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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Brief Statement of the Problem

This thesis is the report and interpretation of an exploratory case study designed to test a redefinition of the Church-Sect typology. In broadest terms the problem of this study has to do with the general theoretical notion that value patterns lead to patterns of association and interaction.

Originating Questions and Rationale

The rationale of this study is ultimately theoretical but the problem began with several questions about the present position(s) and function(s) of organized religion in a secular and religiously pluralistic society: (1) How are religious organizations integrated into or isolated from the structure of a secular society? (2) How do different types of religious groups function in the same social environment? (3) What kinds of changes in religious groups are brought about by changes in their environment?

Propositions about religion in American society by sociologists give some clues. Robin Williams, Jr. suggests that "...American religious organizations are highly segregated from other institutionalized structures."\(^1\) Some implications of this are, first, a relatively

great degree of religious freedom exists and religious toleration is emphasized; second, there has been a comparatively far-reaching secularization of beliefs; and third, there is a general doctrinal cleavage between orthodox and liberal beliefs. The institutionalized principle of separation of church and state and the fragmentation of religious organizations "...have made it possible for secular powers to force the churches quite generally into neutrality, isolation, or 'bystander' support with reference to other issues." In his discussion of the problems of the sociology of religion, Charles Y. Glock points to a condition in society which fosters an inadequate sociological framework, i.e., the authority and functions of organized religion have been whittled away and taken over by secular agencies. Gerhard Lenski's Detroit Area Study concluded that "...socio-religious group membership is a variable comparable in importance to class, both with respect to its potency and with respect to the range, or extent, of its influence." Lenski's study demonstrates the strong influence of various dimensions of religion on other institutional forms of behavior, but he touches only indirectly the structural position or organized religion in American society.

---

2 Ibid., p. 335.
3 Ibid., p. 359.
These general theoretical observations suggest the following patterns: (1) The functionality of religion in modern urban society; (2) The loss of traditional functions by religious organizations to secular agencies; (3) Institutionalized organizational segregation; (4) A general process of extensive secularization. These propositions, based both on impressionistic and empirical evidence, furnish only the broadest kinds of guidelines for further research. There is a need for greater specificity of values, structures, and processes.

Religious organizations and theological schools have sponsored research in the area of religious organizational work in secular higher education but this work is not theoretically oriented. It is carried out with religious orientations and is applied rather than basic research. These studies, while offering important sources of insights, are not systematic enough to supplement the broad propositions suggested above. A few items listed below will suffice to illustrate this type of work.6

Before a theory can be constructed about the structural units and functions of religion in our society theoretically oriented empirical research into the position(s) and function(s) of organized religious groups should be made. This is at least one of the

---

necessary tasks. Then perhaps theoretical schemes may be constructed which define religion in terms of social function and from which testable hypotheses may be derived.

The theoretical rationale of this study has to do with the classical typological scheme—Church and Sect. This typology was originally devised to study the ways in which different types of religious organizations relate to their environment. The major purpose of this study was to test the utility and fruitfulness of a redefinition of this typology, suggested by Benton Johnson, in explaining different attitudes and behavior patterns of religious organizations. His redefinition is:

A church is a religious group that accepts the social environment in which it exists. A sect is a religious group that rejects the social environment in which it exists.7

(Italics his.)

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework within which the problem of this study fits is the distinction between church and sect made initially by Ernst Troeltsch and Max Weber. They distinguished these two ideal types of religious organizations in an effort to describe the typical relationships between religious organizations and society. The definitions given to these types were not systematic and they did not conceive of any movement of religious groups from one type to another. The defining content of each type was a composite description of elements drawn from historical models (Roman Catholic, Lutheran,

---

Eastern Orthodox, Anabaptists, Quakers, Methodists, etc.) but the major definitions and contrasts centered around doctrine, organization and relationship with the social system.

H. Richard Niebuhr refined the distinction and suggested that the sect is an unstable and undeveloped form of the church. Niebuhr said that when the conditions which gave rise to the sect change the sect slowly takes on church-like qualities which it had originally repudiated. His thesis was that sectarian groups must change into churchly types if they are to survive the first generation of believers.

Liston Pope employed this scheme in a community study by devising twenty-one empirical indices of sectarian and churchly characteristics. This was the first attempt to operationalize these types for empirical research. At least one third of the items listed by Pope in his scale of transition from sect to church have to do with the relationship of the religious group to its social environment. Item number four explicitly states this dimension: "From renunciation of prevailing culture and social organization, or indifference to it, to affirmation of prevailing culture and social organization." Many of the other items are implications of this one and may be derived from it, but most of the items have to do with the internal organization and belief-systems of the types of religious groups.


The adequacy of this dichotomized typology has been questioned and it has been criticized recently on several points. J. Milton Yinger criticized the scheme for two reasons: (1) It is difficult, in any dichotomous typology, to give an adequate picture of the full range of the data; and (2) It failed to give an adequate discussion of the conditions under which the various types of religious organizations were most likely to occur. Yinger developed a six-step classification scheme based on two criteria: (1) The degree of inclusiveness of the members of a society; and (2) The degree of attention paid to the function of social integration as contrasted with the function of personal need. His sect-type was subdivided on two dimensions: (1) Differences in need, and (2) Differences in response (acceptance, opposition, and avoidance).

Bryan Wilson observed that some sects persist as such over several generations, some develop into denominations, some die, some fragment, and others are exterminated. He suggests that sects experience different types of tension with their environment which vary according to their value-system and the circumstances of their origin. He proposes that the study of sectarian groups consider the following elements: (1) Circumstances of sect emergence; (2) Internal structure of sect organization; (3) Degree of separateness from the external world, (4) Coherence of sect values; and (5) Group commitments and

---

Wilson restricts this scheme to the analysis of sects but it could be employed in the analysis of any type of religious organization.

David Moberg criticized the classical definition of the typology for several of the reasons given above and added the criticisms that American religious pluralism prohibits the appearance of a real Church type, that sectarian traits are found in churches, and vice versa. 12

Charles Glock criticized the scheme on three additional bases: (1) It does not account for the fact that not all religious groups emerge as sects, (2) It does not take into account religious movements which do not draw their inspiration from the Christian tradition, and (3) It ignores the question of the conditions which produce a religious rather than a secular response to deprivations. 13

Benton Johnson noticed that one of the assumptions of the Church-Sect typology, viz., that the variables subsumed by the type are interdependent, could not be supported. They vary independently. He raises the complaint that in spite of the many elaborations of types to account for the varied and multiple aspects of religious organizations the definition of the types remain ambiguous. He says that this ambiguity must be cleared up before the typology can be fruitfully

---


used. As an example, Johnson states that the majority of the large number of popular religious organizations in the United States cannot be unambiguously classified in terms of the typology. He says,

One can go on creating new types and subtypes as further research and reflection bring to light the independence of more elements in the original formulation. But it is unlikely that this strategy will contribute to the major theoretical aim of sociology, which is to elucidate a variety of particular problems by means of a limited number of concepts and principles of general applicability. With this aim in mind we shall attempt to reformulate the typology in a manner that is both systematic and sufficiently abstract to enable it to be applied to a large number of circumstances both past and present... Since there is some merit in striving for as much continuity with customary usage as possible, we will try to embody one basic distinction which has figured prominently in most previous formulations of the typology...We would like to base the church-sect distinction on this consideration. A church is a religious group that accepts the social environment in which it exists. A sect is a religious group that rejects the social environment in which it exists.14 (Italics his.)

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were two-fold: (1) To order the data in terms of Johnson's redefinition; and (2) To test the utility, fruitfulness, and explanatory power of this redefinition of Church and Sect. We were concerned to know what theoretical difficulties the utilization of the scheme presents, what new insights it permits, and what modifications are needed. The interaction categories were not derived from Johnson's scheme but were necessary to give the research on attitudes and behavior a direction and concreteness which Johnson's scheme did not explicitly suggest. This study focuses on the behavior and attitudes of two types of religious groups as they interact with their

14 Johnson, p. 542.
social environment. This additional conceptual framework served as
a guideline for data analysis. The significance of Johnson's redefi-
nition for the advancement of theory is that it exposes for analysis
one particular dimension of the traditional typology and thereby gives
greater specification to an essentially multi-dimensional phenomenon.
This is part of the necessary movement from descriptive to analytical
concepts.

Variables

The independent variable in this study is the Church-Sect
dichotomy and the dependent variable is pattern of interaction. A
qualitative distinction is made in terms of two broad types--associative
and disassociative. Each of these types has several forms and
some of these forms have more than one mode.

Disassociative. Conflict exists when groups strive to eliminate
each other. In contrast to competition, conflict aims to displace or
destroy the opponent. In conflict the action is directed to the op-
ponent and not to the desired goal(s). Competition is "...mutually
opposed effort to secure the same scarce objectives."15 The situation
is such that goal-achievement by one group precludes identical goal-
achievement by another group. Unlike conflict, competition implies
an absence of coercion and does not necessarily involve direct rela-
tionships. If competition becomes excessively intense, however, it
may develop into conflict. Isolation is the relative absence of social

15 Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, Sociology: A Text with
interaction and expresses itself in social distance, ostracism, and attitudes of mutual avoidance.

**Associative.** Accommodation indicates the adjustments which groups make to prevent or relieve the tensions of competition or conflict. It may take the form of compromise, toleration or arbitration and it insures the stability and order of social relations. Broom and Selznick\(^\text{16}\) make the distinction between stable accommodation which resolves major differences of interest and opens the way for cooperation and assimilation, and unstable accommodation which is a temporary adjustment which maintains unresolved issues. Cooperation refers to the pursuit of goals by two or more groups under conditions where goal achievement is shared. It may involve organized joint action in which the groups need not share equally in the rewards or goals. Cooperative interaction may take several modes such as bargaining (exchange), cooptation, and coalition formation.\(^\text{17}\) Bargaining or exchange consists of negotiated or traditional agreements between two or more organizations for the exchange of goods and services. In cooptation elements external to the organization are absorbed into the decision-making functions of the organization. Under conditions of coalition formation organizations become committed to joint decisions. Assimilation is a form of interaction by which the separate identity of groups is broken down by fusion or by the creation of some new form. To the degree that

\(^{16}\text{Ibid., p. 34.}\)

assimilation is complete the above forms of interaction are reduced and to the degree that assimilation is incomplete the forms of interaction are operative.

Subsidiary Questions

There are some subsidiary questions in addition to the originating questions above: (1) If Church-type groups are integrated into a secular and pluralistic society what functions do they serve, what units are served by these functions and how do they serve these functions? (2) If Sect-type groups survive in a secular society how do they maintain their separateness, what functions do they serve, and what units are served by these functions?

No attempt is made here to account for authentic religious truth and values. This is not because religious truth and values are devalued but because their evaluation falls beyond the scope of sociological analysis. No attempt is made here to determine which of the types of religious organizations is "the best." This study has tried to be objective and to stay away from value judgments. The position of the writer is expressed in the following quotation:

Men have beliefs that are nonempirical and cannot be tested by scientific methods. Some beliefs and ideas are scientifically false, but everything that is not scientifically valid is not ignorance and error...Many religious beliefs and ideas fall in the vast heterogeneous category of the nonscientific. They are not unscientific, because science cannot help in judging their validity...The present analysis attempts to be a scientific, sociological treatment, raising questions to which facts derived from observation can provide answers. It is therefore not connected with the ultimate value or validity of religions. When we analyze religious norms and values in terms of their functions for other aspects of the society,
we are not concerned with the truth or validity of those norms and values.\textsuperscript{18}

CHAPTER II

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Logic of the Inquiry

The needed research might focus on any number of sectors of our society but only those studies which examine the relationship of sharply contrasting institutionalized organizations will indicate in bold strokes the theoretical direction of future systematic empirical research. No environment should be more suitable for the isolation of religious organizations than a state university. A state university is the repository of secular thought and the center of values characteristic of modern urban society. In the state university the general social values of the larger society, such as secular rationalism, science, and bureaucracy converge in concentrated form. Thus, the presence of denominationally sponsored religious organizations with values oriented in the direction of revelation, faith, and tradition should set the stage for value conflict.

If there is latent conflict between religious and secular organizations on a state university campus, then recent studies of the academic world would be expected to expose them. It is curious to note that some of the most important studies of university life make only slight references to religious organizations and activities. This is the case in the studies by Logan Wilson, David Riesman, Theodore Caplow and Nevitt Sanford. The impression is given in these studies that
religious organizations are so marginal to the life and values of state universities that they are unobserved by sociological analysis. If this is the case, then support is given to the generalizations noted above. If this is not the case, one wonders why religious organizations, activities, and officials could have been so universally hidden. In either case there is no positive evidence to support these suggestions in that particular social situation. These propositions remain uncontested and unsupported by empirical evidence.

It may be that the social relations and culture of the academic community prefigure the kinds of values, beliefs and patterns of behavior which will characterize the larger society at some future time. The political and economic importance of the scholar and the technician already indicate strong movements in this direction. If so, where does organized religion fit in such a society? The state university represents the last phase of controlled socialization of the student by the state which stands in loco parentis. In the context of the state university the possibility of rupture between the previous agencies of socialization (family of orientation, home church, and home town) and the future agencies of adult socialization (family of procreation, occupation, and large scale organizations) is great. At this stage in the student's life familial and religious social control is at its weakest and therefore the religious organizations and "student centers" were placed adjacent to the campus to compete with secular organizations for the loyalty of the students.

There would be no potential conflict if any of the organizations would abdicate their right of influence and control, but each
organization embodies some of the institutionalized values of the larger heterogeneous society. There would be no potential conflict of values if either group had legitimate superordination over the other, but the legal definition of their relationship specifies separation and precludes suppression. Each organization is relatively autonomous.

All of these organizations are in the context of a larger social system which has legitimized each and which will tolerate only a minimum of conflict between them. Therefore these groups are forced into patterns of toleration and accommodation.

Formal organizations and the interaction of formal organizations tend to generate informal relations and informal organizations. In spite of the formal definitions of the permissible interactions between officers of the university administration and faculty, and officers of the religious organizations, there may exist networks of informal relations which have an impact on the formal interaction patterns. We do not know how different types of religious groups relate to the same state university or how the same religious organizations interact with different types of state universities. It is important that we learn what relations are common to all types of religious organizations and which are shared by a certain class of religious groups. It is more important that we learn the basis of these different patterns.

The logic of this study was that of an exploratory case study which employed longitudinal and cross-sectional comparisons. The logic of comparative analysis suggested by Johnson involves two types of comparisons: a comparison of two types of religious groups within the same environment and a comparison of each type of group with itself.
at two points in time.

The empirical case or sample of this study is the University of Alabama and the eight professionally led religious organizations. The structural units under analysis are three groups: (1) The formal organization of the University of Alabama, (2) the eight campus religious organizations, and (3) the Greek-letter fraternity system. The structure of informal organizations generated by the interaction of these formal organizations will be presented in Chapter IV.

The main body of substantive data in this report has to do with the differential relation of types of religious groups to their social environment and the interaction patterns of these religious groups with groups in their environment. The data is ordered in terms of interaction categories although no attempt was made to observe or measure systematically the interaction patterns of these groups. The analytical means of differentiating religious groups into types is the Church-Sect dichotomy as revised by Benton Johnson. In order to operationalize the distinction between Church and Sect it is necessary to specify the groups to be classified and the environmental reference point which they accept or reject. According to Johnson, if the dominant value system of the United States as analyzed by Robin Williams, Jr., is taken as the basic environmental point of reference, then most American religious groups are Church types. They may be internally differentiated in terms of the extent to which there are reservations in the support given to these dominant values. But when the point of reference is shifted from the dominant value system to the major value-relevant cleavages in American society, there is a correspondence between theological liberalism and political liberalism over against
the correspondence between theological conservatism and political conservatism. Johnson argues that if the point of reference is shifted to the current controversy between "left" and "right" over matters of social policy such as foreign aid, the United Nations, labor policy, educational objectives, etc., religious groups may be usefully classified. He suggests the following continuum which is subject to modification by region but which holds true for the United States in his estimation.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal (Church)</th>
<th>Conservative (Sect)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unitarians</td>
<td>Congregational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakers</td>
<td>Methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform Judaism</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Episcopalian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the basis of this study the environmental point of reference is the value system of each of the major structural units. The value system given here of the University, of the two types of religious groups, and of the fraternity system is a synthesis of the following sources: (1) major value-orientations presented by Robin Williams, Jr., (2) general sociological studies of religion in American society, (3) implications of the attitudes, opinions and behavior of the ministers, faculty, and administration, (4) my personal experience in participant observation and intuitive impressions. These do not represent a systematic empirical analysis of values embodied and promoted by these groups. I accept these value systems as a given and an assumption since they are only partially derived from the data. These groups were

classified in terms of: (1) The attitudinal and behavioral responses of the ministers to certain value-relevant issues and changes in the life of the University, and (2) The socio-metric choices of the ministers. Johnson's classification ordered the data in terms of two types of religious organizations—churches and sects. The analysis employed in this study went beyond Johnson's scheme by spelling out the value system of each structural unit under analysis. Different value systems of the religious groups is the principle in terms of which the different attitudes and behavior patterns are explained. It answers the question of why the data may be ordered in terms of two types of religious groups. The exploratory character of this study did not lend itself to independent measures of values, attitudes, and behavior.

Values are standards or conceptions by which certain things are desired. They are the standards in terms of which evaluations are made. Value systems means that values are studied not as autonomous isolates but as interdependent and arranged in patterns. Two groups may share the same values but the hierarchical system of values for each group may be different. The values listed below are actually evaluations, i.e., items which are valued, but they are treated as values in this study because they function as values.

The values (valued items) employed in this analysis are: (1) The intrinsic worth of intellectual activity, i.e., it is valued in and for itself; (2) The instrumental worth of intellectual activity, i.e., intellectual activities are means to other valued items; (3) Intellectual autonomy and responsibility, i.e., radical honesty, objectivity, and freedom from any form of restricting cannons of thought other than
formal logic; (4) Pragmatic and proximate concerns rather than absolutes and ultimates; (5) Religious neutrality of non-religious organizations; (6) The legitimacy and autonomy of the University of Alabama; (7) Organizational growth and development; (8) General Democratic values of Justice, Freedom, Order, and Equality; (9) Primary relations and mental health for students; (10) Toleration of non-conventional student morality; (11) Toleration of non-conventional student intellectual activities and expressions; (12) Material comfort, consumer skills and leisure activities; (13) Individual morality; (14) Individual religious piety; (15) Anti-religious cultural dominance; (16) Instrumental and functional relations; (17) Student immorality; (18) Anti-intellectualism and intellectual conformity; (19) Social and recreational activities; (20) Anti-Democratic ideas and values.

