

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-1-1972

### The Changing Objectives and Philosophy of Campus Ministry in the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod

Marcus D. Pera

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Pera, Marcus D., "The Changing Objectives and Philosophy of Campus Ministry in the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod" (1972). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 460.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/460>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

THE CHANGING OBJECTIVES AND PHILOSOPHY  
OF CAMPUS MINISTRY IN  
THE LUTHERAN CHURCH--MISSOURI SYNOD

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty  
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
Department of Practical Theology  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Marcus D. Pera

May 1972

Approved by:

*R. C. Wuffel*

Advisor

*George W. Hoyer*

Reader

ARCH  
BV  
4070  
C69  
M3  
1972  
no.4

92779

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. FROM MADISON TO KENOSHA: A BRIEF HISTORY OF CAMPUS MINISTRY IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH--MISSOURI SYNOD . . . . .	4
III. FROM ENEMY TO PARTNER--THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES AND PHILOSOPHY OF CAMPUS MINISTRY IN THE LCMS . . . . .	18
Conservation of the Faith. . . . .	25
Christian Service. . . . .	28
Reclamation of Souls . . . . .	33
Soul-Winning . . . . .	34
IV. FROM CONCERN TO CONSULTATION . . . . .	43
The Changing Society of the 1960s. . . . .	44
The Changing Student . . . . .	50
The Changing American University . . . . .	65
The Changing Understanding of Mission and Ministry . . . . .	73
The Consultation on Campus Ministry. . . . .	78
V. FROM CONSULTATION TO ONGOING CONSIDERATION . . . . .	89
Campus Ministry as an Ethical Precipitator toward a New Quality of Life in a Quantitative, Technological Age. . . . .	93
Campus Ministry as an Effective Participant in the Process of University Reform. . . . .	97
Campus Ministry as the Facilitator for the Student to Develop a True Identity as He Is Led into Authentic Community. . . . .	101
Campus Ministry as Meaningful Precursor for Ministry in the Church . . . . .	106
Conclusion . . . . .	113
Appendix	
A. "Climate of Commonality" Conference. . . . .	115
B. A Position and Directional Statement on Campus Ministry. . . . .	119
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	128

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Compared to other denominations, campus ministry in the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod (hereafter referred to as LCMS) is a relatively recent area of involvement. The year 1970 marked the fiftieth anniversary of campus ministry in the LCMS. Since the initial pioneering effort of the Reverend Adolph Haentzschel at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry in the LCMS have grown and matured. Due to the rapidly changing situation in society, the church, and the university, these objectives and philosophy are in the process of reevaluation and rearticulation.

It is the intention of this paper to be part of the process of reevaluation and rearticulation. Chapter II will provide a brief history of campus ministry in the LCMS in order to place in perspective and offer a setting within which to consider the development of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry in the LCMS. Chapter III will then detail that development. It is to be noted that all information relating specifically to campus ministry in the LCMS is limited to the information contained in official documents of the LCMS such as the minutes from the annual University Pastor's Conference, the annual reports of the Student Welfare Committee (the designated committee of the LCMS, from 1923-1968, to

administer college and university work), pertinent reports and resolutions from the conventions of the LCMS, articles, and reports in the Lutheran Witness (official publication of the LCMS). Only through a perspective and understanding of the past can one adequately and properly address oneself to the present.

Chapter IV provides the basis for reevaluating and rearticulating the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry for today. Though not exhaustive, an adequate description is given of the presently changing society, the changing university, the changing student, and the changing church. The latter part of the chapter concentrates on and is limited to a meeting which is most significant for LCMS campus ministry-- the 1968 Consultation Conference. This paper highlights the 1968 conference as the formal beginning of a transitional period during which the objectives and philosophies of campus ministry were reexamined in the context of a rapidly changing social scene.

With the understanding of the past and a perspective on the rapidly changing present, Chapter V makes its contribution to the ongoing process of reevaluation and rearticulation. After describing the situation and needs of the contemporary scene, it offers four models of campus ministry which provide viable objectives and philosophies for today.

This paper will work with the following definitions for the terms objectives and philosophy. The objectives are the sought-after results or penultimate goals, the aim or direction

for action. The philosophy is the underlying principle or rationale behind the objectives. The aim or direction (objective) and its accompanying rationale (philosophy) needs to change with the changing environment. This is necessary if campus ministry is to bring about the ultimate goal most effectively, that is, the complete liberation of man, the total restoration of man to his God-intended wholeness.

tion they resolved to call a full-time student pastor to care for the spiritual welfare of the Synodical Conference Lutheran students (LCS, Wisconsin Synod Lutheran, and the Evangelical Lutheran) at the University of Wisconsin's Madison campus. The Wisconsin Synod requested to join the South Wisconsin District in this effort. Permission was granted. Subsequently a joint board called the Reverend Adolph Sautschel who at the time was a professor at St. Paul's College, Concordia, Missouri. Pastor Sautschel accepted the call and conducted his first service in rented quarters on 28 September 1920, with forty-eight students in attendance.<sup>1</sup> Though there had been earlier part-time work on different campuses, this marked the first full-time and formal campus ministry in the LCS.

There were other pioneering efforts in the 1920s. In May of 1929 at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, students, under the guidance of the Reverend W. Gustav Stiegemeyer, laid the foundation for the Concordia House. (This house later became the chapter chapter of the Beta Sigma

<sup>1</sup>Adolph Sautschel, "Lutheran Campus Work," Concordia Historical Quarterly, 2:2 (Fall 1977) 111.

## CHAPTER II

### FROM MADISON TO KENOSHA: A BRIEF HISTORY OF CAMPUS MINISTRY IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH--MISSOURI SYNOD

The South Wisconsin District of the LCMS took the initiative in campus ministry. At their 1919 district convention they resolved to call a full-time student pastor to care for the spiritual welfare of the Synodical Conference Lutheran students (LCMS, Wisconsin Synod Lutheran, and the Evangelical Lutheran) at the University of Wisconsin's Madison campus. The Wisconsin Synod requested to join the South Wisconsin District in this effort. Permission was granted. Subsequently a joint board called the Reverend Adolph Haentzschel who at the time was a professor at St. Paul's College, Concordia, Missouri. Pastor Haentzschel accepted the call and conducted his first service in rented quarters on 26 September 1920, with forty-eight students in attendance.<sup>1</sup> Though there had been earlier part-time work on different campuses, this marked the first full-time and formal campus ministry in the LCMS.

There were other pioneering efforts in the 1920s. In May of 1920 at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, students, under the guidance of the Reverend V. Gustav Stiegemeyer, laid the foundation for the Concordia House. (This house later became the charter chapter of the Beta Sigma

---

<sup>1</sup>Rudolph Norden, "Lutheran Campus Work," Concordia Historical Quarterly, XXX (Fall 1957), 111.

Psi, an LCMS fraternity which still exists today with seventeen chapters, three colonies, and twenty alumni chapters.) However, their first resident pastor did not arrive until 1941. A similar club was founded at Purdue in 1920 under the leadership of the Reverend Paul G. Schmidt.<sup>2</sup>

At the University of Missouri the Lutheran Society of Columbia was formed in 1921 with the Reverend Albert C. Bernthal arriving as the first campus pastor in March of 1922. In May of 1923 the Reverend M. L. Heerboth took up work at the University of Kansas, conducting his first service in an Odd Fellows' Hall. The Reverend Henry Erck accepted the challenge at the University of Nebraska in 1924. Another father of LCMS campus ministry was the Reverend J. A. Friedrich who began work at the State University of Iowa, Iowa City. Happy Iowa Lutheran students wrote that

with impressive services the Reverend J. A. Friedrich, formerly of Missouri, was installed as university pastor on Sunday, December 7 (1924). This marked the culmination of three long years of planning and working under difficulties.<sup>3</sup>

A Lutheran student at the University of Chicago writes of the initial efforts here:

On the 8th of March [1925] a long cherished wish of the writer was realized when he was present at the installation of the Reverend Louis Steinbach as Lutheran University Pastor at the University of Chicago.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Beta Sigma Psi (St. Charles, Mo.: Beta Sigma Psi, 1970), s.v. "History."

<sup>3</sup>"Student Correspondence," Lutheran Student, January 1925, p. 11.

<sup>4</sup>"Student Correspondence," Lutheran Student, May 1925, p. 52.



Though other Lutheran students were being served in some manner at other universities, namely Purdue, the Universities of Michigan, Minnesota, Indiana, and Texas, the above-described efforts were the first full-time campus ministries of the LCMS in the early 1920s.

These first campus ministries were initiated by individual districts of the LCMS. It wasn't until 1923 that the LCMS, as a national body, entered the scene. At the 1923 Convention of the LCMS, Fort Wayne, Indiana, a resolution, offered by the English District, was passed. That resolution reads in full:

1. That a committee be nominated by the honorable president of Synod consisting of three members, to account for the welfare of students outside our circles who do not study at Lutheran institutions. This committee shall, as much as possible, make available the names and addresses and other related facts of such students, and then weigh what steps the situation demands;
2. That the committee immediately begin its work and report to the several Districts of Synod at their gatherings, as to what that situation is;
3. That the committee, from time to time, gather information for the District mission officials, and to pastors and conferences who might be served with the same; furthermore,
4. That the pastors of Synod be earnestly requested to cooperate with the committee to ascertain these facts;
5. That the committee also gather information about student work of other church bodies;
6. That the Board of Directors be empowered to grant the costs which might grow out of the activity

of this committee, especially to receive special gifts for this purpose. [translation mine]<sup>5</sup>

Dr. Pfothenauer, president of the LCMS, appointed the committee consisting of the Reverend Adolph Haentzschel, University of Wisconsin, the Reverend G. Stiegemeyer, University of Illinois, and Professor L. F. Heimlich, Concordia College, Fort Wayne, Indiana. On 5 October 1923 they organized under the name Student Welfare Committee, with an annual budget of six hundred dollars.

At the 1926 June Convention of the LCMS held in St. Louis, the Student Welfare Committee recommended the following:

- (1) That it is the duty of the church to care for its students;
- (2) That synod ask the districts to provide for students through their Mission Board;
- (3) That the Student Welfare Committee correlate and advise on this work;
- (4) That synod call a "General Student Pastor" (executive secretary) with five thousand dollars to be allotted for this work. All of these recommendations, along with several other minor ones, passed. However, the LCMS met in convention only triennially and the above resolution did not specify whether the five thousand dollars was for each year of the triennium, or for the entire three-year period. The Board of Directors of the LCMS ruled on the latter. This effectively eliminated the possibility of the committee's calling

---

<sup>5</sup>Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Synodalbericht der 32. regelmässigen Versammlung der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Synode [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1923], pp. 88-89.

an executive secretary, and "thereupon the committee tendered their resignation to the Venerable President."<sup>6</sup>

On 12 November 1929 a new committee met consisting of the Reverend Albert C. Bernthal, Reverend Edgar T. Friedrich, and the Reverend Paul G. Schmidt. When their recommendation to the 1932 LCMS Convention in Milwaukee to allot one thousand dollars annually for the work of the Student Welfare Committee and to give the committee power to administer campus ministry was defeated, two more members of the committee resigned. Pastors Edgar Plass and W. C. Birkner replaced Schmidt and Bernthal. Again, in 1935, a recommendation to the LCMS Convention to allot five thousand dollars annually and call an executive secretary was defeated.

Action had to await the next convention. In 1938 the Student Welfare Committee effectively reported to the LCMS Convention convened in St. Louis that

the efficient care of these students (estimated at 6,000 plus in attendance at non-Synodical schools) is becoming ever more difficult if we actually hope to preserve their spiritual life unimpaired while they are exposed to the sinister influences on the campus and in the rooming houses.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Regular Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1929], p. 81.

<sup>7</sup>Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Regular Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1938], p. 131.

Thereupon the convention resolved to call an executive secretary for campus ministry.

The Reverend Reuben Hahn, when he received the call from the LCMS to serve as its first executive secretary for campus ministry, had been serving as university pastor at the University of Alabama since 1929. He accepted the position and was installed in office on 29 September 1940.

From its beginning campus ministry in the LCMS has been administered by the individual districts of the LCMS. Thus, the office of executive secretary was to coordinate, promote, facilitate, and through the Student Welfare Committee set policy for the campus ministry of the church. Until the 1965 convention in New York made it a division under the LCMS Board for Missions, the Student Welfare Committee was an autonomous, separate committee of the LCMS. The National Lutheran Campus Ministry (the joint campus ministry of the American Lutheran Church and Lutheran Church in America) differs in that it is administered at a national rather than at a district level. Within this polity structure and within the context of the predominantly rural, largely uneducated, and antiintellectual LCMS of the 1940s Dr. Hahn labored relentlessly.

The developments in campus ministry in the LCMS described in the next chapter are due in large part to the efforts of this effective, aggressive, perceptive, gifted man of God. Dr. Hahn was awarded a Doctor of Divinity degree, honoris causa, on 1 June 1951 by Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri. Though he had an assistant from 1953 until 1968 in the person

of the Reverend Rudolph Norden, Dr. Hahn served as the first and only executive secretary of campus ministry until his retirement in 1968. He was succeeded by Dr. Wilbert Fields, who had been campus pastor at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, since 1950. Dr. Fields took office in the fall of 1970.

In 1944 the Student Welfare Committee was renamed the Student Services Commission, and in 1956 again renamed the Commission on College and University Work. The growth of campus ministry in the LCMS is summarized statistically in Table 1.

Since the LCMS was not in altar and pulpit fellowship with the American Lutheran Church (ALC) until 1969, and to this date is not in altar and pulpit fellowship with the Lutheran Church in America (LCA), it is important to describe what the relationship of the LCMS campus ministry has been and is with the other Lutheran bodies. Initially under the National Lutheran Council, the LCA and ALC have done campus work jointly since 1946. Their joint effort is called the National Lutheran Campus Ministry (NLCM). Although there were ongoing concerns and questions relative to the LCMS's relationship to the other Lutheran bodies at the annual University Pastor's Conferences, it was not until 1945 that the report of the Student Services Commission mentioned any cooperation at all. The cooperation with the NLCM was in the area of "externals," including experiments in the use of joint facilities, joint socials, and in one instance joint participation in a social problems seminar.

TABLE 1  
GROWTH OF CAMPUS MINISTRY IN THE LCMS

Year	Full-time Pastorates	Part-time Pastorates	No. of Students	No. of Institutions
1929*	5	-	-	-
1939*	-	30	2,781	538
1944*	13	419	6,000+	564
1949*	18	447	16,880+	743
1959*	36	593	29,740+	1,274
1969*	77	950	90,000+	1,530
1971*	96	-	-	-

\*The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, Statistical Yearbook (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House).

In 1951 a "Statement of Agreement Between the LCMS and the National Lutheran Council" was drawn up regarding the ministry of these churches to servicemen. The particular relevance of this document was its parallel in situation and applicability to campus ministry. This document mentions that "normal procedure" is for individual Lutheran members to commune at the altar of their respective church affiliation. But it also recognized that there are exceptions to this practice.

Of the eleven points mentioned in this document, three are significant for the purpose of this paper. They are the following:

In exceptional situations, where a member of one group earnestly seeks admission to the Lord's Supper conducted by a representative of the other group, the individual case in each instance will be considered by the pastor concerned. It is agreed that in such cases particular synodical membership of a Lutheran in the armed forces shall not be a required condition for admission to the Lord's Supper.

It is agreed that the chaplain or pastor may commune such men and women in the armed forces as are conscious of the need of repentance and hold the essence of faith, including the doctrines of the real presence and of the Lord's Supper as a Means of Grace, and professes acceptance thereof.

In the administration of the Lord's Supper, chaplains and pastors are encouraged in all cases to take a sympathetic and evangelical attitude toward the men and women in the armed forces.<sup>8</sup>

Where the parallel situation was granted to all "special ministries," and it was in most districts, this policy gave

---

<sup>8</sup>Armed Services Commission of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, "Statement of Agreement Between the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod and the National Lutheran Council," St. Louis, 1951, pp. 1-2. (mimeographed).

considerable opportunity for campus pastors to deal with exceptional cases involving ministry to Lutherans of other synods.

The 1953 LCMS Convention Proceedings indicate that a meeting was held with the National Lutheran Council to explore possible areas of cooperation and to issue a joint statement.

This was followed by another positive action. The Reverend Donald Heiges, executive secretary of the Division of Student Services of the National Lutheran Council, was invited to address the 1954 University Pastors Conference. Since Heiges was unable to attend, his secretary read his paper, "Cooperative Relationship Involved in Ministry on the Campus." He indicated possible areas of cooperation and coordination including the establishing of chairs of religion. Yet in 1956 it is simply reported that a "spirit of amity" existed between the LCMS and the NLCM.

No real breakthrough came until the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the LCMS issued a policy statement regarding "extraordinary campus situations." This policy statement was adopted in the form of a resolution at the 1967 LCMS Convention in New York. The policy statement says in part that

our pastors should give appropriate pastoral care to all students who seek their ministrations. . . . enter fields without undue duplication or waste of resources. Where no Missouri Synod ministry can be provided district boards should . . . make the best possible arrangement . . . on the local, national, or international level, where the faith and confession of the



church are not compromised, and where it appears essential that the churches of various denominations should cooperate or at least not work at cross purposes, our churches ought to cooperate willingly to the extent that the Word of God and conscience will allow.<sup>9</sup>

This resolution also requested the Lutheran Council in the United States of America (LCUSA) to develop "procedures toward assuring the coordinative and consultative functions of the synodical campus work as soon as practicable."<sup>10</sup>

On 24-25 April 1968, a "Climate of Commonality" Conference convened for campus ministry leaders of the LCMS and NLCM. This conference developed a document entitled "Proposals toward a Unified Lutheran Campus Ministry."<sup>11</sup> Recognizing the common understanding of the nature of campus ministry, the conference intended its respective church bodies to consider this document. The LCMS and NLCM, together with LCUSA, were to work toward the realization of the proposal. A 1968 conference of LCMS campus pastors requested the LCMS Board for Missions to adopt the proposal. The Board for Missions acted in March of 1969, issuing a "Positional and Directional Statement on Campus Ministry."

---

<sup>9</sup>Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, "Policy Statement on Campus Ministry," Convention Workbook [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967], app. F, pp. 52-53.

<sup>10</sup>The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Regular Convention of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967], p. 102.

<sup>11</sup>"Proposals toward a Unified Lutheran Campus Ministry." Paper adopted by the "Climate of Commonality" Conference, Chicago, 24-25 April 1968, appended.

In this statement the Board for Missions committed themselves to using the aforementioned document, "Proposals toward a Unified Lutheran Campus Ministry," as "a general guideline for the development of procedures for coordinative planning in ministry with other Lutherans at all levels."<sup>12</sup> Several implementations toward a unified Lutheran campus ministry have occurred. Although in their infant stages, unified Lutheran campus ministries at Cincinnati, Chicago, Washington, Honolulu, Berkeley, and Colorado State are underway with cooperative work existing in seventeen of the thirty-three districts of the LCMS.

The attempt to initiate a unified Lutheran campus ministry took place in Wisconsin, at Kenosha, in August of 1969. There the first all-Lutheran Campus Pastors Conference convened, sponsored by LCUSA at the request of the three respective Lutheran bodies. In August of 1970, again at Kenosha, Wisconsin, the first all-Lutheran Campus Ministers Association was formed.

Dr. W. J. Fields, interim executive secretary of campus ministry of the LCMS during the 1969-1970 school year, studied the needs of LCMS campus ministry and made recommendation to the Board for Missions of the LCMS to call a man to fill the position of secretary for campus ministry of the LCMS, to move his office to Chicago in the LCUSA headquarters, and to allow

---

<sup>12</sup>Board for Missions of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, "A Position and Directional Statement on Campus Ministry," St. Louis, 7-8 March 1969, appended.

him to engage in cooperative work and task force functions with the executives of LCUSA and NLCM.

