The Future and Campus Ministry

By Erwin R. Bode

PROLOGUE

In the summer of 1981 it was my privilege to engage in a nine-week study leave to reflect on the future—the future of the world, the future of higher education, the future of campus ministry and the role of the Indiana Office of Campus Ministry, and my place in those accumulated futures.

It was a rare learning experience and the most intense educational opportunity I have had since leaving seminary twenty years ago.

The basic methods of the study leave were:
reading
interviews
workshops
conferences
writing and personal reflections.

I have subtitled this paper a report of my "65 day learning odyssey" because the word "odyssey" means an intellectual or spiritual wandering or quest. These 65 days are a part of the life-long learning odyssey or pilgrimage of Erv Bode.

In the first entry in my journal I wrote: "These 65 days will hopefully consist of fragments which I hope will build on each other and together make a corporate sound that nurtures me personally for the years ahead, and nurtures, too, those with whom I work and live." The writing of this paper has been invaluable to me for piecing together that corporate impression.

Although I had a planning design for the nine-week period, I sought to be open to the Spirit's leading as events unfolded before me. For example, Cos Rubencamp of the Virginia Campus Ministry Forum took me to the University of Virginia early one morning before an all-day campus ministry meeting in Charlottesville. As a result of that visit to Thomas Jefferson's University, I explored at length the educational contributions of Jefferson and their implications for our time.

Another serendipitous event was an "ah-ha!" moment in a National Training Laboratories workshop with Ed Lindaman and Ron Lippitt when they stated that the future religious leader will be a rare combination of "mystic" and "systems engineer." This revelation has led me into reading biographies of mystics such as Thomas Merton and Teilhard de Chardin, as well as a great deal of reflection about Christian leadership of the future.

I am especially grateful to Sue Bradshaw for allowing me to use her faculty carrel at Marian College during the summer; to Jo Bode, whose efficiency in the office during this period freed me of the daily office workings; to the countless individuals with whom I spoke and from whom I learned; to the members of the IOCM Advisory Commission and the Indiana Council of Churches for granting me the sabbatical; to Robert Lynn for encouraging me to first dream, and then plan this experience; and to the Lilly Endowment for making it financially possible as part of the IOCM Long-range Planning grant.

What follows are key ideas that emerged in the nine-week period. In no way are they meant to be inclusive, but they are themes I want to share with you. If they stimulate your thoughts and produce dialogue for you the reader, then I will have accomplished my purpose for writing this brief paper.

TO PONDER

"There is no riskless route into the future; we must choose which set of risks we wish to run." Robert Theobald

"We have an interval and then our place knows us no more. Our only chance lies in expanding that interval and getting as many pulsations as possible in a given time." Walter Pater

(from the Journal of Erv Bode, August 9, 1981: "I visited this morning the church that I served in Boston as a student 20 years ago. I was perceived as part of the old history by the current young minister. Only three or four of the worship participants really remembered me. The sands close quickly over my steps.")

"We do not inherit the world from our parents. We borrow it from our children." The Values Party of New Zealand

"The changes ahead in the human system will be even greater than what we have witnessed so far." Aurelio Peccei

"We live in the present in the light of the future. Change is biting at our heels and it forces us to skip ahead. As we forge ahead our question is, 'Where are we going?', 'Where do we want to go?' " Edward Lindaman

I. THE FUTURE

Introduction

We live in a time of radical change. Some writers refer to it as an "age of transition," others to a "time of transformation." Whatever the title, the implications are that we have left the moorings of an old order and that a new society is begging to be born.

In her book, **The Aquarian Conspiracy,** Marilyn Ferguson says that in such a moment our society is struggling to be remade, not just mended.

My observation is that there is a great desire by many in the early 80's to push forward with the new, and at the same moment, others are wishing to hold desperately to the old. Most of us are in the middle, willing to search after a new risky future, yet clinging to what we have known from a previous time.

What follows are the particularities, as I see them, of this new order (as they apply to the worlds of higher education and campus ministry).