The value system of each structural unit is presented in terms of the relative degree of intensity with which each value is held. There are four classes of intensity: (1) **Intensive Support**—those values which are actively and intensely sought and maintained; (2) **Passive Qualified Support**—those values to which "lip-service" is given but which are not actively supported; (3) **Tolerated**—those values which are disliked but which are tolerated; (4) **Opposition**—those values which are opposed actively or passively.

The value system of the administration-faculty-staff of the University of Alabama is presented in the following pattern: (1) **Intensive Support**: (a) The intrinsic and instrumental worth of intellectual activity; (b) Intellectual autonomy and responsibility; (c) Pragmatic and proximate concerns; (d) Religious neutrality of non-religious
organizations; (e) The legitimacy and autonomy of the University of Alabama; (f) Organizational growth and development. (2) Passive Qualified Support: (a) General Democratic values; (b) Primary relations and mental health for students; (c) Toleration of moral and intellectual non-conformity; (d) Material comfort, consumer skills, and leisure activities; (e) Individual morality. (3) Toleration: (a) Individual religious piety; (b) Anti-religious cultural dominance; (c) Impersonal and functional relations; (d) Student immorality. (4) Opposition: (a) Anti-intellectualism and intellectual conformity.

The value system of the liberal religious organizations is as follows: (1) Active Support: (a) Individual piety and morality; (b) General Democratic values; (c) Primary relations and mental health for students; (d) Intrinsic and instrumental worth of intellectual activities; (e) Intellectual autonomy and responsibility. (2) Passive Qualified Support: (a) Pragmatic and proximate concerns; (b) Toleration of moral and intellectual non-conformity; (c) Religious neutrality of non-religious organizations; (d) The legitimacy and autonomy of the University of Alabama; (e) Religious organizational growth and development; (f) Social and recreational activities. (3) Toleration: (a) Material comfort, consumer skills. (4) Opposition: (a) Anti-intellectualism and intellectual conformity; (b) Anti-Democratic values; (c) Anti-religious cultural dominance; (c) Impersonal and functional relations.

The value system of the conservative religious organizations is as follows: (1) Active Support: (a) Individual religious piety and morality; (b) Religious organizational growth and development; (c) Social and
recreational activities; (d) Instrumental worth of intellectual activities; (e) Intellectual conventionalism and conformity; (f) Primary relations and mental health for students. (2) Passive Qualified Support: (a) General Democratic Values; (b) Anti-intellectualism; (c) Anti-Democratic values. (3) Toleration: (a) Intrinsic worth of intellectual activity; (b) Intellectual autonomy and responsibility; (c) Religious neutrality of non-religious organizations; (d) Pragmatic and proximate concerns; (e) Material comfort and consumer skills. (4) Opposition: (a) Intellectual non-conformity; (b) Student immorality; (c) Anti-religious cultural dominance; (d) Impersonal and functional relations.

The value system of the fraternity system is as follows:

(1) Active Support: (a) Instrumental worth of intellectual activity; (b) Material comfort, consumer skills, and leisure activities; (c) Intellectual conformity; (d) Social and recreational activity; (e) Anti-democratic values and ideas; (f) Non-conforming student morality; (g) Primary relations and mental health for students. (2) Passive Qualified Support; (a) Anti-intellectualism; (b) Student immorality; (c) Religious neutrality of non-religious organizations; (d) Pragmatic and proximate concerns; (e) Anti-religious cultural dominance; (f) Functional and instrumental relations. (3) Toleration: (a) Intellectual non-conformity; (b) Individual morality; (c) Individual religious piety; (d) Intrinsic worth of intellectual activity. (4) Opposition: (a) General Democratic values; (b) Intellectual autonomy and responsibility; (c) Legitimacy and autonomy of the University of Alabama.
Methods of Data Collection And Analysis

The research procedures for data gathering in this exploratory study may be broadly identified as participant observation. During the year of the study I was a participant in some of the religious organizations through personal friendship and frequent interaction with four of the eight campus ministers. I attended a meeting of the University Ministerial Association, taught a small group study at one of the student centers (for students, faculty, staff, and administration), preached on several occasions at one of the chapels and on one occasion at another chapel. Also, I regularly attended the Sunday morning services at one of the chapels.

Interviews. At least three structured and semi-structured interviews were conducted with each of the campus ministers. This consisted of one interview with a standardized interview schedule and subsequent follow-up unstructured depth interviews. Each standardized interview lasted about one and one-half hours. Intensive structured interviews were held with seven administrative officers, six faculty members, four honor students and several long unstructured interviews with a long-time staff member of the University. All total, over seventy hours of interviews took place.

Correspondence. During the past year extensive correspondence with four of the campus ministers, one administrator, two faculty members and one staff member took place. This additional source of information served to clarify data gathered earlier and to supplement the data from the interviews.
Available Data. A thorough analysis was made of the "Minutes" of the University Ministerial Association meetings which go back to 1948. Included in this were letters from administrative officers, faculty members and staff personnel addressed to present and past members of the campus ministers' association. Each of the campus ministers gave and/or made available to me pamphlets, articles, and small books which were published by their denominations and which explained their philosophy and activities of campus ministry. It is not necessary to list them. One of the ministers made available to me a file of clippings, letters, and other items collected over the past ten years which had to do with his organization on campus. Two unpublished manuscripts about religion on the campus of the University of Alabama were made available to me. One manuscripts was written by Dr. James B. Sellers in 1954 and consists of a chapter entitled, "Religion On The University Campus" from his yet unpublished second volume The History Of The University of Alabama. The other manuscript was written in 1955 by the late Reverend Dubose Murphy, minister of Christ Church Episcopal, Tuscaloosa, Alabama. It is a history of the work of the Episcopal Church on the campus.

Observational Tour. One of the ministers gave me a "guided tour" of the buildings of the religious organizations and explained how the philosophy of the religious organizations is reflected concretely in the kind of building and facilities constructed for their use. It was also noticed in this tour how modifications were made in their use and arrangements which reflected changes in the life of the organization.

The diversity of types of data employed in this study is an expression of its basically exploratory character. Future systematic
empirical studies in this substantive area must be able to move directly from specified hypotheses to limited data-gathering procedures. It is doubtful, however, that exclusive reliance on one type of data could give the kind of depth and wholistic perspective given in a variety of types of observations, cultural products, and interviews. This kind of multiple data gathering procedure is suited for exploratory studies.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH FINDINGS

Historical Background

**The United States.** The general pattern of structural change in the relationship of organized religion to higher education has been that of a movement of organized religion from the center of the college community to the periphery. This change has been due to the variety of social experiences of the United States during its history. Some of these were: the anti-establishment bias of the American revolution, the expanding western frontier, the mass immigration, two world wars, and finally the rapid technological and industrial revolutions since the second world war.

Organized religious interests were of significant influence in the founding of almost every American college during the Colonial period of American history. The establishment of most institutions of higher learning was by religious groups in the interest of a learned ministry and learned civic and political leaders. We need mention here only a few examples: Harvard (Congregational), Yale (Congregational), Brown (Baptist), William and Mary (Church of England), Princeton (Presbyterian), Columbia (Church of England) and Rutgers (Dutch Reformed).

The entire campus climate during this period was directed toward the enhancement of piety and religious motivations. These objectives
were sought through their curricula, their activities, and their leadership. They were centers for the maintenance of theological orthodoxy. Not only would the president be a clergyman but also the teachers, and clergy would dominate the board of trustees. Thus the goals of organized religion would be sought at the very center of the institution.

Public higher education, which was in its earlier days strongly oriented in the same religious patterns as the old liberal arts colleges because of the "Protestant Establishment," tended to become secularized in the sense of relinquishing concern with ultimate issues and giving more attention to pragmatic and proximate concerns. The affiliation and control by religious groups of many of the colleges was given up in later years due to influences which weakened the bonds of higher education and organized religion in the Eastern part of the United States. The vast growth of human knowledge and increasing occupational diversity forced a specialization in training beyond the traditional learned professions of law, ministry, and medicine. The continued controversies between science and religion produced the need for an academic freedom beyond that desired by religious boards.

The religious groups had to abandon partially that particular field to state and private control which created a vacuum of organized religion on the campus. Aside from the unofficial Protestant ethos which characterized many of the colleges and universities in the Atlantic coastal states, these state and non-religious institutions could not assume responsibility for the "religious life" of the students. Thus general historical trends affected society's attitudes
toward religion and these general changes were manifest in the changing status of religion in the centers of higher education.

Following the great revivals in the early nineteenth century, churches established an increasing number of denominational colleges. This was in response to the moving frontier, increased denominational self-consciousness, and the beginnings of public systems of higher education. John Cantelon says that these denominationally related institutions

...were geared to provide a Christian ministry and to combat the secular influences of the rising state universities. These church-sponsored institutions have had an exceedingly high mortality rate. Among five hundred such colleges established before the Civil War, 80 percent did not survive.

Independent of church support and leadership, various sorts of student Christian societies have existed in one form or another since the earliest colonial colleges. These groups were spontaneous, voluntary and sprang up at a time when organized religion could play some part in the life of the colleges. Clarence P. Shedd claims that by 1858 there were over ninety of these societies in seventy different colleges. They were theological societies for the discussion and debate of religious doctrine, groups for the cultivation of personal religious piety through devotions, and foreign missionary societies.

---


Their existence on college and university campuses until the founding of the student YMCA's was an important thread of continuity in the relationship of religion and higher education.

In 1858 quite spontaneously and independently the first college YMCA's were organized at the University of Michigan and the University of Virginia. In great measure they took over the work and emphases of the "societies" which were losing ground. Their programs centered mainly on service projects, temperance and sex education. After World War I the emphases of the Y changed to social issues such as pacifism, support of the World Court, labor relations and business ethics.

The establishment of land-grant colleges under the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862 was important for higher education in the United States. The dominant pattern of the church-related college or private university providing the nation's higher education would be a thing of the past in two generations.

By the early 1890's in the large state universities full-time YMCA and YWCA secretaries were employed. Shedd suggests that they performed on a voluntary basis many of the religious and service functions which the state university wanted to see performed, but which it did not feel free to carry forward officially. Because they included students of all faiths in their fellowships and programs of study and service, state universities welcomed them on the campus and leaned heavily on them for united campus religious work, giving them moral and frequently financial support.

---


5 Cantelon, p. 57.

6 Shedd, p. 22.
The YMCA's were instrumental in the development of student counseling services, placement bureaus and freshman orientation camps. Some of these functions became so significant in student life that many universities themselves were motivated to take them over and operate them. The colleges and the universities began to do on a much larger scale what the Y's had initiated. 7

Several changes in the structure of college and university life by about 1910 produced movements distinct from and in some ways in competition with the YMCA's. One of these changes was the steady stream of students into state universities rather than into church colleges. This forced the various church groups to initiate programs such as trained university pastors and student workers. These programs were designed to maintain church loyalties and of necessity took a unique direction. The work of the churches toward the religious development of students in state institutions was limited to what local congregations might do. Most ministers in university communities had neither the time nor the training to conduct effective student activities. In addition, the churches began to feel that the non-denominational YMCA's were neglecting theological matters and were not preparing students for leadership positions in local churches. Then, too, the associations were suspected by some of the orthodox or fundamentalist churches of fostering liberal theologies and heresies. The new concern of the churches was to nurture students in their faith which neither the state university nor the YMCA could do.

7 Cantelon, p. 13.
Denominational leaders slowly became convinced that these scattered and piece-meal projects were inadequate. The first decade or so of this century saw a variety of experiments usually on the local level and infrequently aided by district or state denominational agencies. The orientation that characterized early denominational campus Christian fellowships was that of providing a "home away from home." The churches were determined to follow the students to college to preserve them for the church and to protect them from the "godless secularism" of the state universities. They built large fraternity-type houses near the campus where student pastors lived with their families. Cantelon comments that

At best this approach to the campus ministry provided a valuable service to a few badly students . . . At its worse, however, it eventuated in the denominations trying to save students for the church by saving them from an education.8

In 1910 the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. created the first Department of University Work but by 1912 the major Protestant denominations supported 26 university pastors. Robert Michaelsen9 reports that in 1938 there were roughly 200 full-time professional workers employed by the churches for campus work. Leadership in organized religion on the campus had thus passed out of the hands of the college administrators and even largely out of the hands of students into the hands of professional campus ministers. This shift undoubtedly produced a number of changes in organizational relationships: (1) Greater

---

institutionalization of religious movements in higher education; (2) the development of another professional association (National Association of College and University Chaplains and the Association of College and University Religious Advisors); (3) carefully planned programs which are the product of national organizations rather than attempts of the local campus minister to be relevant to the immediate campus community.\textsuperscript{10} It may be that caution and conservatism is the price paid by these ministers and organizations for professional leadership and organizational stability.

In 1953 the number of professional workers had jumped to nearly 1000 (Protestants, Catholics, and Jews). Of this number about 825 were employed by the major Protestant denominations. Glen Olds\textsuperscript{11} reported in 1958 that student centers for Catholics, Jews, Lutherans, Methodists, Baptists, and Episcopalians totaled about 1975. "In value these centers range from modest homes to multiutility buildings worth upward of $2,000,000.00."\textsuperscript{12}

All of the major religious groups and denominations now have national organizations to co-ordinate their interest in the religious life of students in public supported institutions. Usually the work of these organizations is carried out on the local campus through a religious foundation or center. In many cases the work is centered in a local parish chapel or congregation. The situation is characterized

\textsuperscript{10}Kolb and McCoy, p. 24.


\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Ibid.}
more by variety and experimentation rather than by stability and continuity.

The relationship of these religious organizations to the university, the major concern of this paper, varies from complete isolation to direct participation in the curricular work of the university. Their student activities, aside from Sunday worship services, range from recreation to serious study, with the latter on the increase. Since World War II a new orientation in campus religious work has been evolving among the principle denominations which is both missionary and ecumenical. The trend has been away from conservation of the churches' youth to "... involving them in responsible witness in the university seen as a microcosm of the culture ... The stress is placed on responsible studentship."13 Other existing new currents are: (1) A rejection of the emphasis on the "student center" as a recreation hall and "home away from home." The trend is toward contributing intellectual substance to the campus ministry, offering intellectual experiences and is attracting brighter students; (2) A trend away from regarding the campus ministry as "student work" toward seeing the whole campus community, including administration, faculty and staff, as the arena of the churches' ministry; (3) A tendency for the campus ministry to come to grips with the intellectual life of the university in terms of relating theology to the various disciplines and discussions of what it means to be a scholar and a person of religious faith. All of this is an attempt on the part of the churches to be

13 Cantelon, p. 15.
involved at the center of higher education rather than at its periphery.  

The present situation on campuses of state universities is relatively unfavorable for non-university-sponsored religious organizations and personnel. This change has been due to many reasons. One of these is the increased concern shown for the religious experiences of students on the part of university administrations. The shift to mass education following World War II resulted in a loss of primary relations among many students and between students and faculty. This, coupled with the realization by administrators that student life embraces more than class-room experience, has brought about increased student personnel work. This concern has expressed itself in a variety of patterns and includes the appointment of chaplains, coordinators of religious activities and student religious affairs directors employed by the universities and responsible to the university administration.

Michaelsen observed that by 1960 about half of the state universities had some such officer. The coordinator of religious affairs usually serves as an intermediary between the Inter-Religious Council and the Vice-President for Student Affairs. His status and role is an indication of the concern of the university administration for an officer who would deal with religious affairs on behalf of the University. It is also an indication of an administrative orientation that everything the student does should be done within the context of university-approved values, intellectual orientations, and behavior.

---

14 Kolb and McCoy, p. 27.

15 Michaelsen, p. 308.
The radical social and intellectual changes of this century, and especially since World War II, have been reflected in the changing goals, functions and organizational structures of state universities. These new situations set new contexts and challenges which organized religion faces as it interacts with the university. These broad social changes and their impact on state universities must be specified.

The first significant change is that of the intellectual climate of the university. Sometimes this change is referred to as a change from religious and then metaphysical control over human thought and reason. In this process the assumption of the existence of an eternal, rational order which man could know and from which truth, values, and an ideal order of society could be deduced, has largely disappeared from the university. With this loss of a total worldview within which all knowledge could be integrated plus the explosion of knowledge in the last two decades, there has been an intellectual and pragmatic fragmentation of the university. In addition, this knowledge has been relativized by the recognition in the behavioral sciences that no truth can be formulated without regard to time and society. The tremendous advances in the sciences, and the new tools such as the computer, have brought about a stress on teaching methodology rather than particular contents.

The second significant change is the new relationship which exists between universities and external organizations such as industry, the

---

military, and the various governments. This is an expression of the interdependence of economics and education. For example, the scientific competition with Soviet Russia initiated with the launching of "Sputnik" in 1957 called the whole American educational process into question. Now the modern university is in danger of being transformed into a technical and vocational school. As science and technology have become more specialized, the government, industrial and military establishments are increasingly demanding specialities from the universities. The financial incentives held out to the universities tend to make them captive to interests outside the university and foreign to the traditional goals of higher education.