This recommendation was approved by the Board for Missions and the following resolution was submitted by the board to the 1971 synodical convention:

Resolved, that the Board for Missions utilize the Lutheran Council's Department of Campus Ministry as its channel to provide national coordinative and consultative services in campus ministry for the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod; and be it further

Resolved, that the Board for Missions establish a relationship with the Department of Campus Ministry--The Lutheran Council similar to that of the National Lutheran Campus Ministry--in keeping with the directives of the New York (3-20) and Denver (1-20) Conventions.<sup>13</sup>

The passing of this resolution would have fulfilled, in part, Dr. Hahn's long-desired and pursued dream. At the point of his retirement and the closing of his Chicago office he wrote to the campus pastors:

While it marks the end of an era, it also looks to continuance and to necessary new approaches sanctioned by synodical resolutions and awaiting implementation. A unified Lutheran campus ministry under the aegis of the Lutheran Council in the USA is in the offing."<sup>14</sup>

However, this resolution was set aside by the floor committee at the 1971 convention and replaced with a resolution maintaining the status quo. The reality of a unified Lutheran campus ministry under LCUSA now must await future LCMS convention action if it is to be implemented.

---

<sup>13</sup>The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, Convention Workbook [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971], p. 24.

<sup>14</sup>R. W. Hahn, "A Time of Transition," Mission Memo: Campus Ministry, May 1968, p. 1.

This brief historical survey of campus ministry in the LCMS, from Madison to Kenosha, provides the setting within which to describe the historical development of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry in the LCMS.

## CHAPTER III

### FROM ENEMY TO PARTNER--THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES AND PHILOSOPHY OF CAMPUS MINISTRY IN THE LCMS

At a 1938 University Pastors Conference, Dr. Hahn, campus pastor at the University of Alabama, presented a paper in which he quoted several LCMS church publications and leaders which aptly reflected the attitude of the church toward the secular university at that time. Typical are the words Hahn quoted from Dr. John W. Behnken, then second vice-president of the LCMS, who spoke of

parents whose hearts at one time were filled with fondest hopes for their boys and girls when, as young Christians, they left home to go to college but are now crushed and gushed and bleeding by the shocking disillusionment that they return to their parental abode as outspoken unbelievers, too enlightened, too intelligent, or shall I say too ungodly to accept any longer the faith once delivered to the saints.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Hahn then goes on to say,

We are committed to the task of conserving the spiritual life of our youth at the secular universities. It is our supreme privilege to throw around our Lutheran students the protecting care of our church and the safeguard of our potent religion.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Reuben Hahn, "Practical Methods for Our University Work," included in Minutes of the University Pastors Conference, Chicago, 4-5 May 1938, Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis, Missouri, p. 1. Hereafter Concordia Historical Institute will be cited as CHI.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

That same Dr. Hahn, thirty years later as executive secretary of campus ministry, stated that the church "must be visible on the campus and work in partnership with the college or university toward the development of the total person."<sup>3</sup> These contrasting quotes express the wide range of growth and development of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry in the LCMS--a range which at one extreme viewed the university as an enemy and at the other as a partner in the task of total development.

The LCMS initially went to the university in order to protect its students from the onslaughts to their faith by the "godless institution." Pastor Th. H. Schroedel, serving at the University of Minnesota, stated it simply in 1938. "The road to knowledge is strewn with the wreckage of human souls. . . . it is imperative that all our young people in secular institutions of learning receive Christian pastoral care and guidance."<sup>4</sup>

The secular university was considered an enemy by the LCMS. First of all the university was regarded as evil because of its approach to science and its teaching of evolution. The University Pastors Conferences of 1936, 1937, and 1938 directed all their major papers to the subject of religion and science. As early as 1921 an article appeared in

---

<sup>3</sup>Reuben Hahn, "On Togetherness in the Campus Ministry" (paper presented at the District Coordinators of Campus Work--NLCM Staff Consultation, Chicago, 24-25 April 1968), p. 1.

<sup>4</sup>Quoted in Hahn, "Practical Methods," p. 1.

the Lutheran Witness entitled "Evolution Brutalizes Colleges."

After discussing the evils surrounding the teaching of evolution, the article comments on its effects as follows:

The external appearances which shock men of sense and decency, "the knee length, kid-glove-fitting-gown with abbreviated top and bottom, to say nothing of the short sleeved or sleeveless waists which accompany these modern creations," all of these are simply outward symptoms of inward decay.<sup>5</sup>

The cause of this, according to the author, is the teaching of evolution, for later in the same article he states that

least of all will the lying evolutionary theories which contradict the Word of God mend conditions. Moral conditions at many high schools, colleges, and universities are truly appalling. The worst has perhaps never been written and published, but the source of all this moral rotteness is the absence of God's Word and the presence of evolution.<sup>6</sup>

The LCMS went to the university also because of the evils accompanying the fraternities, sororities, and boarding houses. Another article in the Lutheran Witness, 1922, reports on a commitment of \$13,000 for a Lutheran student house at Purdue.

Why?

The necessity for these homes for students is not appreciated until we become acquainted with the dangers to which our young people are exposed while at the universities. Many professors and instructors are evolutionists, supporters of the new theology, or even infidels. The textbooks are full of theories which are contrary to Scriptural teachings. Inmates of the same boarding house are often a most dangerous element because of their liberalized religion or utter irreligiousness. . . . after four years of life in this atmosphere, the student often returns

---

<sup>5</sup> [Martin S.] S[ommer], "Evolution Brutalizes Colleges," Lutheran Witness, XL (24 May 1921), 168.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 169.

home educated in worldly science, but shipwrecked in his religion.<sup>7</sup>

Consequently the LCMS went to the university.

A similar speech in Iowa, 1922, was sufficiently disconcerting to bring about another positive response. After a lengthy discussion concerning the evils of evolution, the evils circulating in the college secret societies which melt the Christian's resistance to sin, and the evils accompanying the college dance, the speech concludes:

All these things work together and usually produce one result--this is either a spirit of outward hostility against the simple Bible faith that was inculcated upon the minds of our young people before confirmation, or a spirit of lukewarmness and indifference.<sup>8</sup>

Thereupon the conference passed a resolution to obtain money to buy a home for students at Iowa City.

In Chapter II of this paper, it was reported that approval was finally given to call an executive secretary for campus ministry in the LCMS. This approval came after reference was made to the "difficulty of maintaining unimpaired a student's spiritual life because of the sinister evils of the university and the boarding houses."

A 1928 edition of the Lutheran Witness reported that there was no question that young people were a problem and were meeting more problems than did their parents at that age.

---

<sup>7</sup>"Lutheran Students' Home at Purdue University," Lutheran Witness, XLI (29 August 1922), 284.

<sup>8</sup>Speech quoted in [Martin S.] S[ommer], "The Plight of Lutheran University Students," Lutheran Witness, XLII (11 September 1923), 292.



This applied doubly to those attending college. In the judgment of that article the threat came from three directions: (1) Evolution; (2) Lack of parental and pastoral supervision; and (3) Association with ungodly young people, especially in the fraternities and sororities.<sup>9</sup>

The LCMS went to the university because the university was espousing the pernicious evil of irreligiousness. The words reported in the Lutheran Witness are a summary of why the LCMS went to the university.

These young people constitute a serious problem to our Church. They are associated closely with young people of other faiths and of no faith, and the influence of university teaching to a large extent works an unsettling of religious convictions. Aside from the evolutionistic bias of many teachers, they often have nothing but a pitying shrug for the teaching of our Church, if they do not lend their sneers at these teachings directly.<sup>10</sup>

In the same article the author quotes a letter from a university pastor.

Infidelity at a school like this runs riot. An unbelieving professor can tear down in half an hour the Christian faith of a young person which it took years to build up. Therefore it is so absolutely necessary that those young Lutheran men and women who come to an institution of this kind should immediately be taken care of by the Church, in order that this evil influence be combated. The Church is here; the doors are open; services are held in German and English every Sunday.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>[Martin S.] S[ommer], "Meeting the Problems of Our University Youth," Lutheran Witness, XLVII (10 July 1928), 237.

<sup>10</sup>[Martin S.] S[ommer], "Spiritual Care of Lutheran University Students," Lutheran Witness, XXXIX (23 November 1920), 376.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

The evils of the university during the 1920s and 1930s are now identified--the teaching of scientific, naturalistic, materialistic evolution; the direct attack against fundamental Christian doctrines; the corrupting influence of the fraternities and sororities; and the resultant moral decay. If the LCMS was to keep its young people, it needed to minister to them at the university, in the very setting where their faith was most threatened.

Lest an impression is left of one-sided naivete or myopia on the part of the LCMS for reacting to the university so strongly, it is proper to raise the question as to the validity of such a reaction.

Though the LCMS may have overreacted, it is true that the 1920s in both American history and in the history of the American universities were unsettling and despairing times. This was the era of the Progressives. Post-war economy was booming, so it was also a time of comparative affluence. Darwinian relativism was already replacing a code of morality with situational considerations. Freud entered the colleges during the 1920s, and with an underlying relativistic philosophy many people rationalized or misunderstood Freud into saying that you can do what you please. Eric R. Goldman, American historian, speaking of this period in American history says, "Here was freedom from all absolutes, from all codes, and like all such freedom, it brought an enslavement to nothingness."<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Eric Goldman, The Crucial Decade (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), p. 241.

The novelist F. Scott Fitzgerald captured, in his books, the despairing mood of the 1920s. In his novel, The Great Gatsby, the protagonist, Gatsby, is a wealthy man offering free nightly extravaganzas for anyone willing to come. After the tragedy of a couple of love triangles ending in a fatal hit-and-run accident, Gatsby is shot. Only Mr. Gatsby's father and close friend show at his funeral. Affluence, new values, infidelity, violence, and empty lives became the characteristics of the despairing twenties.<sup>13</sup>

Walter Lippmann, who in 1913 wrote Preface to Politics in which he looked forward to a freedom from tradition, wrote contrastingly in his Preface to Morals.

We are living in the midst of the vast dissolution of ancient habits which the emancipators believed would restore our birthright of happiness. We know now that they did not see very clearly beyond the evils against which they are rebelling.<sup>14</sup>

The universities in the 1920s were, of course, the chief disseminators and discussers of the relativistic philosophy of Darwin and Freud. The scientific-empirical method became apparent as debaters argued from evidence rather than belief and opinion. The battle for academic freedom was waged over this very right. The primary defense was offered by the American Association of University Professors, formed in 1915. Three primary assertions in their declaration were: (1) In

---

<sup>13</sup>F. Scott Fitzgerald, The Great Gatsby, Scribner Library (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953).

<sup>14</sup>Walter Lippmann, A Preface to Morals (New York: Time, Inc., 1929), p. 6.

dealing with sources of knowledge, university professors must be free to come to conclusions about knowledge, unaffected by irrelevant material; (2) The professors major responsibility is to society, not to the governing board of the university; and (3) A professor should be free to report his findings outside as well as inside the classroom, doing so responsibly and only after careful investigation.<sup>15</sup> Obviously this signaled the beginning of the secularization of the university. In this atmosphere there emerged an aversion to and skepticism toward faith, especially the "blind" or unexamined faith held by many students. As further evidence of the presence of this new mentality on the campuses of the 1920s there arose chapters of the American Association of Atheists (AAA).

The LCMS, entrenched in a dogmatic, catechetical approach to Christian education, an approach formerly acceptable to the early American university, looked upon all the above as threatening, ungodly, and a matter of grave concern.

#### Conservation of the Faith

As a result, the initial thrust of campus ministry in the LCMS was to conserve and protect the Lutheran students from the imminent evils surrounding him in the university. Already in 1929, a Lutheran Witness article titled "The Spiritual Care of Our University Students" indicated the following:

---

<sup>15</sup>John S. Brubacker and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), p. 320.

Our Synodical Districts maintain university pastors at those American institutions which are more generally frequented by Lutheran young people. One cannot properly call this mission-work, but it is conservative work of the highest order.<sup>16</sup>

The 1936 University Pastors Conference referred to this as the only objective--the first purpose of the ministry of the LCMS on the campus was to conserve Lutheran students for the church.

The main approach for conserving Lutheran students on the campus has remained constant through the years. The LCMS, born out of the Reformation and with a liturgical tradition, has been committed to a ministry centered in the Word and Sacraments. Article V of the Augsburg Confession clearly states that the Gospel involves the proclamation of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. The conserving task of Lutheran campus ministry was and continues to be approached through an active worship program, along with Bible classes (educational program), and the Word applied individually in counseling. For this reason chapels rather than centers were erected to accommodate LCMS campus ministry.

In 1924, at the first gathering of campus pastors, this commitment to the Word and Sacraments was expressed. "The main thing or first-rate desire is to have each student attend services and Bible class regularly, and to induce all to read and to study the Word of God in their rooms daily."<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Theo Graebner, "The Spiritual Care of Our University Students," Lutheran Witness, XLVIII (25 June 1929), 213.

<sup>17</sup>L. F. Heimlich, "Student Workers Conference," Lutheran Witness, XLIII (9 September 1924), 334.

The Student Welfare Committee reiterated the same commitment, stating to the 1932 synodical convention that the first and foremost duty of every student welfare worker was

to see to it that their charges attend the divine services of their Church. All other activities should be made subservient to the great task of conserving our Lutheran youth at non-synodical institutions for consecrated service in the Kingdom of God.<sup>18</sup>

Worship became an ongoing concern and reappearing topic for discussion at the annual University Pastors Conferences.

The numerical success of this effort is not to be overlooked. Dr. Hahn reports in 1948 that

services for our college folk have proved so popular that a number of student pastors, when every available seat and standing room was taken minutes before starting time, have expressed the hope that no more students would wend their way to the campus "church." In several instances the slogan "Come to Church and Bring One" had to be abandoned.<sup>19</sup>

In his report to the 1956 synodical convention Dr. Hahn again reported that

multiple Sunday morning services, the required enlargement of several existing chapels, attendance which exceeds the number of Lutheran students on record, and alumni at work in church and society attest the effectiveness of the worship-centered program in all of its ramifications.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Regular Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1932], p. 124.

<sup>19</sup>Reuben Hahn, "College Campus Missions," Lutheran Witness, LXVII (2 November 1948), 359.

<sup>20</sup>The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, "Report of the Student Service Commission," Proceedings of the Forty-Third Regular Convention of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1956], p. 358.

This commitment has been maintained through the years. The Board for Missions of the LCMS in their current (1968) document, "Goal and Direction of Campus Ministry," which was approved by the 1969 LCMS Convention, stated that it is committed to "a Word and Sacrament centered Lutheran campus ministry."<sup>21</sup>

Bible classes are in no way to be overlooked under this objective. The Student Service Commission set aside the year 1947 as the year to achieve the major project of a functioning Bible class in each student group. Guidelines were continuously prepared and creative ideas offered by the commission to assist the campus ministries in this area. Dr. Oscar Feucht, long-time LCMS secretary for adult education, frequently appeared at the University Pastors Conferences either to present a paper relating to Bible study or be present as a resource person.

#### Christian Service

In tracing the development of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry in the LCMS one might ask the same question the Student Service Commission raised in 1947 and 1948--"soul conservation for what?" At this time the answer surfaced--soul conservation for training in Christian service. This is not to say that no effort had been expended prior to

---

<sup>21</sup>Board for Missions of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, "A Position and Directional Statement on Campus Ministry," appended.

this time to lead students into Christian service. It does say that at this point in the history of LCMS campus ministry Christian service became a major, articulated, official objective.

The seeds for the development of this objective were apparent in 1944 when Dr. Hahn reported to the University Pastors Conference.

Concerning our objectives: while the idea still persists that we have only one mission on the campus, namely conservation, the educational leaven is progressively effecting a desirable revolution of thought within our church concerning our larger area of service.

Soul conservation must indeed be emphasized, but the opportunities for reclamation, training for Christian service and soul-winning must not be minimized. Our committee believes that the problem of soul conservation will be considerably reduced through a program of Christian action involving the enlistment of our youth for personal soul-winning service.<sup>22</sup>

The embryonic stage of the commitment to Christian service as an articulated objective of campus ministry was apparent, even though it was seen solely as an aid to soul conservation.

The 1947 report of the Student Service Commission to the LCMS Convention indicated the transition.

The objectives in student work are now clearly defined. No longer does the Church focus its attention solely on soul conservation; it now asks the question: Conservation for what? It seeks to answer that question by setting itself to the task of training the Lutheran student for Christian service.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Minutes of the University Pastors Conference, Chicago, 25-26 April 1944, CHI, p. 1.

<sup>23</sup> Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, Proceedings of the Fortieth Regular Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1947], p. 333.



By 1949 this objective had solidified. Dr. Hahn summarized it for the Student Service Commission in his report to the University Pastors Conference. Concerning the objectives of student work he made the following statement.

The student pastor deals with primarily men and women of the household of faith who are on the campus for the purpose of developing their quota of talents for further use. It is the church's responsibility to guide and direct these talents into avenues of Christian service. The objective in student work is therefore clearly this: the release of men and women who are developed not only socially, physically, and mentally, but also, and above all, spiritually. Our word for it is the release of functioning Christians. While soul conservation is still a point of emphasis in our campus ministry it has been catapulted from its exalted position of summa summarum. Our present plan of operation includes the question: Soul Conservation for what? Reflection leads to the conclusion that soul conservation is not the end, but a point of emphasis toward attaining the end: the release of a functioning Christian.<sup>24</sup>

In 1949 campus ministry had perceptively begun to recognize what the LCMS would continue to struggle with--the purpose and goal of the mission of the church.

While campus ministry had perceived its purpose and goal as Christian service, the latter concept was still interpreted primarily in terms of its effectiveness in "training in churchmanship." Dr. Hahn asked the campus clergy whether they were creating a "Synodical consciousness."

Are we acquainting our youth with mechanics of congregational management and of Synod's modus operandi? Are our students familiar with the opportunities for service in a local congregation and with the functions

---

<sup>24</sup>Minutes of the Student Workers Conference, Chicago, 19-20 January 1949, CHI, pp. 1-2.

of the various offices and committees in the congregation and in the Synod?<sup>25</sup>

As late as 1954 the Student Service Commission, in its report to the University Pastors Conference, still emphasized this particular concept of service.

Training in churchmanship remains the chief objective in our program of student service. While such training basically emphasizes the relevance of the Gospel to all aspects and decisions of life and the art of being a Christian student, it must of necessity include the student's development for intelligent participation in the affairs of the local congregation, the synodical district, and the church at large. . . . It should be the concern of the student pastors to provide the dividends which the church has a right to expect from its student service investments.<sup>26</sup>

It appears that very little attention was given to service and action in society. Checking the papers presented at the annual University Pastors Conferences there is a noticeable absence of papers related to social action and concern. An interesting exception was a paper presented to the 1938 conference by Professor Heirling, Fort Wayne, Indiana, expressing the urgent need for the church to enter the arena of social action, specifically to involve itself in the issue of the child labor amendment at that time. The only other papers offered in the area of social action were one by Pastor Martin Graebner, University of Chicago, 1953, entitled "Charting Political and Community Service for the Alumni," one by Professor J. T. Mueller, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, on "the Race Problem,"

---

<sup>25</sup>Minutes of the Student Workers Conference, Chicago, 31 January-1 February 1950, CHI, p. 3.

<sup>26</sup>Minutes of the Student Workers Conference, Chicago, 10-11 February 1954, CHI, p. 2.

and one entitled "The War, Universities and The Church," a deceptive title since the paper merely addressed itself to the problem created for campus pastors by the rapidly changing situation of armed forces personnel on the campus.

Dr. Hahn, in 1945, spoke of postwar conscription. However he ended his remarks thus: "While the question demands serious consideration by each member of the church, it is essentially in its present stage a problem in the domain of Caesar and not of Christ."<sup>27</sup> The only political action mentioned specifically was a petition on the part of the 1946 University Pastors Conference to the President and Congress of the United States

to take steps to open avenues of relief for the people of all our stricken countries in order that millions, now on the verge of starvation and destitution may not perish, but be provided with the basic necessities of life."<sup>28</sup>

The "Campus Pastors Workbook," 1966 edition, still had a rather narrow articulation of Christian service. It mentioned the need to point out and sharpen an individual's spiritual concerns, to develop a sense of Christian vocation, and to develop individual talents. The largest section was devoted to the description of and need for training in churchmanship. A concerted effort was made during this period to recruit students for professional involvement in the church. Though it cannot be concluded that there was no subscription to or

---

<sup>27</sup>Minutes of the Student Workers Conference, Chicago, 23-24 January 1945, CHI, p. 3.

<sup>28</sup>Minutes of the Student Pastors Conference, Chicago, 17-18 January 1946, CHI, p. 4.

involvement in a broader range of Christian service, it is apparent that a broader range was not emphasized.

