better prepared to cope with the unrest of the 80's than they were during the 60's and 70's. I predict that we are on the verge of massive social upheaval. The hundreds of young people recently arrested in New Hampshire signal the signs of the times, for they are a-changing.

3. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 118.

The Spiritual Nurture of Campus Ministers

by J. R. McSPADDEN

I

For the past five or six years, it has bothered me that my colleagues and I have been unable to integrate spirituality or spiritual experience into our ministries of counseling, programming, and responding to campus and societal issues. Although our weekly gatherings forever begin and end with prayer, I do not think we have moved beyond a cosmetic piety which probably retards rather than expands our spiritual development. There is the annual May retreat when we evaluate our ministries, an occasion when a discussion of our inner lives could take place, but attempts at such are usually superficial as bodies begin to wiggle and eyes shift back and forth across the floor. Eventually faint sighs of relief are heard after our leader suggests that we "get on with the agenda."

Much of our anxiety about discussing spirituality—and by that I mean the phenomenon of being centered or grounded in the transformative possibilities of creation—seems to be similar to a general defensiveness we manifest when called upon to acknowledge those violent, sexual, and intimate feelings that influence our lived experience. These feelings create anxiety and conflict as we privately wonder if our most fundamental experiences are valid or "real," if they will be judged as immature or fanatical, or if our colleagues might "tell" our governing board members what we really think.

In addition to the mistrust associated with sharing this side of our personalities, an abundance of psychological literature suggests that the whole area of spiritual experience is simply another coping mechanism we use to squelch our instinctual or learned aggressive drives. Given this understanding of spirituality, many clinicians tend to reduce existential expressions of "emptiness" or feeling "lost" to diagnostic evidence signaling a "neurosis" or an "infantile reaction to stress."

On the one hand, we are silenced by the threat of our colleagues' misunderstanding, and on the other, we are encouraged to deny the validity of our basic human drive for connectedness and meaning because some practitioners of mental health think that existential expressions are symptoms of a personality disorder.

According to Gerald May, there is a deeper element in the ambivalence that emerges when we are faced with questions about our spiritual experience. This element is revealed by the embarrassment or shame that is sometimes felt when we catch ourselves praying (or maybe wishing) for something to happen. Perhaps we long for a friend's safe return from a trip or an end to the pain caused by divorce or death. May writes "there is a deep threat associated with spiritual experience no matter how mature or legitimate it may be. This threat involves the loss of ego boundaries, the loss of individual identity, the loss of control, and the possibility of being swallowed and consumed into infinity. Thus the threat is really that of loss of self or non-existence or death."¹

Abraham Maslow has listed in his book *Religions, Values and Peak-Experiences* a number of egoless characteristics that are common to experiential peaks (moments of heightened spiritual awareness). Several of those characteristics are a sense of belonging, an experience of universality, a dissolution of subject-object relationships, and a recognition of one's uniqueness. These peaks or spiritual experiences are occasionally limited, however, by those of us who view such moments "as a kind of insanity, a complete loss of control, a sense of being overwhelmed by irrational emotions . . ."² The fear that we may lose ourselves accompanies moments of spiritual depth (or height), and our uneasiness is most evident when we attempt to examine our spiritual experience: ". . . we are threatened with dissolving ourselves in the great universal sea where subject and object are one, time is eternal, space infinite, and our own ego but a delusion, . . . such experience is just too close to death for comfort."³

II

One of the consequences of human self-consciousness is the need to protect one's self from loss. Anxiety heightens when we are con-

1. Gerald G. May, "The Psychodynamics of Spirituality," *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, 28 (1974), 87.

2. Abraham H. Maslow, *Religions, Values, and Peak-Experiences* (New York: Viking Press, 1964), pp. 22-23.

3. May, p. 88.

fronted with the possibility of losing a fulfilling job, a beloved spouse, our health, or the position we have within a community. And it is the same fear of loss that precedes occasions of a profound spiritual experience, occasions when we are pushed out to the limits of our knowledge and understanding of this world and when we are forced to re-examine all of life's categories, priorities, and values. Although these experiences may not immediately render "a clean well-lighted place" for us to reorient ourselves, they provide a necessary position to begin looking beyond the boundaries of our particular horizon. Minimally, these moments of spiritual insight remind us that life is inherently ambiguous, that suffering and pain are permanent realities within our world, that loss of meaning and loss of identity must accompany the birth of a new understanding and a new self.

The Old and New Testament narratives are filled with accounts of spiritual experiences where the death of old habits of thinking and behaving is essential before space can be created for something new. "If anyone wants to be a follower of mine, let him renounce himself—for anyone who loses his life for my sake will find it" (Mt. 16:24-25) are terribly frightening words from Jesus. They call for an incredible level of trust, a venture into the "great universal sea" with no assurance that one will land on anything solid.

Father Jeffrey Sobosan describes this movement in spirituality as a growth from nothingness to being:

Jesus the man reveals Jesus the God in that he does humanly what God does. Jesus does not impose meaning on or construe his life; but he allows his life to become. And in this sense the God present in Jesus can be seen as an autonomous creative force which lets life be what it is. In the way he lets his own life develop, therefore, Jesus becomes for the Christian the paradigm of the human being actively open to the creative power within him, which is God. Jesus' individual life can be seen as a way in which all individuals must pursue the search for their own meaning. Which is to say that the path which the individual life must take is one of growth from nothingness to being, by attempting first to understand that one's life situation is ambiguous; second, by opening oneself up to the creative God-power within oneself and waiting for its revelation, however gradually it may come; and third, by acting upon its discovery.⁴

How does one discover his or her being within the experience of loss? There may be a clue for us within the Gospel of Matthew.

4. Jeffrey G. Sobosan, "Suffering, Innocence and Love," *The Christian Century* 91 (14, 1974).

Following Jesus' return from the wilderness and immediately before his entrance into a ministry of proclaiming the kingdom of God, he discovered that John the Baptist had been imprisoned. At that point Jesus took John's place—until he learned that the Baptist had been executed. According to the writer of Matthew, it seems that Jesus withdrew from his ministry after receiving this news. Was John's death so frightening that Jesus backed away from his plans to convert Israel? Perhaps. But whether or not this was the reality which Jesus saw, he must have realized quite clearly that his task was absurd. Yet, in the face of that absurdity, he chose to stay with his mission, continuing "to trust that there was a meaning beyond his perception, as death is necessarily beyond the perception of man. And that he died still teaching and still trusting in the darkness of this possible absurdity is clear: on the cross, we are told, he said: 'Into your hands I commend my spirit.' Only after his death is the man Jesus recognized as the 'Lord.' He saw darkness at the end of his life and trusted in it."⁵

III

Over the past three years I have found the following techniques to be helpful starting points in my spiritual development. Although they are not unprecedented, since contemplatives and religiously non-committed persons have practiced similar spiritual techniques for centuries, they are quite novel within my lived experience as I am able to stop, to back away from numerous quotidian rituals and responsibilities, and to identify those places where I have desensitized myself to what is distracting or unnecessary.

Sometimes following these exercises, I realize that a change in perspective has occurred when I decide to accept the limitations on my time and energy—realities I frequently avoid as the "what I should do" messages are blurred into the "what I want/can do" items during the course of a day. A second change that usually occurs is that many unconscious illusions of being a super-campus minister (Bill Coffin type), super-theologian (a David Tracy), super-preacher (another David C. Read), or super-therapist (an Eric Berne-Henri Nouwen combination) begin to surface, thus reducing my ambivalent and competitive feelings toward those colleagues who threaten the illusory "Coffin-Tracy-Read-Berne-Nouwen Super Star." And, occasionally, I am able to hear within myself and to see within the words and actions of those standing over against me

5. Sobosan, p. 398.

that I am acceptable and that that which accepts me transcends scientific and everyday categories of understanding.

Silence

Four years ago I entered my new campus ministry job full of energy and enthusiasm. I attended every meeting on campus and in presbytery, spoke to everyone I thought I should know, wrote letters and thank-you notes for all the dinner invitations that were extended to me, tried to appear at all the birthday gatherings with a freshly purchased present, led Bible study groups, introduced students to the B-1 Bomber issue, offered transactional analysis workshops, and filled all the empty places on my calendar with counseling appointments. My inability to say "no" to every request resulted in my being well-liked and accepted: but that approval was costing me my health because I was not sleeping, there was no time to read or study, and the "free" time I spent at home was filled with sermon or program preparation. My only retreat from the madness of each day was the five or ten minutes I stood in the shower every morning—a sanctuary without telephones, counseling appointments or seminars. I was not effective in my ministry, nor were my activities meaningful, because I was afraid to take the time to stop, to be alone, and to reflect on my life.