Third, the rapid increase in enrollment and the emergence of the mass "multiversity" have led to increased bureaucratization of the university and increased diversity in the background of students. The increase in the numbers of those of college age with the presence of the post-World War II baby boom has been accompanied by a greater percentage of those in this segment of the population who seek higher education. This growth in size of student body has necessitated increased size and specialization in university administration, faculty, and staff. The total organization has become large, complex and centralized. The range of responsibilities of university administrators has expanded, particularly in the area of student personnel services. Herbert Stroup says,

The college in the American tradition has increasingly taken more and more responsibility for the direction and control of

17 Cantelon, p. 62.
the student, and this has necessitated the presence of a larger number of specialized people.18

A vivid expression of these sentiments on the part of a sociologist and an educator is the following statement by Logan B. Wilson:

I believe that every college or university has a responsibility for what happens to a student outside the classroom, and this is especially true for the residential college. That obligation cannot be side-stepped, no matter how much we may wish to avoid it. Qualities of character, conscience, and citizenship are part of the educational development of our students. All of us, faculty as well as students, make a tragic mistake if we proclaim that this is not the proper business of the college.19

The university is taking on the character of a "total institution." Its dominant model is the industrial corporation, the chief institution of our economic society. This can be observed in the increase in the power of university administrators. They are no longer bureaucrats serving the faculty but have become management employing the faculty. These administrators have a great sensitivity to "image" of the university which is a combination of ideals, facts and public expectations.20

The fourth change is in terms of the implications of these other changes for student life and culture. Aside from the diversity of backgrounds mentioned above there are the two problems of depersonalization and pressures brought on by competition and increased academic loads. There is little or no opportunity for interpersonal relationships with faculty members and less time for "co-curricular"

---


20 Cantelon, p. 82.
activities.\textsuperscript{21} Also, the impact of domestic, and international politics on the present student generation is in the words of one educator, "... breaking down the barrier between learning in the classroom and living outside."\textsuperscript{22}

All of this means that the life of the student today is not one of bracketed removal from vital concerns and therefore anxieties, but one of intensity, high motivation (relative to previous student generations), and intellectual excitement. In terms of types of students, in the South at least, we can see a movement from an anti-intellectual, anti-scientific, parochial, rural, Protestant type to an increasingly scientific, intellectual, cosmopolitan student type.

The place of organized religion in the life of this kind of academic environment with these kinds of students will be largely determined by the extent to which the religious organizations share in the values, ideas, and behavior patterns of this environment.

The University of Alabama. The general pattern of structural change in the relationship of organized religion to the University of Alabama has been, in general, the same pattern which is observed for the United States as a whole. Since this institution began as a state university the process entered at a different stage and because of the strong conservative Protestant environment the process has taken somewhat longer. However, rapid changes occurring in the past ten years have made the pattern fairly observable.

\textsuperscript{21} The Student World, p. 376.

In the opening paragraph of the chapter entitled "Religion On The Campus" Dr. James Sellers says,

Although the University of Alabama is a secular institution, its administration and faculty have never been secular minded. Throughout its long and illustrious history, it has sought to provide an atmosphere conducive to a religious life and has encouraged independent groups to minister as fully as possible to the spiritual needs of students and faculty alike.23

The relationship of organized religion to the University of Alabama is seen best in terms of four stages: (1) A period of Protestant Establishment; (2) A period of accelerated local church assistance; (3) A period of denominationally sponsored professional student workers; and (4) A period of the modern student centers. There is some indication that a new stage in the evolution of the relationship is beginning in terms of changes in the philosophy of mission and changes in attitude toward the secular state university.

The first period in this sequence lasted from the beginning of the University of Alabama until about 1910. During this long period the University, although under suspicion by some anti-intellectual preachers and politicians, reflected the close identification of religion and culture which characterized the region. Dr. George H. Denny, former President of the University, in replying to some critics, is quoted as saying, "... the life of the institution is distinctly religious ... So long as I am president of the University of Alabama, Almighty God shall be the Chief member of its faculty and its Crowned Head."24 The explicit use of Christian symbols by an administrator is

---

24 Ibid.
one indication of the ease with which organized religion might identify with the University and the degree to which the University encouraged religious activities. As late as 1911 each academic day was initiated with prayer and Scripture reading in Morgan Hall auditorium and sixteen Bible study groups, located in dormitories, fraternity houses and private boarding houses, met regularly. Also, during this period the YMCA maintained a full-time student secretary on the campus.

The second period, lasting from about 1910 until 1933 was one of extensive cooperation between University officials and the local churches of Tuscaloosa. The characteristic feature of this period was the employment of an assistant minister by each of the major churches in Tuscaloosa for the specific purpose of serving students at the University. This was true for the Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists. The utility of this relationship opened the possibility for increased cooperation and assistance by the University. In 1920 the Board of Trustees of the University endorsed work on the campus by "... any Christian denominations 'having a substantial following among the people of Alabama' which would aid the religious or moral welfare of their constituents or other University students."25 The board was cautious to mention its concern for the principle of separation of church and state but welcomed any association with the churches within the context of the law. In 1925 Dr. Joseph P. Boone became pastor of the First Baptist Church of Tuscaloosa and sometime later suggested to Dr. Denny that "Bible Chairs" be established at the University. He had established these arrangements at state colleges in Texas and

25 Ibid., p. 2.
emphasized that the principle of separation of church and state would not be violated. University officials agreed that courses in religion should be offered for credit and that these should be conducted by representatives of the religious denominations. Each of these local pastors taught under qualifications approved by the University. By 1955 there were eight ministers teaching such courses and they comprised the University's Department of Religion in the College of Arts and Sciences. This was an essentially Southern phenomenon but illustrates the relationships possible in such an environment.

By 1930 the Student Union Building of the University was completed and the three local church student workers (Methodists, Baptist, and Presbyterian) were given office space in this building to confer with students. In addition, the local Lutheran congregation was holding Sunday services in the auditorium of the Union Building. Since 1914 there had been a total of eight assistant ministers representing the three local churches at various times.

The third period (1933-1950) of the relationship of the religious groups to the University, was a period of great experimentation on the part of the local churches and denominational officials, and of gradually changing attitudes of the University officials to the nature of this relationship. To begin with, there was the presence of a new type of clergyman—the campus minister—which focused the growing specialization of the religious groups and the observable separation of functions between the University and the churches. These were hard years economically for the region, the University and the churches. The depression was still the dominant economic fact of the time and
the entrance of the United States into World War II drained the campus of its male population.

In 1933 Dr. W. G. Echols was appointed Director of the Wesley Foundation at the University. This was the first time a clergyman came to the University to devote all of his time to students. Prior to this the student workers were assistants to pastors of local churches and devoted at least half of their time and energy to those functions. Dr. Echols held worship services in the Union Building and later moved to the auditorium of Dostor Hall because of increased attendance.

During this period of time the total number of clergymen directing their ministry toward the University community grew to eight. Among these were: Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Baptist, Church of Christ, Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Lutheran. They reflected two basic patterns in their philosophy of campus mission: student religious activities and a local university parish. The dominant philosophy was that of nurture, i.e., "the training of churchmanship so that the students would return to their home churches just as well trained religiously, as they were trained for doctors, lawyers, and teachers . . ."26

Several events in this period illustrate the changing pattern of relationships, important organizational developments, and hints of the value orientations shared. The first expresses the kind of intellectual environment which an academic community can create. In 1935 an

26 Ibid., p. 9.
interfaith seminar was conducted on the campus in which clergymen representing Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism participated.

Dr. Sellers quotes the enthusiastic response of the Crimson-White:

This was the first time that a Catholic, a Jew, and Protestant have spoken from the same platform here. We have seldom seen such broad-minded, liberal points of view expressed. Each man firmly believed in his form of religion and at the same time each had an appreciation and a respect for the religion of the other. Too often clergymen are fanatics, sob-sisters, or strict conformists to the letter of the law. Such men can never appeal to an intelligent student. Until we have more men of the caliber of these three seminar leaders we cannot hope that the average college student will become very interested in organized religion.27

Another incident indicates the loyalty and support given by some University personnel to one particular student religious organization. In 1947 a crisis arose in the life of the Episcopal Student Center. The Bishop of Alabama intended to close the operation because of lack of funds. A local Episcopal clergyman called a meeting of thirty faculty members and persuaded them to pledge funds to supplement the appropriation from the Diocese. Mr. Murphy commented: "Money talks, and the Bishop listened."28

By 1948 there were seven full-time ministers at the university. An organization known as the University Ministerial Association was created and held monthly meetings. This gave the ministers a center of communication and a formal structure through which they might interact with the University as a unit. The monthly meetings were attended frequently by the Dean of Students and the Assistant Dean of

27 Ibid., p. 19.

28 Dubose Murphy, "The Church's Work At The University of Alabama," Unpublished manuscript dated 1955, p. 10.
Students of the University. Thus, not only were the ministers organized but they established a formal relationship with the center of power in the University—the administration. It was through the Dean's office that the Ministerial Association communicated with the administration and through this office that the clergymen were assured of the University's cooperation, interest, and support. And equally important, it was through this arrangement that the clergymen had immediate information as to their limits and their possibilities as their activities began to expand.

Religious Emphasis Week was held on the campus in 1948 for the first time as a joint effort of the University Ministerial Association, the Student Religious Association, and the Administration. The convocation speaker's honorarium and certain other expenses were paid by allocated funds from the Students' Activity Fee collected by the Student Government Association and the University. This series of services has been held each year with Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish speakers. This annual event has never been free from controversy and has been one of several issues which have focused group conflict and divisions.

For some time prior to 1948 the President of the University, Dr. Galilee, had promoted the idea of the University's leasing a plot of land to the various denominations for the construction of a single interdenominational activities building or for the construction of separate student centers. With the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the McCollum v. Board of Education case in 1948 the proposal was dropped. The decisive words were as follows:
The 'establishment of religion' clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the federal government can set up a Church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another.29

Thus, the role and function of the University of Alabama in the religious life of its entire community was restricted and organized religion was officially outside the University seeking ways to function within it.

The fourth period in the history of the evolving pattern of relationships could be profitably sub-divided into two periods. The dividing point would be the advent of Frank Rose as President of the University of Alabama in 1957. Not only has the innovating influence of this administrator been felt in the life of the University and the State, but the rapid acceleration of change since that date suitably distinguishes the time since then from the time prior to it.

Between 1951 and 1959 six new religious student centers and chapels were constructed. This gave a concreteness, visibility and permanence to organized religious work at the University which it hitherto lacked. It signaled the fact the religious groups in the state were making considerable effort to be a part of a growing and changing state university. Also, the presence of these buildings created a distinct identity and image of the character of these groups which in many cases has worked against the desired flexibility of several of the groups.

The first of these new buildings to be constructed was Canterbury Chapel, Canterbury House, and the Episcopal Chaplain's residence on Hackberry Lane. The construction of a chapel first reflects the philosophy of the Episcopal church's mission to the university community which centers on the worship services on Sunday mornings. Canterbury House provided kitchen, recreational, and library facilities. In 1952 three different student centers and chapels were completed. The University Lutheran Church, located east of the University on the Birmingham highway, was constructed with its emphasis also on congregational worship and ministry to University families as well as students. The B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation building with its large parlor, kitchen, and recreation hall, expansive library and record room reflects the cultural, social and intellectual emphasis of this group. The Westminster House, located down Eighth Street from the Hillel house, was constructed to meet the then conceived needs of a ministry to university students. It has a large recreation hall with stage facilities, a lounge, a TV room, a kitchen, a chapel, and offices. The Baptist Student Center was completed in 1954 and, although it is larger, matches the type of facilities of the Westminster House. The Baptist Chapel, however, is used only during the week for Baptist students are encouraged to attend local churches on Sunday. Also, the Baptist Student Center contains a library and an apartment upstairs for a married couple. It is well equipped with storage space, rooms and office equipment to carry out an extensive activities schedule.

In 1953 a series of statements was drawn up by the University Ministerial Association in an attempt to define their status vis-a-vis
the University of Alabama. The particular concern had to do with the Department of Religion, its objectives and standards. It was submitted to Martin ten Hoor, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The first part of the statement consisted of four principles: (1) All instructors of Bible or Religion shall possess an M.A. or B.D. degree; (2) Teaching shall be presented in a "non-sectarian" point of view, i.e., instructors shall know and present views which may differ from their own; (3) The use of an announced text book in all courses; (4) Grade lists shall be submitted annually in February to the Department of Religion as a whole for discussion and review. The second part expressed three objectives: (1) A statement was desired of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of his intention for the Department and its organization, viz., will the present policy and organization continue or are changes to be expected?; (2) A request was made to increase to twelve hours the total amount of Religion courses a student may take for credit; (3) A suggestion was offered that the Department of Religion be commissioned to revise its curriculum and have the right to assign new men to courses. The response from the Dean was an appreciation of the standards set by the ministers with an indication that all new courses must be approved by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences as is the procedure in all of the Departments. In 1955 the Department of Religion requested an additional course to be taught by the Disciples Minister, Walter Anderson. Dean ten Hoor in his letter rejecting the additional course said:

30 University Ministerial Association, "Minutes," March 7, 1953.
In respect to the general matter of additional courses in the Department of Religion, it is our opinion that these offerings ought not for the present be extended. It is my suggestion that if and when it is the consensus of the Department that a course should be added, this be offered as an alternative to some other course now offered. Such courses could be given in alternative semesters or alternative years. This is the policy which is being followed in several departments of the College.

Since 1951 Father Mulvoy, minister to Roman Catholics at the University and Newman Club Director, has on several occasions attempted to persuade the Administration to set aside one night each week for "Church Night" and to make this an official part of the week nights on the campus. The Minutes of December 15, 1951 reported that the Dean of Students "... suggested that this idea should come from the student body starting with the University Religious Council, then through the Student Government Association. It is not the policy of the University to clear a night for any group." In 1955 another attempt was made which carried the support of the Ministerial Association that "... late permission for freshmen girls (be given) to sign out to a center..." for Church night which would be every Thursday night. Letters were written to the Dean of Students and the President of the University expressing the wishes of the Ministerial Association on this. The President did not give his support to the idea and the Dean of Students thought that the University could not commit itself to such an arrangement.

31 Ibid., May 7, 1955.
32 Ibid., January 8, 1955.
33 Ibid., April 2, 1955.
In 1955 the Dean of Students resigned his position to take a similar position at another university. The customary pattern of the Dean's sitting in on the meetings of the University Ministerial Association was broken. The position of Dean of Students was at this time divided into the two positions of Dean of Men and Dean of Women. They attended the meetings of the Ministerial Association several times but each time at the explicit invitation of the ministers and for a specific purpose. For example, the new Dean of Men attended the December, 1955 meeting and the Dean of Women attended the February, 1956 meeting. The Dean of Men's office granted permanent bulletin board assignments in the Student Union Building to the Religious organizations.

Since 1957 there have been some organizational and personnel changes in Administration and some cultural changes in the life of the University. Many of these changes were initiated by the new President, Dr. Frank Rose, and many were responses to events and changes in the larger society. Some of the changes initiated by the administration since 1957 are the following: (1) The program centering around Mallett Hall in 1960. One hundred and fourteen students, representing the top ten per cent of the freshman class, were selected to live together in this hall. Faculty members visited weekly the first year and later bi-weekly for discussions with the students; (2) The initiation of the Honors Program in the College of Arts and Sciences; (3) The American Civilization Studies program; (4) The self-evaluation of the Student Government Association which produced the annual Festival of Arts and the new literary magazine, Comment; (5) The intensive four-year evaluation of the fraternity system on the campus
and the functions it performs; (6) Academic requirements were stiffened with the rule that a 1.0 (C) average must be maintained or the student goes on probation for one semester after which he may be dropped from the University; (7) Selective admission of students became possible when the University was no longer required to admit all students from accredited high schools in the state, thus guaranteeing a better grade of students; (8) An upgrading of the faculty and curricula; (9) The expansion of graduate and research programs and the support of federal and state funds; (10) The percentage of the student body participating in the fraternity system has dropped from 37% to 20% in the past ten years; (11) The establishment of a Department of Religion with a paid faculty; and (12) The break with tradition by the desegregation of the University.

The implications of these changes are many but their impact on the patterns of interaction and association of the University of Alabama and eight religious organizations is the focus of this study.

Since 1957 three additional student centers and chapels were constructed. The Wesley Foundation Activities building was completed in 1957 and is undoubtedly the best equipped for activities of all sorts. It has offices, conference rooms, a massive kitchen with restaurant-type appliances, a large hall with stage which serves both recreation, drama and worship services; and a TV room. In 1959 the Church of Christ purchased a large home on Thomas Circle and converted it into a student center and in 1964 they took over the building previously occupied by Howard Johnson's Restaurant and converted it into an elaborate student center with facilities for a variety of activities including a kitchen, conference room, audio-visual aide
room, lounge, stereo-recordings room, TV room, and library-study. Students in this organization attend worship services at the Church of Christ located next to the center on University Avenue and Thomas Circle. Prior to the renovation of Howard Johnson's, the Newman Club and Catholic Student Center was the most recent new construction and it profited from many of the earlier mistakes of the other religious centers. It also is equipped with recreation and banquet hall, kitchen, lounge, offices, residence of the Priest, TV room and library. It is located directly across from the Canterbury Student Center and around the corner from the Baptist Student Center.

The ecological pattern of the group of religious organizations' buildings standing next to but off the campus of the University of Alabama to a great extent concretely pictures the structural relationship existing. These religious organizations are increasingly being identified by students, faculty and administration as an "off-campus" or "co-curricula" enterprise. This structural differentiation and ecological limitation is the context within which the patterns of interaction between these organized institutions take place. The content and change of the pattern of interaction is the concern of the following chapter. The general pattern of change in the relationship of organized religion to higher education, both in the United States and in the University of Alabama, has been that of a movement of organized religion from the center of the university community to the periphery.
CHAPTER IV
VALUE CONSENSUS AND INTERACTION

Structural Units

Formal Organizations. A preliminary distinction between the formal organizations and the informal organizations must be made so that the latter analysis of the patterns of interaction may be clear. There are three formal organizations which form on this level of analysis the basic structural units of the social system under study. These organizations are: the University of Alabama, the University Ministerial Association, and the Inter-Fraternity Council.

The University of Alabama as a structural unit, it is assumed, embodies and promotes a set of values which may be identified as: Intellectual orientation, Science, Pragmatism, Impersonal and Functional relationships, Secularism, and Liberal political ideals. Some of the specific implications of these values for a state university are: (1) The validity of the natural sciences, the behavioral sciences, and philosophy; (2) The validity and necessity of intellectual freedom; (3) The elimination (or minimal use) of explicit Christian religious symbols; and (4) Compliance with Federal Civil Rights legislation. It is a further assumption of this study that in this social system the

\[1\] Hereinafter all references to the "University of Alabama" or "The University" have as referents: Administration, Faculty, and Staff.
organization embodying the dominant value system is the University and that the Administration is the center of power of this organization, and is, therefore, the main bearer of this value pattern.