### Reclamation of Souls

Chronologically, soul reclamation and soul-winning come between the two objectives already described, conservation of the faith and Christian service.

Soul reclamation was a comparatively early emphasis. Already in 1938 Pastor Hahn was talking about "re-churching the de-churched." In the 1947 report to the LCMS Convention Hahn notes that the objectives in campus ministry are now clear: "The reclamation of students who had given up their religion prior to their matriculation has also become a major task of the church's ministry on the campus."<sup>29</sup>

But this work was not limited to Christian students who lapsed before they matriculated. The "Campus Pastors Workbook" defines reclamation as the "effort at reactivating students who are spiritually indifferent, confused, and in the process of lapsing from the faith."<sup>30</sup> Though at some times in history it has been more intense than at others, it has always been true that some young people experience a process of questioning and reexamining the tenets of their faith. This questioning accompanies the process of growing into autonomy; however, in the

---

<sup>29</sup>Mo. Synod, Proceedings, 1947, p. 333.

<sup>30</sup>Commission on College and University Work, "Campus Pastors Workbook, 1946-1965," CHI, sec. I-25, pp. 4-5 (mimeographed).

era under discussion, it was aggravated by the advent of the scientific method and the exercise of free, creative thinking in the university. Away from parental influence, in the presence of peer pressure, and gaining secular knowledge at a disproportionate rate to spiritual knowledge, many young lapse from the Faith.

This problem is not exclusive to the university campus. Home parishes also experienced a heavy loss of active young people during the high school years. The Reverend Elmer Witt, then executive secretary for the Walther League (LCMS youth organization) informed the university pastors in 1964 that 50 percent of the high school youth became inactive before they reached college. This made the need for soul reclamation more intense. Though not too much material was devoted to the area of soul reclamation, it was understood, accepted and acted upon as a major objective of campus work.

#### Soul-Winning

The last detailed objective was soul-winning. Repeatedly the campuses were called the "biggest mission field in North America." Dr. Hahn, in 1949, while reviewing the objectives of campus ministry with the university pastors commented thus:

In recent years we have discerned the fertility of the campus as a mission field. The importance of winning men and women on the eve of their entrance into the professions--into positions of influence and power--cannot be overestimated. We set ourselves for the task of winning the unchurched

student, developing and training him, that we might release a functioning Christian.<sup>31</sup>

In his report to the LCMS Convention Dr. Hahn again referred to the universities as the foremost mission field and said that "the visible results recorded clearly indicate that our church is not only aware of its missionary opportunity on the campus, but is also, under the blessing of the Holy Spirit, doing something about it."<sup>32</sup>

Doing something they were. In 1948 when there were only 20 full-time campus pastors, 304 students and faculty members were "won for our church." In 1949 it was indicated that over three hundred were annually won for the church in the immediately preceding years. A report in a 1957 issue of the Lutheran Witness indicated that every year campus pastors confirmed one thousand students and thirty faculty members.<sup>33</sup> A special manual on campus evangelism was prepared by the Student Service Commission to facilitate the evangelism effort on campus.

Chairs of religion and the Religious Emphasis Week were used as soul-winning tools, and the question of participation became a difficult one for the LCMS. The LCMS took an early negative attitude toward these involvements on the basis of the principle of separation of Church and State. Typical of

---

<sup>31</sup>Minutes of the Student Workers Conference, Chicago, 19-20 January, 1949, p. 2.

<sup>32</sup>Mo. Synod, Proceedings, 1947, p. 333.

<sup>33</sup>Reuben Hahn, "Campus Chapels and Centers," Lutheran Witness, LXXVI (8 October 1957), 492.

this early stance is a 1922 article in the Lutheran Witness entitled "Keeping Religion Out of The University." The author charged a misuse of the Church-State principle when speakers and ministers, orientated toward unionism, talked to the university community at the invitation of the university.

An early advocate for the LCMS involvement with chairs of religion was Pastor Karl Manz from the University of Texas. In 1938 he presented his paper, "Chairs of Religious Education at the University of Texas," to the University Pastors Conference. The minutes of the conference indicated the response:

While no action was taken by the conference, the pastors disapproved of the teaching of Religion at the State University for academic credit, and regarded the procedures as a commingling of Church and State."<sup>34</sup>

Papers continued to be presented. In 1942, the Reverend L. Wuerffel, from Iowa City, cautioned against the theological propriety of participation in chairs of religion. The minutes of the conference again stated that the campus pastors took a negative attitude toward the question. The 1950 University Pastors Conference again featured a panel discussion and a major paper entitled "The Problem of Religion and State Universities," presented by Dr. Wolbrecht.

It wasn't until the 1952 conference that a change in attitude was expressed. Dr. Hahn, again reporting for the

---

<sup>34</sup>Minutes of the University Pastors Conference, Chicago, 4-5 May 1938, CHI, p. 4.

Student Service Commission, announced the position of the commission:

With the improved regard for religion on the part of the State University administrators, and improvement in student attitudes toward Religious Emphasis Week is a normal expectation, [sic] we, therefore, encourage our student pastors to participate in the arrangements for this campus wide religious activity; to eliminate the insipid unionistic services which have nothing to offer, which make no appeal to loyalties, and which invariably attract a minimum number of students; to volunteer their own services for classroom appearances, fraternity and sorority house talks, seminars and skeptic hours, or to invite outstanding Lutheran clergymen or laymen from their areas for such appearances; and to include this item in the annual budget which they submit to the District Mission Board through the District Coordinator of Student Work. Religious Emphasis Week provides opportunities otherwise denied us to make testimony for the authentic [sic] Jesus Christ. It is a mistake to yield this week to religious liberals.<sup>35</sup>

This change in attitude on the part of the LCMS was due in part to the change in attitude toward religion on the part of the university. The philosophy of the university of yesterday, said Pastor E. P. Weber, Purdue, in 1946, "was materialism, pragmatism, and scientism." He described the changed situation as "suddenly God becoming important instead of the real being limited to the realm of the tangible. The intangibles are now being included too, and thus God and the angels are returning."<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup>Minutes of the Student Pastors Conference, Chicago, 5-6 February 1952, CHI, pp. 3-4.

<sup>36</sup>E. P. Weber, "Religious Trends on the Campus," included in Minutes of the Student Pastors Conference, Chicago, 17-18 January 1946, CHI, p. 2.



The reasons for the negative stance on the part of the LCMS seemed to be primarily unionism and a commingling of Church and State. Interestingly enough, the changed attitude which encouraged participation in Religious Emphasis Week and chairs of religion appeared to be the counteracting of liberal theology which allegedly permeated these activities along with a more cordial attitude toward religion on the part of the university. The prior issues of unionism and Church-State commingling seemingly dissipated, though a study was made of the Church-State concern by the LCMS Commission on Theology.

Dr. Hahn reported to the 1953 LCMS Convention in Houston, Texas, that experimentation in credit and noncredit religion courses at state universities, and participation in Religious Emphasis Weeks had taken place. The convention resolved to encourage both activities, and the Reverend Eugene Klug was subsequently called by the LCMS into full-time teaching service at the University of Illinois. The following two LCMS Conventions, 1959 and 1962, resolved to establish five new chairs of religion during the triennium. Unlike the other administration of ministry on the campus which was and is carried out by the individual districts of the LCMS, these chairs of religion were administered and funded by the synod. At present they are being phased out by the synod, though some are being retained or supported by individual districts.

One last phase of work subsumed under the objective of soul-winning was the effort made to minister to foreign students. These efforts took on a greater priority during the

late 1950s and early 1960s. A 1960 report indicated that there were 57,574 foreign students enrolled at some fifteen hundred of the two thousand institutions of higher education in the United States. This marked a 50 percent increase in a five-year period. In 1965 the minutes of the Conference of Campus Pastors indicated seventy-eight to eighty thousand foreign students with 60 percent of them having received their elementary education in mission schools.<sup>37</sup> Such a fantastic growth rate by itself brought about a sensitivity to the need for ministry to this group of students.

The objective of the ministry to foreign students was definitely conversion. In a booklet issued by the Commission on College and University Work, plans for ministry to foreign students were described. The suggestions included inviting a foreign student to spend a weekend at the home of a Lutheran student, offering individual, friendly counsel or service to foreign students, and sponsoring foreign students. The booklet described the advantage of and reason for this area of ministry.

International students returning to their homelands with advanced college degrees will occupy positions of influence. They will be teachers, social workers, and skilled technicians in the many engineering fields. Having gained favorable impressions of a Christian land and its democratic processes, they will be a bulwark against the open onslaughts and insidious blandishments of an aggressive Communism. What is more, having come to faith in Jesus Christ they will go back to

---

<sup>37</sup>Minutes of the Conference of Campus Pastors and Coordinators, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan, 8-11 June 1965, Author's private file, p. 3.

their peoples not only with knowledge and technical skills but also with the high Christian motivation inherent in their acceptance of the love of God in Jesus Christ.<sup>38</sup>

A broader understanding of ministry to foreign students is indicated by the 1965 Conference of Campus Pastors. Benjamin Schmoker, executive director of International Student Services stated that "the church, too, has a role toward foreign students. It can help to meet the students' 'spiritual' needs, that is, their needs as human beings."<sup>39</sup>

The effort of the LCMS to minister to foreign students was not limited to this country. In the 1950s and 1960s campus ministries were also established in Toronto, Manitoba, Hawaii, Mexico, Japan, the Philippines, and India.

In the manner described above the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry in the LCMS developed. Though the next chapter deals in detail with the transitional situation in the last half of the 1960s, the seeds of change, reflecting a broadened understanding and concept of campus ministry, were already sown in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

One change illustrative of this new understanding was the change in title from student pastor to campus pastor. There was another change in title reflecting the same new

---

<sup>38</sup> Commission on College and University Work, *The Ministry to International Students* (Chicago: Commission on College and University Work, n.d.), p. 9.

<sup>39</sup> Minutes of the Conference of Campus Pastors and Coordinators, p. 3.

understanding. The Student Service Commission was renamed, in 1956, the Commission on College and University Work. The specific resolution which brought about this change was quite descriptive of the expanded concept of campus ministry.

Whereas, the present opportunities and responsibilities of the Student Service Commission go beyond the originally prescribed function of service restricted to youth of our Synod at colleges and universities not affiliated with Synod;

Whereas, the Student Service Commission's concern for the total campus community as reflected in its current campus involvements and activities is in harmony with Synodical directives and expectations . . . .<sup>40</sup>

it was resolved to change the name of the commission.

In 1958, Dr. Hahn further illustrated this expanding concept of campus ministry by his words to the university pastors.

The task of bringing Christ to the campus must be implemented by releasing Christ on the campus through the involvement of Christ-committed personnel, students and faculty--in a perpetual campus evangelism crusade whose goal for the total, unreconstructed campus populace is high citizenship here and now, and full heavenly citizenship in the life to come.

The points of emphasis in our future campus ministry shall therefore be twofold: 1) an inclusive<sup>41</sup> concern involving impact on the total campus . . . .

Soon the "Campus Pastors Workbook" would speak about a fifth objective, "total campus impact." There was also to emerge soon the terminology of ministry in the university.

---

<sup>40</sup>Mo. Synod, Proceedings, 1956, p. 362.

<sup>41</sup>"Report of Commission on College and University Work," included in Minutes of Campus Workers Conference, Chicago, 12-13 February 1958, CHI, p. 2.

Through mutual change and growth in both the church and university, the university, in the eyes of the LCMS campus ministry, did change from enemy to partner in the task of total development.

## CHAPTER IV

### FROM CONCERN TO CONSULTATION

The period of the 1960s for campus ministry in the LCMS is characterized by a concern relative to the changing social scene and its impact upon campus ministry. This concern resulted in a consultation meeting in which the campus pastors of the LCMS met in St. Louis in 1968 to struggle with the articulation of new objectives and philosophy of campus ministry. Before that meeting is described in detail it will be helpful to examine that which precipitated the concern--the fast changing social scene. For the purpose of this study, the changing society, the university, the student, and the church are singled out for consideration. Admittedly, each of these areas could be the subject of exhaustive study. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a background for understanding the changing objectives and philosophy of campus ministry as well as to provide a framework for enunciating ongoing objectives and philosophy. Consequently, the treatment of these specified areas will be briefly descriptive, limited to recognized authors in each field to provide the description.

Any analysis of the contemporary situation runs the risk of partial error and misrepresentation. History needs more time to gain objective perspective and properly evaluate a period. The rapidity of changes further complicates the risk.

One observation eliciting general acceptance is the recognition that society today is involved in a kind of social-cultural revolution which has left nothing untouched, including objectives and philosophy of campus ministry. For this reason this section of the study is important and necessary.

### The Changing Society of the 1960s

The obvious societal needs which have resulted in concerned action and counteraction are well known. Paramount is the Viet Nam War, rapidly escalated during the 1960s and still very much alive. Its questioned justification, its outrageous atrocities, its agonizing prolongation have generated intense reaction. Contributing fuel to the reaction has been the development of the military-industrial complex demanding budgetary priorities, gathering frightening arsenals of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, and tacitly creating a military-defense mentality in the country.

Another societal problem equaling the Viet Nam War in intensity during the 1960s, and also very much alive today, is the racial conflict. The Civil Rights Movement, civil disorders, and ongoing racist attitudes have left many impatient, others scarred, and yet others in angry despair. The racial eruptions in Detroit and Watts, and other similar incidents have resulted in tension, hatred, polarity, activism, separatism, growing sensitivity in some, and deepening racist attitudes in others.

Threatening the tolerance of sensitive people's concern for people has been the reality of extensive and disproportionate world hunger in a time of unprecedented affluence. Add to that a population explosion, which, if left unchecked, could lead to frightening survival problems, an ecological crisis which speaks the possibility of an uninhabitable planet in twenty-five to fifty years, and an array of lesser societal needs. The impact of all this has been accentuated with the untimely, violent deaths of some popular, promising, magnetic leaders, among them President John F. Kennedy, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Malcolm X, and Dr. Martin Luther King.

However, these specific problems can almost all be attributed to a deeper, more pervasive, underlying malady. The changing society of the 1960s became aware of some of the repercussions and problems created by the new age into which it was entering--the technological age. Society does not as yet know how to cope with the educated belief that this age is qualitatively different from other times of instability and rapid change in history. Jacques Ellul, famous French social critic, says:

There is no common denominator between the technique of today and that of yesterday. Today we are dealing with an utterly different phenomenon. Those who claim to deduce from man's technical situation in past centuries, his situation in this one shows that they have grasped nothing of the technical phenomenon. These deductions prove that all their reasonings are without foundation and all their analogies are astigmatic.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Jacques Ellul, The Technological Society, translated by John Wilkinson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), p. 146.



Ellul distinguishes and describes seven characteristics of modern technique. Their results add up to loss of spontaneity and creativity, an increasingly artificial world, a slavish following of the one best way prescribed by technique, man reduced to the menial role of technician, technique proceeding in irreversible progression, technique affecting all aspects and systems of society, technique providing a situation ripe for totalitarian rule, and technique separating goals from mere mechanism.

Ellul's description and conclusion is admittedly pessimistic. These are his devastating words:

Technique is possible when men are free. When technique enters into the realm of social life, it collides ceaselessly with the human being to the degree that the combination of man and technique is unavoidable, and that technical action necessarily results in a determined result. Technique requires predictability and, no less, exactness of prediction. It is necessary, then, that technique prevail over the human being. For technique, this is a matter of life or death. Technique must reduce man to a technical animal, the king of the slaves of technique. Human caprice crumbles before this necessity; there can be no human autonomy in the face of technical autonomy.<sup>2</sup>

However, even if Ellul's description is unwarrantedly pessimistic, yet the basic character of the age man is experiencing today begins to emerge.

Ellul certainly is not alone in his description. Theodore Roszak, professor of history at California State College, describes the making of a "counter culture" in terms of youth's opposition to this technocratic society. Technocracy is that

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 138.

state in an industrial society "in which those who govern justify themselves by appeal to technical experts who, in turn, justify themselves by appeal to scientific forms of knowledge; and beyond the authority of science there is no appeal."<sup>3</sup>

The same threat of totalitarian control is sensed by Roszak as technicians (he calls them experts) become the only people who are competent to make decisions. The secret of the technocracy, according to Roszak, lies in its capacity to convince the masses of three interlocking premises. They are:

- 1) That the vital needs of man are (contrary to everything the great souls of history have told us) purely technical in character. . . .
- 2) That this formal (and highly esoteric) analysis of our needs has now achieved 99% completion. . . .
- 3) That the experts who have fathomed our hearts' desires and who alone can continue providing for our needs, the experts who really know what they are really talking about, all happen to be on the official payroll<sup>4</sup> of the state and/or corporate structure. . . .

Youth's opposition consequently faults the adult generation with the irresponsibility of abdicating to the "experts." Perceiving technology's devastating results, youth actively and urgently seek a more humane and democratic existence. This, in turn, led to their formation of a counter culture, "a culture so radically disaffiliated from the mainstream assumptions of our society that it scarcely looks to many as

---

<sup>3</sup>Theodore Roszak, The Making of a Counter Culture (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1969), p. 8.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 10-11.

a culture at all, but takes on the alarming appearance of a barbaric intrusion."<sup>5</sup>

One more recognized author is cited to describe the psychological results of the technological age upon man. Erich Fromm, calling this age the second industrial revolution, says man is being replaced by machine. In the first industrial revolution, energy replaced muscle; in the second, machine replaces brain. (Ellul feels this to be an oversimplification, yet the description and accompanying results are comparable.) This second industrial revolution is characterized by two primary principles. The first is that we ought to do something simply because it is possible to do so, completely apart from values and goals. For example, the United States ought to build the SST simply because it is possible, and the question of value is veiled. The second principle states that maximum efficiency and output are a mandatory aspect of technique. Individuality and creativity are stifled, quantity reigns over quality, and man becomes a number and punch card. Fromm describes the effect this is having and will continue to have on man.

It reduces man to an appendage of the machine, ruled by its very rhythm and demands. It transforms him into Homo consumens, the total consumer, whose only aim is to have more and use more. . . . Man, as a cog in the production machine, becomes a thing, and ceases to be human. He spends his time doing things in which he is not interested, with people in whom he is not

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 42.

interested, producing things in which he is not interested, and when he is not producing he is consuming.<sup>6</sup>

The psychological characteristics resulting from such an existence are boredom, passivity, and alienation. Again Fromm articulates the effects.

Man's passiveness is only one symptom among a total syndrome, which one may call the "syndrome of alienation." Being passive, he does not relate himself to the world actively and is forced to submit to his idols and their demands. Hence, he feels powerless, lonely, and anxious. He has little sense of integrity or self-identity. Conformity seems to be the only way to avoid intolerable anxiety--and, even conformity does not always alleviate his anxiety.<sup>7</sup>

The true picture begins to emerge. The nemesis, whose influence has been experienced more intensely in the 1960s, is the new, uncontrolled technological society. The whole military-industrial complex is a result of this technological age. War decisions are made by technicians, impervious to the desire of the masses who accept them because of a lack of data. Racism is perpetuated by this closed system in which values have little voice, and is further intensified by the dehumanization process. Technology has bequeathed to society almost irreversible ecological problems. Technology is dictating society's values and determining its goals. Prophetically,

---

<sup>6</sup>Erich Fromm, *The Revolution of Hope: Toward a Humanized Technology* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), p. 40.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

Marshall McLuhan has said: "We shaped our tools and now our tools shape us."<sup>8</sup>

With this description of the nature of the new technological society it is quite understandable and easy to recognize that the first generation experiencing this type of society exclusively, the youth of today, would react strongly to it. The problem is intensified with the opportunity the TV babies, today's generation, have to become prematurely aware and sensitive to this age through the media.

#### The Changing Student

Kenneth Keniston, Yale psychiatrist, entitled his book about the students of the 1950s and early 1960s The Uncommitted. Later in the 1960s he published a new study on students called Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth. These contrasting titles indicate the rapid and radical change in students from the 1950s to the 1960s.

James T. Jarrett, professor of education at the University of California, Berkeley, describes the nature of the silent student of the 1950s.

