

NAME CAMPUS MINISTRY AND THE
NOM EMERGING RELIGIOUS CONSCIOUSNESS
JUNE '75

No. D-45



Re-Order No. GL-210R

D0078

CAMPUS MINISTRY AND THE EMERGING RELIGIOUS CONSCIOUSNESS

Robert M. Doran

My friend and colleague at Marquette University, Sebastian Moore, begins an article in the latest issue of CCMA's journal, Process, with the observation: "If President Ford had a dream and told it to Congress, insisting that this dream contained vital directions for coping with the inflation, he would be met with incredulity and, if he persisted, with 'professional help.'" At the risk of meeting a similar reception at your hands, I have chosen to begin my reflections here this afternoon by sharing with you several dreams. I will comment on these dreams as I present them, associating with their symbolism, and indicating that I intend to insist that they contain vital directions for campus ministry. At the same time, I wish to try to give you a demonstration of dealing with dreams as ^a the frequent source of very significant data concerning our lives and our work. ^{Then,} After I have dealt with these dreams in sufficient detail, I shall return to Sebastian Moore's article and use it as a springboard to the further reflections I

with to share with you today. *I shall agree in substance with what he says about the current situation of campus ministry, but I will further qualify his analysis.*

The first dream I wish to discuss is not my own. It is rather the dream of a Jungian analyst named Max Zeller, and it occurred twenty-six years ago. Zeller tells us in a short article in the Jung Centenary issue of Psychological Perspectives that he spent the summer of 1959 in Zurich, and that he frequently met during this time with Jung, sharing with him many of the experiences of his own soul and especially his groping toward an answer to the question that vexed him at that particular time in his life:

"What am I doing as an analyst?" ^{Two}~~The~~ nights before he was scheduled to leave Zurich, he had the following dream, the last dream he shared with Jung during that summer of questioning, of reaching for professional self-understanding: "A temple of vast dimensions was in the process of being built. As far as I could see-ahead, behind, right and left--there were incredible numbers of people building on gigantic pillars. I, too, was building on a pillar. The whole building process was in its very beginnings, but the foundation was already there, the rest of the building was starting to go up, and I and many others were working on it." Zeller then related the substance of his ensuing conversation with Jung:

Jung said, "Ja, you know, that is the temple we all build on. We don't know the people because, believe me, they build in India and China and in Russia and all over the world. That is the new religion. You know how long it will take until it is built?"

I said, "How should I know? Do you know?" He said, "I know." I asked how long it would take. He said, "About six hundred years."

"Where do you know this from?" I asked. He said, "From dreams. From other people's dreams and from my own. This new religion will come together as far as we can see."

Zeller tells us that he then had his answer to the question of what he was doing as an analyst. "The material we work with transforms. It transforms us, and we, being touched, touch other people without even talking about it. It's not necessary to talk about it. . . . The psyche does its transforming work in its own way. . . . Each person works on his own pillar, until one day the temple will be built."¹

I wish to pause ~~first~~ and reflect with you on this dream. The first thing to be noticed about this dream, indeed we might say its essential functional or performative feature, is that the dream was given to Zeller, occurred to him, as he was in the process of a sustained inquiry for professional self-understanding. "What am I doing as an analyst?" was a question to which he had devoted his earnest reflection for a sustained period of time and in the

company of his psychological teacher, Jung. The dream was a part of the data he would use to answer this most important question, a question very much in the forefront of his conscious waking life, his intelligent subjectivity, at this time. Not only that; the dream seemed to him to have come as a kind of release to the tension of this sustained inquiry; it seemed to him to have provided him with the answer; particularly was this the case after he discussed it with Jung ~~on the~~^{two} mornings after the dream. The data of the dream's symbolism, combined with an interpretation which "clicked" for him as an appropriate capturing of the dream's meaning, seemed to him to provide him with the answer to a problem which had caused him much soul-searching and perhaps even much anxiety (if Jungian analysts experience anxiety!)

The second important feature of this dream was its timing. It came right at the end of the period of time Zeller had allowed himself to spend in Zurich with Jung exploring the question which was uppermost in his mind. The dream then seemed to say to him: "You may go home now. You have found what you came for." It seemed to signify a closing of an important, indeed transformative, adventure in his life. It was, Jung would say, synchronistic with the external events in Zeller's life, coming as it did right at the end of his extended private personal search in the best of situations for an answer to a vexing question.