In the fall of 1974, about fifteen months after my arrival, I had the opportunity to read several books by Thomas Merton and Henri Nouwen. In response to their words, I began to set aside three hours every Tuesday morning to be alone. My one rule for the day was to avoid planning the morning's agenda and to keep it free of distracting telephone calls. I simply awakened to the day, opened my blinds, and allowed the morning to lead me to whatever I selected to read, reflect on, or maybe write about (as long as it was unrelated to my job).

Some mornings I could not clear my mind of those things that had taken place the day before or would occur later in the week; and I tried several Yoga exercises, concentrating as much as possible on my breathing and allowing whatever anxieties were immobilizing me to run their course. This did not always work, but when it did, my numerous self-created illusions lost some of their power. Nouwen's words were helpful:

A life without a lonely place, that is, a life without a quiet center, easily becomes destructive. When we cling to the results of our actions as our only way of self-identification, then we become possessive and defensive and tend to look at our fellow

human beings more as enemies to be kept at a distance than as friends with whom we share the gifts of life. In solitude we can listen to the voice of him who spoke to us before we could speak a word, who healed us before we could make any gesture to help, who set us free long before we could free others, and who loved us long before we could give love to anyone. It is in this solitude that we discover that being is more important than having, and that we are worth more than the result of our efforts. In solitude we discover that our life is not a possession to be defended, but a gift to be shared.⁶

Journal Keeping

One of the earliest learnings to emerge from these quiet Tuesday mornings was the recognition of two incapacitating forces within my personality. One side of my personality contained a well-supplied arsenal of omnipotent fantasies about being male, performing scholastically, and being professional. And not very far away from the "Super Star" arsenal, I discovered an equally well-armed rapid fire company of messengers who reminded me that I was basically weak, not so bright, somewhat lazy, and a bit fearful of new people and strange places. These two factions were always present, especially when it was time for a decision, e.g., whether or not to accept a new job offer; and they would cause indigestion, headaches, or maybe a twitch in my eyelid if I tried to ignore their presence. Sometimes the only way I was able to remove myself from their endless comments was to sleep, to eat too much chocolate ice cream, or to distract myself with the sounds of Johnny Carson's late-night voice.

Thomas Kelly has written:

We are trying to be several selves at once, without all our selves being organized by a single, mastering life within us. Each of us tends to be not a single self, but a whole committee of selves. There is the civic self, the parental self, the financial self, the religious self, the society self, the professional self, the literary self. And each of our selves is in turn a rank individualist, not cooperative but shouting out his vote loudly for himself when the voting time comes. It is as if we have a chairman of our committee of the many selves within us, who does not integrate the many into one but who merely counts the votes at each decision and leaves disgruntled minorities. . . . We are not integrated. We are distraught.⁷

6. Henri J. M. Nouwen, *Out of Solitude* (Notre Dame, Ind.: Ave Maria Press, 1974), pp. 21-22.

7. Thomas R. Kelly, *A Testament of Devotion* (New York: Harper & Row, 1941), pp. 116-117.

My vinyl-covered journal has been a better technique for resolving conflicts than were the habits of sleeping, watching television, and eating away the differences that were splitting my interior apart. By naming these two forces within my personality, acknowledging the contributions that each one has for me, and writing down what they are saying, I am at one level claiming fragments of my past and maybe my present that I have consciously ignored. While these conflicting energies or forces rarely reconcile their differences (even after ten long journal pages), my recognition of their presence reduces the fear that I will be swallowed up by one or the other. And on another level, I am reminding myself that good and evil are not simply words but concrete realities in my lived experience, that life does contain its negative moments of anger, jealousy, and greed—which tend to hoarding and protecting everything within my *Weltanschauung*. And at the same time, there are also moments of tenderness, acceptance, and love which lead to openness and availability . . . openness to the sounds of a quiet night, to the discovery of a new friend, or to a horizon of possibilities that I had never viewed before.

Community

It would be incorrect to assume from what I have expressed so far that I singularly possess all the necessary theological and psychological skills to understand and direct my spiritual development. Despite years of studying, analyzing, and using various therapeutic techniques, I have never been able to “get in touch” and “stay in touch” with myself for very long periods of time. Conclusions I consciously reach about my emotional life are seldom final and undergo the pain of repeated disintegration as I receive new information from colleagues and friends in my profession and the community where I work.

I have only begun to sift through the multitude of obstacles that inhibit my development of rich and fulfilling human relationships—obstacles like competitiveness, self-centeredness, illusions of omnipotence, as well as those of powerlessness. This process has only been possible through an association with individuals who are on a similar journey, who come together to read a book, to celebrate the Eucharist, or to plan a retreat. These friends are open and honest, allowing me to check my perception of them and the other relationships that matter most to me. They give me the opportunity to test my faith against the faith of the Judeo-Christian community, to express my doubts and my fears, and to examine my idols and

narrow self-interests. Without these friends, *my* spiritual development would be nothing more than an internal dialogue with myself.

Spirituality is a deeply layered reality involving fear, trust, loss, risk, silence, reflection and community; and it is a lifetime activity in which one both dreads and rejoices in the fact that there is always new and unfamiliar terrain ahead. Elaine Prevallet offers us a useful suggestion on the development of spirituality: "It is likelier to be one of those elusive things that can be sensed but not seen in a place or a group, that can be heard, but only as a short undertone, to ears explicitly attuned. We won't ever be able to grasp it and own it. Sort of like God. But on our journey, it may help, now and again, to remember where it is we want to go."⁸

8. Elaine Prevallet, "Community and Spiritual Development in the Academic Setting," *The NICM Journal*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Winter 1977), p. 100.

The Ministry of the Whole Church to a Learning Society

by CLYDE O. ROBINSON

Recently I received a brochure describing an event sponsored by a number of local churches surrounding a major state university. The opening paragraph of the brochure read as follows:

The Ministry of the church with people and institutions of higher education is not the ministry of the campus minister or the board for campus ministry alone. It is an extension of the mission of the local church. For maximum effectiveness, local pastors and laity need to be involved.

The quotation does not represent a great new insight. It has always been true. For those of us who have connectional understandings of the nature of the church, the truth of that statement rests in the bedrock reality of the "church across the ages and around the world." Certainly for all Protestants it is a clear reflection of the doctrine of "the priesthood of all believers," one that carries with it substantial implications for the partnership of the several levels or courts through which the life and mission of the church are expressed.

In the past we have honored the notion of ministry in higher education as the "extension of the mission of the local church" by putting people from nearby congregations on campus ministry boards and by funding campus ministries with money that derives either immediately or ultimately from local church treasuries.

Past that—and other occasional efforts to get local congregations to help the professional campus clergyperson to do the ministry designed, controlled, and, in the main, carried out by him or her—far more energy has been expended to keep ministry in higher education and mission of the local church separate and apart than has been spent to bring them together. Many campus ministers have sought distance from local church life because they feared, sometimes correctly, that their ministry might be bound, restricted, and limited by a closer relationship. Many local churches, particularly

during the decade of the sixties, welcomed the separation lest they be embarrassed by some of the involvements of the campus ministers.

The insight, nevertheless, has always been there. It does, however, need to be viewed in a different context today, a context that demands much more direct, personal, and concrete involvement on the part of local congregations. Otherwise, the insight is likely to lose any relevant meaning, even as the church's impact on higher education is likely to continue to diminish.

Now let me quickly acknowledge that one piece of that context is money. Higher education expanded tremendously in the fifties and sixties. Today the "middle judicatories" of the churches (the conferences, dioceses, synods, presbyteries) can no longer afford to place a clergy person in a campus ministry center alongside every campus, as once they tried to do. New strategies have had to be found, and most of them call for the new and vital involvement of the people, priorities and resources of local congregations. The new regional design of the Synod of the Virginias emerged under the impetus of that dual increasing demand for ministry and declining financial capability.

There were other reasons for that new strategy for ministry in higher education in the Virginias, just as there are other, and, I think, far more important, dimensions to the context in which we may affirm the role of the local church in ministry in higher education. Money is a part of that picture, but there are theological and institutional factors that finally are much more significant for us.

Let me, then, try to describe some of the factors touching higher education and the church respectively, factors that have directly to do with the opportunity and responsibility of the local church for ministry in higher education.

I. The Scene in Higher Education

K. Patricia Cross, in her article, "Learning Society," (*The College Board Review*, No. 91, Spring, 1974), painted the following picture:

Most people today grant that we are in the midst of shifting from higher education as a privilege to higher education as a right . . .