Eight and ten years ago the worry of faculty groups, especially those who had come of age in the tumultuous thirties, was student apathy. Over and over the complaint was heard: The students don't care, not about anything except a good job, good marriage, a nice home. War and peace, poverty and affluence, oppression and

---

<sup>8</sup>Marshall McLuhan, Quentin Fiore, and Jerome Agel, "The Medium is the Massage (with Marshall McLuhan)," produced by John Simon, New York, Columbia Records, CBS Inc., Columbia Label--CS 9501.

equality, these were words and they didn't want to be bothered.<sup>9</sup>

A 1960 graduate, Mike Gartner, now on the staff of the Wall Street Journal contrasts his class's stance with that of the 1970 graduates. He quotes one of his 1960 classmates, "we were the get out, get a job, get ahead generation," and then he descriptively continues:

So we got out, got jobs, got ahead. Today, we are lawyers, doctors and vice presidents. Instead of drinking beer at the Well, we drink scotch at the country club. We worry more about getting out of sand traps than getting out of Asia, more about losing weight than losing lives.<sup>10</sup>

Mr. Gartner reveals, according to a poll, that a minimum of 40 percent of his class, and probably more, believe the war is currently being conducted in a proper way, and that Vice-President Agnew is generally right in his pronouncements. The biggest thing wrong in America today, the majority of his class says, "is the snot-nosed collegians who refuse to be docile as we were."<sup>11</sup>

Kenneth Keniston describes the new student of today as the professionalist, committed academically, "who values technical, intellectual, and professional competence above

---

<sup>9</sup>James Jarrett, "College Students--The New Breed," The Aim of Higher Education: Social Adjustment or Human Liberation?, edited by Ronald E. Barnes (St. Louis: UMHE/UCCF Publications, 1966), p. 3.

<sup>10</sup>Mike Gartner, "The Silent Generation Meets the Class of 1970," Saturday Review, 15 August 1970, p. 52.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

popularity, ambition, or grace," all necessary to function in a technological society. Keniston concludes as follows:

The faces in the lecture room are the faces of a new generation, in many respects qualitatively different from previous student generations in America. The old faces are, of course, still there, scattered across the room: the gentlemen devoted to being gentlemen, the apprentice committed to making good, the Big Men on campus who want to be popular. But increasingly they are outnumbered by serious, academically-committed students who are headed for a career in the professions, and by their first cousins, the demonstrating activist, the withdrawn disaffiliate, and the self-deprecating underachiever. . . .

all (new types) are non-ideological or anti-ideological; all oppose or despair about large scale political and social planning; all distrust "politicians" and dogmatists in societal matters. Furthermore, all are essentially privatistic: they start not from a desire to reform society or from a blueprint for the future, but from personal or existential statement. The activist emphasizes personal demonstration, the disaffiliate emphasizes personal withdrawal, and the underachiever emphasizes personal blame.<sup>12</sup>

To understand the new student is, furthermore, to understand what is meant by the Movement. Jack Newfield in his book The Prophetic Minority dates the beginning of the Movement to Monday, 1 February 1960, when four Black students sat down at a segregated lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina. The sit-ins spread and the students gleaned that they had some power to change things.

Two organizations are equally important, relative to the Movement. The first is the Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee (SNCC), formed in October 1960, in Atlanta, Georgia,

---

<sup>12</sup>Kenneth Keniston, "Faces In the Lecture Room," Yale Alumni Magazine, XXIX (April 1966), 24, 32.

at a meeting attended by 235 students. SNCC, constituted of blacks and whites, began a civil rights movement using sit-ins, freedom marches and rides as a methodology for attaining civil rights. In 1961, after experiencing extensive harrassment and violence in its efforts to assist in the registering of voters in the rural South, the organization became predominantly black. Stokely Carmichael became head of SNCC in 1966 and led the organization to separatism.

The other organization, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), traces its origin to June 1962, when fifty-nine people met in Michigan to draft and accept the Port Huron Statement as their platform. Many of the SDS constituents were former SNCC participants, and they took the same methods to the campus in reaction to "paranoic anti-communism; capitalism and the welfare state; the military-industrial complex; the university concept in loco parentis."<sup>13</sup>

The first major confrontation occurred at the University of California, Berkeley, when Mario Savio, a summer participant in the Mississippi civil rights project, returned to Berkeley. He describes his welcome as follows: "We were greeted by an order from the Dean of Students' Office that the kind of on-campus political activity which had resulted in our taking place [sic] in the summer project was to be permitted no longer."<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>Jack Newfield, A Prophetic Minority (New York: New American Library, 1966), p. 97.

<sup>14</sup>Andrea Diegel, "The Movement" (paper submitted to the Directing Committee of Lutheran University Ministry, Baltimore, Md., 1 October 1969), p. 2.



With civil rights activism suppressed and restricted on campus, the sit-in tactic was used against the university. Mario Savio, leader of the Free Speech Movement in Berkeley, led the first sit-in in October of 1964. From the several hundred arrested at the Berkeley sit-in, campus disruptions spread across the country; in the first half of the 1967-1968 school year, there were 71 separate demonstrations on 63 campuses, and in the latter half some 221 demonstrations on 101 campuses.<sup>15</sup> The waves spread to the extent that in the spring of 1970, after the student killings by the National Guard and state police at Kent State and Jackson State, demonstrations were held at about one-half of the country's 1500 four-year colleges, and there were walkouts, boycotts, or strikes at 450 institutions.<sup>16</sup>

Young people have varied in their degree of protest, their level of participation, and the depth of their commitment. The Center Magazine, in an issue on youth, suggested that few youth are not involved in at least one of the following:

1. Assertion of autonomy in matters of appearance, taste, morals, and values, combined with an ability to make one's convictions stick. . . .
2. The demand for relevance in education as illustrated by a gathering revolt against the lecture and the authority-in-the-classroom figure; . . .
3. Uncompromising resistance to the militarization of life and to war as an instrument of foreign policy. . . .

---

<sup>15</sup>Jerome H. Shalnick, The Politics of Protest (New York: Ballantine Books, 1969), p. 70.

<sup>16</sup>"What's Going on Inside America--Chapter 2," U.S. News & World Report, 25 May 1970, p. 18.

4. Identification with the poor. . . .
5. A personalist-communalist orientation. Full development as a person is perceived as possible within a community. . . .
6. Alienation. Though "alienation" is a term that covers a spectrum from pathological disorientation to moods of disaffection, its conventional meaning rather accurately describes the experience of young people: an estrangement from the values of one's society and a sense of meaninglessness of life and one's role in it.
7. An ambivalent attitude toward tradition and history.<sup>17</sup>

This is a sufficient description of a phenomenon the results of which most are well aware but the cause of which few understand. If this is the description and trend of the new student, the more important, difficult, and interesting question is to probe why and how he emerged. Though all students are not activist students, activists typify the radical concerns of and sensitivities to the new culture. They have been the most affected by their new environment. They have salient characteristics which most students, to a greater or lesser degree, possess. The activist student is the avant-garde for the cultural change presently underway across the country.

In an attempt to describe the reasons for the strong and often bizarre activism of students today, this brief treatment will depend on the hypothesizing of Dr. S. T. Halleck, director of student psychiatry at the University of Wisconsin.

---

<sup>17</sup>Donald McDonald, "Youth," Center Magazine, III (July/August 1970), 24-25.

The first set of hypotheses Dr. Halleck offers are popular ones negative to the student activists. Permissiveness in child-rearing is an oft-heard explanation for student unrest. These children have been raised according to the directives of Dr. Spock. In the interest of preventing neurosis they have not been taught discipline and responsibility, and the children are consequently spoiled, greedy, and easily frustrated when faced with problem situations. Furthermore, these children have also been raised on the psychology of Dr. Freud. Freud explains man's psychological makeup in deterministic terms. The result, according to critics, is that the individual feels no responsibility for his own behavior.

Finally, the critic of student unrest lists affluence as a contributing factor. Since youth today have grown up in affluence, they do not share their elders' anxiety for economic security. Consequently youth's goals are vague and confused. The result is boredom, meaninglessness, and restlessness.

This set of hypotheses are obviously critical of the student involved in unrest, and Dr. Halleck feels most uncomfortable with these explanations. Though oversimplified and at times irresponsible, there is an element of truth in each.

The next set of hypotheses are sympathetic to student activists, offering specific reasons for their reaction. The first offers war as an explanation. Dr. Wald, Harvard Nobel Peace Prize winner, entitled a very popular article

"A Generation in Search of a Future." After commenting on what he considers the immoral Viet Nam War, the unjust draft, the nuclear-chemical-biological threat, the over-powerful military-industrial complex with eighty to one hundred billion dollars a year spent to support it, Wald states: "I think I know what is bothering students. I think that what we are up against is a generation that is by no means sure that it has a future."<sup>18</sup>

To the disturbing factors just cited should be added the cold war.

To youth, the twenty-five year cold war against communism that has cost American tax payers one trillion dollars in arms and whose chief article of faith is that it is better to be dead than Red, seems incomprehensible."<sup>19</sup>

Add to that the inversion of national priorities illustrated by the fact that \$375 million is spent on one Apollo mission while simultaneously the needs of the poor, dying, deprived people in our country and around the world are left largely unattended.

Another explanation for student unrest and activism is the deterioration of the quality of life. The pollution of our water, air, and land, overpopulation, noise pollution, the crisis in the cities, the lack of personal care and service, the absence of community and intimate relationships

---

<sup>18</sup>George Wald, "A Generation in Search of a Future," Vital Speeches of the Day, 15 April 1969, p. 412.

<sup>19</sup>McDonald, III, 26.

are all part of the deterioration process. Quantity at the sacrifice of quality is a general characteristic of our age.

The next explanation for student unrest is political hopelessness and the rigidity and corruption of our institutions. Some view society as a slave to the system, and the system is controlled. Participatory democracy seems to be a bygone reality. The Democratic National Convention in Chicago, 1968, is offered as an example. Many activists saw Senator Humphrey not as a choice of the people but of the controlled political machine. Consequently, with social critic Herbert Marcuse, many ascribe student unrest to the inability of the political system to bring about constructive change.

The last explanation, favorable to students involved in dissent, traces their tendencies to the civil rights movement. Involvement in SNCC and the SDS, according to this theory, provided a training ground for activism and an experiential sensitivity to the injustice, inequality, and repression in society today. Farber's book, The Student as Nigger, is descriptive of the increasing identification of student activists with black people and their suppressed, exploited situation.

Dr. Halleck is most comfortable with the explanations offered in his third category. He calls these neutral hypotheses of student unrest. The effect of our technological society is mentioned first, and since this topic has been extensively discussed in a previous section it will not be

detailed here. However, one authority, not previously mentioned but consistent with the aforementioned description of technology and its effects on today's generation, is Erik Erikson. This well-known psychiatrist and author, who has directed much of his study toward youth, comments:

But until a new ethic catches up with progress, one senses the danger that the limits of technical expansion and national assertion may not be determined by known facts and ethical consideration, or in short, by a certainty of identity, but by a willful and playful testing of the range and the limit of the super-machinery which thus take over much of man's conscience. This could become affluent slavery for all involved, and this seems to be what the new "humanist" youth is trying to stop by putting its own existence "on the line" and insisting on a modicum of a self-sustaining quality of living.<sup>20</sup>

Halleck's last two neutral hypotheses, based on the influence of the media and scientism, interpret student unrest as a result of a highly developed technology. When discussing the influence of the media, the work of Marshall McLuhan must be considered. After publication of the books Understanding Media and The Medium is the Massage, McLuhan became a controversial figure in academic circles. And though many of his conclusions may be tenuous, his broader description of the influence of the media on our age appears to have a validity worth considering.

Television, the most influential of the media, has grown in the United States from seven thousand sets at the end of World War II, to sixty million sets twenty years

---

<sup>20</sup>Erik H. Erikson, Identity, Youth, and Crisis (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1968), pp. 34-35.

later. In 1971, 98.7 percent of the homes in the United States had TVs, for a total of 92,900,000 sets.<sup>21</sup>

TV's uniqueness is not only in the content of its communication but also, more importantly, in how it communicates. The medium itself is the message. The "how" is a process of involvement, emotional response, and a participation in global events. Young Mark Gerzon, 1970 graduate of Harvard, entitled a book The Whole World is Watching, the phrase shouted before the TV cameras by demonstrators at the 1968 Chicago Democratic Convention. The whole world watching and thus participating is the uniqueness of TV.

McLuhan indicates the influence this has on the values of young people.

The young people who have experienced a decade of TV have naturally imbibed an urge toward involvement in depth that makes all the remote visualized goals of usual culture seem not only unreal but irrelevant, and not only irrelevant but anemic. . . . The TV child expects involvement and doesn't want a specialized job in the future. He does want a role and a deep commitment to his society.<sup>22</sup>

McLuhan's concept of a return to the "global village" has again precipitated a desire and need for deep, personal, human relationships.

Since TV involves an influential effect through the how, the medium itself, it can and has become the tool to shape

---

<sup>21</sup>U.S. Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1971 (92d edition; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 677.

<sup>22</sup>Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man (New York: New American Library, 1969), p. 84.

the thinking, attitudes, and values of millions. When young people realize this, they rebel against these societal values and stereotypes, only to discover that many of these values and stereotypes have been adopted and pursued by their parents. Consequently, they look to each other to develop their own values which contrast with many adult values, and thereby they create their own counter-culture. Mark Gerzon speaks for the young and articulates well this process.

After a young man makes the initial discovery by which he learns to question the media systematically, he naturally responds to them in a more detached way. He loosens their control on his behavior. But in retrospect, he realizes how totally involved he was (and how totally involved his little brother and sister are) with electric media such as television. He resents the manner in which these media have been able to invade his mind and form his attitudes. Unlike parents, whose attempts to mold behavior and interests young people could question and differentiate between, the television "spoke" in images and words that could not be questioned. No motives, no personality factors, no circumstances could be applied to discriminate between the messages. The voice of the medium was not only involving but absolute.<sup>23</sup>

With such control and influence it is a valid question to ask what role television plays relative to a condoning of violence. Certainly the media coverage accorded the youth movement fostered a bond between young people throughout the country and world. The media, then, became instrumental in strengthening the unity of the movement and in inspiring others to be equally committed.

---

<sup>23</sup>Mark Gerzon, The Whole World is Watching (New York: Viking Press, 1969), p. 84.



Halleck, while mentioning the above, proposes his own hypothesis relative to the influence of the media on the young "by prematurely confronting them with the harsh truths and realities of life."<sup>24</sup> Halleck feels the past allowed adolescents to gradually experience the hard realities of life and rely more on authorities in the process of sorting out and finding their own identity. But the media today places these realities before all age groups immediately so that beliefs, authorities, and values are constantly questioned.

The hypocrisies of older generations have always been with us. What is new today is that it is ridiculously easy to expose them. The effect on our youth of premature emergence of truth has been to create a deep skepticism as to validity of authority. Neither the family, the church, the law, nor any institution demands the automatic respect it once did. There may be other factors contributing to this decline in respect for authority, but in my opinion it is best understood in terms of the psychological impact of our new media.<sup>25</sup>

One is reminded of psychologist Bruno Bettelheim's statement that society has made youth obsolete.

The last neutral hypothesis offered by Halleck is that a reliance on scientism has disillusioned youth. The belief in scientism, created and sustained by advanced technology, places unconditional faith in science to create and develop a perfect, joyous, rational, free, utopian world. When the idealistic youth has his cultural "faith" challenged by the irrationality

---

<sup>24</sup>Seymour L. Halleck, Stress and Campus Response, edited by G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968), p. 127.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 129.

of man, by evil in the world, and the multiple imperfections of man due to sin, he reacts by abandoning scientism and turning to the nonscientific, drugs, mysticism, magic, astrology, in hope of finding a new meaning to life. Possibly the current "Jesus freak" movement can partly be explained in this light.

Scientism is a cold, calculating, analytical, impersonal, detached discipline. The youth, fighting dehumanization, with a need and desire for involvement and deep interpersonal relationships, become disillusioned. Alienation sets in, and a very existential approach to life is adopted. Albert Camus speaks as the prophet for this stance: "Thus I draw from the absurd three consequences--which are my revolt, my freedom, and my passion."<sup>26</sup> The revolt is against traditional beliefs, meanings, and values. The freedom is that gained by rejecting these unacceptable ideologies; and the renewed passion is to revolt, to become free, and find a new desire and meaning for life, the existential life.

Mark Gerzon, after quoting Marcuse, describes this process of alienation.

The difference between the social dropout and the politically active and dissident young man is this: the former emphasizes the fact that his personal psychological dissatisfaction reflects the disorders of the whole, and so he decides to remove himself from the whole; while the latter emphasizes that his own dissatisfaction with the prevalent way of life relates directly to the sickness of society itself,

---

<sup>26</sup>Albert Camus, The Myth of Sisyphus, translated by J. O'Brien (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1955), p. 46.

and so decides to establish himself in such a position that he may change the social whole. The difference between the young man who leads the outside life, which is generally considered to be unproductive, and the one who tries to become an active catalyst for social change is the degree to which each feels estranged or alienated from society.<sup>27</sup>

This alienation can be reacted to in three ways. The person can return to the existing social pattern, unfulfilling as it may be. Some call this "selling out." Others remain a part of and within society, reacting to it and actively working from within to change it. Such would be the yippies. Yet others feel no other viable option but to extricate themselves completely from society. The hippies would be an example of this latter group. A further consequence is the existential style of life with its emphasis on value in the "now," a turning to the self for values and identity apart from society's accepted values, and a treasuring of deep, humane, personal relationships. New styles of dress, new styles of hair, different sexual mores, new terminology, new music, and communal living--all find their meaning in this reality.

Much more could be said. However, this description gives an overview of the changing contemporary student, and it is helpful in considering the implications for campus ministry. Paul Goodman perhaps best summarizes the essence of what has been said:

---

<sup>27</sup>Gerzon, p. 152.

It should be obvious by now that the vital conflict today is not between one bloc and another bloc, not between Left and Right, but between a worldwide dehumanized system of things and human decency and perhaps survival.<sup>28</sup>

### The Changing American University

The history of higher education in America is a history of change. As a background for considering the current changing university scene, this history of change will be briefly described.

In 1636, Harvard College became a reality. From the early colonial period until the Civil War years, the motherland, England, was the pattern for American schools. Puritan theology and the classics comprised the course of study in these early institutions. These schools were really no more than the secondary schools of today.

Because of the increasing loyalties to different ethnic backgrounds and the concern to preserve religious denominations, as many as eight hundred "special interest" colleges sprouted prior to the Civil War. Jenks and Riesman describe this period of American education as follows:

Still the special interest colleges we have been discussing were probably no more important or effective as bulwarks of traditional values than were their colonial predecessors. Colleges probably played a far smaller role in nineteenth century America and did far less to define people's attitudes towards themselves and one another than nineteenth century churches did. Earning

---

<sup>28</sup>Paul Goodman, People or Personnel and Like a Conquered Province (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1968), pp. 252-253.

a B.A. was of limited value for getting ahead on the job, and spending four years on a college campus was of even less value in understanding nineteenth century culture.<sup>29</sup>

The post-Civil War period gave rise to the American university concept. The word university can generally be defined as "an educational institution of large size which affords instruction of an advanced nature in all the main branches of learning."<sup>30</sup>

The greatest impetus for the development of the American university concept came with the passing of the Morrill Federal Land Grant Act of 1862. This act provided each state with public land equal to thirty thousand acres, the sale of which would furnish the revenue to establish a college or colleges. The purpose of the land grant college was, "without excluding other scientific or classical studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts."<sup>31</sup> Because the American culture was becoming more industrialized, urban, specialized and secular, the post-Civil War climate was ripe for these institutions. Furthermore, the state university embodied an essential element of American democracy--equal opportunity of higher education for all--and

---

<sup>29</sup>Christopher Jenks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1969), p. 7.

<sup>30</sup>John S. Brubacker and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), p. 143.

<sup>31</sup>Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1962), p. 252.

offered the broadest possible courses of study and broadest possible public services for the people. In this atmosphere and with these purposes, they were bound to flourish.

Two other influences became very important for the rise of the American university. Brubacker mentions the influence of the French Enlightenment which led to the broad utilitarian curriculum. The other influence, listed by Brubacker, was the influence of the German university which emphasized pure research and the freedom within which to pursue it. Many American educators received their formal education in German universities and became enamored with their concept of higher education. They returned to America with a determination to implement the same emphasis on research, accompanied by a more Americanized need of specialization. The result was the establishment of Johns Hopkins in 1876, the birth of the graduate school, the development of other universities, and the American practice of coupling research and creative scholarship with practical and professional training.