The third thing to be noted about this dream, however, is its very important content. Both Zeller's dream and Jung's interpretation of it reveal that the building of the temple, the coming of a new religious consciousness, provides the most adequate framework or directive idea of what authentic depth psychology is ultimately all about. At the very least, they reveal that beyond the therapeutic function of depth psychological analysis, there is the recovery

of the religious function of the psyche and of the religious intentionality of the process of analysis whose main lines began to be laid bare by Jung. Jung himself was very much aware of the potential religious significance of his discoveries and also very conscious that he himself stood only at the very beginning of an elucidation of the religious function of the psyche. He was also quite ready to affirm that the project that his own life was all about was also a project that is going on on many fronts today, in many different ways, in all parts of the earth, as far as one can see. He was, finally, very cognizant of the fact that we are all at the very beginning of one of the most profound and far-reaching transformations in the total history of intelligent life on this planet; that we all have a role to play; and that our principal task is to let ourselves individually be transformed by the power which has laid the foundation of the temple, and allow the effects of that transformation to spread to others and to collaborate with their transformation, unimpeded by fear of ridicule or by lust for power.

Now, it is my considered judgment after much reflection ^{and research} on the subject, that ultimately Jung's own psychological doctrine, taken as a totality, is a religious failure, in fact a reflection of Jung's own personal religious ~~frustration~~ ^{frustration}. With greater assurance, I would have to say that what is currently going forward in at least some branches of Jungian psychology, e.g. in Zurich, is religiously counterpositional in a horrendously dangerous way. I don't want to spend time with you quoting chapter and verse of Jung, however, and in my comments on the emerging religious consciousness of our time in the second part of my presentation, I shall ^{hint} ~~briefly~~ ^{at} briefly my reasons for these perhaps harsh-sounding judgments on Jung and the Jungians. The important point of this first dream is Jung's mention of an emerging religious consciousness, a

consciousness that would not become prevalent for another 600 years, a consciousness that was beginning to develop all over the world, in many ways and in the experience of many people, but one that was just emerging in our own time. Beyond this, I would ask you only to keep in mind the function of Zeller's dream in his own life and the timing, the perfect timing, of the psyche in his regard.

I wish now to share with you a few more dreams, this time from my own life. Again, in commenting on these dreams, I want you to focus first on their function, then on their timing, and finally on their content.

In the first of my dreams, I find myself in a restaurant, seated at table with two other people. Across from me at table is the renowned philosopher and theologian, Bernard Lonergan. To my right is a very close friend of mine, a person who in many ways for a long time represented and symbolized for me what was quite different from what Lonergan would represent and symbolize, in fact from what Lonergan had brought to differentiation in my own subjectivity. This second person represented and symbolized for me sensation, feeling, psyche; Lonergan intelligence, thought, reason, spirit. Lonergan has been my teacher for almost the past ten years. The other person in this dream scene was very much in a position of pupil to me for about the past six years. Functionally, then, I am somewhere in between these two figures: pupil to one, teacher to another.

But in the dream itself I am not between them. Rather I am seated across from Lonergan, and my friend is between us and to my right. Now, it is quite possible for me to interpret the work of my doctoral dissertation as my attempt to mediate for myself, for anybody else who might be interested, and for theologians (whether they're interested or not!) the features of human subjectivity represented and symbolized by these two figures in this dream:

the essence of the work which I recently completed in my doctoral dissertation consists in the mediation of the intentionality so carefully and exactly analyzed by Lonergan with the psyche so perfectly symbolized for me by my friend.

With this much personal detail as background, allow me to go on with the dream.

In this dream, Lonergan is radiantly happy. He is smiling broadly and is very much pleased to be here, content with what he finds, benevolent, peaceful, benign. He is, if you want, the Wise Old Man, and he is not only amicably disposed to the two of us, but also in a position of readiness to bless us and to send us on. He says to us, "I know that the two of you would like to go to another table and be together, and this is perfectly all right with me. Do not be concerned about me. You may go." We are reluctant to leave him alone, but he assures us that we may and should go. So we finally get up to leave him, and as we do so, Lonergan fades into Gandhi and my friend into a fellow Jesuit acquaintance of mine who for the last three years has been engaged in Campus Ministry work.