The University Ministerial Association is made up of all the professional clergymen who serve students and personnel of the University. It includes the ministers who teach Religion courses at the University and who are known as the Department of Religion. The values promoted in this organization are tolerance, primary relations, moderate intellectual concerns, and to some extent the values embodied in the phrase "the American way of life."

The Inter-Fraternity Council is the organizational expression of the fraternity system at the University of Alabama and serves to coordinate their activities and policies, and serves to interact with the administration as a unit. It embodies and promotes the value system of the urban, upper-middle class, Southern whites. These are: Business and professional vocational orientations, political conservatism, moderate intellectual concerns with occasional anti-intellectual expressions, anti-equalitarian, and ideological conformity coupled with moral rebelliousness. 2

Informal Organizations. As indicated on p.17 above, the eight religious organizations were classified into two groups—Liberals and Conservatives. The bases of this classification were four: (1) The national classification employed by Johnson; (2) The strong association

---

2 Unfortunately no systematic data were collected from members of the Fraternity System. The values were inferred from statements by University personnel, my personal experience, and statements by the clergymen.
between political liberalism and theological liberalism among southerners found by Johnson in another study; statements expressing attitudes relative to the four value elements given on page 51; and the analysis of their answers to a question designed to elicit affectional relations and sociometric data.

The group of organizations and clergymen classified as Liberals include the Methodist, Episcopalian, and Presbyterian groups. The values they embody and promote include: Intellectual orientations, political, social, and theological liberalism. Each of the three liberal clergymen gave verbal support to the four value implications listed on page 51 above.

The group of organizations and clergymen classified as Conservatives include the Lutheran (Missouri Synod), Southern Baptist, Roman Catholic, Church of Christ, and Church of God groups. The values they embody and promote include: Moderate intellectual concerns with some anti-intellectual elements; political, social, and theological conservatism. Two of the five conservative clergymen gave only qualified support to the four value elements and three expressed attitudes which indicated rejection of them.

To facilitate notation and to preserve the anonymity of the persons quoted below, the following system of notation will be employed: The clergymen will be identified consistently by the capital letters A through H. The Liberals include letters B, C, and E. The

---

Conservatives include letters A, D, F, G, and H. Faculty members interviewed or written are identified as I, J, O, and U. Administrators are identified as K, L, M, and N. Staff personnel are identified as P, Q, and W. This will give the reader some indication of the spread and the concentration of the data.

Interaction Patterns

The primary focus of this study is the interaction of the religious organizations and the University. Therefore, the interaction of the Inter-Fraternity Council with the University and with the University Ministerial Association is not crucial to this study. The formal interaction of the University with the University Ministerial Association is confined to two broad areas, the Department of Religion and Religious Emphasis Week. However, the interaction of the religious organizations with the University also takes place in the interaction of each individual religious organization with the University. The line between formal and informal relations is difficult to draw when only one clergyman is involved and where each interaction pattern has formal and informal aspects. The analytical distinction is important but an attempt to present the data within a rigid classification would be repetitive and needlessly complicated.

The Ministers and The Students. The work of all the ministers is directed to the implementation of a "program" which comes from their denominational offices and to the expectations of their students. Most of the ministers, however, when asked what the students expected of them were at a loss to give much specific information. They directed their ministry more by their own estimates of what should be
or "by the book" of their denomination rather than as a rational direct response to perceived expectations of students. These ministers are "organizational men" in the sense of expressed satisfaction and loyalty to the goals and procedures of their denominational university work agencies. In a few cases this loyalty alienated them from the local clergy of their denomination. These latter men are "organizational men" of a different sort and tend to emphasize less "progressive" notions of their churches' work.

The conservative ministers were more confident of their estimation of what their students expected of them. Minister (F) said, "They expect a top-notch sermon and a man who is prepared when he teaches. If you can't give them something there you are going to disappoint them. They expect you to be an example and to take time with them personally when the need arises." Minister (A) said, "To meet their spiritual needs, to encourage them in their spiritual and moral living." Minister (D) said, "They expect the same ministerial services as their home pastor." Minister (H) responded, "Someone to talk to, guidance in programming, to be a friend and not a parent substitute."

There is a tendency on the part of the conservative ministers to refer to the students as "young people" whereas the liberal ministers refer to them as "students." This reflects a difference in attitude toward the identity, purpose and nature of the students which expresses itself in many ways. If these people are "young people" then they are still the wards of the family and the home church. If they are "students" they are the wards of the University.
The conservative ministers say that the students have more money and that they are more immoral than students a decade ago. One minister (G) said, "They are more immoral and they are getting worse . . . They don't seem to have that older respect for authority." Another conservative minister (A) commented that " . . . they are not as loyal to their church as they should be and they have more freedom in thinking and behaving than before." The conservative ministers agreed that the students are under greater pressure to conform to new patterns of thought and behavior, and that their training in their homes and home churches is becoming more and more inadequate. One of the conservative ministers expressed this sentiment well in a pamphlet.

Then, too, many students have such a shallow inherited concept of Christianity, due to poor teaching at home, that they shed their cloak of righteousness the instant they near the campus. We are amazed at the large number who scarcely darken the door of the church building when they arrive as freshmen at the State University in our city. It is doubtful that real convictions, developed through childhood, could be overthrown in the first few weeks of school.4

To the conservative ministers the ethos of a state university is a threat to the religious and moral integrity of their "young people." The secular, liberal education threatens the beliefs, and the social life of the campus threatens the morals of the students. Thus the life of the religious college student is pictured as

. . . torn between two alternatives--two warring factions which, from all outward appearances, cannot exist peaceably side by side. Hour after hour, day after day, and in thousands of cases, year after year, the conflict continues until he wearies of the struggle and in desperation disregards his fundamental

---

religious beliefs and turns to science or philosophy as his god.\textsuperscript{5}

It is no secret to you that worldliness takes its toll among our young people. On the campus of the average state university can be found about every form of ungodliness imaginable. Our young people are subjected to every conceivable form of temptation, regardless of whether they live in a fraternity or sorority house, or in one of the dormitories, or even in their own homes. Most parents would be shocked beyond belief at what goes on, for example, in a typical fraternity house.\textsuperscript{6}

The conservative ministers agreed that they expected their students to be more cooperative with their denominational work and to be more loyal to the campus religious group to which they belong. They expect their students to train themselves here to take leadership positions in their home churches when they leave the University.

There was no noticeable tendency on the part of the liberal ministers to refer to students as "young people" for they were consistently referred to as "students." The liberal ministers were also slow and uncertain in stating the expectations their students held and their answers showed some variation. The expectations which students held for the liberal ministers centered around four areas: (1) always be available, (2) operate the center, (3) be a pastor and a friend, and (4) be permissive, intellectual, and "down to earth."

When asked to describe the present generation of college students in comparison with students a decade ago the liberal ministers emphasized that these students have more money, freedom and mobility. They see these students as being more socially sophisticated and

\textsuperscript{5}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{6}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 9.
serious than previous generations of students. One liberal minister (C) described them as, "... vocationally optimistic, competitive and aware of the world situation." Another liberal minister (B) commented that "... they are uninformed theologically and have a simplistic understanding of their faith."

The liberal ministers see in the University of Alabama culture a different set of threats and opportunities to students than do the conservative ministers see. One liberal minister (B) expressed the concern that "... there is too much here to strengthen their conservative values and beliefs." Another complaint of the liberal ministers is that expressed by minister (E), "... there is too much here to distract the students from their studies." Contrary to the conservative ministers, the fundamental expectation which the liberals have of their students is that they will be good students, and as one (C) said, "... develop critical intellectual orientations." The liberals are eager for their students to learn to be critical of the "... standard conservative answers given to them by their families and home churches," as one (B) said. They also expect the students to attend the Sunday worship services (E) and hope that many of them will participate in the intellectual activities at the centers. (C).

The University And The Conservatives. The conservatives are considerably isolated from the Administration and the elements of lack of interaction and mutual avoidance are evident. The conservative ministers are in agreement that the Administration does not, as one (H) said, "... understand or appreciate what we are doing like they used to." He expressed the shared opinion that, "They think we are
just providing another club house and that we are trying to preserve false views of by-gone days." Perhaps of greater significance is the statement by one conservative minister (F) that "We do not know too much about how they feel." One of the ministers quoted above (H) sees that the situation has changed in the last decade and said, "... we do not have as clear expectations from them now as we used to."

Another (G) said, "They expect us to stay out of their affairs," and one (F) said, "I have no contact with them and the same is true for the faculty."

One important mechanism of informal interaction between the University and the religious organizations is the extent to which University personnel serve on the advisory committees of the religious organizations. Only two of the five conservative organizations had University personnel serving in this capacity and these had only two each.

A situation of relatively unstable accommodation exists between the Administration and the conservative groups and the nature of the relationship is changing. Their cooperative interaction is almost exclusively that of exchange of services. The conservative ministers were quick to point out that the religious groups make several contributions to the University among which is that their presence on the campus contributes to the "wholesome" and "safe" image of the University. Fairly frequently in the publicity and public relations of the University there will be pictures and/or references to the work of the religious groups on the campus and it is always mentioned that all of the major religious organizations are represented. The conservative
ministers do not resent this mild exploitation but they do feel that because of it the University should cooperate more than they do with the ministers. One conservative minister (C) said, "They use us in their publicity because we make the University look good to the public, but they don't cooperate with us the way they should."

An additional service which the ministers give to the University, other than free counseling services to students, is the teaching of credit courses in Religion for no salary. This activity is the clearest example of exchange, for the ministers are given legitimate access to the campus and a social context for interaction with students. Some of the Administrators see this more as a service to the religious organizations on the part of the University than as a service to the University on the part of the ministers. The fact is, however, that students pay for this instruction in their tuition but the ministers perform this service free. Because of this the University has until recently exercised little control over the quality or content of the instruction.

These courses in Religion are subject to much criticism by students, faculty, administrators, and some of the liberal ministers. One of the liberal ministers (E) said, "'Everybody' knows that ______ and ________ (two conservatives) courses are cribs. They have huge enrollments, many are turned away after sixty are registered, and advisors recommend that students in need of quality points should take Religion courses." He went on to say that an Administrator several years ago spoke frequently to members of the Department of Religion that they gave too many A's and B's and that "... surely not that
many excellent students had registered for Religion courses."

Some of the conservatives see their teaching as a form of competition with much that is done by the faculty. One conservative minister (F) criticized a liberal minister as "not being interested in the faith of his students" because the liberal minister did not teach courses in Religion. He (F) went on to say that "students need a knowledge of the Bible. We are interested in the faith of our young people and we teach to counter the agnostics and atheists here."

Several conservative ministers were of the opinion that one of the Administrators in particular was uncooperative with the religious organizations. This is pointed up in the minds of these ministers because one of the predecessors of this officer took an active part in the work of the ministers and attended the meetings of the University Ministerial Association. This former officer, according to one of the conservative ministers (G) "... was one of the finest in helping us. He was a great support, but he was afraid of the other Deans. Each one has his own little kingdom. Now they aren't interested in morals—only in 'academics.'" This former officer, according to one of the liberal ministers (E), "had little understanding of alcoholic problems and was, it seemed to many, excessively stringent about some student misconduct and was unaware of other things." The current administrator under dispute said that he went to one of the meetings of the U.M.A. at their invitation when he first came to the University and that he had been back every time they invited him. He (N) said, "It used to be that the students went to the religious centers for social purposes, but now this no longer fills
students' needs. They now want a more intellectual experience except for those who blindly follow the religious and social experience which they had at home." He went on to say that only two ministers were doing a good job and the two he named were liberals.

The interaction between the conservatives and the Administration is limited. They represent competing values and belief systems. The Administration wants to liberalize the students so that their thinking and values will go beyond that which they gained in their families, home town, and home churches. One faculty member (U) was of the opinion that, "the religious centers reinforce home-town values. They keep the same group for four years." With the general orientation of the Administration in mind it is easy to see why the Administration might look with more favor upon the work of the liberals than that of the conservatives. The conservatives attempt to minimize the liberal influence of the University in order to preserve the students for their return to their home towns and home churches.

The pattern of interaction which characterized the conservative organizations and the Administration is that of relative isolation, competition, accommodation, some cooperation in the form of exchange of services, and no assimilation.

The University and The Liberals. The liberals are not isolated from the Administration as the conservatives, but neither are they fully assimilated into the University community. Their pattern of interaction is characterized by stable accommodation, three modes of cooperation, decreasing isolation, and increasing assimilation.

When asked, "What does the University Administration expect of
you"? two of the three liberal ministers (B, C) immediately responded, "Don't rock the boat." Their elaboration of this was that they wanted to move at a faster pace in the liberalization of the University than the Administration was able to move. They realize, however, that the University is constrained by a very conservative social and cultural environment and that the University itself has only very recently changed its dominant value-system. These two liberals see themselves as potential "trouble makers" in their zeal for liberal causes but their strong sentiments for the liberal values promoted by the University prohibits them from being a problem for the Administration. One liberal (B) commented on this by saying, "I would hesitate to be too critical of this University because it is the only agency around here dedicated to human ideals. This University has a very large social function in this culture." In general, however, the liberal ministers agreed that the Administration did not communicate explicit expectations but that, as one liberal (B) said, "they are seemingly appreciative and give us a great deal of freedom."

Another liberal (E) answered the question by saying, "... minister to the students. In some respects they don't look on me to minister to the faculty and staff."

One of the most important differences between the liberals and the conservatives is that the former see their ministry directed toward the total University community, i.e., students, faculty, administration, staff, etc. To implement this purpose the liberal ministers try to provide opportunities for religious activity for all of the University personnel as well as students. They do this in
several ways, e.g., seeking the participation of University personnel in worship services, advisory committees, and providing counseling services to them and pastoral services to their families. By contrast, and with only one exception, the conservative ministers leave this up to the "town churches." One liberal minister (E) stated that he wants "to help integrate students, faculty and administration, and help break down the divisions which fragment the University."

An important context of interaction between the liberal ministers and University personnel is the extensive involvement of the latter on religious organizational advisory committees. Committee membership here is determined by request of the church or denominational agency and not by the University. The conservative organizations do not function this way. The relationship with the University through University personnel is intended by the liberal denominations. Technically these men function as lay churchmen and not as official representatives of the University. Each of the liberal groups has at least four University personnel serving in this capacity. Since membership on these committees rotates periodically, more and more University officers and faculty are brought into an informed and informing relationship with the liberal religious organizations. The liberal ministers are not responsible to these committees, for these committees are "officially" advisory rather than policy-making in function, but the liberal ministers thus open their organizations to a subtle informal mode of cooperation. The formulation and adoption of policy on the part of the liberal organizations takes place within the context of their being highly informed of the wishes and goals of the faculty and Administration. Also, the goals, facilities, and activities of these organizations
are well known by the Administration through the participation of University personnel in the life of these groups. When some situation arises which is not in the interest of the liberal organizations, the liberal ministers do not hesitate to go to the top officers of the administrative hierarchy to discuss current policy and to make suggestions for change. In addition, these advisory associations lead to informal associations and friendships which bind the liberal ministers even closer to the life of the University and the Administration.

One important context of informal interaction between the liberal ministers and the University is provided by the morning and afternoon coffee sessions in the student union cafeteria and snack shop. Throughout the year in which this study was made all three of the liberal ministers were frequently observed drinking coffee and talking with administrators, faculty, staff personnel, and students. Despite the unsystematic and random nature of these observations they lend additional evidence to the overall pattern. Only two of the conservative ministers were observed at any time in the coffee shop and these times were few. Two of the liberal ministers explicitly pointed out that they considered these informal coffee sessions and conversations as a most important part of their ministry at the University. The liberal ministers also made it a point to attend all plays, concerts, and cultural events sponsored by the University. Their presence at these events lends organized religion a visibility and legitimation in many phases of the life of the University. They are identified as sharing the interests and pleasures promoted by the University.

In spite of this fairly close interaction with University personnel, all of the liberal ministers desired increased and more
intensive association with University personnel. To a great extent this is a function of the "marginal role" of the campus clergymen and is some indication that there is a relatively latent element of isolation between the University and the liberal ministers. The liberal ministers see this isolation and marginality as a deprivation. All of the liberal ministers see themselves as ministering to the entire University, but University personnel see them as ministering to students primarily. One liberal minister (B) stated that most of his ministry was directed to single students and that his intention was to minister to the whole University community. He said, "I hope this can be altered. You can't deal with faculty and administration apart from their families. I would like to have the structure to concentrate on faculty members and administrative officers because we can't affect the life of the institution through the students." Another of the liberal ministers (E) said, "...it would be better to get the faculty committee more involved in the work. Their function is advisory and not decisive."

It would not be accurate to say that the liberals are accommodated to the University in the form of compromise. The pattern of relationships exists within the framework of legal definition. Also, the value system of these religious organizations is such that they share much of the value and belief system promulgated by the University. No intellectual or moral compromise is necessary. The foundation for extensive cooperation and assimilation is laid even prior to their interaction but their interaction cements and elaborates these relationships.

None of the liberal ministers feel that the Administrative officer mentioned by the conservatives was non-cooperative with the religious
organizations. They stated that they were on good relations with that particular office. One of the liberal ministers (E) said, "I see him quite often and often have coffee with him in the mornings. I think he is an excellent (administrator), an idea man, and one of the University's valuable assets." He went on to say, "he thinks some of our religious centers aren't functioning very helpfully and he may be right."

As mentioned above, the administrative officer under question (N) said,

I think there are only two ministers who are doing a good job around here and I have referred students to them before but not to the other ministers. Most of these religious groups are not planning for the new role they'll have to play in higher education, but _____ and ______ (two liberal ministers) are more sensitive to social change. When asked: "What would happen if these religious organizations were to withdraw from the campus?" he responded jokingly, "There would be nobody to pray at banquets." In a more serious tone he continued, "We would miss people like ______ (a liberal) who really understands student culture." He described the fraternity system and the religious organizations as "'parasites' unless they get involved in the task and responsibility of higher education. If they aren't, they shouldn't be on campus."