A. **A new communications era is dawning.**

The 80's and 90's are the beginning of a communications era and the demise of our predominance with industrial growth. Edward Lindaman[1] reports that in 1980, 65% of all U.S. workers are in the communications industry. We are entering a time of staggering growth in knowledge and the ability to disseminate it. We witnessed, for example, the Prince Charles and Lady Diana wedding this summer with 500 million people from 50 countries.

This is not to suggest that industry and agriculture will vanish, but the dominant sector in which energy will be placed in the last two decades of the 20th century will be the communications sector.

The Annenberg Project in this country has recently been initiated with a $150 million gift to explore the use of telecommunications in education. Interestingly, I.U. President John Ryan is a member of the Council overseeing the work of this new venture. 2,200 Educational computer terminals are already being utilized by the State of Minnesota.

The number of teleconferencing users will increase fourfold in the year 1981. The cost of video conferencing (which means persons being in different locations and yet in conference with each other through the use of video media) is now comparable to travel for a one-day meeting. The prediction is that 25% of the Fortune 500 companies will possess full video teleconference capability by 1985.

My mind runs rampant as I think about the implications of all this for organizations like the Indiana Office of Campus Ministry. Geographically dispersed groups throughout the state will be able to regularly exchange information and opinions without physically being in the same room. By the late 1980's such new directions will be rampant among us.

Edward Lindaman believes we will become a nation of "computer campfires." I like that imagery. The campfire suggests an intimacy we have always considered possible only in face-to-face conversation. Increasingly we will have opportunities to complement our face-to-face discussions with conversations throughout our state . . . and our world via computers and satellites.

B. Educational reform is imperative.

On the wall beside my desk this summer have been two quotes. The first is by Robert K. Greenleaf:[2] "The good design of education is to **excite,** rather than to pretend to satisfy an ardent thirst for information; and to **enlarge** the capacity of the mind, rather than to store it with knowledge, however useful."

The second quote is by David Allan Hubbard:[3] "The power of an educational institution is to seize and shape the **spirit** of its young."

What a high calling for education! The question to be raised is, "Why is there such a gap between the intent of education and its actuality (whether in the university or the church)?" As Robert Bellah, Chairman of the Department of

Sociology, University of California at Berkeley, said to us at the National Campus Ministry Association Conference in August: "The secular university today is a controlling, aggressive, dominating, and lifeless environment."

To illustrate the problem, it is stated in the important 1980 study, "Three Thousand Futures: The Next 20 Years in Higher Education" (a report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education): **"Excellence** was the theme in higher education in the 1960's and 1970's; in the 1980's and the 1990's it will be pure **survival."**[4]

Here, on the one hand, is the great promise of education as caught in the two quotes. On the other hand, due to financial restrictions and student enrollment shortages, the institutions responsible for education are fighting for their very existence. What does higher education do? How does campus ministry relate to the university in these times?

One possibility for the university is to retrench and to stick its head in the sand. Robert Greenleaf suggests this is indeed what is happening when he says, "What is missing in the university today is a strong conceptual stance. In many ways the university resembles the railroads. Nearly everybody in administration was busy running the railroad day-to-day. Not enough able and well-placed people were thinking about the problems of railroads and the future contingencies."[5]

A second option, however, is that reform of the university is possible in the immediate decades ahead.

Parker Palmer suggests such an alternative when he says, "We need to call the university to contemplation and to remind it of its own tradition. The precurser of the university was the monastery, and in its earliest years the university had a monastic vocation to transmit knowledge of the sacredness of life, to channel the spiritual formation of individuals and whole cultures."[6]

Martin Marty has been extremely helpful to me to point to such a direction when he says, "I think there has to be a vision for a good university. The university does not exist for transmission for what is settled in a culture. It should rather treat everything as problematic. The best thing we can do for people is to teach them how to face contemporary problems. Locate them, define them, and begin to address

them. We can always pick up the necessary skills later."[7] He is speaking, of course, about issues of society such as war and peace, prejudice, and hunger.

This is the kind of educational vision I feel is necessary for the 80's and 90's.

It was encouraging this summer to listen to Dr. Harold Shane, Indiana University Professor of Education, enthusiastically describe the work of I.U.'s Futures Research and Education Development Committee. The task of F.R.E.D. is to look at futuring issues in Indiana University in the coming decades and to make a report to the I.U. Board of Trustees in the spring of '82.