The next developmental phase of the American university occurred when the American culture, in its prosperous years, offered success to many not so much because of the academic skills they acquired from universities but because of the poise, class, and polish they had gained. These traits were the sign of an educated man in the early 1900s. "Many a 20th century father sent his son to college less to sharpen his wits than to polish his manners."<sup>32</sup> The universities again

---

<sup>32</sup>Brubacker and Rudy, p. 269.

adapted by introducing a whole range of extracurricular activities and personal services designed to educate and serve the whole student. The fraternities and intercollegiate sports were among them.

But the greatest change has occurred in the American universities since the end of World War II when the GI Bill provided the means for thousands of returning veterans to attend college. In terms of growth alone, the proportion of college age population attending college has doubled from 22 percent in 1946 to 50 percent in 1970; the number of college students has grown from 1,708,000 in 1940 to 8,498,117 in 1971.<sup>33</sup> Accompanying this growth has been the societal need for technically trained people, competition in academic excellence, and professional competence to fit in to today's complex, highly developed culture.

With this background, we look to the current transitional period, the changing American universities of the 1960s. Clark Kerr, former president of the University of California, Berkeley, articulated this change as he described the new university in his 1963 Godkin Lectures at Harvard.

The American university is currently undergoing its second great transformation. The first occurred during roughly the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when the land grant movement and German intellectualism were together bringing extraordinary change. The current transformation will cover roughly the quarter century after World War II. The university is being called upon to educate previously unimagined numbers

---

<sup>33</sup>U.S. Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1971, pp. 126-127.

of students; to respond to the expanding claim of national service; to merge its activities with industry as never before; to adapt to and rechannel new intellectual currents. By the end of this period, there will be a truly American university, an institution unique in world history, an institution not looking to other models but serving, itself, a model for universities in other parts of the globe.<sup>34</sup>

This passage describes both the changes occurring within the contemporary American university as well as the elements which are evoking the strongest negative and often violent reactions against it. Three major characteristics of the "multiversity" can be distinguished from Kerr's statement.

The first characteristic is signaled by Kerr's reference to the university of today being called upon to educate "previously unimagined numbers of students." The multiversity is thus becoming a series of ghetto communities and activities on a common campus. They are loosely tied together by a common name, a common governing board, and a common educational purpose. This has made possible a university system open to students of every level, degree of wealth, status and ability. The university has also, consequently, offered degree programs in fields previously considered unacceptable.

The second characteristic of the multiversity today is that of responding to national needs and services. Though the university of today is properly meeting national need, yet this factor has become a pitfall for the university. Since the universities are in need of federal monetary support, the

---

<sup>34</sup>Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), p. 86.



growth, direction, purpose, and personnel of the university are all influenced by and dependent upon the federal government if they are to retain this support.

Thirdly, the multiversity, as it merges its activities with industry, becomes the supplier of technicians for today's technological needs. Along with supplying the personnel, they retain their own technological expertise for the ongoing program of competent research and education in order that they might supply new techniques and new technicians. This has necessitated curricular changes which have little relation to the established, traditional programs of university education.

Kerr's most recent academic critic is Dr. Robert Wolff of Columbia University, who registers four negative reactions to the multiversity concept. The first negative reaction discredits the multiversity for admitting everyone and teaching everything. Wolff says this reaction can be discarded primarily as intellectual snobbism.

The second reaction charges the multiversity with removing faculty and students from the governing process. The governing board becomes a centralized elite, a somewhat inevitable tendency for any organization so large, diverse, and loosely knit. This reaction is, according to Wolff, legitimate.

However, the third negative reaction directed to the purpose or rationale of the multiversity--to respond to national needs--is much more serious. Dr. Wolff goes to considerable length to show the difference between social need and national

needs in terms of market demand. He castigates the multiversity as a type of "university for hire."

When Kerr speaks repeatedly of the multiversity's responsiveness to national needs, he is describing nothing more than its tendency to adjust itself to effective demand in the form of government grants, scholarship programs, corporate or alumni underwriting, and so forth. But his language encourages the readers to suppose that the demands to which the multiversity responds are expressions of genuine human and social needs, needs which make a moral claim upon the effect and attention of the academy. It takes very little thought to see the weakness of this implicit claim. . . . When Kerr speaks of "demand" for engineers as one to which the multiversity ought to respond, he is covertly<sup>35</sup> (and probably unwittingly) endorsing the space program.

If this is the commitment of the multiversity, it is no longer in a position to judge the value of or response to market demand needs.

This leads into the fourth negative reaction. "If it [the university] is an instrument of national purpose, then it cannot be a critic of national purpose, for an instrument is a means, not an evaluator of ends."<sup>36</sup>

These are the basic factors eliciting the violent and radical response in the university today. Students and faculty are protesting their limited rights and freedoms--thus the Berkeley Free Speech Movement. Curriculum and teaching methods adjusted only to respond to national needs have created furor. Competent professors are saved for graduate school and research as assistants take over their classes. Establishment trustees

---

<sup>35</sup> Robert Paul Wolff, The Ideal of the University (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), p. 40.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 41.

and administrators, hyperresponsive to "national needs" and monies, and insensitive to student or social needs and desires, control courses, primarily determine hiring and firing, and court industry and government with passion for their dowries. The free stance of the university is threatened and its role as critic paralyzed. The response to this existing situation within the university has been strong.

The last area of protest to the university today is the competitiveness and sheer size of the universities which results in a lack of community, a lack of meaningful relationships for the students, and a failure to facilitate the development of the whole person.

The depth of the student reaction to the university's faults is evident in these insightful words:

The first principle of institutional diagnostics is that something is wrong when those best suited to the life of the institution rebel most violently against it. If the secular at heart drift away from Rome, the Church can comfort itself that not all are called to the service of God; but when the priests rebel, then it is almost certainly the church itself which is at fault. So too, professors need not be unsettled by the defection of students who are obviously unsuited for the activities of the academy. But the rebels today are the best students, not the worst, and that can only mean trouble in the university itself. . . .

So strong is their identification with the university, that although the rebels will criticize it, condemn it, revile it, obstruct it, even--God forbid--burn it down, the one thing they will not do is simply turn their backs on it and walk away.<sup>37</sup>

This, then, is the general description of the changing scene in the university. It is not necessary for the purpose

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., pp. 48-49.

of this paper to describe or assess specific corrective measures and movements.

### The Changing Understanding of Mission and Ministry

Since Vatican II and a barrage of books extremely critical of the church, the church has experienced many changes. Many more changes are needed and await realization. Again it would be a study in and of itself to examine these changes, even within a given institution. In the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, change has been comparatively minimal. Its traditional conservatism, the effects of the uncertain and somewhat chaotic social scene which cause fear and apprehension, and its congregational polity make the process of change slow and tedious.

Furthermore, changes at a synodical or "official," clerical theological level have, by and large, not been implemented and realized at a practical or local level. Theologically, the one area in the LCMS which has received much attention at conferences, in official papers, and in academic study is the area of mission and ministry. For purposes of this study, mission and ministry are the two applicable areas of change in the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. They are selected because of their implications for Lutheran campus ministry. It is preferable to refer to change in these areas as new theological emphasis. This age does not lay claim to an unprecedented understanding of mission and

ministry, only a new emphasis mandatory for implementing viable mission and ministry for today.

In each area we shall use only one reference. The area of ministry, with its new and more extensive emphasis, is defined by Dr. Erwin Lueker. After examining the witness of Scripture, the early church fathers, and the Lutheran Confessions, Lueker summarizes a concept of ministry with four statements.

In the discussion of the ministry in the New Testament, four factors must be borne in mind: 1) All ministry centers in Jesus Christ; 2) the entire Christian community is active in ministry; 3) the ministry is given by God and is exercised by the spontaneous use of special gifts; and 4) special ministries are needed for specific situations in an evolving society.<sup>38</sup>

These statements provide for Gospel-centered ministry, lay ministry, diversified ministry in terms of employing special and varied gifts, and diversified ministry relative to time, place, and situation in our changing world. These statements elucidate a valid understanding of ministry, offering a flexibility for the church to adapt its ministry to the needs of the age and situation in which it is located, a luxury that has not always been accorded the ministry of the church. This change is apparent in the existence of the varied and diverse ministries attempting to meet today's need. Apart from and along with the traditional parish concept of ministry are street and inner city ministries, ministries to race track personnel, motorcycle gangs, and high-rise apartment residents.

---

<sup>38</sup>Erwin Lueker, Change and the Church (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1969), p. 118.

The significant document on the concept of mission, officially accepted by the LCMS at its 1965 Detroit convention, is entitled the "Mission Affirmations."<sup>39</sup> These affirmations reflect a beautiful, broad, and mature understanding of the mission of the church. Each of the six affirmations will be stated with a descriptive paragraph following the affirmation.

1. The Church is God's Mission

The mission is the Lord's. It is the mission of a denomination or a type of ministry or an individual's mission only insofar as it joins Christ in his mission. Denominationalism, parochialism, self-centeredness, institutional self-preservation often hinder and even work at cross purposes with the Lord's mission. They are part of Christ's mission only as they parallel his purpose of freeing man for a new and full life. The Lord's mission is not an optional activity for the people of God, but a responsibility for God's people to which they must attune their entire activity.

2. The Church is Christ's Mission to the World

The witnessing, mission task of the church has global dimensions. To carry out this worldwide effort, all the tools of communication and mass media should be utilized.

---

<sup>39</sup>The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Regular Convention of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1965], p. 79-81.

3. The Church is Christ's Mission to the Whole Church

This affirmation recognizes the ecumenical imperative. It recognizes the inherent unity of and in the Body of Christ. Therefore, it also recognizes the privilege and obligation of members of the Body to share with all other members in the mutual interest of edifying, educating, admonishing, supporting--in general contributing in any way to bring the Body of Christ to maturation. This affirmation also beautifully articulates that the Lutheran Church is a confessional movement within Christianity; it is not, properly understood, an institution erecting barriers of separation.

4. The Church is Christ's Mission to the Whole Society

All of society is God's creation. All of society is God's object of liberation, peace, love and justice. The church, here, is called to a total commitment, both as individual Christians and corporately, to work within and for all segments of society--governmental, institutional, industrial, individual--to bring God's healing and wholeness to his entire creation. The church is not called to isolation but to be an effective, powerful instrument for the transformation of all of society.

5. The Church is Christ's Mission to the Whole Man

The church is not to speak and act only in relation to the spiritual brokenness of man, but to speak to his total brokenness and act for his total wholeness. This implies offering the word and action of healing for man

in all of his needs, physical, mental, economic, and spiritual. It means speaking and acting for man whether his sickness be guilt or poverty, whether he lacks dignity or justice, or whether his relationship with God is intact or broken.

#### 6. The Whole Church is Christ's Mission

The Lord's mission is every Christian's mission, every Christian's ministry. It is not the exclusive task of the clergy, not the sole task of white Anglo-Saxon Protestants, nor the special privilege of one denomination over, or in contradistinction to, another denomination. Clergy rule as well as anticlerical agitation by laity is deplored. Everything that divides, destroys, and disrupts is deplorable. That which unites and edifies is a cause for joy and praise, for in so doing Christ's mission has free course.

With this understanding of her mission, the LCMS is free, even constrained, to serve in heretofore neglected areas of life, with methods previously foreign to or rejected by her. To fulfill this mission is to leave no person, no segment of life, no part of the world or church untouched by God's love, healing, peace in Christ.

This background, the brief description of the changing society, changing student, changing university, and changing emphasis in mission and ministry, provides the setting within which to understand why the LCMS campus ministry found it necessary to take a new look at its objectives and philosophy.



This was initiated at a 1968 meeting in St. Louis when LCMS campus clergy and responsible LCMS administrators convened for a consultation. This background will provide the basis for an assessment of that consultation. It furthermore will provide the basis from which new objectives will be elucidated.

### The Consultation on Campus Ministry

The consultation on campus ministry, LCMS, was assembled by the Board for Missions of Synod on 23-26 October 1968, St. Louis, Missouri. The purposes of the meeting were:

1. To provide opportunity to those engaged in campus ministry to assess and evaluate corporately the present and future role of campus ministry of The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod.
2. To develop consensus position papers on facets of campus ministry in The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod which needed review and evaluation.
3. To enable The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, specifically the Board for Missions, to develop the policies, goals and plans for an effective program of Lutheran Campus Ministry for the '70's.<sup>40</sup>

The conference received papers from an administrator, Dean Moulton of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois; Erika Lindemann, an officer of Gamma Delta (LCMS college student organization); and Jodi Kretzmann, a "new breed" student. All were on the subject "The Campus--Say It as It Is." The obvious intention was to give the participants in the conference input,

---

<sup>40</sup>Board for Missions of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, "Consultation on Campus Ministry: Reports and Findings," St. Louis, 23-26 October 1968, forward (mimeographed).

from varying perspectives, as to what was rapidly and radically happening on the American university scene.

These papers gave a perspective from which to consider two other position papers. They were "Theology and Objectives of Campus Ministry" and "Philosophies and Objectives of Campus Ministry," both delivered by Reverend Wayne Saffen, LCMS campus pastor at the University of Chicago. These position papers are important for this study and will be treated in detail.

In Saffen's first paper, "Theology and Objectives of Campus Ministry," he incisively and perceptively warns against the danger of setting forth an ideology for a theology of campus ministry. Ideology attempts to make sense out of a nonsensical and unpredictable world. Ideology offers ready answers for all questions. Ideology seeks, quite successfully, to gain converts to its set of answers. But its weakness and error is that "it reduces mystery to manageability and subverts faith from openness into fanaticism, and eventually into that familiarity which breeds contempt."<sup>41</sup> Having uncovered the false faith of ideology, Saffen concludes as follows:

In short, ideology tries to impose its conceptuality view of reality upon the reality itself to force it to its purpose. Faith, on the other hand, faces the reality in all its irrational terror and, in the face of things and events, says: "I still believe in God-- at work in these very things and events to do His purposes and will, not ours." It's hard to forge a pattern of rationality out of such faith, for faith itself waits to see what God will disclose and lives in hope. But faith does assert the way we live in the face of the imponderables and unexpected. We live in hope. This is

---

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

a theology of sorts; it is Lutheran because we start by letting God be God. It is Lutheran because we believe in God, in spite of the evidences to the contrary. It is Lutheran because it hopes against hope (despair); and believes against doubt, and loves against hate. It is manifestly unprogrammatically because God sets the agenda, not we. Our goals are his goals.<sup>42</sup>

This warning against the tendency to replace theology with ideology is well taken, especially in campus ministry where successful student accessions to other organizations threaten and puzzle campus clergy, where responsible church boards pressure for accountability measured only by numerical success, and where faith in the face of unpredictability is not only hard to live with but also much harder to sell.

Saffen then lists five goals for campus ministry.

(1) "Tell it like it is." This phrase implies a commitment to truth, the same commitment the university has. For campus ministry, the goal is to take up the cross and follow, in word and action, the true, real Christ of the Gospels, not the Jesus often misrepresented by the organized church. (2) "Love the world." (3) "Seek not our own"; love is not self-seeking but is characterized by altruism: "what we have we give away for the sake of others without seeking our own institutional advantage." (4) "Hope in God." (5) "Do your thing; . . . do your theology, do your campus ministry. Do what you believe. Be what you are. Let it swing. Be free. Be authentic. Be true."<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., pp. 13-14.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., pp. 15-17.

The perceptive reader recognizes these goals as the biblical concepts of truth, faith, hope, love. This is the style of life to be emulated, the seeds to be planted, the truths to be authenticated in campus ministry. The anxiety should not be with the fruits; that will come. The singular goal of campus ministry, according to Saffen, is that these seeds be planted in human lives wherever campus ministry exists.

Under the section "Campus Ministry" Saffen uses the servant image as a worthy description of ministry.

That is a ministry of 'getting where the action is,' superlative rather than directive, serving rather than commanding, other-directed rather than inner-directed, a ministry to others rather than a dispensing of bromides and solutions out of our campus ministry kit."<sup>44</sup>

The third section is entitled "The Theology of Campus Ministry." Theology is defined, not as an ideology or rationale, but as a description of an activity in progress (doing theology) and as a prescription as it articulates an understanding of that activity in relation to Scripture.

This theology recognizes God as active also apart from the ministry of the church. But God certainly is also active in and through the campus ministry, and Saffen specifies the theology for that ministry in the following manner:

- (1) Illuminating: by bringing revelation to reason to help light up the landscape.

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

- (2) Witnessing: by being Christians publicly, privately, and corporately and by the ministry of the Word (logos) of God (theos).
- (3) Celebrating: the Eucharist the center of a joyous community celebrating life.
- (4) Verbalizing: by engaging in the academic dialogue as partners in discussion.
- (5) Symbolizing: by modes and styles of Christian presence, architecture, and activities.<sup>45</sup>

This theology is descriptive in that it needs to be given form and implemented as one ministers in a given place. It is prescriptive only in that Lutherans come to the campus committed to Scripture, as the only norm and source of faith, and to the Lutheran Confessions, a confessional movement within Christendom operating within the dialectic of Law and Gospel, Word and Sacrament.

The concluding paragraph to this first paper draws together what has been so far summarized.

What we have, then, is an already operative campus ministry. That is, a ministry to a particular kind of place in a particular kind of field, which requires an understanding of that place and field, so that the style of ministry may be appropriate and effective. The theology for doing this grows out of the theology we have when we come, the theology we learn by hearing the Word of God in what is said and done and learned, and by doing the theology we arrive at as we grow in grace and faith and knowledge; and, we hope, in favor with God and man, so that we may be found faithful servants in all our ministry, and in whatever our theological modes and methods.<sup>46</sup>

The second position paper presented by Saffen deals more specifically with the objectives and philosophy of campus

---

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

ministry. The subtitle indicates his working definition of campus ministry, "Ambassadors for Christ." The ambassador for Christ seeks to bring reconciliation, "not the false conciliation of unresolved differences but the elucidation of real differences through conflict (Law) and the reconciliation of people through the forgiveness of sins (Gospel)."<sup>47</sup>

Sponsored by the Lutheran Church the ambassador is an ambassador for Christ to the university. As such he is, as in the diplomatic world, a spokesman for his nation in a foreign nation, seeking to serve both. He is there, possibly working out of his Religious Center (embassy), to serve not just fellow Lutherans (countrymen) but to minister to the whole community. As an ambassador, he is one of many (other denominations) and needs to cooperate with them in their common task.

Saffen then offers what he calls the central goal of campus ministry.

The goal of all Christian ministry is the liberation of all men through the Gospel of Christ, by forgiveness, from all bondages which inhibit the full and free exercise of human liberty, that they may realize potentials as children of God. Then the Christian ministry is in immediate coalition with all forces working for human freedom and against all forces which would suppress human freedom and impose new bondage.<sup>48</sup>

Here the university becomes a friendly "foreign country" in that it, ideally, is working toward the same liberation, the

---

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 23

university liberating the mind and the church liberating the will. The two, then, form a type of partnership in their common goal of reaching and freeing the whole man.

This position paper concludes with two possible models for authentic campus ministry in 1968. Both are contrasted to false models. The first false model is "Corporation Standard Brands Lutheran Church: the Church as Denominational Imperialist and Exploiter." To remain free from the false model, two concepts must immediately be abandoned. First, the campus church should not be patterned after the parish church back home. It should be experimental, changing students who in turn might bring about a broader renewal. Secondly, the campus ministry must abandon the effort of being a recruitment service for the denomination. Such a service is imperialistic and exploitative.