Let me first center my attention on the function and timing of this dream. The dream occurred approximately one and one-half months after I had completed the defense of my doctoral dissertation, that is, after I had finished a major project in my own life and just about at the time when I was beginning to get ready to organize myself for taking up something new. The dream had that quality that some few of our dreams have, the quality of being what some ^{American} Indian cultures refer to as "big dreams." As is ^{often} ~~always~~ the case with such dreams, the dreamer is lost for a while as to its meaning. The dream is not similar to Zeller's at least in the respect that it did not come at the end of a major project, sealing the project as it were with the approbation of the psyche, but rather occurred as the initiation dream of a

new project. It had been preceded by several dreams more or less preparing the way for something new, but in itself stood out from these dreams because of its clear quality of importance and of mystery.

Furthermore, the dream occurred on the night prior to the day on which Lu Roy was to send me the invitation to speak at this Institute. Whether this is psychically significant or not is difficult for me to tell, but it is clear that the dream was in part directing my attention ^{away} toward Campus Ministry, by having my friend fade into a Jesuit acquaintance of mine who is engaged full-time in Campus Ministry work.

As regards the content of the dream, beyond what I have already indicated, let me say that I now see the dream as pointing to the end of one meditation I had performed in my own life and to the beginning of another. As I indicated earlier, my dissertation had basically consisted in the task of critically mediating intentionality analysis (Lonergan) with analysis of the psyche (my friend). It is now time for the two of us, my friend and myself, to move on from Lonergan to something new, not in the sense of abandoning Lonergan nor a fortiori of repudiating him, but rather in the sense of being sent by him with his blessing as we move on to what comes next. And what comes next is vaguely, so very vaguely, symbolized in the transformation of Lonergan into Gandhi and of my friend into the campus minister. The dream would now seem to be saying something like: "As you have satisfactorily mediated intentionality with psyche, Lonergan with friend, so you may now move on from this task to a new one: that of mediating Gandhi with campus ministry."

But what in the world does this mean? What could possibly be the meaning of mediating Gandhi with campus ministry? The meaning I am slowly coming to understand and affirm in this symbolic representation is probably clear to you,

at least in part, from the title I have given my reflections with you this afternoon, "Campus Ministry and the Emerging Religious Consciousness." In a sense, what I am trying to do here this afternoon is a kind of first installment on the task being pointed out to me by this dream, the task of going out, with Lonergan's blessing and thus bringing with me what I have learned from him, but moving on now to another major project, the project of trying to work once again as a minister to the college campus in the context of an emerging religious consciousness. Surely, ^{however,} the dream means more than this. The figure of Gandhi is more specific than this. In fact, to say that Gandhi symbolizes an emerging religious consciousness obviously needs some explanation, as it is by no means self-evident.

What then does Gandhi specifically represent? If you are familiar with John Dunne's very fine book, The Way of All the Earth, you will know that Gandhi functions there for Dunne as a kind of living symbol of a paradigm of the new religion which Dunne says could be coming to birth in our time. Gandhi's experiments with truth, in which he passed over into the religious experiences and understanding of traditions other than his own Hindu heritage, only to return to his own religion and eventually to his own life with greater insight and creativity, constitute for Dunne the paradigm of the religious journey of our time.

Moreover, Gandhi had come to mean something more than this for me. He is one of the few men in history, let alone in our century, with the discipline to keep spirituality and politics in close and essential relation to one another. Gandhi is the originator of what is probably the most authentically executed project of human liberation in our century. He is, to put it mildly, a man of heroically courageous moral action. The adjective "moral" will be very

important later when I try to indicate some of the dangers attendant upon the religious adventure of our time. ^{Gandhi} ~~He~~ is a man of compassion for the outcasts of humanity, for the most oppressed people in India, and at the same time he is a man of uncompromising fidelity to the Sermon on the Mount--something he had discovered in his own experiments with religious truth--with its attendant message of non-violent resistance, the height of religious and moral authenticity. Not only an emerging religious consciousness, then, but also an emerging political consciousness. The two are really one. For Gandhi there was no authentic religion unconcerned with human liberation and no authentic project of liberation apart from the strictest observance of the Sermon on the Mount. One is the other. The Sermon on the Mount is work for liberation, and genuine work for liberation is identical with living the Sermon on the Mount, with taking it literally, as Dietrich Bonhoeffer insisted we must. Moreover, Gandhi's political involvement was not significant for only one portion of one nation. Erik Erikson says of Gandhi's theory-praxis of Satya-graha that it was the East's answer to both Woodrow Wilson and Lenin, Western democracy and Bolshevism. It is an alternative social, economic, and political theory-praxis to that operative in the two most powerful countries in the world. Obviously both Western democracy and Soviet communism are colossal failures in procuring a humane society. Is it Gandhi who holds the answer? Does he actually teach us an entirely new way to structure human society that could supplant the monsters of America and Russia?