From my interviews, reading, and reflection this summer, reform in the university seems to lead into these paths:

1. The university is in great need of providing a greater degree of **experiential** learning.

Research has shown that 85% of the population learns best from experience and has trouble with abstract concepts, yet abstract concepts still dominate university curricula. As Elise Boulding says, "It is possible today to feel educated with nothing but second hand knowledge. We lack first-hand terrain knowledge, and we are abstract. Reform in the design of education to include the experiential dimension is crucial."[8]

2. Learning needs to be **participative.**

Learning is not being spoon-fed by a teacher into the mouth of students to be regurgitated back to the professor. Robert Theobald says, "Most of higher education is still based on the assumption that somebody (the teacher, administrator) is needed to make choices for the student, and that young people will make too many mistakes if they determine their own directions."[9]

3. Learning needs to be **dialogical.**

One of the intriguing paths of my sabbatical experience, as I stated in the prologue, has been to reflect on the educational process of Thomas Jefferson. What struck me as I did so was that much of his early critical learning happened through conversations with two teachers at William and Mary who also brought him into frequent dialogue with the Governor of Virginia. The four would spend evenings at the Gover-

nor's mansion talking about the affairs of the world. Much later in his life when he designed the campus of the University of Virginia, Jefferson intentionally placed the students in close proximity to the faculty residences. He knew that the educational process demanded close communication between faculty and student.

4. Learning needs to be **life-long.**

The biography of Jefferson is fascinating at this point. When he was Minister to France in his 40's he travelled widely and broadened his knowledge of many subjects, especially his learning in architecture and farming. At the age of 65, after retiring from the Presidency of the United States, he spent the next 17 years pursuing his various interests, entertaining friends, and carrying on an immense correspondence. It was during this retirement period that he created the University of Virginia. He organized the curriculum, hired the faculty, selected the library books, drew the plans for the buildings, and supervised the construction of the campus. He was a life-long learner.

Opportunities for contemporary life-long learning need to be greatly expanded in the 80's and 90's.

5. Learning needs to be **holistic.**

Harlan Cleveland of the Hubert Humphrey School at the University of Minnesota says that "what we need today are people in higher education who understand the whole system. Not people who specialize, but persons who work interdependently and integratively. We need to get a sense of the whole and where each person's part fits in. We need breadth as a complement to our depth of individual disciplines. We need reflective leaders who think about the whole canvas while painting their own part of it."[10]

Once more I think of Jefferson who refused to grant degrees in his new university. He said that students should have great latitude to study what they chose—a freedom based on the premise that specialization had to be related to the whole of knowledge.

6. Learning needs to be focused in **problem-solving.**

Educators and students need to be problem-solvers in the coming decades through bringing together different disciplines

to address current world issues. A good example of this approach to learning is an organization called Forum Humanum. An international project of a Swiss foundation, it supports teams of people in their 20's and 30's to work presently on global issues that will be with us beyond the year 2000.

A suggested problem-solving curriculum might have these themes:

     A. planet
     B. nuclear proliferation
     C. cancer
     D. inflation
     E. global interdependence

The participants in the 1980 Three Thousand Futures Carnegie Study said it this way: "By the year 2000 we have some new business in higher education—to identify the most productive areas for new research such as sources of energy and preservation of the environment, and shifting resources to them and prosecuting them actively."[11]

7. Learning needs to be **anticipatory.**

In "No Limits to Learning," an international report to the Club of Rome edited by James Botkin, it is stated that future learning must anticipate and work toward a preferred future for individuals and societies. Such a style was the main theme of the five-day NTL Futuring workshop in which I participated in August at Bethel, Maine. We were intentionally designing the kind of world we preferred for 1990, and planning concrete steps to achieve that goal.

These seven points and their overlapping of each other are the major directions for educational reform in the 80's as I see it.

C. A values revolution is before us.

A dominant theme of my 65 day pilgrimage was the growing awareness on my part of the urgency to develop a new value orientation in the 1980's. Values which today are widely held are actually becoming threats to our future well-being. We have to evolve a new social ethic. The problem is that relatively few universities, or churches for that matter, have programs where students can acquire practice in making ethical choices, especially if those choices call existing values into question.