(We are watching) . . . the change in the concept of college from exclusiveness to inclusiveness. Gradually at first, and now with increasing momentum, the barriers to college admission have come tumbling down. In the early days of private colleges, criteria for admission were social and financial. Those excluded

were primarily those who lacked money for tuition and expenses. With the advent of public colleges, we began the meritocratic phase of higher education in which those excluded were those who lacked the high school grades and the test scores to indicate academic promise. With the increasing social sophistication of the country, we realized that most barriers to further education were highly inter-related, operating to exclude quite consistently certain groups of people. With that realization, the national picture changed abruptly, and we found ourselves abolishing one barrier after another in rapid succession. The call for equality of educational opportunity brought the establishment of open-admissions community colleges at the rate of one a week throughout the late 1960's. Then we found ourselves actively recruiting previously excluded poor people, ethnic minorities, and women. Now we are looking for ways to abolish all other exclusionary practices including discrimination because of age, part-time student status, and geographical isolation.

Most people want to learn and they want society to provide the opportunities. In a national survey conducted by Educational Testing Service last year (1973), 80 per cent of the adults between the ages of 18 and 60 said that they were interested in learning more about some subject, and one third had actually engaged in some type of formal learning in the year prior to the study. The respect for learning is widespread; people believe in it, and given appropriate opportunity they practice it . . . In the short space of twenty years, we have moved from a national policy of exclusion to inclusion in college admissions.

A parallel and related factor is the decline in numbers of the traditional 18-24-year-old student. Stephen Dresch of Yale predicts that the enrollment of persons in that age group will decline by 40 per cent between 1980 and 1990. The average student age in some institutions is already approaching thirty, as older, non-traditional students from among the poor, the ethnic minorities, and women flock into post-secondary education. "Full Time Equivalent Fever" is driving to accomplish what inclusive, egalitarian, democratic, or even Christian impulses might never have.

There is now a new, much broader constituency for higher education than there has ever been before. That constituency, to be found in *every* part of the society, must be considered as the church plans its ministry.

In the second place, the current constituency of higher education is coming to think of *learning as a life-long activity* rather than something one does through college and graduate school before going to work. Post-secondary education is increasingly seen as on-going and oft-repeated as people prepare for career changes, as

they enhance their skills, or as they simply enrich their lives. Both community colleges and urban universities, as well as occasional private institutions, see themselves more and more as primary resources for people well beyond the traditional undergraduate age, people with much more sharply defined educational goals, people, once again, drawn from every sector of the community.

In turn and interrelated there is a third trend that Pat Cross calls "campus expansiveness." She says:

Geographically, as well as conceptually, colleges are reaching out to include a broader community. Early in the history of higher education, colleges were deliberately located in small towns such as Ann Arbor, Ithaca, and Palo Alto away from the hustle of the city. Faculty lived around the campus and students lived on the campus, and college was a community unto itself—its geographical isolation a symbol of its removal from the worldly concerns of the masses.

Today things are quite different. Institutions of higher education are much less cloistered, isolated, controlled environments than they were in my college days. My *Alma Mater* advertised itself as "A Safe Place to Send Your Son." Many, including upper level institutions, either have no dormitories or are having trouble getting people to live in them. Parietal rules are virtually gone. The curricula are much more flexible. The face of the institutions, be it public or private, is increasingly turned outward toward the communities it serves rather than inward toward its own self-defined interests.

As the walls of isolation have come down, so has it become impossible to define institutions of higher education by proximate geographical boundaries. The new strategy is to take the colleges to the people and to identify, coordinate and make available to them the learning resources that are already in their midst. As Cross puts it:

This new geography of college location reflects the change from exclusiveness to inclusiveness, but it reflects something even more fundamental to the learning society. It recognizes that universities no longer serve as the repositories of all knowledge. Great cities are conceded to have some of the finest educational resources available anywhere. Metropolitan libraries, museums, symphonies, and business offices combine with rich cultural diversity to provide learning experiences unparalleled on conventional college campuses.

Further, colleges and universities are using facilities (public schools, garages, churches, factories, stores) scattered all through

the community. Radio, television, audio-visual learning packages, and even mobile classrooms are means by which higher education has moved off campus into the community.

In summary, the limiting marks by which it was once possible to define and describe higher education are disappearing: Age, class, ethnic background, sex, preparation, discrete geography, and time in life are open-ended categories for the New Learner in our society. As Pat Cross says, "The learning society breaks loose from those boundaries, and learning pervades the entire community."

That is important information for local churches who care not only about ministry in higher education but much more fundamentally care about ministry that is relevant to people and the communities in which they live. The church cannot effectively provide pastoral care for people unless it understands the circumstance of the New Learner because its people are New Learners. The church cannot speak with power and effectiveness to its community unless it understands that community to be a part of the Learning Society. The church cannot fail to relate to the people and processes of higher education in 1977; the only questions are how informed and how effective that relationship will be.

II. *Some Facts About the Church*

The ecclesiastical scene has changed (and is still changing) since the time we developed the strategies for ministry in higher education that we are still using. Those strategies depend almost exclusively upon a strong middle judicatory funding base, a church-wide consensus about the purpose of ministry in higher education, and a high degree of denominational identity and cohesiveness. The circumstances are different today.

Today people do less out of denominational loyalty than once they did. They are much less inclined to use a particular educational curriculum "because our denomination produced or recommended it" than they once were. Similarly, they are slower to give to denominational programs out of loyalty than once they were. You cannot get support for programs just because they are Presbyterian or Episcopalian anymore; you have to convince people of the program's worth in terms of the values of those people.

It probably should not surprise us, then, to discover that money is staying closer home where people can see what is being done with it and can share in its use than was once the case. In the synods of the Presbyterian Church, the financial resources, whether devoted to campus ministries or to the support of church-related colleges,

have not kept pace with inflation, at least in part for the above reason. Many synods, consequently, are struggling to divide an ever diminishing financial pie, looking for funding partners among presbyteries, local churches, and other denominations, or giving over the responsibility for ministry in higher education to the lower courts.

Finally, and of the highest importance, there is a crisis in terms of the theological purpose for ministry in higher education, which, likely, is a reflection of the larger issue of the nature of ministry in general. There are not many among us who can speak compellingly and thoughtfully to the question: "Why ministry in higher education?" We are vulnerable in terms of our strategy and our performance when we lift up the "pastoral and priestly care of students" rationale (around which we once had consensus), are found wanting by its standards, and yet have articulated nothing to replace it. It is small wonder that the church often appears to be apathetic about the future of the colleges to which it has historically been related and that, as the priorities are emerging in a number of synods, campus ministry is found well down the list. Understanding and commitment are both logically and humanly prior to funding.

III. *Some Implications for the Church*

The implications of this educational and ecclesiastical context have to do with the whole life of the church at every level. I see rooting ministry in higher education at the local level in a much broader and more substantial way *positively*, largely because it has the promise of engaging so much more of the church in that ministry *and* of making the resources of higher education so much more available to the churches. Nevertheless, there are unique responsibilities for ministry at the middle judicatory and general church level that must be addressed if the implications we have discussed are to be taken seriously. We, therefore, are talking about the whole church.

A New Conceptualization

We need to think some new thoughts about ministry in higher education whether we are thinking about the local church, the middle judicatories, or the national church.

In the past we have been prone to think of ministry in higher education as something the church does *to* higher education, or, more likely, to the people to be found in educational institutions.

and feelings too quickly and too directly from the New Testament" (written in prison in 1943). It seems clear, from Kuske's study, that Bonhoeffer envisioned a completely Christocentric understanding of the Old Testament.

The presuppositions of this position can be stated briefly. First, "the God of the Old Testament is the Father of Jesus Christ." Second, all of Scripture belongs to the Church, and the Old Testament is the "book of Christ" for Bonhoeffer, who actually uses the phrase "Christ in the Old Testament." Light is one metaphor that explains this presence; the light goes out from Christ and illumines the Old Testament. Those who are aware of the typology which flourished among the Church Fathers and the Scholastics will recognize it in Bonhoeffer's exegesis, e.g., the relationship of David (especially as author of Psalms!) and Christ. A third presupposition can be put in Bonhoeffer's words: "The Old Testament must be read in the light of the incarnation and crucifixion, that is, the revelation which has taken place for us. Otherwise, we are left with the Jewish or heathen understanding of the Old Testament." This dilemma led to the general parallel which Bonhoeffer drew between the incarnate, crucified and risen Christ, and the accepting, judging, receiving Lord of the Old Testament. Particularly in the treatment of "ungodly passages" (such as the vengeance and violence in Ps. 58) Bonhoeffer elaborates a systematic theology that undergirds his interpretation: Jesus, the "crucified Godless One" bears the wrath of his Father.