Several days later, I dreamt a very beautiful dream which obviously followed up on and continued the direction begun in the Lonergan-Gandhi dream. In this dream, I am to be a part of a group going to Kansas City to make a 17-week retreat. My friend, the same friend as in the previous dream--thus the connection from the first dream to this one--is visiting me at this time in

Further
questions
we can't
deal with
explicitly
in detail.

the dream, and when he learns of the retreat decides quite readily to go along with us and to make it himself. He is quite sure that this is the thing for him to do. We set out in different cars to go to Kansas City. I go in an old Buick, driven by another Jesuit, and my friend goes in another car. The scenes that remained most vivid in my mind were those in which I got into the back seat of the car, quiet and happy, and a scene in Kansas City, where I am aware that my friend is along for the retreat ^{without community} and is happy to be there.

Regarding this dream, let me say that I discovered the next morning that there were exactly 17 weeks until the start of the fall semester at Marquette University and that my friend had only recently left a visit in Milwaukee after a 17-day stay in which profoundly transforming psychic and spiritual experiences had occurred to him, the kind one associates with the word "retreat." Carrying over from the first dream is the notion of campus ministry, in that I have been removed from the active ministerial scene for the last three years while finishing my doctorate and in seventeen weeks from the night of this dream would be resuming active ministry in a full-time capacity.

Several days later, in a third dream, I receive in the mail a small package in a plain brown paper wrapping. It appears to be a book. I open it and it is indeed a book, and to my utter surprise a new book by---guess who?---Lonergan! He may have sent me and my friend on, but with more than a blessing! The book has a dark blue jacket with white letters, like Method in Theology, but no picture of Lonergan on the jacket as does that book. This new book is entitled The USA and Its Way. I am surprised that Lonergan has already produced a new book. I suspect that it is an economic treatise, since this is what he may well turn his attention to next. But I open the cover of the book and find from the dust jacket that it is not a study of economics at all but rather

a depth psychological study of American culture. The dust jacket is literally filled with a description of the book, including the inside of the dust jacket which normally is simply blank paper surrounding the book. The inside of the jacket unfolds into a lengthy description of the book, interspersed with pictures. Imagine--a Lonergan foldout! Included among the pictures are two photographs in which people are wading into the water from a beach. I am in both of these pictures. In each case, the people are very happy and seem to share a community life with one another.

On the same night as the Lonergan book dream, I had a second dream, in which Campus Ministry is again explicitly called to my attention. In this second dream I am asked to name the original members of Marquette's Campus Ministry staff and I experience difficulty in remembering all of the names. The upshot of the dream is that there is something that needs to be clarified regarding Campus Ministry. This is confirmed by a dream the following night in which there appeared my former secretary. In this dream, I went to see her for secretarial assistance, even though I was no longer involved in the Campus Ministry office. While she was happy to see me and glad to do the work for me, she also complained to me that currently Campus Ministry was in a bad state. She was definitely trying to sort things out. This was particularly the feeling that came to me from her standing at a file drawer and removing a particular file which was out of place in the drawer.

I hope it is clear to you how all of these dreams are connected together by various threads from one to the other. All four of my own dreams which I have related to you thus far have some intrinsic connection one to the other. A set of images and symbols is being assembled, pointing me in an ever more explicit direction. "Take what you have learned already in the mediation of Lonergan and psychic analysis," they seem to be saying, "and move to a new medi-

ation of a politico-religious consciousness with the work of ministering on campus; but be sure to keep your reflections constantly related to "the USA and its way," to the American condition.

I could say more about individual symbols in these dreams, but I prefer to move on to the final two dreams which I wish to relate to you, since they concretize more specifically the directives I seemed to be receiving in these dreams.