Several statements by Dr. Frank Rose, the President of the University of Alabama, are significant for an understanding of the expected role of organized religion in an academic community. These statements are characterized by a distinct absence of explicitly Christian symbols and they imply that the task of religion is primarily instrumental to other values, particularly moral and intellectual.
This task is seen and legitimated as a service to the University. He says,

We think and live in one of the most revolutionary ages that history has ever known. The scientific advances of the last decade have brought the world closer together and this calls for greater knowledge and understanding, not only of other cultures but of our own. Modern man is being forced to re-examine and re-evaluate many of his ideas in the light of new knowledge that is being discovered and new advances that are being made. No individual in an academic community can escape some of these searching inquiries.\(^7\)

At an earlier time he stated that Religious Emphasis Week provided an opportunity for the University (Administration, faculty and students) to "pause and evaluate our participation" in a society composed of forces which "beat upon our physical and emotional lives...We will all be better learners and teachers because of it."\(^8\)

A faculty member (I), when asked: "What could these religious organizations do to enhance their status in the University community?" responded,

\[
\text{(a liberal) is not afraid of ideas...He welcomes, in fact encourages, students to bring in any new ideas which they may have, no matter how radical. He encourages open discussion of these ideas among the students with him there in the \underline{\text{__________}}. I think that this kind of attitude and approach toward learning and toward new ideas will do more to enhance the status of a student religious organization within the university community than anything that I can think of.}
\]

This attitude was shared by a staff member (P) who responded,

The center directors, with a few exceptions, are not intellectually equipped to minister to a more intellectually-oriented community. 'Activities' at all centers seem to have dwindled. For study, for counseling in time of trouble, they seem to retain their hold.


\(^8\) Religious Emphasis Week Program, January, 1960.
The lack of an official policy stating the relationship of the University to the religious organizations has facilitated the establishment of flexible patterns of interaction through tradition. These, in turn, are modified by social and historical circumstances. One high-ranking administrative officer (M) stated that there was no official policy regarding the relationship of the University to the religious organizations "because we don't want to be in a position of being able to tell these religious congregations what they can or can't do." He mentioned that the University offered some services to these religious organizations in Religious Emphasis Week and in the Religious Preference cards filled out by students at registration. He also mentioned a specific instance in which the assistance of the religious organizations was sought. He (M) said,

Before the integration of the two Negro students, we (another high-ranking administrative official) met with the student ministers to inform them of the situation and to discuss with them how they might help the situation through their congregations. (Italics mine.)

One administrative officer was asked if he thought that the religious organizations should give more support to the tasks of the University. He (K) responded: "They do not give any now except in friendly assistance. It is probably a good idea to maintain distance. Each could spoil the other by trying to mix in its affairs." His honest appreciation of the ministers was that they were "good for students at a very sensitive time in their lives." (Italics mine.) Another administrator (L) said,

The advantages of this lack of a formalized relationship are many, probably the most significant of which is that no toes are stepped on and there is very little hostility between the University and the various religious organizations. We enjoy a near-complete separation of church and state.
Commenting on the possible contributions which the religious organizations make to the life of the University, he said,

I have a feeling that the religious organizations have a very real stabilizing influence on the student body as a whole and that this affects the life of the University more perhaps than we realize...In some cases their stabilizing influence is perhaps too effective. Possibly they act as a soothing blanket. It is my impression that soothing blankets of this sort in some cases have a tendency to suppress certain kinds of thinking, particularly radical thinking. I don't advocate radicals, but on the other hand I deplore blanket-type suppression of radical ideas. I think it is extremely important that students in some stage carry out intellectual battles with all kinds of radical ideas. (Italics mine.)

The cooperative interaction of the Administration and the liberals is thus characterized by exchange and cooption in spite of fairly formal relationships and official segregation. This formal relationship establishes limits to the interaction but does not fill its content. These formal bonds are expanded and elaborated by several informal bonds. When asked if the relative influence of the ministers with the Administration had increased or decreased in recent years, one of the liberal ministers (E) responded that the ministers who had been at the University longer had "the opportunity to be respected as a permanent member of the University community." This liberal minister preferred the phrase "persuasive ability" better than "influence" and mentioned what he called "accidents of friendship" as being a contributing factor. He and a high-ranking administrative officer have been close personal friends since the minister arrived at the University. This administrator has served as an advisor to the religious organization directed by the liberal minister. Also, this liberal minister's family and the family of another high ranking official of the University are "close friends and car pool associates." The minister (E) said, "I can speak
with him more easily than can some."

A further example of cooperation between one liberal organization and several organizations connected with the University, which increases interaction and bonds of reciprocity, is that one of the liberal groups opens its facilities to any group meeting connected with the University but turns down requests from groups not associated with the University. All of the following groups have at one time held regularly scheduled meetings at this particular center: French club, Spanish club, Executive committee of the University Dames, and Law Wives. In addition, its facilities are used for several other special occasions connected with the life of the University community, e.g., for several years there was an annual concert sponsored by the Department of Music held in the chapel of this group; the cheerleader contest is held on their lawn, honorary groups hold initiation ceremonies and serve refreshments there, the University Choral Union "warms up" there before concerts in Foster Auditorium and all the High School Bands "warm up" there before concerts. For these and other events the University furnishes folding chairs and frequently pays for cleaning up. Most of the expense for janitorial service after these meetings in the centers must be met by the liberal religious groups. One liberal group was forced to minimize this service to the University because of the cost. The minister (C) said, "I did not encourage groups to come, since we could not really afford the power and the janitorial costs involved, but I never turned down a request."

This form of service to the University groups is carried on by only one of the conservative religious groups and not to the extent described above. Another of the conservative groups allows weddings and
receptions to take place at their center for a fee.

One of the issues which illustrates the possibilities and the limitations of the position of the liberals vis-à-vis the Administration is the change in the Department of Religion. For about five years one of the liberal ministers had urged the Administration to employ a Ph. D. in Religion or Theological Studies to teach top-quality undergraduate courses in Bible and Religion. In 1958 the chairman of the Department of Philosophy, who was technically head of the Department of Religion, and the Vice-President in Charge of Student Affairs attended the Conference on Religion and the State University at the University of Michigan. One of the conservative ministers (H) stated that these men came back from this conference convinced that the University ought to teach Religion courses but no changes were made. Two years ago another liberal minister made a request to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences that the University employ a faculty member to head the Department of Religion. It is important to recognize that this request for a change in policy did not come from a representative of the Department of Religion or the University Ministerial Association but from an individual liberal minister. The possibility of such a change had been discussed in the Ministerial Association in years past at the urging of previous liberal ministers but no formal request ever came to the Administration from that organization.

The liberal ministers who went to see the Dean independently and together at a later time, complained about the heavy concentration and duplication of courses in Bible and specifically New Testament. They also complained that some of the courses had a reputation for being a means to an easy grade. One of the liberal ministers originally
suggested that his denomination might financially support a qualified faculty member to teach courses. The Dean disapproved of this because of the implication that some group outside the College would decide what would be taught in his College. The Administration did not want to do anything that could weaken their limited control over the teaching of Religion. Also the Dean was of the opinion that the "Bible Chair" arrangement was not the best way to organize the study of Religion at the University. According to the Dean (K), Religion in a State University has two functions which should be kept separate and distinct:

One is the fostering of the religious life of students, which should be a function of those in charge of student affairs and of the various churches and religious centers in the community. The other is the study of religion as a human and social phenomenon and as a central element in the great cultures of the world. The latter is an academic function and ... should be handled by academic rather than clerical persons. (Italics mine.)

The Dean had recommended in his budget estimate in the Summer of 1962 that at least one additional man be employed in the Philosophy Department for the purpose of teaching Religion on an academic basis. This request was not granted then but it was the following year when it was made again. According to one of the liberal ministers (E), all of this happened without the knowledge or explicit council of any of the ministers. This marked a basic policy change in the life of the University and it was accomplished with the urging of the liberal ministers but without their sharing in the decision or recruitment. Presumably, if the liberal ministers had not found out about it when they went to make their requests jointly, the Administration simply would have announced this change to the Department of Religion. The liberals were able to secure their requests without causing a disturbance in the Ministerial Association, thus maintaining bonds of friendship and
communication. Their approach to the Administration was based on the common intellectual values they shared and their common commitment to higher education. Their complaint was, in effect, that the University was not doing its job properly by allowing the present conditions to continue. Thus, what the liberals sought was granted, not as a favor to the liberals, but as an expression of the interests of the University. It was not, however, in the interests of the conservative ministers. One administrator was asked if they had taken any precautionary steps to minimize possible negative reactions to the new policy. He (K) said, "We do not want to antagonize anyone, but it is the University's prerogative to manage its own affairs."

It is not inaccurate to describe the interaction of the liberals and the Administration in this change as an informal coalition formation based upon shared values but involving no formal agreement between them. In this action the University was able to seek its own interest with the full knowledge that it had the encouragement of at least three fairly influential ministers. The liberals taught liberal ideas in their courses and the conservatives taught conservative and devotional ideas in their courses, but only the liberals sought a monopoly in the classroom of a liberal intellectual orientation. They were able to achieve this through the indirect use of superior power. The conservatives had not sought to displace the teaching functions of the liberals even though they were in competition with them for influence on students. The conservatives sought to maintain their status and autonomy on the basis of a traditional arrangement (Bible Chairs) which is being dropped.

The interaction pattern of the liberal religious organizations and the administration is characterized by relative integration, a high
degree of cooperation, stable accommodations and increasing assimilation.

**The Liberals and the Conservatives.** The two issues which express the differentiation of the liberals from the conservatives are those of the Department of Religion and Religious Emphasis Week—the two points at which there is the most concentrated formal interaction between the University and organized religion. Their different attitudes toward teaching, the nature of higher education, and the function of organized religion in a secular society reflect their divergent value orientations.

All of the conservative ministers who teach courses feel that this should be a part of their work at the University unconditionally. They state that their teaching experience is the most enjoyable thing that they do and that they were trained to do it. They value their teaching positions for several reasons but particularly because it gives them time and contact with students. They would like to extend the courses they now teach from two to three credit hours because "more time with students is needed" as one minister (D) said. The conservative ministers were all acutely aware of their self-imposed limitation to be "non-sectarian" or "non-denominational" in their teaching, but they are regarded by some of the liberal ministers as being "devotional" or "evangelistic" for their denominational point of view. The conservative ministers do not think that other University faculty members are fair in their appraisal of the Religion courses. One conservative minister (H) said, "the faculty does not understand or appreciate what we are doing."

The conservative ministers are particularly interested in
strengthening the faith of their students and some of them say that they are combating the agnostics and atheists at the University. Thus, since they have invested a great deal of commitment and expectation in the "Bible Chairs" arrangement, they are extremely hesitant and cautious about the University's change in policy. They all agreed that it would be satisfactory as long as the present situation is allowed to continue parallel to the new Department of Religion courses. One conservative minister (G) said, "The new man may develop the department, but the system at present is better. The other departments don't let one man teach everything. What is a 'University level'? This is the problem. People want a rational explanation." Another conservative minister (F) said,

I think it's all right if they'll allow the pluralistic approach to continue. I'm against the University employing any one man—he'd be biased. It would border on state religion. He would be a liberal Protestant and I'm not a liberal.

The liberal ministers who teach religion courses reflect a different attitude. One (C) said that they should teach "...only so long as the University failed to function adequately in this capacity."

Only two of the three liberals taught courses in Religion at the University. One resigned several years earlier as a protest against the lack of control exercised by the Administration over the quality of courses. Also, he did not want to be identified with something which he considered inferior and subject to ridicule by many in the University community. Another liberal minister (C) said that

... teaching Religion is a service a minister may perform if he is qualified to do so; it is not a professional right, but a privilege granted by the University...If it is seen as a justification for his existence on campus, or as a promotional gimmick for his student center, he is using the campus in a way that he would not want the University to use his own religious institution.
One liberal minister (E) complained that "Some of them are teaching the most awful stuff for credit, but their teaching is suspect by the faculty and administration." The other liberal minister (B) said, "It is an excellent opportunity to present an intellectual approach to the Christian faith." One liberal minister (C) said, "It is an excellent situation. Nobody fusses at me for teaching liberal ideas but I lose about one-third of my classes." The liberal ministers are not particularly concerned to maintain any norm of "non-denominational" teaching. They are explicitly liberal and intellectual in their teaching rather than devotional. They use the classroom to promote liberal values and ideas. They are more concerned with being academically respectable in the eyes of the faculty and Administration, and they are not interested in supporting the current religious beliefs of the student. One liberal minister (C) said,

Those of us who favored a change pointed out that a full time Religion Department would raise the status of Religion in the thinking of faculty and students, that it would provide a rich resource for all our programs, that it would raise questions in students that it was our job as ministers to deal with. However, we were frank to admit that in dealing with factual, historical material, and searching objectively for truth, we do risk the inherited faith of the student, but that it is not the task of the University to protect inherited beliefs of the students. It is not the task of the University to break them down either, but to examine them.

All of the liberal ministers were eager to change the present situation. The major suggestion they made was that, as one liberal (C) said, "We need teachers academically prepared with faculty status so that they can be paid and directed by the University." Another liberal minister (B) said, "We need a scholar and not just a man who has done graduate work."

The liberal minister quoted at length above (C) was asked if the
new faculty member in the Department of Religion would displace any functions of the religious organizations, he (C) responded,

It seems to me a real Department of Religion will not displace any functions of a religious organization except the teaching for credit by the chaplain. It ought on the other hand to raise the level of theological dialogue and give Religion some academic respect among the rest of the faculty. The status of the teaching of Religion in the past has, I think, handicapped the religious organizations.

In order to have some means of determining the sociometric structure and prestige system of the University Ministerial Association in 1964 the following sociometric question was asked: "If you were to work on some campus project and needed the help of some of the other ministers, which three would you select to work with you"?

Diagram I

Diagram II

Diagram III

Diagram IV

Diagram I is a presentation of the structure of first choices.

Diagram II is a presentation of the structure of first choices with the choice of liberal minister (C) omitted. Diagram III is a presentation
of the six-ranked status system based on the total number of choices each minister received. Diagram IV is the status system based on the first two choices of each minister.

The triangle choices among the liberal ministers C, B, and E; and the common loyalty of the conservatives D and F to H in Diagram I is an indication that shared values and beliefs give rise to associations. If the ministers were ranked on the basis of total first choice votes received then ministers C, H, E, and B would be tied with two choices each. Diagram II is a graphic presentation of the fact noted in Diagram III that ministers C and H were tied in number of total votes but that minister H gave his first choice to minister C. The prestige of ministers C, H, and E in Diagram IV is evident on the basis of the first two choices of each of the ministers. This status hierarchy diagram (IV) may be the most meaningful of all the status diagrams presented in that many of the ministers made their first two choices easily but had to pause for consideration of the third choice. Future studies of the social system of Ministerial Organizations should employ more systematic sociometric questions and utilize such indices as group cohesion, integration, and expansiveness.

These crude diagrams do not stand by themselves as evidence of the internal division of the Ministerial Association in 1964. There are several other elements which support and reenforce them. Foremost among these is the attitudes toward each other that were expressed by the ministers. Many of these attitudes were shown in connection with the discussion of the Department of Religion. Religious Emphasis Week is another point at which these differences are crystallized.
The structure of sentiments and identification among the ministers point out the utility and the validity of Johnson's revised church-sect classification. Three of the ministers made remarks which support the accuracy of their status and that of the other ministers. One conservative minister (D) after having selected three other conservatives made the unsolicited comment, "I consider them to be conservative theologically. I would get a better hearing and affinity of ideas with them." One of the liberal ministers (E) who selected two liberals for his first two choices said,

\[(E, C, \text{ and } B) \text{ shared agreements on many subjects. Among them we wanted a better Department of Religion, we did not like Religious Emphasis Week, we were theologically, racially, and politically more 'liberal,' if that's the right word, than the others. Our attitude in general is that the Church should be in the University not distracting students from full participation in University life nor serving primarily as a 'home away from home.' We do not feel so much that 'Christ is the Answer,' but rather that, 'Christ stirs up some hard questions.' \]

One example of the internal associations along liberal-conservative lines is the ecumenical study group which was held in the Fall of 1963. The group was sponsored by the three liberals and was not a function of the University Ministerial Association. The group was created for students and met once a week for eight sessions. Although the meetings were advertised and all religious groups were invited to attend, only members of the three liberal groups participated. An implication of the internal division among the ministers is the loose organizational structure and relatively unspecified goals of the University Ministerial Association. There is a concern on the part of some of the ministers to keep the Ministerial Association a loose-knit organization. Several liberals and conservatives said that the primary purpose of the organization was "fellowship" and that it was not
intended to be a "strong" organization. One minister (E) commented that if the U.M.A. were "more vigorous an organization, actively stirring up excitement and initiating changes...it might alienate members) depending on what the activity might be. The chief advantage of the U.M.A. is that every chaplain takes part." Minister (F), when asked about the U.M.A. said, "We meet once a month--do nothing."

Since the organization includes liberal and conservative Protestants, a Roman Catholic, and a Rabbi, the level of consensus necessary for purposive action would probably be difficult to achieve. Each group is determined to preserve its autonomy vis-à-vis the U.M.A., and feels that it can best achieve its goals independently rather than in concert. A stronger and more unified organization of ministers might commit all of them to compromises which they do not have to make under the present conditions. Whatever cooperation, beyond Religious Emphasis Week and the Department of Religion, takes place, is divided along the liberal-conservative lines already examined. It is characteristic of the liberals to be ecumenically oriented and equally characteristic of the conservatives to be individualistic.

The interaction between the liberals and the conservatives is competitive. Each group seeks to promote its value and belief system in the context of a secular state university. What association there is between individual ministers across the liberal-conservative boundary is on the basis of casual friendship established through many years of interaction and, significantly, through residential propinquity. For example, there are some fairly strong bonds of cordial friendship between ministers whose student centers are close together. For the most part, except for the monthly meetings of the U.M.A., and chance
meetings, the liberal ministers are rather isolated from the conservative ministers. The conservatives are critical of the liberals and vice versa, but they accommodate themselves to a situation which they inherited and which they have no desire to change radically. One of the conservative ministers (F) thinks that because the liberals are not interested in keeping their teaching positions that they are not concerned for the faith of their students. Another conservative (H) said that the liberals emphasize an intellectual approach but we take the position that we should concern ourselves with the average student... They make the assumption that this is primarily an academic community. Our responsibility is to reach more people than just intellectuals. There are not as many intellectuals here as some think.