Reasons of space allow only a quick reaction to these principles. A Christian can certainly agree that the God of the Old Testament is the Father of Jesus. It is the unpacking of this that will lead to differences of opinion. While Scripture is the book of the Church, the phrase "Christ in the Old Testament" snuffs out the legitimate self-understanding that Yahweh's "first-born," Israel, had of herself. I

think that typology has to be controlled by the types of the New Testament, and not increased by the fertile imagination of the Fathers or Bonhoeffer. Finally, the dilemma between choosing a Christocentric or a Jewish/heathen understanding is a false one. There is such a thing as a Christian understanding of the Old Testament that sees it in continuity with the revelation of the Lord in Jesus Christ. This can be worked out along several lines, and certainly less rigidly than with the heavy systematic principles involved in Bonhoeffer's approach.

The great virtue of Bonhoeffer's grappling with the question is that it challenges every Christian reader to analyze just how he or she appropriates the Old Testament. For this reason, Kuske's analysis is thought-provoking, and to be recommended as an introduction of Bonhoeffer's vision of the "unity" of the Christian Bible.

Roland E. Murphy

Biblical Interpretations in Preaching.
Gerhard von Rad. Abingdon. 1977.
125 pp. \$5.95.

This is a collection of twenty-one "homiletical meditations" composed by the late Gerhard von Rad between 1946 and 1964, when he was at the height of his illustrious career as an Old Testament scholar. To these have been prefixed some rough-hewn notes "about exegesis and preaching" which were composed for a practical seminar (1965-66), directed by von Rad, G. Bornkamm and H. F. von Campenhausen. What a seminar that must have been!

Readers familiar with von Rad's *Old Testament Theology* and his studies on Genesis and Deuteronomy will recognize here the sure hand of the master. He does everything but write the sermon. That is to say, he provides solid exegesis of the Biblical passage, alerting the homilist to the theological thrusts in the text. Frequently he speaks of what the "sermon" should concentrate on, what

points should be called to the attention of the "congregation," and of the task of the "preacher." The passages commented on are taken from Genesis (6), Joshua (1), 1-2 Kings (2), 2 Chronicles (1), Job (1), Psalms (2), Deuteronomy (2), Isaiah (2), Jeremiah (2), Haggai (1), and Malachi (1). One text is from the New Testament: Hebrews 4:1-11 (the pilgrim status of the people of God—on the theme of "rest," which was the subject of one of his scholarly essays).

Professor von Rad's words to his seminar students are challenging. They must do the preparatory work and come to the seminar "with an opinion already formed and take a stand." For him "there is no fundamental distinction between exegesis and preaching"—preaching is interpretation, only in a different form of speech. "The great discovery which all of you must make in preaching," he tells the students, "is that the texts themselves actually speak." Otherwise, "you are lost"! He had the knack of getting to the heart of a text, and coming through it to the situation of the modern Christian. As is well known, he did not disdain typology, the correspondence between the OT and NT situation, but he never underplayed or underrated the OT message.

This is a delightful book, well translated by John E. Steely of South-eastern Baptist Theological Seminary. It will help all of us to be better preachers.

Roland E. Murphy

The Historical-Critical Method. Edgar Krentz. Fortress, 1975. 88 pp. \$2.75.

The Krentz volume is a part of the "Guides to Biblical Scholarship Series" of Fortress Press. Its purpose is to introduce "the college and seminary student and the interested layman to the chief methods used by scholars who work methodically at biblical interpretation. . . . The book describes the goals and techniques used by both secular and biblical scholars, showing that biblical scholars do indeed use

historical methods that compare with those of secular historians."

After a brief introduction, Krentz describes the origin and development of historical criticism in the Reformation and subsequently. Following discussions of its aims, functioning, presuppositions, and achievements, he treats the debate over the legitimacy and limitations of historical criticism which has gone on since World War II. Here such names as Käsemann, Ebeling and Stuhlmacher loom large.

In accord with the purpose of the series, Krentz intends to break no new ground, but to tell a story and describe a discipline or cluster of disciplines well-known to professionals in the field. The proper critical question therefore is how well this task is accomplished. In my judgment an unambiguously positive answer cannot be given. Some complaints are technical and perhaps minor: secondary works are cited sometimes in footnotes, sometimes in in-text parentheses, but according to no apparent rationale. Occasionally a scholar's position is represented on the basis of a summary in another secondary source (p. 56, n.2.). There are some infelicitous, if not questionable statements, e.g.: "Bultmann solved the problem [of the relation of faith and historical criticism] by making the theological function of historical criticism the demonstration that man's historicity lies in his need for authentic existence." This may be a defensible statement—although I am inclined to doubt that it is. But it certainly requires some unpacking. Actually, the entire book has a somewhat laconic, as well as abrupt, character. Many positions and figures are referred to, but sustained exposition of any one of them is rare. In part this is due to the necessarily limited scope of the work. Yet its character and intended audience actually invite, or even demand, fuller explanations than are often given.

Perhaps because the series contains other volumes on form, redaction, and literary criticism, Krentz devotes relatively little space to historical criticism

as an exegetical, interpretive method. Certainly in the present scene, however, this is a most important function. Much more space is devoted to questions of the nature of history, its indispensability to theology, and the possibility of divine intervention in it. While in a variety of ways Krentz asserts that a proper historical method will not exclude that possibility, he does not satisfactorily suggest how, in the case of specific texts or narrated events, historical criticism can allow for God's activity in history.

As historical criticism teaches, any document is in some measure the product of its author's historical milieu. This little book is no exception. Krentz, as a member of the faculty of Concordia Seminary in Exile, has doubtless endured much hardship in defense of the integrity and necessity of the historical method in the scholarship of the church. For those of us who are dedicated to it as a necessity for exegesis and theology, his book will provide absorbing reading. Moreover, knowledge of that background makes it more intelligible even as it reminds us of our debt to the author.

D. Moody Smith

The Johannine Circle. Oscar Cullmann. Translated by John Bowden. Westminster. 1976. 124 pp. \$6.95.

For more than a decade we have been awaiting Cullmann's commentary on the Gospel of John. The commentary is yet to appear, but in this slim volume Cullmann has published the material originally intended for the introduction.

Cullmann does essentially two things: he judiciously articulates general hypotheses about the character and origin of the Fourth Gospel; he sets forth or reiterates and puts into an overall perspective his distinctive theories of Johannine origins. In the first chapter, on literary problems, Cullmann warns against placing too much confidence in theories of multiple redaction, sources, and rearrange-

ment of the order of the text. Nevertheless, he accepts as probable a three-stage process of composition (primitive traditions, author, redaction) spread over a number of years. He then discusses the purpose of the Gospel, which he believes to be the strengthening of the faith of believers by showing the intrinsic connection between the events of the life of Jesus and the Johannine church. Although *ecclesia* does not occur in John, it is actually the most churchly of all the gospels in its interest and focus. The church John represents and addresses is somewhat off the beaten track, but not a heretical gnosticizing sect at odds with the main stream of Christianity (Käsemann). Rather than representing docetic Christology, John combats doceticism.

While the Gospel cannot be taken as purely historical in purpose, it contains a factual element which the exegete is bound to take seriously. Moreover, "the evangelist is evidently convinced that he is reporting facts" (p. 22), while at the same time, and quite obviously, making history serve his theological purpose. The theological intent of John is pervasive and formative of its basic content to an extent unprecedented in the other gospels.

Following a brief chapter on Johannine language and style, Cullmann discusses the non-Christian environment of the Gospel and what he calls the *Johannine circle* (rather than *school* or *church*) which produced it. The proximate environment was a heterodox, gnosticizing Judaism represented also in the Christian Pseudo-Clementine literature. This Judaism, indigenous to Palestine, was related to, although not identical with, the sectarianism of Qumran. It was also connected with baptizing movements, as the prominence of John the Baptist in the Gospel suggests. Moreover, the special relation of John to Samaria and distinctively Samaritan concepts cannot be overlooked.

The Gospel of John is not, however, simply the product of a syncretistic,

gnostic background, for it represents a distinctive form of early Christianity. As in some of his earlier writings, Cullmann draws lines of connection between heterodox Judaism, the Hellenists of Acts, and the Johannine circle: "There is a very close connection, if not complete identity, between the *Hellenists in Jerusalem and the Johannine group*" (p. 43). Both the Gospel of John and Stephen's speech (Acts 7) are rooted in heterodox Judaism, and especially Samaritan theology. Nevertheless, in John one can detect a variety of other heterodox Jewish elements: Qumran, the Mandaeans, the baptist movement, syncretism and gnostic Ebionitism. Aside from the Gospel this Johannine Christianity can be found in the New Testament in the Epistles of John and to a lesser extent in the Apocalypse of John and Hebrews. John's ambivalent attitude toward Peter and the Synoptic tradition indicates a certain distance from, but not hostility toward, the main stream of early Christianity. Traces of Johannine Christianity, or points of similarity and contact, may be found in the later Pseudo-Clementine literature, Ignatius of Antioch and, albeit in a distorted form, in certain circles of gnosticism.