We are, therefore, counterposing the model of campus minister as ambassador of Christ (authentic model) to the model of campus pastor as field agent for the home company in a strange territory opened up for company expansion, exploitation, and imperialism (inauthentic model). We are in the university for mission. The mission is not acquisition but liberation. . . . those who want to be disciples of Christ, having been freed by Him for service, will join us of their own accord because they wish to be part of such a mission.<sup>49</sup>

The second false model is: "Sociological: The Church as Validator and Support [sic] of the Military-Industrial-University Establishment." Resulting from a technological society, the university is producing technicians for

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

corporations, and the largest and strongest of these is the military-industrial establishment. The military establishment requires the research competence of the universities, and so the university becomes a "contractor for the government delivering humans into the kind of labor market needed by the military state."<sup>50</sup>

Thus one of the goals of campus ministry, according to Saffen, is to work toward the dissociation of the university from governmental control in order that it might maintain its freedom of inquiry and pure research. The church cannot be the agent working for conformity to this system, but rather it must work to restore freedom to the total university community, faculty, administration, students and staff, ministering to ward off and eradicate oppression for the sake of liberation. "What I am proposing is a heightening of the conflict situation between authority and freedom, in the name of autonomy for freedom against the heteronomy of authoritarianism."<sup>51</sup>

Such action will undoubtedly bring strong recriminations from the establishment including the ecclesiastical establishment. But the day calls for a prophetic voice and responsible action, even if authorities seek to quiet and suppress the same. The task of campus ministry in the 1970s is to break

---

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 29.



the false image of the church as supporter of the military-industrial-university establishment.

Let no administrator--church, university, military, or political--rest easy with campus pastors as if we were part of the prevailing establishments. We are ambassadors of the coming Kingdom, representing Jesus Christ in a land over which He is Lord, although He is not acknowledged as such as yet.<sup>52</sup>

Upon recommendation of a special task force, the 1968 conference accepted the two papers, "Theology and Objectives of Campus Ministry" and "Philosophies and Objectives of Campus Ministry," plus the "Mission Affirmations" adopted at the LCMS Convention in Detroit, "as working papers indicating the direction and style in which our campus ministry ought to be moving."<sup>53</sup> Although it was the desire of the 1968 conference to formulate a statement on philosophy and objectives of campus ministry to be presented to the 1969 campus pastors conference, this desire, to date, has not yet materialized. Thus it can be assumed that the two position papers by Saffen and the "Mission Affirmations" reflect the last articulation of the philosophy and objectives of campus ministry in the LCMS.

The only assessment that will be made of the 1968 consultation on campus ministry is one of observation. Saffen's two authentic models for campus ministry flow out of and parallel this paper's description of the changing society, student, university, and church. Recognition is made of the technological

---

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., p. 31.

society suppressing and dehumanizing people. The university is described as the feeder for and slave to this technological society, especially as it serves the establishment, particularly the military-industrial complex. The position papers view the student growing in social awareness and struggling for liberation within his university environment. Saffen recognizes a broader understanding of mission and ministry as he calls for the church to actively oppose all forces of evil and bondage-- in fact he sees ministry precipitating conflict as well as working for and with all those pursuing liberation.

The other brief assessment, referred to in the next chapter, is the affirmation that these position papers still have merit, validity, and viability for campus ministry today.

The consultation conference, in accepting these papers along with the "Mission Affirmations" as directional documents, evidenced its flexibility and sensitivity to the changing situation in society along with a desire to relevantly relate to the changing scene. Because of the quasi-official acceptance of these papers, this chapter limited the transitional period in LCMS campus ministry to the time of their delivery. With the 1968 consultation a new period of campus ministry in the LCMS was set in motion.

It is worthy of note that the consultation conference did not intend these papers to be any kind of definitive, last word statement of philosophy and objectives of LCMS campus ministry. Rather the conference saw them as a contribution to the ongoing need for articulation, adjusting, emphasizing,

developing, and contemporizing the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry. Their stated intention was that this process continue as an ongoing activity of and need for campus ministry.

This last chapter is a positive response to the desire of the 1958 Consultation Conference for an ongoing articulation of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry.

The intention in this last chapter is to set forth, in a cohesive manner, the broadest possible articulation of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry. Ministry could be determined and evaluated on the basis of such a comprehensive and definitive statement. However, this would not only be unrealistic, it would conflict with the entire witness of this paper. Articulation of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry is an ongoing process and necessity. Therefore, this last chapter will simply contribute to that process by offering what is deemed valuable and important at this point.

Social scientist Phillip Hammond, in his 1961 study of campus ministry, supports this same contention. In his study he probes for an answer to the question of why campus ministry has not become institutionalized after six decades of existence. Hammond defines what he means by vocational institutionalization

Institutionalization in this sense is the degree to which positions are socially structured. A process which typically is thought to consist of two experientially related but analytically distinct components. First is the question of how widely understood are the expectations held both by the occupant and by others who interact with occupant. Second is the degree to which these expectations are taken seriously,

## CHAPTER V

### FROM CONSULTATION TO ONGOING CONSIDERATION

This last chapter is a positive response to the desire of the 1968 Consultation Conference for an ongoing articulation of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry.

The temptation in this last chapter is to set forth, in a cohesive manner, the broadest possible elucidation of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry. Ministry could be determined and evaluated on the basis of such a comprehensive and definitive statement. However, this would not only be unrealistic, it would conflict with the entire witness of this paper. Articulation of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry is an ongoing process and necessity. Therefore, this last chapter will simply contribute to that process by offering what is deemed viable and important at this point.

Social scientist Phillip Hammond, in his 1963 study of campus ministry, supports this same contention. In his study he probes for an answer to the question of why campus ministry has not become institutionalized after six decades of existence. Hammond defines what he means by vocational institutionalization.

Institutionalization in this sense is the degree to which positions are socially structured, a process which typically is thought to consist of two empirically related but analytically distinct components. First is the question of how widely understood are the expectations held both by the occupants and by others who interact with occupants. Second is the degree to which these expectations are taken seriously,

that is, the degree to which partners to the interaction are committed to the fulfillment of the expectations.<sup>1</sup>

To say that campus ministry is poorly institutionalized is to confess that its expectations are not overwhelmingly understood or shared by its participants. The consequent commitment to that ministry is weakened, as is evidenced by the large turnover of personnel.

There are four factors or conditions, according to Hammond, necessary for an occupation to become institutionalized. First, there is a need for recruitment of personnel with the proper prerequisite skills. Secondly, training is necessary so that expectations are understood and shared. Thirdly, there is a need for proper motivation to fulfill these expectations. Finally, these expectations must be adapted to a given location.<sup>2</sup> Ambiguity in defining the task or expectation will result in difficulty in recruiting, difficulty in training, and an accompanying difficulty in motivation.

Hammond sees a partial answer in the professionalization of campus ministry. Professionalization involves the following characteristics: (1) Determination by the professionals of their own standard of training; (2) Licensure requirements; (3) Licensing boards consisting of members of the profession; (4) Freedom from lay evaluation and control; (5) Strong identification and affiliation by members with each other; (6) Expectation for the

---

<sup>1</sup>Phillip E. Hammond, The Campus Clergyman (New York: Basic Books, 1966), p. 19.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 26-28.

profession to be a terminal occupation.<sup>3</sup> The positive result would be the possible institutionalization of campus ministry as previously defined. A negative result would be the loss of some flexibility. The recent development of the Lutheran Campus Ministers Association will undoubtedly grow to care for some of the concerns and needs outlined above.

The primary import of the Hammond study at this point is the witness his study makes to the need for the objectives and philosophy (expectation) of campus ministry to be understood and shared. This chapter offers some objectives and a philosophy that emerge out of the changing scene in society, the church, the university and its students. With campus ministry in transition, the intention is that this offering will contribute to a greater understanding and sharing.

Before articulating these new emphases we reiterate the basic convictions of Lutheran campus ministry. The central goal of campus ministry remains in its pivotal position. As elucidated by Saffen it is "the liberation of all men through the Gospel of Christ, by forgiveness, from all bondages which inhibit the full and free exercise of human liberty, that they may realize potentials as children of God."<sup>4</sup> The Board for Missions states its directional goal for mission in the 1970s in this manner:

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 141-142.

<sup>4</sup>Board for Missions of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod, "Consultation on Campus Ministry: Reports and Findings," St. Louis, 23-26 October 1968, p. 48 (mimeographed).

A growing number of people in all structures of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod renewed and released through the Gospel of Jesus Christ by the Spirit of God, with a new awareness of their ministry as God's people called to speak the Word of reconciliation and manifest Christ's kingdom on earth with a new willingness to risk their total selves that God's kingdom might break through in all areas of life and society.<sup>5</sup>

Dr. Fields, executive secretary of campus ministry for the Board for Missions of the LCMS, also states this to be the directional goal for campus ministry.

Secondly, the Lutheran clergyman comes to the campus committed to his prescriptive theology of Scripture as the only norm and source of faith, and the Lutheran Confessions as a true exposition of the same. The manner and style in which he lives out his commitment in his existential situation is the descriptive task of doing his theology.

Thirdly, while recognizing the need for different styles and methods today, this paper reaffirms the ongoing viability of the past objectives--conservation, reclamation, training in Christian service, soul-winning, and total campus impact. Central to this task is the continued commitment to a Word and Sacrament approach to ministry on the campus.

Lastly, this paper reiterates the decision of the Consultation Conference, accepting Saffen's two models for campus ministry as well as the "Mission Affirmations" which presented a worthy, contemporary and viable set of objectives and philosophy for LCMS campus ministry.

---

<sup>5</sup>Wilbert Fields, Inter-Nos, February 1971, p. 4.

Four new models will now be offered which parallel and are precipitated by the four changing areas in today's society, detailed earlier in this paper. These objectives and philosophy are seen as viable, important, and necessary for relevant campus ministry today.

Campus Ministry as an Ethical Precipitator  
toward a New Quality of Life in a  
Quantitative, Technological Age

The first model speaks from the changing societal scene. Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr., executive vice-president of Evergreen State College, Olympia, Washington, in a paper entitled "The Futureless Generation," echoes George Wald's description of today's generation. Recognizing man's tendency toward evil, Shoben dismisses violent reaction to a violent government as a viable answer for a recreated future. Rather

the great ethical issue lying at the very heart of the human condition is that of how to apply knowledge in ways that maximize man's growth and finest aspirations and that minimize his propensities for evil.<sup>6</sup>

Shoben continues:

As Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, another Nobel laureate has put it, the crisis of our age may be less in our immediate problems, gigantic and frightening though they are, than in the question of whether man as a species, evolved to meet the conditions of life 10,000 years ago, has the intellectual capacity and the moral and psychological resources of courage, self-control, and cooperativeness to sustain and humanize the world he has created. Universally and primitively endowed

---

<sup>6</sup>Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr., Students, Religion and the Contemporary University, edited by Charles E. Minneman (Ypsilanti, Mich.: Eastern Michigan University Press, 1970), p. 18.



with the emergency reactions of "flight or fight," men must now deal with the issue of how these fundamental affects can be constructively employed in societies that are densely crowded and in which a decent distribution of food, peace, and personal fulfillment is dependent on the dynamics of a moral management of technology and highly complex patterns of social organization.<sup>7</sup>

In view of this situation, Shoben sees two primary educational needs. The first is to create an awareness as to the tragic possibilities that lie within man and his immanent possibilities for self-destruction. The second is an increase in technical comprehension and competence to more fully understand this complex technological society. The questions this raises are:

How can men effectively couple long-range moral concern with the vigor of technical thought? How can human beings provide the necessary outlets for their inherent destructive impulses while harnessing the force of their emotional resources to the search for social forms that enhance and facilitate individual dignity and interpersonal generosity? How, in crowded and technical societies, can the political process be shaped and controlled so that the decisions of government reflect as fully as possible the spirit of one world in both domestic and international affairs?<sup>8</sup>

The entire section of this paper dealing with the technological society begs this question of the quality and future of life. The students' concerns, Viet Nam, military power and priority, the environment, dehumanization, racism, injustice and inequality, all are related in part to technology and all raise moral questions. Students and society plead with the

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 21.

university and place their dwindling hope in the university, sometimes in the church, to speak to and act in relation to their concerns. Though hope in the church as an institution has vanished among many, perhaps the church in the university is able and in a position to speak and act for a new quality of life for individuals and society.

No methods are offered to fulfill this objective. This is dependent upon the place, resources, creativeness, and perceptiveness of the ministry in a particular university and community. However, a rationale is offered in the description of one aspect of ministry distinguished in the recent Danforth Study of Campus Ministries. The Danforth study subsumed all ministry under four modes--the priestly, pastoral, prophetic and governance modes. The governance mode, according to this study is in need of the greatest attention and development.

The study found an ignorance on the part of campus ministry as to where and how decisions are made, and few campus clergy identified with this process of governance in society.

The Danforth study defines governance as follows:

Governance is the exercise of power in the structures and loyalties of a society or people; it is rooted in the statutes, functions, and authority of a society's organizations and associations. Thus Christ as King is worshipped in the church when men, already trying to govern humanly, perceive that the model of humanity by which motives and aspirations are to be appraised is love: the building up of the common life so that variety is not sacrificed to harmony or harmony to diversity. . . .

our view of governance is a process of enabling persons and associations with many different goals to interact effectively in achieving institutional and public purposes. . . . Governance, then, is an effort

to channel and persuade this expression to serve viable and just social and public programs.<sup>9</sup>

The implications of this mode of ministry in a campus setting are many. Campus clergy could gather together leaders of the university and community, business and labor, industry and government, especially when and where policy or pending decisions will affect, negatively or positively, the quality of life for people. Campus ministry could become a catalyst in the process of calling together responsible people, initiating ethical concern and sensitivity, bringing together research, and gathering resources in an effort to fight the dehumanization process of technology, to place quality in balance with quantity, and to develop and foster a growing sense of community, dignity, and justice for people.

This cannot simply be an effort on the part of the campus pastor toward an individual. Campus ministry needs a growing sociological awareness, for in a complex, highly developed society, changes are made and new directions achieved through corporate structures and power. The Christian man and woman need not only be motivated to do his or her "thing." He must be motivated to do it in concert with others if it is to have societal effect.

The depersonalization of life today, the emasculating of man by machine, the slavery in our institutions to

---

<sup>9</sup>Kenneth Underwood, director of the Danforth Study of Campus Ministries, The Church, The University and Social Policy (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1969), I, 294.

self-preservation and policy over people, the threat of life without a future, or a perverted future, are all urgent social needs and moral concerns. The quality of life, the humanness of man, is at stake. Many say something must be done toward this end; few have done anything. The church in the university has an enviable opportunity with the resources at hand. There can emerge a growing sensitivity to the need and a commitment to effect change. A worthy objective and philosophy of campus ministry for today is to creatively, innovatively, and boldly become a precipitator of change. The challenge is to become catalysts, set up the structure and motivation, offer the ethical sensitivity, and gather power groups to achieve desired goals. In this manner Christ, the King, can work more effectively through His people to bring liberation not only to the inner man but to the whole man and his society.

Campus Ministry as an Effective Participant  
in the Process of University Reform

The second model emerges out of the changing university scene. The university, in the last decade, has been bombarded with critical words, angry demonstrators, even bricks and bombs. It is not simply coincidental that frustrated students have vented their anxiety at and within their place of residence. The university is the cause of much of their disillusionment as well as the object of much of their criticism.

Earlier this paper specifically mentioned needed university reform in the areas of governance, curriculum, student

and faculty freedoms and rights, and teaching methods. It mentioned the intimate relationship between the university and the establishment, and the concomitant result generally described as "selling her soul." Lastly, the huge assembly line nature of the contemporary university has left a loss of community and total person development among its constituents. Campus ministry needs to be sensitive to, concerned about, and active in the task of eradicating these evils.

The United Ministries in Higher Education (UMHE) has caught the urgency of this need and is in the process of re-directing the majority of its resources toward a ministry in the university to help bring about the needed structural changes. In its 1971-1972 statement on directions and priorities the UMHE states:

It is because higher education is an advocate of a new order of humanity that the church has a ministry in higher education. UMHE will work on behalf of organizing the source of power and expertise in such ways as will contribute most effectively to the advocacy, the building, and the sustaining of a system of higher education which leads to a new order of humanity. While it will work toward keeping higher education open for all advocates, it will stand as one advocate within higher education. [emphasis mine]<sup>10</sup>

Strategies to bring about the new order are worked out at a local level. At any rate, strategy and coalition are essential in effecting change in the structure where the decisions are made.

---

<sup>10</sup>National Commission of United Ministries in Higher Education, "Directions and Priorities, 1971-72," Valley Forge, Pa., 1971, p. 5 (mimeographed).

Another facet of ministry to the university in its present need is the restoration of a sense of religion, of ultimate concern to the university. Dr. Gilkey, professor of theology at the University of Chicago, elucidates this by drawing a parallel between the rejection of the church during the Enlightenment and the rejection of the university today. Gilkey observes a common malady. The failure of the church during the Enlightenment was twofold. The church was berated for its supernaturalistic ideology which resulted in a failure to relate constructively to the ills of that day. It was berated also for its over-worldly concern for its own existential well-being which resulted in selling its soul to power, self-preservation, and the establishment. So the church sank into irrelevance and became the object of scorn.

Interestingly enough the university also has its supernaturalistic ideology in its battle cry of objectivity and rational, free inquiry. As such it has denied its moral role and remained distant from being an effective voice for moral rectitude within our social ills. Like the church during the Enlightenment, the university of today is also over-worldly in its struggle for power, money, and prestige, selling its own soul for its well-being. In so doing, it too has become establishment and representative of its concomitant evils. The verdict is moral stagnation in the face of supernaturalistic irrelevance.

The university has failed to take into account the demonic. Even objectivity is a moral accomplishment. In the ideal of

objectivity the religious dimension of moral questions, values, and ultimate concerns have been discarded. Gilkey observes: "When the region of ultimacy is left empty, the demonic rushes in to fill it."<sup>11</sup> It is to this absence of the religious dimension in university existence that campus ministry should address itself. This dimension is essential to the university's reform. Gilkey says:

The need of the university for the disciplined study of religion in its midst is not, however, exhausted by its need for an inclusive curricular study of man and his history. It evidences itself, as we have argued, in the character and the conflicts of university life itself. That corporate life--both in its internal structures and its external roles in society--is in danger of suicidal self-destruction because it has ignored the inevitably religious dimensions of its own existence: the question of its own ultimate ends and goals, the problem of the demonic repudiation of its ends in its own life, and its consequent tendency to serve for extra pay other certainly unexamined and often lesser social goals in the wider community.

Like all of us, the university represses the moral dimension in order to escape self-criticism . . .<sup>12</sup>

The university needs to be led to Pogo's discovery: "We have found the enemy and it is us." Gilkey concludes:

History seems to show--in the case of the church and other institutions, and the serious level of the conflict between student and administration reaffirms it--that unless somehow a social community can come to understand the religious and moral dimensions of its own life, the importance of its own ideals and its tendency to deny or tarnish them, it will not be able at all to continue those profane tasks which are its raison d'etre, in the case of the university, the

---

<sup>11</sup>Langdon Gilkey, "Religion and the Secular University," Dialog, VIII (Spring 1969), 115.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., VIII, 115-116.

tasks of objective inquiry and technical development which are its immediate and conscious goals.<sup>13</sup>

If Gilkey's analysis of the underlying malady of the university today is valid, and it certainly is worthy of consideration, then campus ministry has a gigantic task. To uncover the problems, create sensitivities, and work with like-minded groups to effect change at a decision-making level is an urgent and profoundly difficult ministry. But if the infected university and ministry to higher education are taken seriously, this objective is viable for campus ministry today as it serves the university and its community with needed reform.

Campus Ministry as the Facilitator for the  
Student to Develop a True Identity as  
He Is Led into Authentic Community

The changing student provides the framework for the third model. A charge that is leveled against the large universities of today is that the university, because of its size and complexity, is fostering a fragmented life for the student rather than developing the whole person through meaningful relationships. In the earlier section of this paper the new student was depicted as personalistic, alienated, rejecting society's old values, finding life and one's niche in it rather meaningless, somewhat despairing because of the dismal prospects of the future, and having an intense desire for and need of deep, meaningful, personal relationships. The Center

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., VIII, 116.



Magazine was quoted as saying that few youths are not involved in "a personalist-communalist orientation--full development as a person is perceived as possible within a community."<sup>14</sup>

If it is true that students face an identity crisis, that their environment has necessitated deep relationships, that their sick society has alienated many of them, that society is increasingly dehumanizing and impersonalistic, then campus ministry, to meet the new student in his need, must seek to assist the development of a true identity for the student by leading him into authentic community.