An intriguing exercise I did in the NTL Futuring Workshop in Bethel, Maine, was to envision flying on a magic carpet, looking down on the world of 1990. The following images emerged as I did so. I placed them in the present tense as if they had already occurred.

1. There is a de-emphasis on materialism; the GNP has been laid to rest as the supreme goal in life.[12]

2. A voluntary simplicity ethic has emerged. We are avoiding clutter and are focusing our energy on what really matters.

3. Spirituality is on the rise and persons are open to the learnings of both eastern and western religions.

4. There is an international disarmament commission with nations meeting regularly and with intention. Nuclear weapons are frozen.

5. Third and fourth world nations are feeling a part of the world community and are respected by the U.S., U.S.S.R., Europeans, Japanese, and the Chinese.

6. The distribution of food and world hunger is creatively being addressed.

7. A stewardship ethic prevails concerning the environment. In fact, environmentalists and industrial leaders are problem-solving together.

8. The minorities—blacks, youth, women, etc.—are participating actively and meaningfully in the whole American fabric.

9. People again feel rooted in their primary community. Yet they have a vision and affirmation of the world community.

10. There is excitement and anticipation about the year 2000. And there is laughter again.

When I asked Dr. Harold Shane of Indiana University the question, "What is the greatest learning for you personally about your conversations with the 132 scholars throughout the world?", he answered, "Their unanimity on the need for a transition to a new set of values by the year 2000!"

I realize such a value revolution, particularly as I have outlined it in my 1990 exercise, seems Pollyannish and naive and unrealistic. However, unless we encourage each other in these directions, the future of our world does indeed seem

questionable. For in the 80's and the 90's we are indeed walking a tightrope between global progress and global catastrophe.

Edward Lindaman keeps saying that what we have to do is describe our **preferred** future and then work toward it. And the future I am preferring will require planting seeds toward a new value orientation in our world.

D. A new kind of religious leader is needed.

Robert Greenleaf states, "A mark of a leader is that he/she is better than most at pointing to the right direction."[13] "Not much happens in any organization without a dream, and the leader must shape that dream."[14] "Able leaders are usually sharply awake and reasonably disturbed."[15]

Greenleaf is speaking of leadership in general, but I believe his wisdom points a direction for the peculiar needs of religious leadership in the 1980's. My assessment is that the following leadership characteristics need to emerge in the 80's. In some cases they are timeless traits that require rededication.

1. We need Christian leaders who "know" God—who experience God and who carry with them the aura of spiritual wisdom.

There is enough competence and expertise in professional ministry to last a millennium, but there are few persons who "know" and can teach others to "know." Rabbi Abraham Heschel said a few years ago, "For 50 years you Christians have had an ecumenical movement, a liturgical recovery, a biblical rebirth, and a theological recovery . . . but I have not seen a trace of spiritual recovery."[16] Very few of us seem to think and live integratively and with a strong sense of an ethical futuristic direction.

For me the most profound speaker at the National Campus Ministry Association (NCMA) Conference at San Francisco in August was Jacob Needleman, Professor of Philosophy and Religion at San Francisco State. During the past five years he has been interviewing Christian leaders throughout the world and inquiring of them their own spiritual development. His assessment is that there is a great dichotomy in the Christian community between religion and spirituality. He defines religion as liturgy, social action, and the organizational life of the Church. In these areas the international

Christian community seems to be doing fairly well. On another level—the level of spirituality—he states that Christian leaders and the Church seem to be floundering. Needleman believes there is a spiritual quest among people in the West that is all-pervasive and widespread in the 1980's. Unfortunately, the Church, and particularly the clergy, do not appear to be comfortable in the area of spirituality and mysticism. Therefore, the primary need of people in the West is not being addressed by the Christian community. We desperately need Christian leaders who "know" God and who can teach others "to know."