Perhaps most likely to attract attention and spark debate is Cullmann's treatment of the question of authorship. He insists on taking seriously the Gospel's claim to stem from the testimony of an eyewitness. The external, late second-century testimony identifying the evangelist with John the Son of Zebedee is, however, scarcely correct. The attitude of John toward the Twelve indicates that the evangelist, whoever he was, did not belong to their number. Yet we may indeed see in the figure of the "beloved disciple," who is the same as the "other disciple" (1:35ff.; 18:10ff.), a surrogate for the evangelist. He was a former disciple of the Baptist (1:35ff.) and acquainted with the high priest (18:15ff.). He seems to have witnessed and followed Jesus in Judea, when Jesus was with the Baptist, and in

Jerusalem during the Passion. He collected his own group of followers who could attest the validity of his witness (21:24). Probably he was an eyewitness to only a limited number of the events which he records. Whether this eyewitness was himself the original author or evangelist, as distinguished from an authority standing behind him, is impossible to say with certainty, but Cullmann is inclined to take at face value the statement of 21:24 that the witness was the author (the one who actually wrote), and not to multiply entities needlessly.

In conclusion Cullmann suggests that the Johannine circle is rooted not only in a witness and disciple of the historical Jesus, but in Jesus himself (p. 87): "We thus arrive at the following line, moving back in time: Johannine community—special Hellenist group in the early community in Jerusalem—Johannine circle of disciples—disciples of the Baptist—heterodox marginal Judaism. However, one link is missing between the Johannine circle of disciples and the Baptist's disciples . . . Jesus." Jesus himself was no stranger to the heterodox Judaism mirrored in the Fourth Gospel, and Cullmann boldly suggests that the speech of the Johannine Jesus, while obviously subject to a Christian theological development, has its origin in the way Jesus addressed the Johannine circle of disciples.

As to date and place of origin, in an appended chapter, Cullmann agrees with the now widely held opinion that the present form of the Gospel appeared near the end of the first century (although the early stages of its composition may antedate the fall of Jerusalem) and suggests that the place of publication was likely either Syria or Transjordan. The latter is favored for several reasons. It was, in Cullmann's opinion, a place of religious syncretism in which Christians, Qumraners, and perhaps disciples of the Baptist had settled after A.D. 70.

Brief as it is, this book touches upon almost all the fundamental issues of Johannine origins as they

are presently perceived. It is a coherent and, in considerable measure, persuasive statement of the circumstances within which Johannine Christianity and the Fourth Gospel appeared. Much of what Cullmann has to say, particularly about the nature of the Johannine "circle" and its relation to other forms of early Christianity represented in the New Testament, is in all probability correct. Certainly it is congenial with the view I outlined at about the same time ("Johannine Christianity: Some Reflections on its Delineation and Character," *New Testament Studies*, 21 (1975), 222-248). My own article was an attempt to assess critically where scholarship now stands, and therefore I can only be pleased to find that Professor Cullmann's work at so many points accords with that assessment. On certain matters where Cullmann sets forth his distinctive position in an effort to give specific historical coloration to the Johannine circle, there is bound to be continued questioning and debate. I refer to the trilateral connection with Samaritanism and the Hellenists of Acts, as well as to the effort to identify the evangelist and define his connection with the historical Jesus. On the latter point there will always be disagreement. Yet it is to Cullmann's credit that he not only takes seriously the Gospel's claim to be related to an eyewitness of Jesus, but, as a good historian, attempts to specify the nature of that relationship, difficult and uncertain as that task may be.

D. Moody Smith

Women, Men, and the Bible. Virginia Ramey Mollenkott. Abingdon. 1977. 142 pp. \$3.95. Study Kit (cassette tapes, leader's guide, study book) \$24.95.

Mutual submission in Christ—men to women and women to men—is the message of the Bible for the church today. Beginning with this bold affirmation, Dr. Mollenkott shows through

careful examination of Scripture, looking especially at the teachings and behaviour of Jesus, that human equality was the intent of the creation of men and women "in the image of God" (Genesis 1:26-28).

This study kit includes tapes for six two-hour group or individual work sessions, a useful leader's guide, and the basic text. The sessions are arranged to give participants maximum opportunity to study the Biblical passages. Discussion questions and self-understanding quizzes help group members get in touch with their own feelings about Biblical interpretation and men/women relationships. Virginia Mollenkott, professor and department chairperson at William Patterson College in New Jersey, is a well-known author in the evangelical tradition. Her strong, warm voice and highly articulate presentations on the tapes make the book come alive for the reader.

First discussing the Christian way of relating, she guides a study of Eph. 5:21-31, Phil. 2:3-8, and 1 Pet. 3. These passages, which show that the submission of every Christian to every other Christian is the context in which wife to husband submission is set, form the foundations of the mutual submission model.

She contrasts this model with the dominance-submission model of relating espoused in books such as *The Total Woman* by Marabel Morgan and *The Christian Family* by Larry Christenson. The dominance-submission model, she holds, has been adopted by Christians not because it is Biblical but because it is accepted by the culture. Its serious danger for Christians lies in the fact that it encourages the idolatrous worship of the husband instead of the worship of God and teaches women to abdicate responsibility for their own salvation.

Mollenkott then (chapter 3) answers the question, "Is God masculine?" with a firm "no". Illustrating that the Bible describes God with both masculine and feminine images, she asks readers to consider the influences in

society and the church—especially sexist language—that have lead some Christians to the un-Biblical conclusion that God is masculine.

Through her analysis of many of the problematic passages concerning women in the Bible, Mollenkott illustrates how Christians must learn to de-absolutize the Biblical narratives, as is done with passages supporting king-

ship or slavery, in order to seek the word of God for this day.

In conclusion this book and study kit should have wide appeal to both men and women in the churches. May there be more contributions like this one which take the Bible seriously and hear clearly its call to live as one in Christ (Gal. 3-28).

Martha Montague Wilson

Far too often our thinking has had little reference to the educational task in which those people were involved or even less to the unique and critical role of those institutions in the society. We have been inclined to look at people in higher education, primarily students, as if they were no different from any other convenient collocation of warm bodies, ignoring the learning process in which they are engaged as well as the enormous impact, for good or ill, their institutions make upon all of us.

It might be more helpful for us to think of the church and higher education as two institutions or sets of institutions both of which stand in the same social context and are present within all our communities performing their respective functions.

The Church *proclaims* the Good News that God is victorious over the demonic and dehumanizing forces in our midst and calls us singly and corporately to wholeness and obedience; the Church *teaches* the living tradition, instructing the faithful about the events out of which the Good News grows; the Church offers the service of the people who have heard the proclamation and who respond with love for their neighbor and care for the created order; the Church lives as a *community* marked by self-giving love for one another and for all for whom Christ died, even for the world.

Higher education, through *research* (discovery) and *teaching* (propagation), conserves and transmits knowledge, skills, and values; creates new knowledge, new skills, and new valuing systems fit for a new day; and advocates a humane future out of a range of options it glimpses as possible.

What Can and Ought One to Have to Do with the Other?

First, each has something to GIVE the other:

Higher education can serve the church by helping it keep in touch with what is happening in the world and by providing it with the knowledge, skills, and sometimes even the humane values necessary to its mission lest it become obscurantist, sectarian, and unfaithful to its own calling and, therefore, irrelevant to the world for which Christ died.

The church can serve higher education by reminding it of its pretensions, by calling it to keep the life of the mind in the perspective of the wholeness of human personality, by raising value questions about its life and its activities, by calling it into the service of all those in the society, not just the élite, by helping it (in turn) to stay in touch with what is happening in the world, and by caring for its people.

The two institutions, celebrating as they do the wisdom of Athens and the transcendent perspective and ethical obedience

of Jerusalem respectively, serve each other well when they call each other to be faithful to the best that is resident in their own traditions. Either may be pretentious or obscurantist or elitist or uncaring or inhumane. The involvement of one with the other is good for both and for the society as long as the purpose or mission of each is kept in mind and the integrity of each is respected.

Second, they can become co-authors of responses to human need: The relation of co-authorships can express itself in a variety of ways. For example, the church, when it has identified a community need or problem such as the problem of the aging, can enlist higher education to research the problem and then use the findings of the research in its own ministry to the elderly. Or the church may assist in influencing public opinion in favor of projects, programs or policies through which higher education may more effectively respond to human need. I think immediately of the present need to keep the educational door open to the poor and disadvantaged, the first to go in a time of retrenchment. I remember how the Synod of North Carolina and the community colleges of that state have collaborated to meet the needs of children and families.