One of the liberals (B) mentioned that part of his ministry was to help students achieve a faith of their own and this may alienate them from their home churches. For fear of this the _____ do not do it. They represent a new 'legalism' which says that, 'if you don't do this it will keep you close to Jesus.' They have placed side issues in a place of prominence. Our emphasis is like that of the _____ and _______.

Another liberal minister (C), in comparing the emphasis of his group with that of one of the conservative organizations, said, " theirs is almost a fraternity-sorority for the independents, and this meets many social, and to some extent devotional, needs for students. It is oriented to the ________ Church rather than to the campus in basic philosophy.

The conduct of Religious Emphasis Week is the other issue which divides the liberals and conservatives sharply. The liberals dislike it because it is "awkward," it brings disapproval from faculty and administration, and it does not serve their interests. The expenses
for Religious Emphasis Week are paid for in part by the Students Activity Fee which is collected by the University and disbursed by the Student Government Association. The major convocation speaker is invited each year by one of the religious organizations, a duty which is shared through rotation, so that all eight religious groups in time have a representative of their denomination. Additional clergymen from the city of Tuscaloosa and from the State of Alabama participate in this annual event. Last year one of the liberal groups was in charge and this immediate year one of the conservative groups was responsible. In each case the speaker reflected the general orientation of the religious group he represented. This year the liberals were highly critical of Religious Emphasis Week in general and the featured speaker in particular. One of the conservatives (G) thought he was one of the best speakers to appear in recent years. The topic of the week and the speaker's topic was "God in Our Changing Society." One of the liberals (E) remarked, "The eyes of the Nation and the State were fastened on Selma, Alabama and its tragic events and he (the speaker) never mentioned it or even referred to it obliquely...How irrelevant can one get?" Quite typical of the conservative concerns mentioned earlier the speaker addressed himself in one speech to all the things which can cause a student to lose his faith. Another minister (B) was strongly upset with it and spoke critically of it. One of the liberals pointed out that less than four per cent of the University community attended the convocations even though all classes at those hours were excused. The liberals' negative opinion of Religious Emphasis Week expresses itself to some extent in passive support. There is a tendency for the liberals to withhold strong
support to Religious Emphasis Week and to give it only perfunctory support. They expect it to die a natural death because of lack of response and the active hostility it creates on the part of some faculty members. One of the conservative ministers (H) is concerned about Religious Emphasis Week and says,

the main weakness of the whole thing is that the ministers are not doing one thing to make it effective...We just aren't ready--it seems--to enter into that sort of close cooperation. Religious Emphasis Week just simply doesn't have either the respect or the support of all the ministers.

There may be some modifications in the conduct of Religious Emphasis Week in the near future and if there is, it will be to a large extent at the urging of the liberal ministers. They will define the desired changes in the interest of the University and will thereby gain support from the Administration. Whatever modifications come about probably will be praised by the liberals and criticized by the conservatives although they will accommodate themselves to the new situation. The result will be that organized religion will be further from the official life of the University. The conservatives will be increasingly isolated from spheres of influence because of their lack of strong informal relations with the Administration.

The pattern of interaction between the liberals and the conservatives is that of relative isolation and competition. They compete for status in the university community by different means. The liberals enhance their status through giving strong support to the Administration, through closer association with the University personnel and through offering intellectual experiences for the students. The conservatives enhance their status through the increased participation and loyalty of students in their various activities. A situation of unstable
accommodation based on tolerance exists. There is little motivation for extensive cooperation between the liberals and the conservatives. These groups are potentially conflict groups and the conservatives are at a disadvantage because their value and belief orientation is dissonant with that of the dominant power structure—the Administration. The liberal ministers do not hesitate to align themselves with this power center because they are motivated to promote the same values. The liberals seek to initiate change in line with the value and belief orientation of the University, but they do not do so through the Ministerial Association. They are able to achieve their ends without disrupting the "fellowship" of the U.M.A. and without asking the administration to support "religious" functions.

The pattern of interaction characteristic of the liberal and conservative groups is basically that of accommodation with disassociative and associative elements. They are relatively isolated from each other and interact infrequently. They enjoy a kind of superficial "fellowship" which does not deal with basic value conflicts and they cooperate on a very limited scale. In many instances they are highly critical of each other and compete for status in the University community.

The Fraternity System and the Conservatives. As indicated on page 52 above, no systematic collection of data from the fraternity system was made. The evidence which follows thus only describes one side of the interaction but indicates clearly the different attitudes toward the fraternity system on the part of the liberals and conservatives.

Relative isolation characterized the over-all pattern of interaction between the conservative religious organizations and the
fraternity organizations. Complete isolation of these groups is ex­cluded by definition since they are both members of the larger Uni­versity community which presumes some social ties. But they are more isolated from each other than are the liberal organizations and the fraternity system.

The conservatives as a group look with disfavor on the fraternity system and see it as the source of much of the "worldliness" they com­bat. Except during Religious Emphasis Week, when the ministers visit the fraternity houses for "bull session," there is no formal inter­action between them. Informal interaction is minimized because very few students are active in both the fraternity system and the conserva­tive religious organizations. One conservative minister (F) said, "I encourage the student to seek social life here at the center. They (fraternities) can't offer what we offer here. If we didn't offer fellowship here they'd have a good argument." Another conservative (A) said, "I discourage my young people from belonging to them." One conservative (D) said in agreement,

I recommend to parents of Freshmen that students refrain from it the first year. It is a burden and it qualifies their perception of campus life. The students who go into Greek organizations as freshmen lose interest (in religious organi­zation) by the time they are sophomores. They have more con­trol on the time of the students.

According to the conservative ministers, most of the students who are active in their religious organizations are opposed to the fraternity system. One conservative minister (D) observed that "the background of the student influences his decision to join the 'Greeks' and those who do join are 'status seekers.'" He was of the opinion that this was true for girls more than for boys and added that some of
the girls frequently attend services at one of the liberal chapels for the same reason.

The form of accommodation to the situation which is taken by the conservative organizations is that of toleration and opposition. This accommodation is relatively unstable because the groups adapt themselves to immediate realities despite the existence of unresolved issues. The persuasion of the ministers is directed to their students and considerable loyalty is expected of them. One conservative minister (H) said, "They (fraternities) need specific adult supervision. They have no sense of responsibility for what goes on. Local people should help but they don't. The Greeks have missed their chance to do something significant."

The conservative ministers are in competition with other sources of loyalty for the time and therefore the loyalty of students. They conceive of their mission to the campus as primarily that of involving the students in different kinds of activities at the religious center. Where they spend their time is an indicator of the object of their loyalty and their value-system. The fundamental complaint of the conservative ministers is that the students "do not give us enough of their time." One implication of this is that the more time a student gives to religious activities at the center the more his values and beliefs are supported and consequently the more tightly he bound to the social norms of his group. This is most important for competitive groups, as one conservative minister (F) indicated, when he said, "When young people are actively associated with fellow Christians, they aren't interested in wild parties and so forth." The busy life of the student renders his time as the scarce value of the competitive
situation. Wilbert E. Moore identifies three *universal scarcities* as *time*, *troth*, and *treasure*. The meaning we give to this situation is that *time* is an indicator of *troth* and *treasure*.

Since the conservatives and the fraternities are aware that they are competitors they may be considered rivals. One of the tactics of the conservatives is to emphasize social and recreational activities rather than intellectual activities. Because of this some of the liberal ministers said that the conservatives are "running fraternity-sororities for the independents."

We saw above in the brief review of the history of the religious groups on the campus that one of the conservative ministers repeatedly attempted to gain more *time* with the students through the help of the Administration. If he had achieved this end, he would have relativized one source of the competition. He asked several times for one night each week to be set aside as "Church Night" so that the students will have an appointed time to attend the religious centers. The failure of the Administration to give this support is seen by this particular conservative minister as a lack of cooperation on the part of the Administration.

According to the conservative ministers, there is little or no over-lapping membership among students of the conservative groups and the fraternity system. There is little communication and the attitudes of mutual avoidance are strengthened. There is no cooperation of the
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 conservatives with the fraternity system for there is no basis for it in shared values or goals. They are competitors because their goals cannot be shared. I have no evidence to support the claim but one basis of the lack of association between the conservatives and the fraternity system probably can be explained in terms of social stratification. The fraternity system represents the upper and upper-middle class and the conservatives represent the lower-middle class students.

The pattern of interaction which characterizes the conservative religious organizations and the fraternity system is that of relatively high isolation, high competition (with latent conflict), toleration as a form of accommodation, and no cooperation.

The Fraternity System and the Liberals. The interaction pattern of these two groups has elements of competition, accommodation, cooperation and assimilation. These two groups are much less isolated than is characteristic of the conservatives and the fraternities, but they do hold to different values. According to the liberal ministers, students who are active in both the fraternity system and liberal religious organizations are in a minority but a large and influential minority. Many of the officers in the liberal religious organizations are members of Greek organizations which is some indication of the inclusiveness of the liberal groups. It also indicates that these two groups of organizations represent less conflicting operational values than even the liberal ministers would desire. In addition, their memberships are probably drawn from roughly the same social class stratum. Some fraternity system members are apparently able to participate actively in the intellectual activities of the liberal groups without having their conservative social ideology seriously threatened.
The attitude of the liberal ministers to the fraternity system is mixed for they are neither in favor of them nor do they actively oppose them. They do object to certain features of the fraternity system which serve to perpetuate some degree of mutual avoidance. One liberal minister (B) voiced his objection to the fraternities by saying, "they impede rather than aid the purpose of higher education, they work against an inclusive sense of brotherhood, and they foster 'snobbism.'" Another liberal minister (C) said that "They develop social and cultural values which do not contribute to the total society." The significance of these statements is that they are framed in terms of the values promoted by the University and not in terms of specific religious values. All of the liberal ministers agreed that the fraternities make students waste a lot of time which might be spent in academic pursuits.

The organizational pluralism at the University (325 organizations) increases the chances that students will belong to several types of organizations. The liberal ministers do not expect exclusive loyalty to their organizations as do the conservatives. Consequently the liberals do not complain about the students' not giving them enough time. The liberals feel that these people should be engaged in some kind of intellectual activity whether promoted by the University or the religious organizations.

Because of over-lapping memberships, extensive communication between groups, shared backgrounds, values and sentiments of friendship, there is considerable cooperation between the liberals and the fraternity system. This cooperation is informal cooptation and resembles the pattern existing between the liberals and the administration. Some
students are leaders in the liberal groups and leaders in the fraternity system. This shared leadership minimizes possible conflict and serves to inform the liberal ministers of the values, thought patterns and behavior of the fraternity system. In turn, some elements of the fraternity system are probably informed of the values and expectations of the liberal religious organizations. In this way misconceptions and suspicion is minimized, if not eliminated.

The accommodation these groups make to each other is relatively stable because they have resolved many of the major differences of interest which are deemed vital to continued interaction. This accommodation sets the conditions in the social environment for cooperation. One of the liberal ministers (C) said, "The students who have been youth leaders in their home churches are not necessarily interested in the ______ ________. They got a belly full of religion in high school. Now they fulfill their leadership needs in the Greek organizations."

Changes Since 1950. In 1950 far fewer students drove cars and the student centers constructed between 1951 and 1954 made only small provision for parking space. Students then were children of the depression and early war years. There were fewer strong academic pressures then and the problems created by mass education and the multiversity had not come to Alabama. The atmosphere was relaxed. Seven of the eight professional religious leaders were at the University by then and the work of all the religious organizations was active and enthusiastic. This was the third year of Religious Emphasis Week and it received a favorable response from the University. The University Ministerial Association maintained a close association with the
administration and six of the seven organizations were making plans for the construction of large student centers. The new legal definition of state-church relations in 1948 set the context for future attempts by some of the ministers to gain a stronger formal position at the University. The pattern of future secularization was just beginning to take shape and all six of the new student centers reflected an orientation of the campus ministry at that time: off campus student organizational activities.

One of the most concrete and visible indications of changing orientations and emphases in the life of organizations is that of problems created by the structure of their buildings and other facilities. The changes in the student centers operated by the religious organizations illustrate this. One of the liberal ministers (E) pointed out that, "What people think of college religious work qualifies what they build." Every student center constructed since 1951 has kitchen and eating facilities for suppers, banquets, and parties. They vary in the extent to which they are used but they indicate the social and recreational potential of these groups. One of the liberal ministers (E) commented on another liberal student center in saying, "They built an activities building which reflected their concept of university religious work." Only three out of the six student centers constructed from 1951 to 1957 had libraries.

By 1964 the students at the University were highly mobile and affluent. These students were born since World War II and they are children of affluence. Since 1957 the administration and faculty made innovations which increased the intellectual activity and pressures for academic achievements. Motivations for academic excellence are
stronger now and competition among students is stiff. Students are expected to have intellectual needs and culture interests.

Since 1950 there have been important changes in the relation of organized religion to the University and in the internal life of the religious organizations. The two items which focused the relationship of organized religion to the University, the Department of Religion and Religious Emphasis Week are now centers of controversy which divide the religious organizations. The group of organizations identified as liberals have gained in influence with the administration and faculty while the conservatives have become more marginal to this center of power. The new developments in the Department of Religion have served to isolate the administration and the conservatives. An orientation toward the campus ministry is firmly grounded in the liberal organizations which distinguishes them from the conservatives: a ministry to the total academic community with an emphasis on intellectual experiences. Since 1950 two of the three liberal groups converted rooms in their student centers into libraries and study rooms. All of the liberals now de-emphasize social-recreational activities, but are constrained by the kinds of buildings they have to continue them. Several of the liberal ministers complain about the fact that they inherited kitchen and eating facilities in their buildings and are therefore expected to have parties and suppers simply because the facilities are there and are part of the tradition. The same is true as far as recreation is concerned. One liberal (C) observed that the concept of recreation is outdated and that some of the liberal ministers have to continue this orientation simply because the buildings were constructed with recreation rooms and facilities. Another liberal
minister purposefully did away with the ping-pong tables and a pool table which he inherited. A bulletin by one of the liberal ministers stated that

Use of facilities for general recreation is limited because of the increased academic load and the provision of recreational facilities in University residences. However, a number of students still make themselves 'at home' in the student center.

There is a concern on the part of the liberal ministers now to encourage students to take their current vocation as students as a part of their religious commitment. The liberals consciously avoid competing with intellectual and cultural activities sponsored by the University.

The conservatives, however, have maintained a continuity in their emphasis and have changed their functions only slightly. They see their recreational and social activities as contributing to their spiritual ministry and they direct their work with an increased emphasis in this area. There is an indication that the conservatives are aware of the fruitfulness, in terms of increased student participation, of intellectually oriented student activities. Each of the newest student centers built by conservatives has a library and study room for students. Some are beginning to have study groups for their students.

It remains evident, however, that the conservatives seek to motivate and strengthen the faith of students through devotional, social, and recreational experiences. The liberal ministers placed primary emphasis on intellectual programs and experiences for students, and an increased emphasis on congregational worship services. A feature of
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the worship services of the liberal organizations is sermons by the minister designed to meet the intellectual needs of students. Frequently in their sermons the liberal ministers will recommend paperback books to their student congregations. Also, the liberal ministers advertise their student centers as quiet places to study. One of the liberal ministers emphasizes the Sunday worship services primarily because it gathers all segments of the University community into one corporate religious activity, requires a minimal amount of time of the students, and focuses on a religious and intellectual experience. One of the reasons why the small ecumenical study group was started by the liberal ministers was to provide, as one (C) said, "college level fare of theological thought and training." This study group was, in the judgment of one of the liberal ministers (E), unsuccessful because the University community "is not yet full of intellectual excitement, like it was at _________ (another university) but it is improving all the time." One liberal minister commented with some pride that one student joined his church because, he (E) said, "he said that we were the only group on the campus that encouraged scholarship."

The changing emphasis of the liberal religious groups is a further service to the University and a form of cooperation which the administration notices and appreciates. The fact that some of the conservative groups are beginning to move cautiously in this direction is an indication of their lack of resistance to changes initiated by their secular and intellectually oriented environment. That they are doing it cautiously indicates that it does not dominate their strategy, as it does the liberals, and also indicates their continued isolation and segregation from the value orientation of the University.
The effort of the Administration to move the entire University community into a more scholarly and intellectual direction in recent years is visible in other areas as well. Increased pressure is being brought by the administration on the fraternity system to go beyond their social and recreational functions and to contribute to the total University. The Dean of Men recently stated that

...we saw the need for a complete evaluation of the fraternity system on our campus. A four-year evaluation in greater depth than any attempted in the country, that we know of, is now in its third year. Basically its purpose is to seek an answer to the question: 'What is your purpose and what are your programs for carrying out that purpose?'

...it is my belief that the student society determines the values, determines the culture of the institution. If there is a pep rally culture or a pool table culture it will be because the students make it. If there is an artistic, intellectual, and highly scientific culture it will be because the students desire it.

Needless to say, the administration is actively stimulating and coercing this desire in students and student organizations. Although they have not made a formal study, we may be reasonably certain that the administration is probably wondering about the campus religious organizations: "What is your purpose and what are your programs for carrying out that purpose?" We noted earlier the remark by one administrator (N),

It used to be that the students went to the religious centers for social purposes, but now this no longer fills students' needs. They now want a more intellectual experience except for those who blindly follow the religious and social experiences which they had at home.

12 Ibid., p. 10.
Neither the fraternity system nor the religious organizations attract most of the highly intellectual or politically sensitive students, but the liberals attract more of them than do the conservatives. The liberals will attract more intellectual students in the future as they continue to emphasize intellectual experiences and as the new Department of Religion stimulates more excitement in Religion as a legitimate and interesting area of scientific and historical investigation.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY

The University permits and even encourages the formation of subgroups because they are of potentially great value in facilitating the life of the total University community. Subgroups provide primary group interaction which is essential to personal stability and socialization into the normative structure of the community. Subgroups serve as mechanisms for the development and promotion of the secondary group values and ideology of the University. The University tends to reward those groups which support and promote the interests of the University. Approved groups are rewarded in terms of words of appreciation, recognition, and primary relations with the center of power of the University—the administration.