2. We need religious leaders who are passionate.

Robert Rankin states: "When Christians in the university (campus ministers, teachers, and administrators) are passionate for the recovery of spirit in higher education, they CAN convert the climate of an academic institution from the fetid atmosphere of a suffocating imprisonment to the open and fresh air of intellectual and spiritual freedom."[17]

3. We need spiritual leaders who are participative.

It is a curious fact that ultimate authority is given to the leader who enables participation of the group members. In my long conversation with David Rich, Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Commission for United Ministries in Higher Education, he kept using the term of "orchestra conductor" to describe his leadership role. By this he means he leads PA/UMHE by encouraging the local campus ministry units and the state commission to work together . . . to create music, if you will. My interviews with his constituency suggest that his intention is a reality.

Roy Amara, Director of the Institute for the Future (located in Menlo Park, California) says that future leadership will be "steering" rather than "driving."

4. We need leaders who are both visionary and inordinately practical.

The new leader is able to choose goals and objectives, question assumptions, extend ranges of alternatives, and deliver concrete actions.

5. We need Christian leaders who live holistically and think futuristically.

The religious leader will live in the present in the light of the future, and in order to do that, must possess a holistic

approach to life. An intriguing dimension of Ed Lindaman's life is that universities have granted him three honorary degrees—one in the humanities, another in science, and a third in theology. That is an external recognition of an internal integration which holistic spiritual leaders possess.

6. The spiritual leader of the 80's will model the values revolution I described earlier (Section C).

This person is uniquely able to lead the communities of higher education and the church into a radical value shift and enable others to participate in it. For example, at the August San Francisco NCMA conference I met campus ministers from South Dakota and Portland, Oregon who are already living this new value life style.

In summary, I am suggesting that there is a critical need for a new kind of Christian leader. Ed Lindaman stated it most succinctly for me (as stated in this paper's prologue) when he said that leadership in the next two decades will be given to people who are both "mystics" and "systems engineers." On the one hand, the leader is comfortable with the mysteries of life, acknowledges the unknown, and trusts feelings and intuition. At the same time, the leader must be comfortable with tasks and facts, takes a job and does it, and tackles a problem and finds a solution.[18]

It is nothing short of a new paradigm I am suggesting, and there are only traces of this future direction among us. In fact, it is extremely difficult to point to present models of such leadership today. Both detachment and involvement are necessary; both distance and participation are essential.

II. CAMPUS MINISTRY IN THE 80's
A. Campus ministries have distinguishing markings.

In speaking to the NCMA conference, Robert Bellah said, "Campus ministry in the 80's needs to be a presence that offers alternatives to the present utilitarian, despairing, and secular scene. We need your witness in our profoundly alien world, which seems to have an empty soul."

In order for us to do that, we must possess the following characteristics:

1. Our ministries need to be well-defined.

The task of the Indiana Office of Campus Ministry long-range planning is a tedious one, but it is an example of what

every local campus ministry needs to do. Goals and objectives of a ministry must be clear. After five and a half years of experience in a statewide campus ministry office, it is my firm belief that an effective ministry is one that knows where it is going, and has a strategy for accomplishing its purpose.

2. The campus ministry must be led by a creative staff.

I have come to dogmatically believe that the most important decision a local board makes is the hiring of their campus minister(s). Staff spiritual leadership, as I have defined it in an earlier section (Section D) must be evident in order for the campus ministry to be faithfully and creatively implemented. After spending a day with the leaders of the Pennsylvania Commission of United Ministries in Higher Education I wrote: "David Rich, the fulltime director of PA/UMHE, is crucial to the life of the Commission. The success of the Commission in its new areas of work is in large measure due to the person and skill of its leader." Everywhere I visited local campus ministries the same marking is clear. A creative staff makes possible a dynamic campus ministry.

3. A further marking of a distinguished campus ministry is that it is comfortable with working "on the margins."

Campus ministry is "in" but not "of" the worlds of the local church and higher education. Furthermore, it is forever financially in doubt and will continue to be so. An invigorating "living by faith" style will always be inherent in the warp and woof of successful campus ministries.

4. A fourth mark of a distinguished campus ministry is that it has an effective methodology for building bridges to the university and to local churches in the community.

In the 1980's campus ministries cannot exist with an islands mentality, and need to effectively relate to the institutions of the university and the local church. Linkages must continually be built between people in the university and the campus ministry, as well as between clergy and laity of the local churches and the campus ministry.