The Local Congregation

The implications of the educational and ecclesiastical context we have sketched call local churches to claim ministry in higher education as an integral part of their own ministry in which someone is sent somewhere else to act in their behalf. The people of the congregations are increasingly a part of higher education, and the institutions of higher education are more and more a part of the communities in which every church is set. Conversations about how each institution can serve the other with integrity and about how together they can serve the needs of the community need to be underway. The function of available professional staff should become an enabling one through which people in the congregations are helped to plan and carry out their ministry in relation to higher education. The ministry then is likely to be seen as integral and worth paying for, no longer a fringe concern, a luxury that churches expect distant agencies to provide for them.

The Middle Judicatories

Synods and presbyteries have historically seen their role to be the funding of local campus ministries. Our analysis suggests that there are some crucial dimensions of ministry that cannot be accomplished locally and that need to be emphasized *even* if the funding responsibility diminishes or is transferred.

The judicatories need to provide leadership for ministry in higher education. Local churches need help in thinking through the purpose of ministry in higher education and in devising strategies for engaging in that ministry. They need information that provides a realistic picture of higher education and of the needs of persons involved in its life. They need consultative support as they shape their response.

The leadership role of the judicatories includes identifying neglected areas of ministry in higher education and laying the challenge of that ministry before local churches. I think immediately of ministry in the community college context. Sometimes seed money and often advice and counsel are helpful contributions for the judicatory to make. The judicatory is also in a position to help local churches discover that higher education represents not only an area of mission but also a very helpful resource *for* mission.

Local churches individually and corporately need judicatory leadership if issues that emerge from the state and regional systems of higher education are to be seen and responded to. Advocacy in behalf of higher education that is open to the poor and the disenfranchised; the preservation and strengthening of the historically Black institutions; the fencing of higher education from the heavy interfering hand of the government bureaucrat or the state legislator—these are all concerns that the church needs to address in state, regional and national arenas. Ministry that ignores system-wide issues that heavily influence higher education is likely to be parochial and in some measure irrelevant.

Finally, if the middle judicatories are effectively to provide the services we have been talking about and if the church is to be present in some very important specialized areas such as medical and legal education, then synods, presbyteries, conferences and dioceses must continue to provide some professional staff. In most cases staff will need to think of themselves as enablers of the church's ministry rather than as those who carry out ministry in behalf of the church. Always they have the obligation to bridge the distance that all too often has separated them from the church and to see their work as rooted within the life of the church.

The National Church

Supporting the middle judicatories as they help local churches understand what has been happening and what will happen in higher education and as they develop their ministry in relation to

that changing scene is a very important function of the churches at the church-wide or national level. Good stewardship as well as commitment to the unity of the church argues strongly for offering that support through an ecumenical strategy as nine denominations have been doing through United Ministries in Higher Education.

If higher education is both a field of mission and a potential partner for the churches at every level, then it would seem to me to be very important that the national agencies of the denominations provide a forum in which both the church-related colleges and those involved in ministry in public higher education can deal with common concerns and consider important policy issues as together they try to lead the church in this area of ministry. Brokering the resources of higher education to the several thrusts of the church's mission; alerting the church to issues in higher education to which she should speak out of her understanding of the Gospel; providing the arenas in which the church nationally can gather to share and benefit from the experiences, the problems, and the insights of its several parts—these are functions the national agencies of the churches can helpfully provide.

Higher education lives not only through individual institutions, state systems, and regional agencies. Higher education also has a national dimension in which it is both possible and desirable for the church to press its mission, and which it is difficult for local churches and middle judicatories to address. For example, United Ministries in Higher Education works through the Society for Health and Human Values, an organization of medical educators, theologians and ministers in medical schools, to affect materially the curricula of many schools of medicine and to contribute significantly to the discussion of ethical issues that touch both medical research and medical practice. Again, through the Community College Program of United Ministries in Higher Education it has been possible to research and to share nationally models of ministry in the community college context as well as to initiate moral discourse in the national forums of the community college movement, particularly in the American Association of Junior and Community Colleges. We need to be at work in many other similar areas. The national guilds and organizations are the crossroads of higher education in which issues are aired, policies are developed, and the future begins to emerge. The church that cares about where our society is moving and what is happening to the people in it will be wise to carry its mission into those arenas.

Conclusion

Higher education has always had major social significance. It is the institutionalized process through which the knowledge, the skills and the values of our culture are conserved and passed on from generation to generation. It also, with an eye to the future, helps us imagine and prepare for the tomorrows that stretch before us. As leaders are trained, as citizens are developed, as careers are prepared for, as values are examined and claimed, as the heritage of the past provides the material for the invention of the future, we discover the enormous impact of higher education on all our lives. In a day when higher education is well on the way to being democratized and when we can reasonably speak of a "learning society," it is especially important for the whole church, as it participates in that society, to be engaged with higher education and to carry out its Gospel mandate to increase the love of God and neighbor.

The Sacrament of Particularity: University Ministry through the Local Parish

by PETER JAMES LEE

A professor of *belle lettres* at the University of North Carolina in the 1820's and 1830's influenced religiously a handful of students and faculty members, and under his leadership they founded an Episcopal congregation in Chapel Hill. The Rev. William Mercer Green led them to lay the foundation for a chapel, completed in 1848, surrounded by the university campus, and still in use. The oral history of the congregation recalls that construction took six years because the bricks were made in a kiln in the rector's yard, and every chance he had to sell bricks to the University he stopped work on the chapel and made a little money to augment his university and churchly stipends.

Six years after the Chapel of the Cross was completed, a slave named Cornelia was baptized there. In February, 1977, her granddaughter, Pauli Murray, the first Black woman ordained an Episcopal priest, celebrated her first eucharist in the chapel where her slave grandmother was baptized. She read from a Bible from which her grandmother Cornelia read to her as a child—and the Bible rested on a lectern given in memory of the slaveholder who brought Cornelia to baptism.

In 1938, Pauli Murray was denied admission to the University of North Carolina because of her race. In 1977, she celebrated the eucharist and preached in the midst of the university community that once rejected her.

Ministry within the University of North Carolina must take seriously the particular history that shaped its particular community. The heritage of Southern racism with its ironic countertheme of deep personal ties among Southern whites and Blacks; the long policy of denial of admission to women until their junior year; the classic identity of Chapel Hill as an oasis of liberal culture and of

personal freedom; the sense of *noblesse oblige* inculcated after the Civil War and well into the mid-twentieth century among those few Southerners who could afford an education—all these and more are emblematic of the particularity of one university. The Chapel of the Cross, for better or for worse, has endured in the midst of the University. Its history and the history of the University interact. “University Ministry through the Local Church” is the subject I am invited to address in these pages. By definition, that cannot be done without reference to a particular community since that is what a local parish is: a sacrament of particularity.

People And Their Places

Southern readers will skim through the above introductory lines with conscious or unconscious awareness that understanding of persons is always mediated through their places. The land and the farm, place in community, place in the economy, place in family heritage, religious identity—all help mediate personhood from one to another, from one generation to the next, and, traditionally at least, Southerners have been especially sensitive to the structures of mediation. In 1977, freshmen students at Chapel Hill often continue to respond with identification of their counties of origin when asked, “Where are you from?” Not Henderson, but Vance County. Southern fascination with place is deep and abiding, and analogues to it are beginning to erupt throughout the country. Rekindled appreciation for ethnic heritages and ethnic communities and the popularity of “Roots” and its consequences among Blacks in search of heritage are symptomatic of a renewed regard for the infrastructure of institutions that make up “place.”

The recent work of Peter Berger and Richard Neuhaus, two prominent members of the liberal religious establishment for more than a decade, is directed towards refocussing public policy on support for what they call “mediating structures”—the neighborhood, the family, the church and the fraternal association.¹

No longer can the mid-size, nongovernmental structures of place be dismissed as inherently oppressive nor can “parochial” remain a pejorative term.

Ministry in higher education obviously has continuing themes on campuses throughout the nation. But the vivid, concrete particularity of a specific university community requires the parallel particularity of a local parish for effective ministry in that com-

1. Reported in Kevin P. Phillips' column, King Features Syndicate, Feb. 22, 1977.

munity. The "place" in which persons exist is always particular. Ministry needs to regard seriously that particularity, that "place."

Particularity: The Biblical and Sacramental Heritage

A renewed celebration of particularity in communities of faith in universities is a recovery of foundational motifs in the Judeo-Christian heritage. The Bible is radically specific. Moses, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Ruth, Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Micah: they are real persons in particular historical communities. The eschatological focus is not a generalized fraternity of mankind but the New Jerusalem. The land: its character, its physical riches and shortcomings, its clear lines, its lakes and rivers. The people: their kings and poets, their lusts and losses, their palpable humanity. These weave the particular fabric of Biblical faith.