On one night I had the following two dreams. In the first, there is again a group of people joined together in a room. I am a part of this group. The group is obviously close-knot, poor, and joyful. We receive word, not from any written communication nor from any spoken voice, but from out of the group itself, that Adolf Hitler is on his way, and we realize that we must leave San Francisco. We remain very happy and joyful as we pack our clothes, and in the dream itself it is obvious that there is no thought of mine and thine. It is a community which I associate with the communities of Christians in the Acts of the Apostles.

In the second dream, I have volunteered to accompany a choir as organist at a Mass, but without having practiced to do so. The Kyrie Eleison goes quite well, as does the Holy, Holy, Holy. Also I play a short interlude at the Offertory, which ends just as the celebrant is about to move onto the Pray, Brethren. But when we get to the Agnus Dei, the choir director gives the choir their lead notes in harmony, but I find that I have only a series of numbers, no music to read. I try to put notes to the numbers, but I cannot transcribe the code correctly. The choir director comes from another part of the church to see me about it, but I still can't do it when we try again. He and I agree quite amicably that the choir will have to sing the Agnus Dei

without organ at this time, but that I must learn the music.

How do these dreams move the process further? First, there is the community of men and women as in the dreams of the retreat and of the wading into the waters of rebirth. This is a connecting thread to the previous dreams. Then, there is the message which we seem to derive from our own midst, the horrible message that Adolf Hitler is coming. Adolf Hitler: a monstrous evil, a mass murderer of millions for the vilest of reasons, a power absolutely and ruthlessly fixated on efficiency, productivity, performance, sovereignty. San Francisco: the home of esoteric cults, of faddish forms of the emerging religious consciousness, of phony gurus and mindless followers. In the face of the emerging monstrosity of the mega-machine, with its callous disregard for the weak, the defenceless, ^{the unborn,} the underprivileged, the poor--in the face of this, leave behind you all the nonsensical forms of religion infesting our land today and learn how to live the genuine one in community with your brothers and sisters in the Lord. Let this be your alternative to the machine and its attendant political and economic horrors: authentic Christian community patterned ^{Acts of the Apostles and on} on the ^{ashram} of Gandhi. The emerging religious consciousness is a highly ambiguous phenomenon. There is Gandhi, there is radical Christianity, but there is also San Francisco, the mindless trips of dulled brains following money-hungry fakes who promise the same kind of wholeness which Jung long claimed to be available to us in the experience of the Self; a wholeness that is really nothing but a psychic trap, a perpetually recurring psychic still-birth, a treadmill of self-analysis leading further and further into an intra-psychic erotic cul de sac.

But to move out of San Francisco and into reality, you will have to learn to transpose into new music with which you are not yet very familiar.

You've learned the Kyrie Eleison and the Holy, Holy, Holy, and you have the timing just right on the offering of the gifts. But the Lamb of God, the Suffering Servant of Yahweh, the slaughtered victim of human history--that you don't yet know very well. You must learn that music, for it is the only music and rhythm to which to move in the face of the immanent arrival of the monster and his machine. San Francisco will not do. Neither will a religion you keep to yourself in prayers for mercy and praise of God's majesty. You must now learn, as Gandhi learned, the rhythm of service under the standard of the one who died for you.

I said at the beginning that I would comment on dreams as the frequent source of very significant data concerning our life and our work. I also said that I would further turn to Sebastian Moore's paper and use it as a spring-board for ^{*drawing from these dreams of mine*} further reflections on campus ministry work today.

Moore compares the reception that President Ford would receive if he announced to Congress the solution to the economic crisis revealed in a dream with the reception which the advisors of other rulers have given to similar revelations at other points in time and space. All of these responses, he indicates, are culture-bound, and our Western culture is ill-disposed to take seriously or as meaningful for conscious waking life, for the project of our lives, any presentation of data welling up from what we now call the psychological depths. At best such data are wish fulfillments or manifestations of neurotic conflicts, sexual frustrations, or infantile traumata not yet resolved and preventing the individual from living an normal and well-adjusted life in our (supposedly normal and well-adjusted) society. The idea that a