The Conservatives

The behavior patterns and attitudes which characterize the conservatives and the administration are that of relative isolation, competition, accommodation and some cooperation. The explanation of this is in terms of value consensus and value conflict. The conservatives and the University administration give intensive shared support to one value only—intellectual activities as instrumental to other values. The values which they share in terms of passive qualified support are: general democratic values and the emotional health of
students in terms of primary relations. At the same time the values supported intensively by the conservatives are in conflict with some values supported intensively by the administration. The administration gives intensive support to intellectual autonomy and responsibility while the conservatives merely tolerate these and some anti-intellectual values as well. In addition, the administration is tolerant of much moral non-conformity on the part of students while the conservatives actively oppose moral non-conformity and try to isolate themselves from it. Further, the administration tolerates the growth of secular cultural dominance and the conservatives actively oppose this in the name of religious cultural dominance. The administration actively supports intellectual non-conformity and the conservatives actively support intellectual conformity.

The attitudes and behavior patterns which characterize the interaction of the conservatives and fraternity system is that of isolation, competition, and accommodation. The conservatives and the fraternity system give intensive shared support only to two values: the instrumental value of intellectual activities and primary relations in terms of social and recreational activities. At the same time they give passive support to anti-intellectual and anti-democratic values. They both oppose intellectual non-conformity but to different sets of belief systems which serves as one element to keep them separate. The conservative emphasis on moral conformity is in direct conflict with the support given to moral non-conformity by the fraternity system. The emphasis on materialism, consumer skills and leisure activities by the fraternity system stands in contrast to the traditional ascetic
values of the conservatives.

This analysis reveals that the conservative religious organizations are becoming increasingly marginal to the centers of power of the University of Alabama. Aside from some important internal variation among the conservatives, they are relatively isolated from all of the three structural units: the administration, the fraternity system and the liberal religious organizations. Their behavior patterns and attitudes are disassociative and their accommodations hide their latent conflict. Although the conservative ministers are more marginal to the centers of power their influence and support among large groups of students may be gaining as the pressures for academic achievement and intellectualization increase. The conservatives do not see the university community as primarily an intellectual community but emphasize that the real concerns of most of the students are not intellectual but moral, religious, social, and recreational. They attempt to minister to the average students, i.e., the non-intellectual and the non-fraternity. In this sense they meet some of the same needs which the fraternity system and the university-sponsored student activities meet but for a segment of the student population which express religious concerns. Nearly all of the conservatives are non-intellectual in their orientation and most are anti-intellectual.

One source of the anti-intellectual orientation of the conservatives is experiences of some students who accepted an intellectual and scientific orientation and rejected their inherited faith. The loss of faith is the worst thing that can happen to a person with a conservative religious orientation and so intellectualism and science
come to be viewed with intense suspicion. Also, a person who em-
bodies an intellectual or scientific role (professors and administra-
tors) are viewed with suspicion and are accorded prestige only if
they are also religious persons. The conservatives are eager to
demonstrate that an intellectual can be religious. The liberals are
eager to demonstrate that religious persons can be intellectual. The
ultimate values of the conservatives are not legitimated by the dominant
group of their environment and since they hold their values and beliefs
with such intensity they tend to become defensive and avoid associa-
tion with those who do not share their values. They maintain a rela-
tively sharp but obscure distinction between God's truth and man's
truth and hold that the two are forever in conflict. They oppose as
"modernism" all attempts to take human intellectual achievements
seriously enough to reconcile the two systems of truth. For the con-
servatives truth is One, Absolute, and Revealed and the truth of the
university and science is plural, relative, and sought. They fear
that if their voice and influence is removed the University will be
abandoned to agnostics and atheists and that God's truth will no
longer be told.

Although the conservatives claim the same love ethic as do the
liberals, their concern for religious elements such as salvation and
faithfulness over-ride their ethical concerns. They see their love
ethic as being embodied only in individual interpersonal relations and
not in the general social values of justice, freedom, order and
equality. Although they give nominal support to these values because
they support "Democracy" they are not motivated intensely for social
criticism and social reform. Their logic is that these things will follow automatically if people will direct their attention to love, morality, salvation of souls, and individual responsibility. Because of this orientation and because of the lower-middle class status of their constituents they do not lend support to civil rights legislation. They remain silent and therefore do not lend religious sanction to the implementation of the democratic values they nominally support. The anti-democratic and anti-intellectual values of the Southern culture go unchallenged by them.

Their ethical concern is directed almost exclusively toward individual morality because of the intimate association they see between immorality and loss of faith. Their logic is that once the moral doctrine of the religious group loses its authority then the religious doctrine will also and the students will lose their faith. Conversely, if the students' faith is weakened through the intellectual confusion created by "agnostics and atheists," then the students will become morally irresponsible. They protect their students by offering social-recreational activities rather than intellectual experiences and by stressing the "evil" and "sin" of the dominant morality of dancing, drinking, smoking, and sexual activity on the campus. The religious sanctions they impose on behavior are quite clear.

The participation or lack of participation in their activities furnishes them an immediate index of their success or failure in achieving their goals. They do not have difficulty getting large groups of students for parties and recreation, but do have trouble getting student participation for other activities such as Bible
study or organizational meetings. This is the probable basis of their complaint that they don't have enough *time* with the students. The potentiality is great for them that the secondary value of numerical growth will become a primary value since *success* is defined in numerical terms. Since they are interested in reaching as many of the average students as possible they should be able to achieve this organizational goal. The continuity of their definition of the situation and of their task in it in the face of rapid changes in the life of the university means that they will increasingly look to their denominational leaders for financial and ideological support in order to increase the quantity and quality of their activities. They are furnishing their students a much elaborated form of "home church away from home church." This meets a genuine need of a large segment of students which is filled by no other campus agency.

There seems to be a crisis in the life of the conservative organizations. They are having to make extensive evaluation of the changes taking place around them and they are being forced to alter their strategies of mission. Predicting on the basis of what we know now, it is probable that the conservative groups will initially isolate themselves from cultural contamination by intensive activities at their student centers and interact less with the other student religious organizations. However, the conservative groups that share the most intellectual orientations supported by the University will change in the direction followed by the liberal organizations. They will probably expand their activities to attract intellectual students as well as non-intellectual students. They will not eliminate their
current programs but will add other types of programs. The addition of libraries, the beginning of study groups, and other intellectual experiences for their students is an indication that some of the conservatives are already moving in that direction. In doing so, they will have to stretch their values, change their ideas, and possibly alienate some students, but this is the price they will have to pay for survival. They are in a tension between their desire to maintain their status in the university community and their desire to maintain their value-belief system.

The Liberals

The pattern of interaction which characterizes the liberal religious organizations and the University Administration is that of relative integration, a high degree of cooperation, stable accommodation, and potential assimilation. This pattern of behavior and attitudes is explained in terms of the value consensus between the University and the liberal religious organizations. The cluster of values which is intensely held and actively supported by the liberals and the University centers around the intrinsic and instrumental value of intellectual activity. This is supported by the intensely held value of intellectual autonomy and responsibility. The value held passively and with qualified support by both the liberals and the University is: toleration of moral and intellectual non-conformity. On the other hand both the administration and the liberals actively oppose anti-intellectual values and intellectual conformity. Although the University and the liberal religious organizations share several other values they differ in the intensity with which they hold
these values and this creates potential strains between them. There are at least five of these: (1) The liberal religious groups give active support to the democratic values of freedom, justice, order and equality while the administration gives only passive and qualified support to them; (2) The liberals give active support to primary relations and the administration gives only minimal support to them while emphasizing functional relationships; (3) The university holds intensively the value of the religious neutrality of non-religious state institutions while the liberals give only qualified support to it; (4) the university is concerned with pragmatic and proximate concerns and the liberals share these only as they promote ultimate concerns; (5) The University of Alabama actively and intensively seeks to establish its legitimacy in the South and in the United States while the liberals are only concerned for this in a qualified manner.

The attitudes and behavior patterns which characterize the interaction of the liberals and the fraternity system have elements of accommodation, competition, cooperation, and integration. Both the liberals and the fraternity system actively support intellectual activities which are instrumental to other values. They both support the value of primary relations but the liberals think that this can best be served by small discussion groups and the fraternity system thinks that this is best served by parties and recreational activities. Both the liberals and the fraternity system give passive support to the religious neutrality of non-religious organizations. Conflict of values between the liberals and the fraternity system is centered around the support given by the fraternity system to
anti-intellectual and anti-democratic values. Strained interaction between the fraternity system and the liberals is created by the differential degree of intensity with which they hold other values. For example, the liberals give passive qualified support to the toleration of moral non-conformity even though they do support individual morality and some degree of moral conformity. The fraternity system, on the other hand, actively supports moral non-conformity. The liberals support intellectual non-conformity while the fraternity system supports intellectual conformity. The liberals give qualified support to the autonomy of the University of Alabama and the fraternity system only tolerates it and possibly actively opposes it through the alumni. The fraternity system supports actively material values and consumer-oriented behavior while the liberals tolerate it and oppose some of the consequences of it.

The attitudes and behavior patterns of the liberals vis-a-vis the conservative religious organizations is marked by accommodation with some elements of relative isolation, competition and limited cooperation. The intensely held values which are shared by the liberals and the conservatives are not sufficient to break down the value conflicts which divide them but they are important. Both the liberals and the conservatives support the values of individual piety and morality, the emotional health of students, and the instrumental value of intellectual activities. But they hold intensely to conflicting values. The liberals actively support intellectual autonomy and responsibility while the conservatives support intellectual conformity and anti-intellectualism. The liberals actively support
the implementation of democratic values and the conservatives give passive and qualified support to democratic and anti-democratic values.

Because of the wide range of values promoted by the liberal religious organizations they are able to maintain forms of communication and cooperation with many of the diverse groups and interests of the university community. They are one of the few groups on the campus that maintain patterns of associative interaction with the administration, faculty, staff, the fraternity system and the conservative religious organizations.

The extensive cooperation of the liberals and the administration has obtained mutual support and gains for each group but they have not shared equally in these gains because the liberals have paid for their prestigious association with the surrender of some autonomy. The administration has made only those changes which have been to its advantage and at its own pace. The administration has simply extended the province of its interest, service and control within the framework of an accepted legitimacy and within the context of an historical trend in this direction. Whatever tension might have existed or should have existed between religious organizations and a secular state university is becoming increasingly relaxed as the liberal religious organizations are brought more and more into the services of the secular institution. The liberal organizations in their close association with the university have frequent opportunities to assess the consequences of their behavior for the university and for themselves. The extensive bonds which bind the liberal organizations to the university in terms of shared values and informal relations have reduced the autonomy of the
liberals. Extensive evidence cannot be given to support this proposition but the norms expressed by the liberal ministers ("don't rock the boat" and "don't make them any trouble") and the hesitancy of the ministers to criticize the university certainly point in this direction. What would the liberals do if the administration were to act decisively in its own interest and against the interests of the liberal ministers. The voice of protest may have been paid off. The reduction of autonomy may be the price paid by the liberal organizations for their influence at the center of the university. They, not unlike the university, may be more captive of their environment than they suspect or desire.

The liberal ministers support secular liberal values because they derive them from a religious ethic. In this way they are able to maintain a coherent value-belief system and support elements of their environment without involving themselves in either moral or intellectual compromise. The religious ethic of the conservatives does not lend itself to the support of the same secular values. The theological basis of the values of the liberals is in terms of a radical love ethic which is a response to their experience of God's love. This love ethic expresses itself in a disinterested concern for the good of all people through supportive interpersonal relations and through the embodiment in society of the social values of justice, freedom, equality and order. Their concern for these values aligns them with secular agencies which seek these same values through the responsible use of power. Their religious values and social ethic motivates them to cooperate with and support secular agencies. Their motivation may be
potentially, if not actually, corrupted by power-seeking whereby they gain status and power through their alignment with secular power.

Intellectual activity has been traditionally valued by the church as the servant of the church. With the liberal ministers there is the potentiality that the secondary instrumental value of intellectual activity will be incorporated into their value-belief system as a primary value. The study and analysis of religion becomes an exciting interest in itself and is given religious motivation. The liberal ministers value and support the new Department of Religion not only because it potentially raises the respectability of religion as a legitimate area of academic concern but because it promotes an activity which the liberal ministers value, i.e., intellectually stimulating dialogue between faculty, students, and ministers about religious concerns and about their implications for human values and behavior. The liberals have been trained in certain intellectual skills which they value and through which they gain ego satisfaction and status recognition. Thus the value of intellectual activity may have become secularized in the sense that the motivation for it is no longer religious but secular.

Their commitment to radical honesty and truth aligns them with the scientific values of honesty, truth, and objectivity. They make no claims to possess absolute truth, but claim, as an item of faith, that God is Truth as well as Love and that no truth or love can be against God. The liberal ministers do not make the radical discontinuity between man's truth and God's truth but assert that the relationship between the two is not clear. This position does not necessarily
conflict with the pragmatic empirical position of science because science supposedly makes no explicit metaphysical claims. The liberals affirm the legitimacy of scientific methods of inquiry in philosophy, history and religion. Therefore they are allies of the University and add religious legitimacy to some of the goals and endeavors of the University.

Their concern for radical honesty and intellectualization leads them to evaluate highly the questioning and speculation about religious beliefs by students. They insist that the inherited faith of students must be examined critically and accepted on the basis of meaningfulness and not in terms of authority. The question they raise is not: "What should I believe?" but "What do I believe?" Belief for the liberals must be personally relevant and should be formed in an unending dialogue between traditional belief symbol systems and contemporary thought forms.

The fact that the liberals who taught courses had many students drop their courses because of the liberal intellectual approach taken is an indication that only a select group of students is interested in this approach to religion in particular and in intellectual activities in general. The fact that the liberal ministers complained that they have difficulty stimulating and maintaining intellectual controversy among students and admit that this campus is not as intellectually stimulating as other campuses is another indication that the conservative ministers more than the liberals give students what students want. The liberals are eager for the University to assume responsibility for the intellectual approach to religion so that the ministers
can devote more time to interpersonal relations with students, faculty, and administrators and to their private intellectual pursuits. This explains the apparent paradox that the ministers who most desire an intellectual approach to religion are the ones most eager to give up their teaching positions.

The liberal ministers are under some pressure from the students to offer more social and recreational experiences but these ministers discourage this even though they have the facilities. This lends additional credence to the conservative ministers' assertion that most of the students are not intellectually oriented and that therefore the liberals are neglecting a large group of students. However, the University is interested in discouraging a social-recreational student culture and promoting a scientific-intellectual student culture. The University thinks that all social and recreational activities should contribute somehow to the intellectual growth of students. The conservatives think that all recreational and leisure pursuits should contribute to the moral and religious growth of students. The liberals do not actively oppose leisure activities but they think that they should not assume responsibility for it, that there is too much of it now, and not enough intellectual concerns. All of the liberals changed in recent years from social-recreational and numerical growth concerns to worship and intellectual concerns.

The values of religious liberty and toleration are held by the liberal religious organizations and they do not seek to dominate the University community with specifically Christian symbols. For this reason they do not actively support Religious Emphasis Week as
conceived by the conservative ministers. The liberals do not think that the University should sponsor "church services" in Foster Auditorium and they do not seek to legitimize their position at the University of Alabama in terms of Religious Emphasis Week. They seek to legitimize their position in terms of promoting the intellectual and social ethical values which they share with the University. They reject the other-worldly implications of the value-belief system of the conservative ministers because it leads to a socially irrelevant pietistic individualism which directs concern away from social and intellectual values. The liberals have sought to relativize the influence of the conservatives through only passive support of the conservative-backed traditional pattern of relating to the University, viz., the Department of Religion and Religious Emphasis Week.

The religious sanctions imposed on belief and behavior by the liberals are not clear in terms of the religious symbols as those imposed by the conservatives. The liberals realize that religious sanctions are powerless (non-legitimate) in a secular society and therefore they employ the symbols, rationality, and values of their environment to support and reinforce their religious values. The conservative organizations define their functions in symbols that are distinctly religious, e.g., "spiritual life," "Word and Sacrament," "sermons," "biblical," etc. The liberal organizations define their functions in a secular vocabulary, e.g., "critical intellectual orientations," "democratic values," "human ideals," "intellectual integrity," "moral integrity," and "academic respectability." By so doing the liberals identify some of their functions with that of the University.
Both the conservative and the liberal ministers are aware that the socio-cultural environment of the University community is a different kind of community than the ones from which the students come. They see the students as unprepared for this new experience and they function as socializing agents for competing value systems. The conservatives see the students as morally and religiously unprepared to meet the threats of the University life. The liberals see the students as intellectually unprepared in their religious life to profit from their socialization into the liberal values embodied in the University.

Subsidiary Questions

Social Functions of Churches. One of the subsidiary questions raised in the guidelines for this study was: if church-type religious groups are integrated into a secular and religious pluralistic society, what functions do they serve and how do they serve these functions? One answer suggested to this question, by this study, is that religious groups that actively support the major values of their social environment are culturally integrated by definition and socially integrated by being functional for their social system. The primary functions served by the liberal organizations for the University of Alabama are two: legitimation and socialization. The University constantly strives to gain and maintain recognition as one of the legitimate authorities of the State and religious groups are major forces shaping men's view of legitimacy. The liberal religious organizations help make the secular state university legitimate to their students and to the religious people of their denomination beyond the area of the university in terms of religious values. By reinforcing important intellectual
values of the university with religious sanctions and symbols, the liberal religious groups aid in the acceptance and internalization of the secular intellectual norms and values. By "praying at banquets" and other symbolic acts the liberals serve to integrate symbolically the University community. By maintaining communication and interaction with all subgroups of the University community the liberals function to integrate the community.

Social Functions of Sects. The second subsidiary question of this study was: if sect-type religious groups survive in a secular society how do they seek to maintain their isolation and what functions do they serve? The groups studied were not pure sect types, for the very presence of such groups as the Church of Christ and the Church of God on the campus is an indication that they are already far along the road on the movement from the sect to the church type. They are linked with and involved in the other institutions of society and therefore their values can never be clearly and completely separate from those prevalent in the larger society and the University. The cultural and social isolation previously maintained by ghetto, valley and communistic communities are no longer viable in modern American society for most sects. Spatial isolation through which people in sects could live in physical independence of non-members and through which a value-belief system could be sustained and perpetuated by the whole community must be given up for new forms of separation. One such form is social or psychological separateness through moral injunctions and primary group associations. The consciousness that the group's value-belief system runs counter to all that the world and established
religious groups offer helps to cultivate the feeling of isolation. Sect members must adopt behavioral rules which protect sect values by reducing the influence of the wider society when interaction is unavoidable. The tension created by loyalty to sect values and the desire for social status and social mobility is relieved through primary group devotional experiences and a different set of values with a transcendent reference.