Popular Protestant piety in the West has sometimes encouraged a non-Biblical, a-historical spirituality. Biblical faith, by contrast, is vitally concerned with history and the earth as they are. The "religious" questions of the human race, from the perspective of classical Biblical faith, are almost always framed as historical challenges. From the crucible of the civil rights struggles of the early 1960's, and continuing through the agony of Viet Nam, a renewed and refined Biblical faith has emerged more strongly in America, recovering the classic historical emphases and questions. Justice, for the person of Biblical faith, can never be isolated as an abstract ideal, but must be realized within particular circumstances.

The scandal of the Incarnation is always abrasive, and for those within Christian communities of faith that scandal must drive the faithful to the encounter with the Christ in the specific circumstances of the world where he promised he would be met.

Churches with strong sacramental traditions have within them the resources to respect the sacramentality of particularity—provided they do not trivialize their sacraments by divorcing them from the ambiguity and tension of their particular communities. But all faith communities, Jewish and Christian, share a heritage respectful of particularity and appreciative of history.

Catholicity and Particularity

The "local parish" is a redundant term. There is no parish except the local parish, insofar as a particular assembly of the faithful can be identified. Christian community identity includes a tension between catholicity and particularity, a tension sadly broken when it is structured into separate polities. A university chaplaincy

separated from the particular community in which it lives and identified more by its ties with similar chaplaincies of the same denomination on other campuses risks abandonment of the particularity essential to ministry in an historical faith community. At the same time, the local church that remains ignorant of or disobedient to its catholicity, to its self-understanding as part of the people of God throughout the world and continuous through history, is likely to fulfill the prophecies of prejudice and myopia so often raised against local congregations.

Christianity's worst moments have been times of abandonment of the tension between catholicity and particularity. Particularity is symbolized by the nature of those to whom the Epistles of Paul were addressed: specific churches in particular towns, specific persons in particular circumstances. The ancient custom in which bishops are identified by the names of their dioceses is a happy symbol of the tension between catholicity and particularity; a bishop is a symbol of catholicity, its continuity and universality, yet he is identified always by his particular see: Canterbury, Rome, Antioch, Raleigh, New York.

The catholicity-particularity tension is a significant context for ministry within universities. Students in universities may be described as persons searching among the universality of human wisdom to claim the particularity of their own identities. The process is dialectical. So is the church, when it embraces the tension of its identity.

Higher education in the United States is dominated by the universalism required by a technological culture. Parker J. Palmer made the point in *The NICM Journal* (Winter, 1977) that "Higher education's product is not teaching and learning but a credential, a credential to practice a trade, a credential to consume."² Technology requires standardization. Accreditation procedures are designed to assure standardization for the reliance on credentials. The passivity of current student populations on American campuses is interrupted only by the bizarre manifestations of individuality that appear as quaint relics of the not-much-lamented counter-culture of the early 1970's. The choices for current students are grim: passivity and standardization or radical, anarchic individualism. Most choose the former.

A local parish, an assembly of believers faithful to the catholicity-particularity tension, offers a genuine alternative. It demands

2. Parker J. Palmer, "Pastoral and Political Community: A Ministry to Higher Education," *The NICM Journal*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Winter 1977).

serious attention to what is given in a culture—in the particularity of the student's specific goals and strengths, in the particularity of what is offered to and demanded of him in the specific university discipline in which he lives. But the assembly will not permit the particularity of a university's demand to become a substitute for the catholicity of the church in which the student's value is not dependent on how well he fits the standardization demands of the culture. Particularity is fragile in a modern multi-university, and the faith community offers the strength of its enduring existence as the nourishing context for particular persons.

Nurture, of course, is a function of every assembly of believers. It is a legitimate, protective, and growth-enhancing process. Assemblies—local churches—that live faithfully in the tensions required of them will include nurture among their functions, but will not permit nurture to foster faith that is stultifying, dependent, or oppressive.

The local parish in a university community can be a paradigmatic community by its fidelity to the tension between catholicity and particularity. It can provide a model through which persons can experience life in a community that endures.

Structuring Tension

The key to an effective university ministry through the local parish is the parish's ability and willingness to provide a structure for the maintenance and management of tension. Structuring tension means the concurrent acceptance of the interests of diverse constituencies and management of those interests in such a way that none excludes others. A student group may wish the experience of an informal, experimental liturgy in a parish where normative liturgical patterns are highly traditional. Structuring tension means provision for the experimental liturgy and simultaneous maintenance of the traditional pattern. Negotiations will vary—whether such liturgies are alternated at the same hour, occur at different hours, or are incorporated into a single pattern. The negotiation will mean that those committed to each must encounter those who disagree and take them into account.

The local parish provides a structure for tension because its unifying system is non-ideological. Ministry to a homosexual caucus within the parish, for example, is possible and non-divisive, provided the parish is not required to define precisely whether such a ministry is advocacy of a particular ideology for sexual expression.

In the early 1970's the Chapel of the Cross included persons who were vigorous in their opposition to the Vietnamese War and who participated in local and national protest demonstrations. Active duty military personnel were also present in the congregation. No one quarreled with the Rector's right to speak clearly from the pulpit in opposition to the War, although some took issue openly with the substance of what was said. The Sunday after the cease fire, the intercessions at the eucharist were led by two persons—one, a student who had been active in anti-war demonstrations; the other, an Army major who had led troops in combat in Viet Nam. Among the specific persons prayed for then were two other parishioners—one in Viet Nam, the other in prison for violation of the draft law. Tension was recognized and divisions acknowledged.

What unites the local parish is not its ideology but its faith and liturgy. Its essential structure is inclusive and broad and permits diversity, conflict, and their consequences.

For about forty years, the Chapel of the Cross has experimented with several structures for the management of the tension between ministry to the university and parish ministry. The most frequent pattern has been the employment of a chaplain on the diocesan payroll and responsible, therefore, to the bishop, but whose ministry was based in the Chapel of the Cross. The rationale seemed to be that the chaplaincy needed protection from the narrow interests of the parish. Rarely has the system worked to the satisfaction of all parties. Less frequently, the chaplain was "independent." His office was elsewhere, and he had no altar. Much occurred through the ministry of the independent chaplain that was helpful to the community, but the symbols were awry since the chaplain was divorced from the particularity of the gathered people.

Now, the parish has approved in principle a pattern for university ministry that acknowledges ministry to the university as an essential and abiding element in the life of a university church and part of each person's ministry, clergy and lay. The pattern includes the development of an advisory and review board to set objectives for campus ministry and to evaluate performance. Students will dominate the board. Final authority, delegated normally to the board, rests with the normative ecclesiastical authority of the parish—in the Episcopal Church, that means Rector and Vestry.

Will it "work"? It has a chance because it is the first open acknowledgement in decades of a structure for tension within a

single community of faith. It implicitly acknowledges the need for what Sharon Parks calls "multiple community experiences during college years,"³ a multiplicity which no single pattern can provide. But a local parish, because of its diversity and continuity, has resources for structuring tension that can offer that multiplicity.

The movement towards the local parish as the primary locus for campus ministry is a major shift in the operative assumptions behind much that has occurred in the name of campus ministry. Michael Novak's description can apply to some assumptions of campus ministry since World War II:

The central idea of our foggy way of life . . . seems unambiguous enough. It is that life is solitary and brief, and that its aim is self-fulfillment. . . . Sanity, we think, consists in centering upon the only self one has. Surrender self-control, surrender happiness. And so we keep the other out. We then maintain our belief in our unselfishness by laboring for "humanity"—for women, the oppressed, the Third World, or some other needy group. The solitary self needs distant collectivities to witness to its altruism. It has a passionate need to love humankind. It cannot give itself to a spouse or children.⁴

Novak is writing about the family. He could well be speaking of other mediating structures, e.g., the local parish. Campus ministry divorced from the local parish has often stressed the need for self-fulfillment and advocated the "rights" of minorities. Mediating structures require less glamorous, more difficult, and, ultimately, far more fulfilling assumptions among those who live and work in them. Campus ministry exercised through a local church means that young and old will encounter one another—and, perhaps, enrich one another. It means that "issues" will be not only the trends of the campus but the maintenance issues of the congregation (fixing the organ and teaching the children). Distinctions like those between "true" and "false" community will not hold because in the tension between the community as vision and the community as praxis life will be *experienced* and not described abstractly. Structuring tension requires intentionality, in part, but it also requires recognition of the experience of the management of tension too many local churches discount. Most such communities have experience in tension they are unwilling to claim. It is a strength, a gift, and from it, members of the community can claim the diversity openly that often exists in fact but is unacknowledged.