dream might reveal vital directions in which one not only might but should turn his or her responsible attention in daily living is commonly regarded as preposterous. We are programmed to regard ourselves as independent and autonomous agents in a world that is nothing but the object of our desires, ^{scheming} thoughts, and exploitative actions. It is not part of our daily self-understanding to regard ourselves as primordially and from the beginning within, involved in, and variously connected to a world which envelops us, feeds into us, directs us, at the same time as we act on it and change and mold it to suit our ambitions. We have, of course, become profoundly aware in our time that economic, social, and political factors have brought us to the point where hardly anybody ~~is~~ really believes deep-down that he or she has any power to change or mold anything, that power is removed from the hands of individuals and progressively even of independent interest-groups and placed in a huge, impersonal, bureaucratic machine that is beyond not only our capacity for effective transforming action but even our limited ability for understanding. And yet we still tend spontaneously to understand ourselves as over against the world, as independent (albeit frustrated) autonomous egos, whose immediate response to all data is, "How can I deal with this?" The question increasingly is given less and less of an answer, other than the answer, "We can't do anything about it." And yet we continue to ask the question in this way, assuming, because of our cultural heritage, that everything should be able to be dealt with. If we silently acknowledge our despair in the face of this question--and there are some who do--we rarely acknowledge that it is this way of understanding ourselves in relation to the world that has produced the mega-machine that increasingly robs us of our freedom, our capacity for creative action, our sense of meaningful and responsible agency. Ego-individualism, as many authors of the past several

years

have cogently argued, has produced our current cultural disease, a disease that can only be understood on the analogy of cancer. (Slater, Goodwin) It is because of our ego-individualistic self-understanding, still manifested in our spontaneous responses to almost all data, that we are caught in the monstrous alienation that is the core experience of our American culture.

At the same time, in order to support an argument for a new mode of self-understanding, a radically different one, Moore appeals to a recent study by Andrew Greeley which would seem to reveal that 37% of the American people "have at some time had the experience of being in the presence of an enveloping reality, a power, that lifted them out of themselves." Because of their spontaneous self-understanding as individualistic and autonomous egos, most of these men and women have never spoken of their experience to anyone, for fear of the same reaction President Ford would undoubtedly receive at the hands of our elected representatives (let alone the electorate) for revealing the solution to the economic crisis manifested to him in a dream.

But, says Moore, these 37% should be encouraged that the culture that would greet them with this condescending (at best) reception is rapidly dying. Its city gods are already dead, but it takes cultures a long time to catch up with the death of their idols. Cultures die hard, especially the culture so unambiguously built on the foundations of ^{perhaps} the most grandiose immortality quest ever undertaken by the human ego: the culture of the white man in modern civilization. That cultures die hard is especially manifested in our spontaneous understanding of God, an understanding that is dictated by our autonomy-centered culture. "Our belief tells us that God has the ultimate control over our lives and over the world, but this control, we think, must be some mysterious ultimate design in which our autonomy plays its part, and the playing of this

part is all that we are to know about. God has the last word. But the last is a long, long way off. God helps those who help themselves--so let's help ourselves, to Arab oil if necessary." None of our statements about God, says Moore, "speak of direct presence and power, of being lost in the abyss of God, of dying to all our normal perceptions, of being dispossessed and taken over by the Spirit. Our typical religious statements are couched in terms of self-initiated, not other-initiated experience. And this notwithstanding the fact that they are statements about the transcendent Other." We select only those belief statements that do not interfere with our culturally inherited self-understanding. Imagine a contemporary man or woman in America introducing what he or she had to say with the words: "Thus says the Lord Yahweh, your God!" "God" for us, says Moore, "is the name of something that is said to be the case, or to 'underlie' the whole thing. He is not the name of a devastating experience."

For Moore, the death knell of our ego-individualistic culture began to be sounded in the depth psychological discoveries of Sigmund Freud and C. G. Jung. Whether we agree or disagree with this historical judgment is immaterial. What is undeniable is that in depth psychology, if it is correctly understood--and my own research has convinced me that it rarely is, least of all by Freudians and Jungians--there are discoveries which insinuate "a new concept of the subject: as not autonomous, as not independent, as not able to cope rationally with the all-encompassing reality, as incomprehensible to himself, as born into a mysterious partnership with a large reality, as created in a dance whose steps he must painfully and obediently and attentively learn. . . . It is the discovery of the subject, that he is not the autonomous and all-controlling being that culturally he takes himself to be."