5. Finally, a contemporary distinguished campus ministry will include volunteers in a meaningful way in the ministry.

Due to the economic realities of the 80's it is imperative that volunteers be an integral part of the ministry. In some instances, volunteers will supplement the work of the fulltime staff; in others they will be the staff. In either case, they are crucial to its life and witness.

Whatever success the Indiana Office of Campus Ministry has enjoyed these past five years has been due in large part to its volunteer leadership. Every local campus ministry requires the same kind of involvement in this decade.

Ronald Lippitt, a founder of the National Training Laboratories (NTL), said to us this summer at the Futuring Conference in Maine, that "the volunteer movement will be THE direction for the human services field in the 1980's." His encouraging note is that he believes it is already happening throughout the western part of our world.

B. **The campus minister's role is changing.**

1. The campus minister will nurture both the subcommunities and the total community of the university.

In the recently published campus ministry study entitled **The Recovery of the Spirit in Higher Education,** edited by Robert Rankin of the Danforth Foundation, the contributing authors make a strong case for the recovery of Christian community within the university through the campus minister offering opportunities for contemplation, social action projects, and called-out faith communities. Basically, they believe the need is for small cell-like groups of Christians to gather for liturgical celebration, spiritual discipline, and action projects.

In addition, however, the campus minister also needs to remind the university of its own vision—its own genius. The signals of the late 70's and early 80's seem to indicate an unalterable fragmentation in the university. But there is in the midst of all that fragmentation a vision of the total university, however dimly perceived it is at the moment.

Someone has to remind the university to seek after that overarching vision. In my opinion the person most likely to have the freedom to do so is the campus minister. We do not have the vested interest that other members of the academic community live by. Robert Parsonage of the National Council of Churches says that our uniqueness as campus ministers is our "dispensibility" to the university, and that really makes us

"indispensible." We are in a position to remind the total university of its own mission and calling. Obviously, that requires a good deal of analysis and reflection on our part.

Grasping the vision of the whole **IS** an extremely difficult task. Emilio Conti, Executive Secretary of the World Student Christian Fellowship (WSCF), illustrated this elusiveness by referring to the difficulty of finding an overarching **Christian** vision for the world student movement. He said to us at the NCMA Conference that "the big issue facing WSCF is to find a common vision among all of the Christian communities of Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, and Latin America."

"Each section of the world," Conti says, "is so distinct with its own needs and problems."

And the same is true for the university. The forces of specialization and special interests mitigate against a common purpose. Yet I believe it is crucial that the university community has a common vision, and that campus ministers serve as a catalyst in its development.

A second changing role for the campus minister of the 80's is their resourcing of local congregations in student ministry.

I have felt this for some time through my work with IOCM, and this hunch has been substantiated through my sabbatical travels to other campus ministries in the country.

Jim MacDonald of the Wesley Foundation of the University of Virginia told me that most of the new Methodist campus ministers in Virginia have as a part of their job description a responsibility to help local congregations with their student ministries.

In the 1979 "plan for ministry in higher education," adopted by the Pennsylvania Commission of United Ministries in Higher Education, a high priority is the development of student ministries in local congregations.

Campus minister J. Springer, in his work in northeast Pennsylvania, has been assisting local congregations in raising issues about the K-12 public education system in their communities.

In Indiana, campus minister Wayne Olson is assisting local churches in Indianapolis, and David Wade in Muncie and Roger Sasse in Bloomington are doing the same.

What is presently a steady trickle in this direction will become, I believe, a major force in the 1980's.

3. A third changing role for campus ministers of the 80's is their assumption of regional responsibilities.

In some cases, the campus minister will carry a fulltime regional portfolio.

I consider my work with the Indiana Office of Campus Ministry a regional responsibility, and organizations like IOCM are "linking pin" structures. As Kay Adams of northern Virginia said of me, "You are a walking library and resource for persons for the region of Indiana."

In northern Virginia near Washington, D.C., there is now a regional person who coordinates the work of campus ministries in ten community colleges.