The identity crisis which youth today are experiencing is due in part to the radically different manner in which they are finding their identity. Ask a typical adult who he is, and he probably will define himself by where he works, what he does, what education he has and where he received it, to whom he is married, where he lives, and to which organizations he belongs. Ask a typical young person who he is, and he will attempt to articulate about his inner self, what he feels, what he thinks, how he fits into life and society. After he determines this, he chooses a vocation on the basis of it. For this reason many young people "stop-out" and drop out of college.

One important aspect in finding this kind of identity is to find it in relation to others. Community and meaningful,

---

<sup>14</sup>Donald McDonald, "Youth," Center Magazine, III (April 1966), 24.

deep interaction is therefore mandatory. Campus ministry, in its relationship with individuals and groups, must place a priority on creating the atmosphere for and leading people into this discovery. Tony Stoneburner, a professor of literature, writes the following in the epilogue of the book Community on Campus:

Community seems an urgent topic for persons on campus. It appears to promise (and produce) personal fulfillment and institutional humanization. Without it, persons suffer the superficiality of conformity and social irresponsibility. If community is so important for the campus, it is unlikely that it is less important for the campus ministry.<sup>15</sup>

Ross Snyder in his book Young People and Their Culture titles one chapter "People With Whom You Can Make Yourself." Together, in community, is the only way an individual can be a human being. He offers five ministries to help develop this interpersonal relationship.

#### 1. The Ministry of Authenticity

This ministry helps others to become their authentic selves.

Erich Fromm believed a certain malady characterized American civilization--we all tend too much to become the 'marketing personality,' trying very hard to sell ourselves to others, rather than being authentically an integrity that is a truth."<sup>16</sup>

Snyder's following words apply to the campus minister.

---

<sup>15</sup>Tony Stoneburner, Community on Campus, edited by Myron B. Bloy, Jr. (New York: Seabury Press, 1971), p. 153.

<sup>16</sup>Ross Snyder, Young People and Their Culture (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1969), p. 158.

Perhaps our greatest ministry to inter-personal events in another is to be an integrity ourselves. To be personal integrity that has found what he is true to and what is true to him, that encounters rather than evades or conforms, that stands out in some clearness of structure rather than hides or dissolves, that must be taken account of, that can be dialogued and co-created with, with whom others can know where they stand.<sup>17</sup>

## 2. The Mutual Ministry of Self-Revelation

A man is not a man until he has stated his truth with vigor before a group and in a situation where it can be challenged, shaped, forced to come to terms with the boundaries of other people's views.<sup>18</sup>

Campus ministry can provide the opportunity for this to occur.

## 3. The Ministry of Understanding and Midwifery

When we come to know that the way we see and feel things can be significantly seen and felt by another human being, we are joined to the human race. . . . Only as we become aware that another person understands us (and not just our ideas) are we released to be ourselves.<sup>19</sup>

What a challenge this is for the campus minister to both emulate and develop in others.

## 4. The Ministry of the Great Conversation

"The Great Conversation is a small group of people matching themselves against the great problems of life that have to be decided in their existence."<sup>20</sup> Campus ministry can provide a structure within which such conversation can happen.

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., pp. 158-159.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 159.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., pp. 159-160.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 161.

## 5. Dialoguing with Culture Content

Therefore the ministry of culture content is not primarily the usual kind of education at all, but rather training ourselves and others in the art of "entering into"--the art of entering into the inner world of the people of all times and places (including our own) who have lived life with peculiar intensity and integrity. . . . It is a centered effort to acquire the inner world of other men and the hidden significance of crucial events.<sup>21</sup>

Campus ministry can certainly hope to achieve part of this kind of meaningful community in the celebration of the Eucharist. Through its many small group meetings, campus ministry can become competent to provide both the settings and the leadership for development of the self-in-relation-to-others. Communes, retreats, coffee houses, fraternities, and sororities can become opportunities for the same development of meaningful relationships.

Since much of the counseling a campus pastor is involved in deals with some aspect of the individual's becoming and understanding what it means to be a human being, the campus pastor has an opportunity here both to emulate what it means to be a human being as well as to tie these counselees into meaningful community and relationship with others. Finding ways to assist the student to develop his identity as he lives in meaningful relationship and community with others, thereby assisting him to become a more human being, is an important and viable objective of campus ministry for today.

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 163.

Campus Ministry as Meaningful Precursor  
for Ministry in the Church

Many personnel involved in campus ministry, older and wiser than the author, would remind him that the history of campus ministry has not been a story of a very profitable, close, meaningful relationship with neighboring parishes, pastors, and church leaders. Hammond supports this contention in his study. He discovered that campus clergy in general are more liberal, both theologically and politically, more ecumenical, more critical of the church and society, better educated, and more social action-orientated than their counterparts in the parish. In view of this campus ministers are often held in suspicion.

[They] are criticized not for what they do, but rather that what they do is seen as critical of the church and, therefore, is not acknowledged. Passive indifference (the response of cosmopolitan universities) has its parallel here as an active failure to understand . . . denominations are seen by campus ministers as responding with a plaintive "Why did you do that? We don't understand." The church does not criticize specific acts of its campus clergy so much as it withholds specific approval. The church is not particularly critical of its campus ministry, but it does fail to understand why the campus ministry is critical of it.<sup>22</sup>

This factor provides for a split between campus clergy and parish pastors.

Furthermore, there is a rift between campus clergy and the laity in the parishes. Jeffrey Hadden, relying on and

---

<sup>22</sup>Hammond, p. 101.

broadening a later study by Hammond, accepts the observation that radical clergy in the church are co-opted out of the parish not only into campus ministry but also into administrative positions and other areas of specialized ministries with the result that parishes have remained static and have lacked creative and innovative ministry for today. Hadden says, "One of the critical conclusions of my own work is that the churches have been systematically isolating innovators from the parish, and hence from potential conflict with laity, for many years."<sup>23</sup> The laity are not led into new sensitivities, so the split between them and more liberal campus ministers is widened.

On top of this, Lyle Schaller, director of the Center for Parish Development in Naperville, Illinois, speaks of campus ministry as "the most divisive ministry in the 70's." He offers twelve reasons for the growing tension and concludes that if the church is to meet the needs of ten million young people by 1980, five assumptions require some semblance of acceptance. They are:

- A. Ministry must be identified and accepted as servanthood and not as control or subjugation or regimentation.
- B. The church cannot afford to retreat from any challenge to ministry simply because it threatens to be divisive.
- C. The persons financing ministry cannot always control the form of that ministry.

---

<sup>23</sup>Jeffrey K. Hadden, "The House Divided," in Underwood, II, 283.

- D. The campus ministry must be seen as more than a ministry to students; it must also be seen as an opportunity for students to minister to the world.
- E. There must be at least a tolerance, and preferably an open and affirmative acceptance, of diversity and pluralism in campus ministries and in all other expressions of the ministry of the church.<sup>24</sup>

Obviously these conditions are not currently being met in the churches, and so the split between campus ministry and parish ministry is presently very wide.

Yet, in the face of the current situation, this paper affirms the viable objective of campus ministry as a meaningful precursor for ministry in the whole church.

The divisive nature of their role became apparent for many campus clergy around the country when they experienced repercussions for attempting to minister responsibly within the disruptive atmosphere which exploded on their respective campuses in the 1969-1970 school year. The attempt to bridge the potentially dangerous gap between parish and campus ministry must be given priority; if it is not, misunderstanding of the campus ministry will become even greater among parish communities, the financial support of parishes will be lost, and the present gap will continue to grow and widen.

However, there is another, more important reason for placing a priority on this goal. The recent Danforth Study

---

<sup>24</sup>Lyle Schaller, "The Campus Ministry: The Most Divisive Ministry of the 70's," Event, II (January 1971), 6.

of Campus Ministries termed this ministry a "precursor" ministry. Rightly so, and especially so today.

The first attempt to justify this contention is centered in the changing university and its role in society. Ministry has always adjusted to and allowed itself to be formed by the environment within which it is situated. Only then can it be relevant. The university has changed in recent years, and so also the church in the university must adjust to its new situation.

The new university is best characterized by Clark Kerr, former president of the University of California, Berkeley, in his term "multiversity." He says that

The university is being called upon to educate a previously unimagined number of students; to respond to the expanding claim of national service; to merge its activities with industry as never before; to adapt<sup>25</sup> and rechannel new intellectual currents.

Though many criticisms can be leveled against Kerr's description of the new, transformed American university, it is true that today the university is no longer simply a detached community of masters and scholars in pursuit of knowledge. Today's university is central to and has tremendous effect upon society. Technological society is largely dependent upon the university for its expertise, its resources, and its trained technicians.

It follows, then, that the church in the university, must also reevaluate its relationship to its broader church society.

---

<sup>25</sup>Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), p. 86.



It is no longer a detached campus church. With a projected ten million college students by 1980, the parish church will also be somewhat dependent upon its precursor, campus ministry, if it desires to adapt its ministry to the emerging needs of this changing society.

The knowledge gained by campus ministry in relation to ecumenical relationships, shared facilities, new societal needs, sensitivities and emphases, viable worship experiences, and in struggling with pluralism or developing an operative sense of community, can be of great value to the surrounding church community as it seeks to minister for today. What is learned through experimentation, what is attempted because of available resources, what is evaluated as a mere passing fad or an emerging societal inadequacy or contemporary human need, can be of utmost value to the parish church seeking today to reevaluate and redirect part of its mission and ministry.

This is not to imply that campus ministry has some kind of exclusive rights to relevance, vision, and creative change. Neither does it say that campus ministry is a model for parish ministry. It simply recognizes the reality that many changes in society are experienced earlier at the university. It recognizes the possibility for campus ministry to become aware of these changes with the freedom and resources to relate to them. It recognizes the growing number of college students and graduates, many now residing at home, conspicuous by their absence from parish involvement.

The concept of campus ministry as precursor does not imply that the campus church has nothing to learn from the parish church. As the university must act in relation to and be informed by society, so the campus church must act in relation to and be informed by its larger church society. This interaction can be mutually profitable.

This may sound like unrealistic idealism. However, with creative effort on the part of the campus clergy and with the support and involvement of committed church leadership, fruitful attempts can be made to begin achieving portions of this goal. It calls for campus ministry to be, in fact, precursor. It calls for methods of communicating what it struggles with and attempts to learn. It calls for parish clergy to be willing to struggle together, receive, and attempt to implement what might be useful in their particular setting.

Kenneth Underwood, head of the ambitious Danforth Study of Campus Ministries, had visions of this same development. An unfinished paper at the time of his death stated: "There are emerging, in the midst of profound crisis over the direction and purpose of the ministry, the basic lines of march for fundamental reform. Campus ministry," he said, "reached a position in [their] histor[ies] when policies toward [them] can be formulated only within the context of the church's whole ministry to society." Underwood's hope was that campus

ministry can "offer substantive possibility for renewal and wholeness throughout the church's contemporary ministry."<sup>26</sup>

This ministry, if carried out, will be a divisive ministry. It will be difficult. It will involve criticism of the very institution that supports campus ministry as well as divisiveness for the parish pastor in relation to his parishioners. But this ministry can and needs to happen. The times are different. The university is different. The needs are different. Sensitivity on the part of the leadership of the church and campus ministry can result in meaningful structuring of new lines of communication and interpretation. This communication should be transmitted from the campus pastor to the parish pastor, and from the parish pastor to his parishioners. This would require greater lay training, education and involvement, a sensitized clergy, and the commitment of church leadership. If the new emerging role of the university in relation to society is taken seriously, if the number of college-going youth continues to grow as projected, then the church in the university needs to take seriously its new relationship to a broader segment of the church. For these reasons, this paper submits the promotion of this relationship as a worthy objective for campus ministry.

---

<sup>26</sup>Underwood, I, 345.

### Conclusion

The first two chapters of this study, with their survey of the past, provided more than a backdrop for the contemporary scene. History not only informs and places in perspective --it also provides an appreciation of the problems, struggles, and achievements of the past.

In retrospect it can be concluded that the LCMS was courageous and faithful to the Gospel in initiating campus ministry when and in the manner it did. Faced with limited resources, unable to draw upon past experience in campus ministry, enveloped by a latent antiintellectualism within its ranks, and inhibited by a climate of skepticism and suspicion on the part of the university community of that day, campus ministry in the LCMS did remarkably well to develop as quickly and substantially as it did. Though the methods and styles are in constant need of adjustment, the earlier developed objectives of conservation, training for Christian service, reclamation, soul-winning, and a ministry with a total campus impact are still important and necessary objectives for campus ministry today.

The other observation from history is the witness of the progression and development of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry. The early ministries did not embody all-inclusive concepts of campus ministry. Yet they grew and developed as ministry adjusted to the needs of the day and as understanding, both of ministry and the university, increased.

The section of the paper detailing the changing society, changing university, changing student, and changing church made obvious the unprecedented challenges for campus ministry today. Not to reckon with and relate to these changes would be to minister in a vacuum.

Again, the church being faithful to its past and committed to relevant ministry in the present, attempted to deal with this continual need of reevaluating and rearticulating the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry for the present at their consultation meeting. The last section of this paper is a continuation of their desire as it offers its own contemporary articulation.

This study becomes, then, an open-ended study. It has gathered together from the beginning to the present the LCMS understanding of the objectives and philosophy of its campus ministry. New emphases are offered. However, this in no way exhausts the areas of study and inquiry. The need for and the process of constant and continued reevaluation and articulation of the objectives and philosophy of campus ministry will be present as long as campus ministry exists. The challenge to the reader, the church, and campus ministry is to become part of and continue this process.

Appendix A  
"CLIMATE OF COMMONALITY" CONFERENCE

Consensus Statement

Chicago was the place; April 24-25, 1968, were the dates. Reuben W. Hahn and A. Henry Hetland had called an informal consultation on Lutheran campus ministry under the theme "The Climate of Commonality in Campus Ministry." Attending from the LC-MS were district campus ministry coordinators, some district mission executives and representatives from the national missions board. Attending from the NLCM were national staff and the Advisory Committee (local staff) on Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod Relationships.

Hahn and Hetland had appointed a task force which met the day before the consultation. The assignment to the task force was to produce a paper under the title "The Preferred Future Government of the Unified Lutheran Campus Ministry: Local and National But Especially Territorial Administration." Such a paper was produced. It was discussed in plenary sessions and in small groups. Following those discussions, the task force was instructed to bring a revised paper to the full consultation. This was done on the morning of the 25th. After discussion and amendments, the following document titled "Proposals Toward a Unified Lutheran Campus Ministry" was accepted as the expression of the assembled group.

This document has no official status whatsoever. It is, again, the expression of the assembled group and is addressed to the executive director of the NLCM, the secretary for campus ministry of the Department of Campus Ministry LC-MS and the executive secretary of the Division of Educational Services LCUSA. It is understood that these three persons may make use of this document as they see fit.

A. Roger Gobel  
Co-Chairman of Task Force

PROPOSALS TOWARD A UNIFIED LUTHERAN CAMPUS MINISTRY

In recognition of a "Climate of Commonality" that exists among the American Lutheran Church and Lutheran Church in America, acting in concert through the National Lutheran Campus Ministry, and The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, as exhibited in its resolution 3/20 regarding campus ministry (1967 New York Convention), we wish to state our common conception of the nature of campus ministry and to work toward a common ministry as soon as possible in accord with the fellowship of the respective church bodies.

I. The Nature of the Lutheran Campus Ministry

The Lutheran campus ministry should be:

- (a) Theologically, representative in its purpose and function of the centrality of the Christian Gospel as described in the Holy Scriptures and exhibited in the Lutheran Confessions.
- (b) Functionally, oriented to the academic community and institution in which it has its basic mission.
- (c) Structurally, in its normative form a community of Christians within the theological orientation mentioned above, who gather around and are nurtured by the regular proclamation of the Gospel and the celebration of the Sacraments, and who seek to live lives of service and witness.
- (d) Relationally, seeking to establish mutually helpful rapprochments with other Christian groups, and in rightful common causes with other groups.

II. The Field of the Campus Ministry

- A. The enterprise of higher education is manifest today in a variety of forms.

1. Primarily residential colleges and universities.
  2. Non-residential colleges and universities in urban settings.
  3. Community colleges, university branches and similar institutions.
  4. Institutes, technical and specialized schools.
- B. Various groups and kinds of persons are engaged in the enterprise of higher education.
1. Students, undergraduate and graduate
  2. Faculty
  3. Administrators
  4. Consultants and researchers
- N.B. Due to the increasing internationalization of higher education, substantial numbers of nationals from other countries can be found in each category.
- C. The total field needing Lutheran ministry today and in the future reaches far beyond the universities where we already have ministry. In order to establish an identifiable Lutheran ministry to the emergent educated society in America at its source, commitment to planning at all levels is needed to achieve:
1. Full-time Lutheran university ministries at 125 major institutions.
  2. A system of ministry (both professional and parish) in the educational systems serving urban concentrations.
  3. Enlistment of parish ministries to serve perhaps 2,000 smaller schools.

### III. Policy Formation

Campus ministry is one of the fields of church endeavor which is rapidly changing and on the basis of the past and present experience, we can predict that this situation will change more rapidly in the future. In response to this situation it is imperative that responsible officials, boards, and committees of the Lutheran church bodies and cognate agencies shall take into consideration the advice and counsel of professional campus ministry staff and responsible members of the academic community (student, faculty, and administration).

### IV. Strategies for a Lutheran Campus Ministry

#### A. A Model for a Future Unified Lutheran Campus Ministry

##### 1. Area Structures

- a. The jurisdictional units of the church bodies having proper interest in the campus ministry in a given area shall establish area committees.
- b. The membership of these committees will include both representatives of the respective jurisdictional units and representatives of local ministries or local coordinating committees.
- c. The area committees shall:
  - (1) Exercise supervision over existing campus ministries.
  - (2) Plan and implement future campus work.
  - (3) Approve the appointment of all local staff personnel. No church body will call a full-time campus pastor without consultation with and approval of the area committee.

(4) Serve as the agency by which church bodies provide funds to local campus ministries. The area committee will have jurisdiction over the deployment of such funds.

d. An "area" shall comprise a territory no smaller than a state or major metropolitan area.

## 2. Local Structures

### a. Full-time campus ministries

(1) There shall be a local directing committee.

(2) The organization and operation of the committee shall be provided for in guidelines consistent with the policies of campus ministry established by the area committee.

### b. Town-Gown Ministries

(1) In instances of medium-sized colleges where a full-time ministry is not practicable but yet a regular program of campus ministry must be established and maintained, the area committee shall establish a covenant relationship with a local congregation and pastor selected to provide the needed campus ministry.

(2) The covenant shall include the pledge by the congregation and its pastor to give high priority to campus ministry in their total program. Such congregations may request financial assistance from the area committee to fulfill the program.

### c. Contact ministries

(1) Where there are community colleges and/or junior colleges needing formal attention, the area committee shall cooperate with local congregations to develop a common approach to the institution in their midst.

(2) Where it is feasible, they should recognize one local pastor to serve as contact campus pastor.

(3) The contact campus pastor shall be in charge of on-campus programs and shall represent all participating Lutheran groups in relationship to the college administration.

3. In order that area and local structures may come into being in an orderly fashion and continue to function harmoniously with their counterparts in all sections of the three church bodies, there must now be national coordination and thus the NLCM and the Board of Missions, LC-MS, through the use of the good offices of LCUSA, should determine the most effective way of bringing about this coordination.

## B. Plan for Coordination of Present Lutheran Campus Ministries

### 1. Area Structures

a. The jurisdictional units of the church bodies having proper interest in the campus ministry in a given area shall establish area committees.

b. The membership of these committees will include both representatives of the respective jurisdictional units and representatives of local ministries or local coordinating committees.

c. Initially the area committees shall:

(1) Exercise responsibility for coordination of campus ministries.

(2) Supervise joint planning of future campus work.



(3) Review the appointment of all local staff personnel. No church body will call a full-time campus pastor without consultation with the area committee.

d. An "area" shall comprise a territory no smaller than a state or major metropolitan area.

2. Local Structures

a. Full-time campus ministries and town-gown ministries

(1) There shall be a local committee.

(2) The organization and operation of the committee shall be provided for in guidelines consistent with the policies of campus ministry established by the area committee.

b. Contact ministries

(1) Where there are community colleges and/or junior colleges needing formal attention, the area committee shall cooperate with local congregations to develop a common approach to the institution in their midst.