There are, of course, other manifestations than depth psychology of the death knell of rational self-sufficient man, and Moore points to evidence of these manifestations in various popular movements springing up all over the country. But these movements present us, I believe, with at least as much of a problem as does individualism and the bureaucratic monster it has so unwittingly created. Moore enumerates many of these movements: occultism, Satanism, a science-denying fundamentalism on an enormous scale, pentecostalism, a rebirth of Christian mysticism, transcendental meditation, mind-control, a newborn science of parapsychology. You name it. It's there."

Surely this is a difficult package to unravel. And the difficulty is compounded by the undifferentiated nature of the response given by the dying culture to these various and strange phenomena. They are all bracketed, says Moore, as "subjective," but without being treated with the further question, "What is all this telling us about the subject, about you, about me?" And theology, for the most part, is not helping us at all. Bernard Lonergan has been insistent in pointing out that the contemporary crisis in theology is rooted in a profound neglect of the human subject, and that the neglected subject, who does not know himself, leads to the truncated subject, who does not know that he does not know himself, and to the alienated subject, unwittingly unfaithful to his own immanent orientation to and capacity for, meaning, truth, and value; the subject mystified by ideology and caught in the biases of egoism and class consciousness, and in the triviality or fanaticism of a culturally induced common sense unaware that the subject is capable of raising and answering questions in search of meaning, questions in search of truth, questions in search of what is good. And so we have, on the one hand, an anachronistically individualistic self-understanding victimized by the Frankensteinian mega-machine issuing from its selfish pursuits of unlimited exploitative growth; and, on the other hand,

a vast variety of religious phenomena only some of which are authentic and most of which are the creations of the new ego-individualists--the phony gurus of contemporary youth, the therapeutic religionists so mercilessly exposed for the sham they are by Ernest Becker in The Denial of Death and for the evil for which they are directly responsible by R. C. Zaehner in Our Savage God. It is this two-fold polaristic phenomenon, ^{-- Hitler and San Francisco --} which locates for Sebastian Moore the contemporary field of activity for Campus Ministry. He is correct, I believe. He says: "Campus Ministry has an opportunity of a unique kind to speak to the new and more intimate spiritual needs, the more ambitious spiritual desires, of this critical time. The more I think of this opportunity, the more it takes on the austere character of a call." He continues: "We need to cultivate a certain generosity and daring in our approach to meditation and prayer--our own and of those with whom we work: to listen for God to speak not through the religious concepts of our mind but more in the fiber of our feelings." He draws to the close of his article with the expression of what he presents as a prediction, but which I think can be no more than a fervent prayer: What is to come "will not be a return to the primitive, undifferentiated self-experience out of which our culture magnificently emerges, blind, as all cultures are, to its shortcomings." And he finishes with what may well be a fact: "We children of this culture are being invited into an adventure with God more self-aware than man has ever been able to be in that adventure."

The litany of phenomena or "popular movements" given by Moore as evidence for the death knell of the old culture indicates to me that what is to come from these movements may very well be for the large part a return to a primitive, undifferentiated consciousness. What is particularly frightening about this prospect is that this non-differentiation will extend to good and

evil. For the gurus responsible for much of this phenomenon have fancied themselves as "beyond good and evil" and as gifted with the power, indeed the call, to guide others into the blessed "Now" where All is One and One is All. Zaehner's book, Our Savage God, argues that this perverse use of Eastern thought (and, I might add, Martin Heidegger's analogous attempt to demolish the genuine achievements of Western reason together with its aberrations by returning to pre-Socratic utterance for authentic articulation of Being) may be directly associated with the still very occasional but nonetheless profoundly indicative horrors of which the ritual murders performed by Charles Manson and his "Family" are the clearest expression in our time. The historical symbol most clearly speaking the evils of the machine created by an ego-individualistic self-understanding is, for me, the My Lai incident. That expressing the horrors attendant upon the countercultural "response" to this bureaucratic machine is the Manson case. What is there to choose between these two monstrous evils of our day? Is it any step forward that we now can witness various "popular movements" tolling the death-knell of a rational self-sufficient man? The latter murders from a distance an indigenous peasantry of a land which ^{he} ~~it~~ ravages and poisons. The respondents murder at close range the rich, neurotic citizenry of Hollywood, California, and do so under the inspiration of a hodge-podge of the new movements supposedly correcting our one-sided and individualistic self-understanding. Zaehner's book makes this all too clear. We have to do better than the various "popular movements that spring up all over the country" if we are to find our own way and provide guidance to others to find their way through and beyond the nightmare of the mega-machine. As another friend and Marquette colleague of mine, Matthew Lamb, has put it: "The God-question of the transcendental exigence recognizes