In Pennsylvania there is a Northeast Regional Ministry staffed by J. Springer. His role is to coordinate the work of volunteer teams at community colleges in his part of the state.

In other instances, campus ministers will assume regional responsibilities on a part-time basis. For example, in southwest Virginia there are three fulltime campus ministers at area residential universities who have also become a core leadership team to resource eight community colleges in their part of the state. Their responsibility is not to DO the ministry at the eight colleges, but rather to serve as resources for the volunteer campus ministers.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

Those of you who know me realize I am an eternal optimist. The future for me is a time of opportunity for campus ministry, higher education, and the world. That is not to say that I am blind to the signs of darkness among us. There are more doomsday predictions than we can count. And it is not to say that I do not suffer my own discouragements.

William Irwin Thompson affirms my position in the title of one of his recent books, **Darkness and Scattered Light.** There is always Light in the midst of all the darkness about us.

I was enlightened, for example, by the biography of Teilhard de Chardin. One of his most hopeful books, **The Phenomenon of Man,** was written in 1940 in immediate misery in China as the Japanese were invading his missionary compound. The entire biography of de Chardin is intriguing to

me. He personally experienced both World War I and II, and had insurmountable difficulties throughout his life with his Jesuit superiors. Yet he is one of the most futuristic theologians of the twentieth century.

I, too, am enfused with that same hope for the future. I believe that this decade bodes well for campus ministry, however changing it may be . . . for higher education, however threatened it may feel . . . and for the world, however chaotic it may become.

During the summer I developed a scenario for the coming decade entitled "a clash of wills." In this scenario I foresaw an inevitable clash between the forces pushing for change and the forces wishing to remain with the status quo. (For example, between the industrialists and the environmentalists over the use of our spaceship earth.) In that extreme clash of wills, however, creative use of the resulting energy can make possible radically new, exciting directions not envisioned by either side.

That is my hope for the years immediately ahead.

Footnotes

1. Edward Lindaman is the Futurist in Residence, Whitworth College, Spokane, Washington.
2. Robert Greenleaf, **Servant Leadership** (New York: Paulist Press, 1977), p. 184.
3. Robert Rankin, **The Recovery of Spirit in Higher Education** (New York: The Seabury Press, 1980), p. 25.
4. Quoted from a speech by Harlan Cleveland at the American Association for Higher Education annual meeting, March, 1981.
5. Robert Greenleaf, **loc. cit.,** p. 69.
6. Robert Rankin, **loc. cit.,** p. 104.
7. The Marty Lectures at the Center for the Study of Campus Ministry, Valparaiso, Indiana, 1978.
8. Peter Wagschal, editor, **Learning Tomorrows: Commentaries on the Future of Education** (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1979), p. 98.
9. Robert Theobald, **Beyond Despair** (Cabin John, Maryland: Seven Locks Press, Inc., 1981); p. 43.
10. "Education for Reflective Leadership," a tape of the March 4-7, 1981, American Association for Higher Education Conference in Washington, D. C.
11. **Three Thousand Futures: The Next Twenty Years in Higher Education** (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980), p. 136.
12. A background for this statement was my conversation with Harold G. Shane, Indiana University Professor of Education, who last year interviewed 132 scholars of the world about what they thought necessary for the education of youth in preparation for living in the 21st century. They unanimously agreed that there had to be a de-emphasis of economic exploitation in the world and the channeling of that energy into other world issues. Dr. Shane's findings are published in **Educating for a New Millennium,** Phi Delta Kappa Press, P. O. Box 789, Bloomington, Indiana 47402, 1981.
13. Robert Greenleaf, **loc. cit.,** p. 15.
14. **Ibid.,** p. 16.
15. **Ibid.,** p. 28.
16. Stated in a conversation with Martin Marty; quoted from the **Center for the Study of Campus Ministry Yearbook IV** (Valparaiso, Indiana: Center for the Study of Campus Ministry, 1981), p. 72.
17. Robert Rankin, **loc. cit.,** p. 322.
18. Edward Lindaman, **Thinking in the Future Tense** (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1978), pp. 8-9.

Editor's Note: Due to space considerations a lengthy bibliography and listing of interviews have been deleted. These are available upon request.