3. Sharon Parks, "Communities as Ministry," *Ibid.*

4. Michael Novak, "The Family Out of Favor," *Harper's*, April 1976.

The Sacrament of the Budget

The major financial element in the new design for university ministry at the Chapel of the Cross is the acknowledgement that, ultimately, the local parish has financial responsibility for ministry to the university. Judicatories have been the prime funding sources for many campus ministries. Diocesan and synodical budgets are notoriously unreliable for the maintenance of long-term funding. Traditional campus ministries, separated from local, self-supporting parishes, are dependent communities. Can dependent communities ever be healthy communities? The local parish, whatever its size, is responsible for its own life and mission. Mission strategy overseas increasingly recognizes that point. Mission strategy on campus needs a similar recognition.

"We can't afford a chaplain."

That is often the form for justifying the continuation of dependency. It is, therefore, understandable that the finances of dependency often issue in a dependent clericalism. "Chaplain," indeed, has a subtle ring of dependency to it, a suggestion that "campus ministry" requires someone provided by a superior authority. The ministry of the local parish in a university community, by contrast, assumes that ministry and mission are functions of the whole people and that the ordained clergy have no ministry separate from the assembly of believers. When ministry is understood as the enterprise of a particular community, issues of funding become secondary. The community engages in ministry with the available resources. If external funding is provided, it is negotiated by the community's representatives to assist and extend an existing ministry, not to establish an isolated chaplaincy. Specialized clergy are not essential to an assembly of believers that accepts ministry as the vocation of all. Budgets measure priorities. If the local parish has been successful in structuring tension into its life, the legitimate priorities for campus ministry will be examined by the community along with its priorities for self-preservation and other mission tasks.

Ministry in higher education through the local parish is an increasing reality because of the decline in financial support for independent campus ministries. What I have tried to suggest is that this development may not be the demise of freshness in campus ministry, but an occasion of beginning when a faithful community, gathered in a particular setting, intentionally accepts its ministry to the university in which it lives. In the Judeo-Christian heritage, beginnings are openings to the Spirit. Deliberate design of various

models and acknowledgement of the diversity inherent in particular faith communities—the local parishes—may offer to the university and its people mediating structures of vitality and promise. It is a beginning.

Contributors

Robert L. Johnson, solicitor and compiler of this issue, is Southern Regional Director for the National Institute for Campus Ministries with office in the Divinity School at Duke. He was United Methodist Chaplain at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill for eighteen years.

Nancy Rosebaugh is Administrative Associate in the Southern office of the National Institute for Campus Ministries and a former student at Duke Divinity School.

Bernard LaFayette is Central Regional Director for the National Institute for Campus Ministries with offices at Washington University in St. Louis. He was a founder of S.N.C.C. and worked with Dr. Martin L. King, Jr. in organizing the Selma campaign and serving as coordinator of the Poor People's Campaign.

J. R. McSpadden has been Presbyterian, U.S., Campus Minister at Winthrop College in Rock Hill, S. C., since 1973. He was a member of the Thomas Merton seminar at Pendle Hill last summer and is presently completing a Th.M. degree at Princeton Theological Seminary.

Clyde O. Robinson serves as Chairperson for the Southeastern team, United Ministries in Higher Education, working out of Charlotte. He is an ordained elder in the Presbyterian Church, U.S., and was formerly Presbyterian Chaplain at Duke.

Peter James Lee is Rector of the Episcopal Chapel of the Cross in Chapel Hill. Before coming to Chapel Hill, he was on the staff at St. John's Episcopal Church, Lafayette Square, Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

Introduction to the Old Testament. J. Alberto Soggin. Westminster. 1976. 510 pp. \$16.50.

This is a translation of the highly successful Italian *Introduzione* of 1967. One of the strengths of Soggin's *Introduction* is that, while he does not neglect German scholarship (no one can!), he is very much aware of the contributions of scholars from other countries and traditions. As is to be expected, Italian scholarship (Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant) is well represented. One is reminded of the half-joking, half-serious remark of an American scholar that he is now studying Italian—in view of the recent epoch-making discovery of over 15,000 cuneiform tablets at Ebla-Tell Mardikh by an Italian archeological team.

What are the other strengths of this *Introduction*? Prof. Soggin is a scholar of international repute, and his studies have always been marked by balanced judgment. The same quality attaches to his exposition of the several problems surrounding the various books of the Old Testament. To this he adds clarity of thought and felicitous expression. The work reads well (e.g., the history of Pentateuchal criticism); it is not just a computer machine of factual data. Moreover Soggin gives equal attention to the so-called deuterocanonical books, or Apocrypha, which have taken on ever-increasing importance since the Dead Sea Scroll discoveries at Qumran. Finally, there are two valuable appendices: one deals with the Palestinian inscriptions discovered during the past hundred years; the other, with the papyri (Elephantine, Samaria) that bear upon the post-exilic period.

When one considers the great extent of excellent information provided here, it seems ungracious to single out failings. Suffice it to say that the evaluation of the wisdom movement, and the treatment of individual wisdom books (esp. Ecclesiastes, Ben Sira, and Wisdom of Solomon), are not adequate. There still remains a basic prejudice against Israelite wisdom, which puts it in opposition to Yahwism, as reason is to faith. This is a misapprehension. However Soggin's book deserves commendation and welcome; everyone who is interested in the Bible will learn from it.

Roland E. Murphy

The Triumph of Faith in Habakkuk. Donald E. Gowan. John Knox Press. 1976. 94 pp. \$5.95.

Resources for interpreting the difficult text and ground-breaking insights of the prophet Habakkuk are comparatively rare; hence any addition to the corpus should arouse the interest of scholar, preacher, and layperson. Gowan, Associate Professor of Old Testament at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, has produced a work primarily for the latter two categories of readers, and I would recommend it as a worthwhile investment for the church library. At the same time, scholars may read it with interest and with admiration for the ease and clarity with which the methodologies and results of Biblical criticism are explained.

The prophet's oracles are discussed according to literary unit-division, most broadly, 1:2-2:4; 2:5-20; 3:1-19. With respect to these and smaller

units the question of orderly progression of thought is helpfully discussed: regardless of whether the sequence resulted from author or editors, just why this particular order and how does it contribute to the overall progression of thought?

In addition to discussing what the oracles might have meant in their original setting (the advance of the Babylonian army near the beginning of the 6th century, B.C.), the author tries to demonstrate the importance of the prophet's thought for the Church in the present. Regardless of whether one agrees with him at all points in this regard, one may applaud his attempt to deal with exegesis as a theological task.

The central problem of the book (Habakkuk's and Gowan's) is theodicy: in Harry Emerson Fosdick's imaginative phrase, "How to believe in a good God in a world like this?" Hence, much discussion centers around the crucial but difficult 2:4, "The righteous shall live by his faith" (so RSV; footnote alternative: "faithfulness"). In Gowan's view, this means that God declares "to be right" the one who, in moments when God's justice and mercy are not evident, nonetheless continues to act faithfully, remembering a wider span of God's activity in the past and anticipating a future clarification. Rather than a rational explanation for the evil in the world, we are offered encouragement to continue as a faithful member of the Community in spite of the poverty of "answers" in the present.

Without detracting from the strengths of the book, two larger problems may be noted. (1) A greater unity of thought sometimes seems attributed to the Bible (and especially to the Old Testament) than may actually be the case. For example, Habakkuk is bracketed with Job and Ecclesiastes, without reminding the reader that they are far more radical in their questioning and "solutions" than he. Indeed, it has been argued that Job is a renunciation of all attempts at theodicy (Terrien)! (2)

Christian reflection on theodicy is presented in subjectively evaluative terms: the solution is "far more clear" in the cross of Christ, although it is not shown precisely how this is so! It needs to be added that the New Testament (and some earlier apocalyptic thought) "solved" the problem of theodicy, in part, by reverting to pre-Yahwistic demonology, although in a severely modified and limited form. The result is that the severity with which the problem is perceived and the faith/faithfulness required in the "solution" are pale in comparison with the position of Habakkuk.

Lloyd R. Bailey

The Old Testament as the Book of Christ: An Appraisal of Bonhoeffer's Interpretation. Martin Kuske. Philadelphia. Westminster. 1976. \$12.95.

The very title of this 1967 Rostock University dissertation states the bold claim that the noble Christian, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, has made over the Old Testament. Kuske's work is entirely analytical, using all the published writings of Bonhoeffer, and further studies about his thought. While Kuske differs with some interpreters, the average reader has reason to believe that he gives an accurate presentation of Bonhoeffer's views. Only a few times does he have recourse to phrases such as, what Bonhoeffer "could have been thinking" about (p. 50).

But what about the substance of the book? Is Bonhoeffer's Christian appropriation of the Old Testament viable? The reviewer confesses to a mixed reaction in his past understanding of Bonhoeffer's position. The reading of *The Prayerbook of the Bible* a few years ago was a disillusionment; the approach to the Psalms did not allow these Old Testament prayers to speak on their own (inspired) level. On the other hand, there were always those striking words of Bonhoeffer: "In my opinion it is not Christian to want to take our thoughts