the validity of religious experience, but it does not thereby legitimize all religious expressions. Insofar as historical religions tended to oppose the unfolding of human attention, intelligence, reasonableness, and responsibility they have been guilty of alienating religious expressions from an authentic experience of the God-question. God is not experienced in history as an answer, for the God-Answer would sublate all history. Rather He is experienced as Question and Mystery, as the assurance that the ultimate questions of meaning and value are real questions and so answerable only in going beyond the limitations of any finite achievement." Beware of all gurus with God-Answers! They will probably shortcircuit the only authentic human process, the process from experience to meaning, from meaning to truth, and from truth to responsible decision and action.

Despite my severe qualifications of Moore's predictions that what is to come will not be a return to a primitive, undifferentiated consciousness, I want to say that it need not be such a catastrophe, and that I think ^{all} of us involved in Campus Ministry have the austere call of seeing to it that it is not. I also want to say that Moore's focus on the subject is the correct antidote to a primitive response to the evils of our American cultural machine. Both the machine and most of the "popular movements" cited by Moore as evidence for the deficiencies of the machine are products of neglected, truncated, and alienated human subjects. The primary cultural need of contemporary Western civilization, short of an outpouring of God's Spirit, is the development and propagation of a thoroughgoing, internally consistent, and accurate theory-praxis of the human subject, particularly insistent on this subject's immanent orientation to and capacity for the discovery and implementation of meaning, truth, and value through the process of raising and answering questions. You can do nothing more effective in preparation for Campus Ministry

than come to affirm about yourselves the following propositions and resolve to help others come to the same self-affirmation about themselves:

1) I am an intelligent human being, capable of discovering meaning in my inner and outer experience through the process of questioning that experience;

2) I am a reasonable human being, capable of affirming that the meaning I have discovered is or is not accurate, true, through the process of checking, marshalling the evidence, discerning with a community, reflecting on the adequacy of the meaning to the data which gave rise to it, and ruthlessly asking whether there are any further questions;

3) I am a responsible human being, capable of evaluating potential courses of action, of delineating those which I am able to fulfill from those which I do not have the resources to meet, of discriminating those which are sources of good for others from those which lead only or mainly to my own satisfaction, those which are really good from those which are only apparently good, of judging the greater good from the lesser good, and of choosing the greater good which lies within my resources and acting on that choice, no matter what the consequences for me may be;

4) I am a religious human being, oriented by an inner law beyond everything finite, temporal, spatial, external, or internal, to the transcendent Mystery of Awesome Love which is the God revealed in Christ Jesus.

These are no mean affirmations. If you are like most of the rest of us, truly to make them will change your experience and understanding of yourself in the most radical fashion possible; you will be lifted out of our usual, ordinary world of what seems, of what I merely feel, of what is apparent, and you will come into the world of what is, of yourself as in a world which you can understand, know, make decisions about, and in relation

to which you can act on your decisions, constituting the world. The recovery, the thorough-going, internally consistent, and accurate self-appropriation of the human subject as human subject is the indispensable basis of beneficial activity today; it is also the core of any message that is worth taking the time to preach; and it is, finally, the most important objective of Christian labor in the Lord's vineyard today. It is the heart of a meaningful, true, and responsible alternative to the efficient inhumanity of the bureaucratic megamachine and to the social alienation of the counterculture. Neither manifestation of the power of evil--that exhibited by the uncontrollable bureaucracy and that inspiring the mindless trips so many today call religion--is able to conquer the human spirit in possession of itself as capacity for meaning, capacity for truth, capacity for responsibility, capacity for self-transcending and self-sacrificing love, capacity for the authentic community achieved in the discovery, implementation, and fostering of common meanings, common affirmations, and common values all of which are known to be true. *There is an urgent need for attentive, intelligent, reasonable, responsible, Christian discrimination in face of the emerging religious consciousness. Only such discrimination will keep your response and that of students from ~~the~~ slipping into the self-centered mindlessness of the contemporary quest for Wholeness. It is not in Wholeness that the authenticity of man resides but in the self-transcendence of Crucified Love.*