The conservative religious groups at the University of Alabama function to provide religious rewards and consolations to offset the personal deprivations of the non-intellectual and non-fraternity students. By doing so they facilitate the continuous adaptation of these students to the University of Alabama. Thus these sectarian groups (conservatives) are functional for a segment of the students at the University of Alabama. They are dysfunctional for the University in that they subvert the liberal and intellectual values of the University. They are functional for the students who seek status and achievement neither through liberal intellectual orientations nor through the fraternity system. The conservative religious organizations function to relieve these students of their intellectual anxieties by providing viable simplifications of a complex culture and relieve them of their moral anxieties through group support and a simple moral code.
CHAPTER VI

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION

Contributions

The ideal typology constructed by Weber and Troeltsch defined Church and Sect in terms of both logical opposites and empirical differences drawn from existing historical models. Johnson's redefinition in terms of one dimension is an attempt to clarify these theoretical types, to reduce their ambiguity, and to suggest a modification for future empirical studies. His suggestion is that sociologists start over and look at the characteristics one at a time in terms of particular dimensions. The dimension which he selects as a start is that of the relation of the religious group to its environment, i.e., "acceptance" or "rejection." A brief survey of the literature in this substantive area is convincing that this dimension has figured significantly in most of the definitions.

Although only a first step, this focus on one dimension of the traditional typology encourages a systematic utilization of the scheme and potentially adds to the evolution of a theory. This does not exclude the possibility of the expansion of the typology through the incorporation and elaboration of other dimensions but encourages it. This redefinition draws attention away from an exclusive concern with the internal life of the religious groups and focuses on the socio-cultural context of the groups. This follows the current systems
theory of sociology which finds the meaning of structural elements primarily in terms of the functions they serve for the social system and how they serve these functions.

One significant contribution of this redefinition to this study is that it ordered the data meaningfully. It gave a systematic and theoretical structure to the data initially ordered on an impressionistic and intuitive basis. Given this order, its basis and implications were examined. The analysis and interpretation of the data was then a matter of explaining why this data could be ordered in this manner.

His redefinition allows for the possibility that sub-units of larger heterogeneous religious organizations will interact with their environment in ways that are neither characteristic of the religious organization as a whole nor characteristic of other subunits in different social environments. For example, his redefinition allows the traditionally Church-type religious groups, the Lutherans and the Roman Catholics, to be classified rather unambiguously (in this study at least) as sect-type. If the classical definition of Church had been employed in this study, the close functional similarity of the Lutheran group and the Roman Catholic group with the Baptist, the Church of Christ, and the Church of God would have been obscured. There is important variation between these groups both in terms of Johnson's redefinition and in terms of other dimensions, but the failure to see their similarity would have resulted in an inadequate picture of organized religion in this particular situation. The fruitfulness of Johnson's modification of the scheme in terms of uncovering new relationships and pointing to new observations is demonstrated.
This redefinition opens the possibility that the Church-Sect typology is a special case of the more general theory of inter-group relations. One implication of this is that all groups (religious or not) which oppose dominant values in their environment are sectarian in their behavioral character. Furthermore, there is an essential kinship, on the one hand, of Church-type religious organizations with other institutionalized organizations, and on the other hand, of religious sects with secular social movements. These types may be used to analyze political and economic groups as well as religious groups.

Problems

The six primary concepts of Johnson's scheme (acceptance, rejection, liberal, conservative, environment, and religious) are crude in terms of specifying the observations necessary for their utilization.

The major short-coming of Johnson's scheme is that it attempts to be unidimensional and is not. The "Acceptance-Rejection" continuum is not one dimension but is at least two and therefore is not an unambiguous classification scheme. What does "acceptance" mean? If it means both passive and active support or toleration then it is too crude. For example, using such a broad definition, both the liberals and the conservatives, of this study, "accept" the intrinsic value of intellectual activities, but the liberals actively support them and the conservatives only tolerate them. This difference is crucial and should not be obscured because different patterns of behavior and attitudes result from the different position this value occupies in the value-system of the two types of groups. The way in which a value is "accepted" determines the behavioral response of a group to that value in
its environment. It may be actively or passively supported or merely tolerated.

What does "rejection" mean? If it means both passive and active opposition or toleration then it is too crude. For example, both the liberals and the conservatives "reject" the morality of the fraternity-system culture. The liberals tolerate it but the conservatives withdraw from it and attack it. Again the difference in the precision of definition is crucial for understanding the differences of these groups. The way in which a value is "rejected" determines the behavioral response of a group to that value in its environment. It may be actively or passively opposed or merely tolerated.

If the environmental reference point is shifted from the value-system of the University of Alabama to the centers of power in the State of Alabama then the "liberals" at the University become "conservatives" by Johnson's definition but not by the traditional definition of "liberal" and "conservative." The "conservatives" at the University would, in turn, become "liberals" because they give support to important elements of the value-system of their social environment, e.g., the anti-democratic and anti-intellectual values. The use of the concepts "liberal" and "conservative" instead of "church" and "sect" are cumbersome and potentially misleading rather than useful. The terms "liberal" and "conservative" may be useful when the values studied are exclusively political but when the values are heterogeneous such designations are not suited. Their use is situation specific. It is perhaps better, at least provisionally, to maintain the concepts "church" and "sect."
The value-system of any heterogeneous society contains potential conflicts and strains. Values are hierarchically structured and are held with varying degrees of intensity and extensiveness. "Environment" has an unnecessarily complex referent for a conceptual scheme. A number of diverse religious groups can exist in a complex society and each may support, with various degrees of intensity, some of the values of their environment. A religious group must accept some of the values of its environment to survive. The value-system of the "environment" of the two types of religious groups and the value-system of each type of religious group had to be specified in this study to account for the differences in their attitudes and behavior. The conservative religious groups did not "reject" all of the values of their "environment." They "accepted" the instrumental value of intellectual activities and the general social-recreational values of the fraternity system. Also, the liberal religious organizations did not "accept" all of the values of their "environment" for they "rejected" the anti-democratic and anti-intellectual values of the fraternity system, the anti-intellectualism of the conservatives, and the passive support given to democratic values by the University.

In order for this scheme to be useful the structural units of the "environment" must be specified along with the value-system of each unit. Further, all values are not held with the same degree of intensity or extensiveness so some modification of the scheme must be made to specify those values which are intensively held, those which are held with qualification, those which are tolerated, and those which are opposed. Each type of religious group may be differentiated along
several dimensions when their value-systems are specified. For example, even though two sects reject the same values of their environment they may be significantly different in terms of the values which they support. In this study some of the conservative religious groups supported intellectual and democratic values more intensely than did other of the conservative groups. This could not be elaborated because the conservatives were more alike in this respect than they were different.

Other than religious values must be considered in the specification of the value-systems of religious groups. Religious values are often used to support non-religious values and primary values tend to be displaced by secondary values in the life of organizations. For example, the importance given to intellectual activities by the liberals does not spring from their religious values entirely but is reinforced by other values. Also, the importance given to meeting the needs of large numbers of students by the conservatives comes as much from their organizational numerical goals as from their religious values. Strictly religious values of religious organizations are often subordinated to other institutional values, e.g., the value given to toleration by all of the religious groups is an indication that the crucial values of our society are not couched in a religious framework and that religious differences are subordinated to the value of religious liberty. A needed modification of Johnson's scheme would be the incorporation of the additional dimension of value-system. This differentiates groups on more than one continuum and thereby increases the theoretical specificity and precision of the scheme.
The way in which Johnson employed the Church-Sect scheme is to say something about the behavior of individuals, viz., their political behavior. Is sectarian a property of groups or of individuals or of both? The traditional usage of this typology was to say something about the properties of groups, i.e., the responses of groups to aspects of their environment. A modification in terms of Johnson's redefinition must say something about the relation of group properties (e.g., value-system) to the "acceptance" or "rejection" of the environment. For example, the position of a value in the value-system of a group determines the reaction of the group to values in its environment.

If the focus is on the behavior of individuals then the several typologies of religious orientation could be employed rather than the organizational typology of Church-Sect. A link between the two types of theoretical problems would be the relationship of types of religious groups to types of religious orientations.

An important variable observed in this study was that of socialization. Any attempt to employ values as part of a conceptual scheme should deal with the social mechanisms through which norms are sanctioned and values are inculcated into the character-structure of group members. The difference between the liberals and the conservatives in terms of how they attempted to strengthen or change the value systems of the students was one of the important observations of the study. These differences represent different concepts of education and character development.

The liberals and the conservatives represent different types of
religious orientations (as well as types of groups) which produce different styles of life. Johnson skirted the issue of the nature and function of religion as a socio-cultural phenomenon and concentrated on nominal religious groups. Future research should utilize a definition of religion in terms of social and cultural functions so that the notion of functional alternatives may be brought into the theoretical analysis. Groups nominally identified as "religious" may perform secular functions and non-religious groups may perform distinctly religious functions.

This study went beyond Johnson's scheme in two basic respects. First, the value system of each structural unit was specified and the different attitudes and behavior of the groups was explained in terms of value consensus and value conflict. Second, the basis for the consensus or conflict was specified in terms of the religious value-belief system of each type of religious group. Thus the correlation between religious and secular liberalism on the one hand and religious and secular conservatism on the other is given a theoretical basis.

Suggested Modifications

On the basis of the study of religious organizations at the University of Alabama the following modifications of Johnson's scheme are suggested. These modifications are based on the general proposition that the reaction of a group to a value in its environment is a function of the position of that value or conflicting values in the value-system of the group. Four possible positions of a value in the value-system of a group are derived from a two-dimensional dichotomous property-space. One dimension is extensiveness, i.e., the degree to which a
value is held throughout the group. The other dimension is intensity, i.e., the degree of intensity with which the value is held. The four possibilities are as follows: (1) High intensity and high extensiveness; (2) High intensity and low extensiveness; (3) Low intensity and high extensiveness, and (4) Low intensity and low extensiveness.

Four types of responses are derived from a two-dimensional dichotomous property-space. One dimension is the dichotomy of support—opposition. The other dimension is activity—passivity. The four types are: (1) Strong support (active support); (2) Nominal support (passive support); (3) Attack (active opposition); and (4) Withdrawal or Toleration (passive opposition).

The following propositions are derived from this modified conceptual scheme:

(1) If a value external to a group is held with high intensity and high extensiveness in the group it will be given strong support by the group.

(2) If a value external to a group is held with either low intensity and high extensiveness or high intensity and low extensiveness in the group it will be given nominal support by the group.

(3) If a value external to a group is in conflict with a value held with high intensity and high extensiveness in the group it will be attacked by the group or the group will withdraw. Whether the group will attack or withdraw is dependent upon the position of the conflicting value relative to other values held with high intensity and high extensiveness in the group. If the conflicting value is the only one held with high intensity and high extensiveness then the
group will attack the external value. This accounts for the phenomenon of martyrdom, i.e., when a powerless group attacks a value in their environment which conflicts with a value held with high intensity and high extensiveness. If the conflicting value is subordinate to other values held with high intensity and high extensiveness then the group will withdraw. Thus, whether they attack or withdraw is not a matter of their power as it is a matter of their value system. Withdrawal is a strategy to preserve values other than the ones in conflict. Martyrdom is the defense of a value at the cost of life itself.

(4) If a value external to a group is in conflict with a value held with high intensity and low extensiveness or low intensity and high extensiveness then it will be nominally opposed or tolerated. The situation of toleration is that of internal conflict in a group between values held and values opposed. The tension is broken when either the intensity or the extensiveness with which it is held shifts from low to high. The group will then attack or withdraw depending on the conditions mentioned above. The problem created by internal value conflict points to the systemic character of a group's values, i.e., a particular value has its meaning and implications relative to other values.

(5) A condition of indifference exists when a value in the environment is neither a part of the value system of the group nor in conflict with elements of the group's value system.

(6) The more a Sect incorporates external values into its value system the more it will function as a Church and the more the group
will become Church-like in structure.

(7) The more a group tends to develop internally conflicting values, each held with high intensity and low extensiveness, the more group solidarity will be diminished and the more the group will tend to fragment into two or more disassociative groups.

Propositions three and four explain the difference between the liberals and the conservatives relative to prevailing student morality. The liberals tolerate it because they hold the value of individual morality with high intensity but low extensiveness. The conservatives withdraw from association with it because it is in conflict with the value of individual morality which they hold with high extensiveness and high intensity. But the conservatives also hold to the instrumental value of higher education with high intensity and high extensiveness. This conflict of values (withdrawal vs. participation) leads them into a position of toleration.

Propositions one and four explain the difference between the liberals and the conservatives relative to the change in the Department of Religion. The liberals strongly support it because they hold intellectual values with high intensity and high extensiveness. The conservatives tolerate it because they hold to intellectual values with low intensity and low extensiveness; and they hold to anti-intellectual values with low intensity and low extensiveness. This internal conflict of the conservatives is compounded with the value of organizational stability and growth which they hold with high intensity and high extensiveness.

Propositions one and three explain the difference between the
liberals and the conservatives relative to Religious Emphasis Week. The liberals alternate between attack and toleration because it conflicts with the values of religious neutrality of non-religious organizations and intellectualism which they support with high intensity and high extensiveness. The conservatives support it strongly because they hold with high intensity and high extensiveness the values of the religious commitment of Universities and religious organizational growth.

The implementation of these modifications involves the specification of the value system of each group in terms of intensity and extensiveness, and the specification of the values of the relevant groups in the environment. This framework can be employed on the national level and/or on the community level and may be as broad or as narrow as the number of values considered. The relationship between group values and other group properties can be studied systematically within this framework. This study functioned to clarify and to elaborate Johnson's fruitful redefinition of Church and Sect.
APPENDIX

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Date
2. Location
3. Name of Respondent
4. Official Title
5. Telephone number
6. Location

7. How long have you been a campus minister?
   7a. How long have you served in that capacity here?

8. Were you trained specifically for this type of ministry?
   8a. What was the nature of this training?
   8b. What minimal preparation for this type of ministry is required by your denomination and by this University?

9. What were you doing at the time you decided to enter this kind of ministry?

10. If you were influenced by a person or circumstances to enter this kind of ministry who was this person or what were the circumstances?

11. Was there a campus minister to students at the college you attended?
   11a. How would you describe your relationship to him? Close friend Reasonably close Passing acquaintance Indifferent

12. What expectations, if any, did you have about this kind of ministry before you entered it?

13. What kinds of things did you not anticipate? Examples?
   13a. Would you say that these are characteristic of campus ministers in general or do they apply just to you?

14. Please rank the following duties in order of their importance for your ministry here. (Card I) Give me the numbers in rank order.
   (1) Preacher (2) Social Critic (3) Teacher (4) Priest
   (5) Pastor (6) Administrator (7) Organizer
15. Please rank the same duties in order of their satisfaction to you.
16. Please rank these duties in order of time spent carrying them out.
17. How are you related organizationally to your larger church body?
18. What disadvantages are there to this relationship?
19. What advantages are there to this relationship?
20. Who is responsible for your activities? i.e., as far as organization is concerned, to whom are you directly or indirectly responsible?
21. What is the source of your personal income? Does it come from your Church body or from various contributions?
22. Do you think that your personal income is commensurate with your duties and responsibilities? If not, please explain.
23. Do you think that your personal income is commensurate with your needs?
24. If you became thoroughly dissatisfied with your work here and you found it necessary to move, what kind of work or ministry would you seek? Please explain.
25. What, in general, do your organizational superiors expect you to do here?
26. Are there any duties which take more of your time and energy than can be expected justifiably of you? If so, what are they?
27. What is your operating budget for the year?
   27a. Is it sufficient for your current needs?
   27b. How much more, in general, would be sufficient?
   27c. Is your personal salary included in this budget?
28. Please indicate according to this card (Card II) how much of your time and energy is directed to the specified groups:
   None  Some  Great Deal  Most
   Single Undergraduates
   Married Undergraduates
   Single Graduate Students
   Married Graduate Students
   Faculty
   Administration
   Staff
29. How would you distinguish your ministry here from the way in which the other campus ministers carry out theirs? Please be specific, give examples, and explain.

30. How do you account for these differences?

31. How have college students changed in the last fifteen years or so?

32. How do you account for these changes?

33. Please rank the following groups in terms of the amount of influence (positive or negative) they have on the students with whom you work.

(1) Mass Media  (2) Books  (3) High School Teachers
(4) College Teachers  (5) Family  (6) Peer groups
(7) Home Church  (8) Campus ministers

34. In general, what do your students expect you to do here? Examples?

35. What do the parents of the students expect of you? Examples?

36. What does the University Administration expect of you? Examples?

37. What do the local city ministers expect of you? Examples?

38. What does the University faculty expect of you? Examples?

39. What kind of background do the majority of students have who work with you? (Home town size, family, church, urban-rural, etc.)

40. What is the general attitude of your students to the fraternity system here?

41. What is your attitude toward the fraternity system? Why is this?

42. About how much time, if any, do you spend on the campus in an average week?

42a. What were the reasons for your being there?

43. What kind of relationship do you have with the other campus ministers?

44. If you were to work on some campus project and needed the help of some of the other ministers, which three would you select to work with you?
45. Do you now teach or did you teach at one time courses in Bible or Religion at the University?
   45a. What is most significant to you about your teaching there?
   45b. Do you think that this should be a part of your ministry here?
   45c. What kinds of limits, if any, are placed on your teaching?
   45d. What changes would you like to make, if any, in your teaching situation?

46. What do you think of the University's new policy of employing a full-time faculty member to teach Religion courses? Please explain.

47. Please rank the following emphases in terms of their importance in your ministry here (Card IV):
   (1) Doctrinal instruction    (2) General Education
   (3) Conversion             (4) Character development

48. What new directions, if any, would you like to take in your ministry here? Why do you want to do this?
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