(2) Where it is feasible, they should recognize one local pastor to serve as contact campus pastor.

(3) The contact campus pastor shall be in charge of on-campus programs and shall represent all participating Lutheran groups in relationship to the college administration.

3. In order that area and local structures may come into being in an orderly fashion and continue to function harmoniously with their counterparts in all sections of the three church bodies, there must now be national coordination and thus the NLCM and the Board of Missions, LC-MS, through the use of the good offices of LCUSA, should determine the most effective way of bringing about this coordination.

V. Additional Concerns for Immediate Attention

Immediate attention must be given to the following:

A. Definition of purposes of the Lutheran Campus Ministry

B. Provision for conferences of full-time and part-time personnel

C. Abetting the formation of one national Lutheran student organization

D. Development of publications, training conferences and procedures for selection and placement of staff.

Adopted by Board for Missions - January 10-11, 1968  
Adopted in Revised Form by Board for Missions - 1970

Prepared and distributed as a service to the participants by

**National Lutheran  
CAMPUS MINISTRY**

130 North Wells Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

**Appendix B**

**A POSITION AND DIRECTIONAL STATEMENT  
ON CAMPUS MINISTRY  
(Revised Copy)**

**Outline**

**Part I - Background**

**Introduction**

**The Present Reality**

**Part II - Position & Directional Statement**

**Goals**

**Commitments**

**Responsibilities**

**Adopted by Board for Missions - January 10-11, 1969**

**Adopted in Revised Form by Board for Missions - March 7-8, 1969**

Part I - BackgroundIntroduction:

Lutheran Campus Ministry, both in The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and the National Lutheran Campus Ministry (ALC and LCA) is in a stage of transition and change. The knowledge explosion, growing campus population, student movements, etc., are a few signals of new life, greater opportunities and a new era for Lutheran Campus Ministry. A growing common understanding of the nature and scope of Lutheran campus ministry and a growing recognition and relationship between Lutheran Campus ministries are apparent and visible at all levels of The Lutheran Church and point to the need and possibility for a greater united Lutheran campus ministry in the future. New directions in coordination and united planning need to be found and fostered. The Board for Missions of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod faces increased responsibilities with the Lutheran Churches in America in the Lutheran Council of the USA for the emergence of an enlarged and strong Lutheran campus ministry for the 1970's. To this end the following is a position statement with directional resolutions to enable the Board for Missions of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod to faithfulness in Christ's mission in campus communities in the immediate years which lie before us.

The Present Reality -

The following "present realities" attempt to list some of the facts and factors which indicate the need and reason for a position and directional statement in campus ministry at this time by the Board for Missions of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

1. New York Convention Resolution "To Provide for Campus Ministry" (Res. 3-20 New York Convention Proceedings p. 101 & 102) and "Policy Statement on Campus Ministry" (appendix F. N.Y. Convention Workbook pp. 52-53) directed (a) the continuation of campus ministry as "the direct administrative responsibility of synodical districts" and (b) the development in and with LCUSA of "procedures toward assuring the coordinative and consultative functions of synodical campus work as soon as practicable."
2. A Lutheran Climate of Commonality in diverse campus situations and in varying degrees exists between LC-MS and NLCM Campus ministries in North America as expressed in:
  - a) "Proposals Toward a Unified Lutheran Campus Ministry" --a consensus statement developed in a Climate of Commonality Conference between LC-MS District Campus Coordinators and NLCM National and local staff representatives.
  - b) the position statements and resolutions of full time LC-MS Campus pastors at the October 23-26, 1968 Campus Ministry Consultation;

- c) the consultations and negotiation between Gamma Delta and LSAA moving to an all-Lutheran Student Movement and Organization and the resolutions of Board for Missions in this area:

Resolved, that the Board for Missions recognize the "Joint Planning Committee" as the committee designated for development of closer cooperation between Lutheran student groups (Gamma Delta and LSAA) on the college campus.

Resolved, that this action be communicated to the President of Gamma Delta and that the Secretary of Campus Ministry or a representative appointed by the Assistant Executive Secretary for Special Services will represent the Department of Campus Ministry on this committee." (March 2, 1968.)

Resolved, that we reaffirm our resolution of March 2, 1968, Minutes 119, informing the Board of Governors of Gamma Delta that our encouragement for Lutheran work is extended only to "closer cooperation between Lutheran student groups (GD and LSAA on the college campus" until such time that the Synod and the majority of District Mission Boards have voiced their position on any involvement beyond this point. (January 9-11, 1969.)

3. The Board for Missions of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod on June 28-29, 1968, requested the following services of LCUSA:
  - a) Publications treating matters of common interest in Campus Ministry.
  - b) National surveys and assessments of campus conditions and needs.
  - c) Preparation and distribution of annual comprehensive rosters and reports of Lutheran campus ministries carried out by the cooperating bodies at non-Lutheran institutions of higher learning.
  - d) Joint consultation and planning meetings for staff of co-operating bodies.
4. NLCM requested the identical services (3 above) of LCUSA in the fall of 1968.
5. The ALC and LCA have requested LCUSA to administer the entire operation of NLCM to become effective as soon as possible in 1969.
6. Various special services requested by NLCM and Board for Missions of The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod of LCUSA have been and are being implemented:

- a) Joint Directory of Lutheran Campus Ministries and Student Referral System - August, 1968.
  - b) Joint campus agency staff consultations - on a monthly basis since July, 1968.
  - c) Joint Campus Publication Project, January 1, 1969.
  - d) Joint Staff Conference, August, 1969.
  - e) Joint Staff Orientation Conference, 1969.
7. Coordinative and cooperative planning for Lutheran Campus Ministries with NLCM representatives has occurred and is continuing to occur in a growing number of districts, thus avoiding duplication of effort and resources.
8. A spirit of concerned cooperation with a genuine respect for differences in administration and polity is evident at all levels of inter-Lutheran consultation and planning for campus ministry.
9. a) In at least one District the discussion of Campus Ministry with NLCM representatives over a period of years has resulted in a completely coordinated campus program. Other Districts are currently studying this possibility.
- b) In other Districts, on the basis of comity arrangements, determinations for specific areas are made to establish only one Lutheran ministry on each campus. This single ministry is committed to serving all Lutheran students and faculty with Word and Sacrament.
- c) Where two Lutheran ministries exist on the same campus, new efforts are being made to reduce duplication. Relationships in such instances range from "very poor" to "very good." Coordinated and cooperative programming is happening in some places.
- d) Faced by a growing number of campuses and limited resources of money and manpower districts together with other Lutherans have wrestled with the problem of planning and development of new Lutheran campus ministries "without undue duplication or waste of resources" and yet being faithful to policy statements of the synod e.g., appendix F, N.Y. Convention W.B. p. 52-53. Some districts have been faced with a greater problem than others because of the great number of campuses in their geographic area. In these districts a policy statement of the former Commission on College and University Work no doubt was a meaningful guide. It stated:
- "When confronted with exceptional problems that extraordinary situations must be met in extraordinary ways and that one Lutheran body may well meet the needs of the other while the need exists."

## Part II - Position and Directional Statement

### Goals:

God gives the unity and continuity of campus ministry through the Gospel of Jesus Christ. This calls for a dependence upon the power and work of the Holy Spirit through the Word and Sacrament in God's people at all levels and in all areas of campus ministry. It demands of all who have been placed in positions of leadership in campus ministry a personal commitment to Jesus Christ and His mission as revealed in the Holy Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions.

On the basis of this confessional principle the Board for Missions, together with synodical districts as instruments of Christ's Mission in The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod shall be concerned with planning and policy development which reaches forward to the following priority of goals:

1. Growing worshipping, witnessing and ministering communities of Christ's Body in The Lutheran Church which recognize and manifest Christ's Mission in the uniqueness of each specific campus community in accordance with the Word of God, the Lutheran Confessions and the Mission Affirmations.
2. Organizational and administrative forms of campus ministry on the local, district, regional and national levels which enable facilitate and coordinate the diversity of Lutheran Campus ministries which the contemporary campus scene demands.

### Commitments;

In its work toward these goals the Board for Missions affirms its commitments -

1. To a Word and Sacrament centered Lutheran Campus Ministry that is (a) faithful to the Christian Gospel as it is revealed in the Holy Scriptures and affirmed in the Lutheran Confessions, and (b) oriented to the campus community in which it has its basic mission.
2. To a form of administration that allows continuation of the involvement of District Mission Boards of The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod in campus ministry in keeping with the spirit of the Mission Affirmations.
3. To forms of organization and administration for campus ministry that involve people in the planning and decision making process as close as possible to the place of action and ministry, e.g., local areas.
4. To the goal and task of coordinative and consultative planning of campus ministry with all Lutherans at all levels - local, district and jurisdictional, regional and national.

5. To the use of the document, "Proposals Toward A Unified Lutheran Campus Ministry" as a general guideline for the development of procedures for coordinative and consultative planning in ministry with other Lutherans at all levels.

Under IV "Strategies for a Lutheran Campus Ministry" it should be noted that there are two options "A" and "B". It is the consensus of the Board that option A has some very real polity problems for the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. Hence "B" under strategies for a Lutheran Campus Ministry is the more viable option as a general guideline.

#### Responsibilities:

Clarity in goals and commitments in campus ministry is necessary for cohesive leadership and balanced planning and programming of campus ministries in The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in the immediate future. Another necessary ingredient is interdependence of campus ministry leadership at all levels - local, district and national - with a clear understanding of responsibilities in planning, programming and policy development of campus ministry at every level. The following outlines responsibilities of the local, district and national levels:

#### I. Responsibilities at the local level

- A. Establishment and development of a Word and Sacrament centered Campus Ministry.
- B. Planning of Christian edification, witness and service program;
  - 1) which ministers to the special needs of Lutheran students and faculty;
  - 2) which reaches out to the non-Christians and the indifferent of all cultures in the campus community;
  - 3) which ministers to and with the structures of the college or university;
  - 4) which involves all Lutherans in the planning process;
  - 5) which recognizes other Christian campus ministries.
- C. Polity and practice that grows out of study of the Holy Scriptures, the Lutheran Confession and resolutions of the synod and district.
- D. Consultation with district and synodical leadership in campus ministry in major plans for personnel, facilities and program as well as extra-ordinary decisions in polity and practice.
- E. Regular reports and/or interpretation of the local campus ministry program to the district.
- F. Procedures for adequate responsibility records and files.
- G. Budget development and control in consultation with District Board responsible for campus ministry.

**II. Responsibilities at the district level.**

**A. Administrative procedures which -**

- 1) involve campus personnel in the planning and decision making process of the district in the area of campus ministry.
- 2) provide adequate counsel and aid for the development of effective campus ministries;
- 3) coordinate the many types of campus ministries in the district;
- 4) utilize the staff resources of the synod and LCUSA.

**B. Policies and procedures which provide for -**

- 1) coordinated planning of campus ministries with other Lutherans in the geographic area of responsibility of the district that initiates new ministries, strengthens existing ministries and avoids duplication of effort and resources;
- 2) adequate staffing in campus ministries utilizing the personnel data available from the office of the Secretary for Campus Ministry of the Board for Missions;
- 3) in-service training and conferences for --
  - a) full-time campus pastors in coordination with the Board for Missions;
  - b) part-time campus pastors of the district;
  - c) campus contact pastors of the district.
4. Operating and capital funds for campus ministries.

**C. Interpretation of District Campus Ministries to the constituency of the district.**

**D. Reports and information on the operation and development of district campus ministries to the Secretary of Campus Ministry of the Board for Missions.**

**III. Responsibilities at the synodical level (Board for Missions)**

**A. National policies in campus ministry which sensitize, facilitate and coordinate districts in -**

- 1) development of campus ministry in every district;
- 2) recruitment, pre-service training and in-service training of campus pastors;



3) Planning district campus ministries -

- a) new ministries:
- b) experimental ministries;
- c) shaping old ministries.

4) Organization and Administration of campus ministry.

B. Provide the following resources for districts:

- 1) National Campus Ministry Staff for consultation and planning (field service).
- 2) National Studies on Campus Ministry.
- 3) National Publications for Lutheran Campus Ministries.
- 4) National and/or Regional Campus Ministry Conferences.
- 5) Campus Personnel Data.
- 6) Pre-Service and In-Service Training for full-time campus pastors.
- 7) Budget Funds, if needed.

C. Represent the concerns and needs of campus ministries of all districts in national consultations (Lutheran and others) and communicate national directions and actions to districts.

D. Involvement through its staff (Secretary for Campus Ministry and others so designated) with National Lutheran Campus Ministry Staff (ALC and LCA) in LCUSA in ongoing study, planning and developmental processes which -

- 1) Develop and shape common services (publication, conferences, etc.) that enable and strengthen Lutheran Campus ministries at all levels;
- 2) Develop national procedures in campus ministry that help give direction to local, district and regional campus leadership in the expansion and coordination of Lutheran Campus Ministry;
- 3) Develop position papers in Lutheran campus ministry that help National Lutheran Church Bodies in developing necessary national policies for campus ministry, e.g., world dimensions of campus ministry, ecumenical relations, every congregation's involvement in campus ministry, student movements, ministry to and with university structures, etc.

- E. Represent policies and concerns of the Board for Missions in the areas of campus ministries to overseas churches and missions and to contribute positively to more effective Lutheran witness in the world-wide campus ministries, at the same time communicating experiences and insights of those involved in campus ministries overseas to the church in North America.

Adopted by Board for Missions - January 10-11, 1969  
Adopted in Revised Form by Board for Missions March 7-8, 1969.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. Primary Sources

Armed Services Commission of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. "Statement of Agreement Between the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod and the National Lutheran Council." St. Louis, 1951. (mimeographed)

Board for Missions of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. "Consultation on Campus Ministry: Reports and Findings." St. Louis, 23-26 October 1968. (mimeographed)

Commission on College and University Work of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. "Campus Pastors Workbook, 1946-1965." Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis. (mimeographed)

Commission on College and University Work of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. The Ministry to International Students (booklet). Chicago: Commission on College and University Work, n.d.

Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. Convention Proceedings. [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1923-1971].

Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. Convention Workbook. [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1923-1971].

Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. The Statistical Yearbook. [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1938-1971].

Lutheran Student, I-II (1925-1926).

Lutheran Witness, XXXIX-LXXXVII (1920-1968), passim.

University Pastors Conference (also referred to as Student Workers Conference, Student Pastors Conference, and Campus Pastors Conference) of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod. Minutes, 1936-1968. Concordia Historical Institute, St. Louis.

### B. Secondary Sources

Ambrose, Haydn W. The Church in the University. Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson Press, 1968.

- Barzun, Jacques. The American University. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Beta Sigma Psi (brochure). St. Charles, Mo.: 1970.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. "The Anatomy of Academic Discontent," Change, I (May/June 1969), 18-26.
- Bloy, Myron B., editor. Community on Campus. New York: Seabury Press, 1971.
- Brubacker, John S., and Willis Rudy. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.
- Buttler, Richard. God on the Secular Campus. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1963.
- Camus, Albert. The Myth of Sisyphus. Translated by J. O'Brien. New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1955.
- The Rebel. Translated by Anthony Bower. New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1956.
- Chamberlin, Gordon J. Churches and the Campus. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Dennis, Lawrence E., and Joseph E. Hauffman. The College and the Students. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.
- Diegel, Andrea. "The Movement." Paper submitted to the Directing Committee of Lutheran University Ministry, Baltimore, Md. 1 October 1969.
- Ellul, Jacques. The Technological Society. Translated by John Wilkinson. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.
- Erikson, Erik H. Identity, Youth, and Crisis. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1968.
- Insight and Responsibility. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1964.
- Evans, David M. Shaping the Church's Ministry with Youth. Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson Press, 1965.
- Ferkiss, Victor C. Technological Man: The Myth and the Reality. New York: George Braziller, 1969.
- Fields, Wilbert. Inter-Nos, February 1971.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. The Great Gatsby. Scribner Library. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

- Foster, Julian and Durwood Long, editors. Protest: Student Activism in America. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1970.
- Fromm, Erich. Escape From Freedom. New York: Avon Books, 1941.
- . The Revolution of Hope: Toward a Humanized Technology. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.
- Gartner, Mike. "The Silent Generation Meets the Class of 1970," Saturday Review, 15 August 1970, pp. 52-53.
- Gerzon, Mark. The Whole World is Watching. New York: Viking Press, Paperback Library, 1969.
- Gilkey, Langdon. "Religion and the Secular University," Dialog, VIII (Spring 1969), 108-116.
- Goldman, Eric. The Crucial Decade. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.
- . Rendezvous with Destiny. New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1956.
- Goodman, Paul. New Reformation. New York: Random House, 1970.
- . People or Personnel and Like a Conquered Province. New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1968.
- Hadden, Jeffrey K. The Gathering Storm in the Churches. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Anchor Books, 1970.
- Hahn, Reuben. "A Time of Transition," Mission Memo: Campus Ministry, May 1968.
- Hammond, Phillip E. The Campus Clergyman. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Hoffman, Nicholas von. The Multiversity. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966.
- Horn, Henry E. Lutherans in Campus Ministry. Chicago: National Lutheran Campus Ministry, [1970].
- Jarrett, James. "College Students--The New Breed," The Aim of Higher Education: Social Adjustment or Human Liberation? Edited by Ronald E. Barnes. St. Louis: UMHE/UCCF Publications, 1966. Pp. 3-5.
- Jenks, Christopher, and David Riesman. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Anchor Books, 1969.

- Katz, Joseph, and Others. No Time for Youth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.
- Kauffman, Joseph F. The Student in Higher Education. New Haven, Conn.: The Hazen Foundation, 1968.
- Keniston, Kenneth. "Faces in the Lecture Room," Yale Alumni Magazine, XXIX (April 1966), 20-34.
- Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Lippman, Walter. A Preface to Morals. New York: Time, Inc., 1929.
- Lueker, Erwin. Change and the Church. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1969.
- Lutheran Quarterly, XXI (August 1969).
- Marcuse, Herbert. An Essay on Liberation. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.
- One Dimensional Man. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.
- McDonald, Donald. "Youth," Center Magazine, III (July/August 1970), 22-33.
- McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. New York: New American Library, Signet Book, 1969.
- McLuhan, Marshall, and Quentin Fiore. The Medium is the Massage. New York: Bantam Books, 1967.
- McLuhan, Marshall, Quentin Fiore and Jerome Agel. "The Medium is the Massage." Produced by John Simon. New York, Columbia Records, CBS Inc., Columbia Label--CS 9501.
- Minneman, Charles E., editor. Students, Religion and the Contemporary University. Ypsilanti, Mich.: Eastern Michigan University Press, 1970.
- Moberly, Sir Walter. The Crisis in the University. London: SCM Press, 1949.
- National Commission of United Ministries in Higher Education. "Directions and Priorities, 1971-1972." Valley Forge, Pa., 1971. (mimeographed)
- Newfield, Jack. A Prophetic Minority. New York: New American Library, Signet Book, 1966.

- Norden, Rudolph. "Lutheran Campus Work," Concordia Historical Quarterly, XXX (Fall 1957), 111-115.
- Rogan, Donald L. Campus Apocalypse: The Student Search Today. New York: Seabury Press, 1969.
- Roszak, Theodore. The Making of a Counter Culture. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Anchor Books, 1967.
- Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1962.
- Sanford, Nevitt. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.
- Sanford, Nevitt, editor. The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962.
- Schaller, Lyle. "The Campus Ministry: The Most Divisive Ministry in the 70's," Event, II (January 1971), 2-6.
- Shalnik, Jerome H. The Politics of Protest. New York: Ballantine Books, 1969.
- Smith, G. Kerry, editor. Stress and Campus Response. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.
- Snyder, Ross. Young People and Their Culture. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1969.
- Theobald, Robert, editor. Dialogue on Technology. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1967.
- Underwood, Kenneth, editor. The Church, the University and Social Policies. 2 vols. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1969.
- U.S. Bureau of Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1971. 92d edition. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.
- Wald, George. "A Generation in Search of a Future," Vital Speeches of the Day, 15 April 1969, pp. 410-413.
- Walsh, Chad. Campus Gods on Trial. New York: Macmillan Company, 1953.
- "What's Going on Inside America--Chapter 2," U.S. News & World Report, 25 May 1970, pp. 17-23.
- Wolff, Robert Paul. The Ideal of the University. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.