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The Jesuit University: Vestige of the Past
Or Vanguard of the Future?

JAMES W. SANDERS, S.J.

The April, 1966, University division of the JEA meeting in Chicago touched on an issue which deserves further comment. This is the disaffection many younger Jesuits feel for their own universities. Father John P. Leary's opening address dealt directly with the phenomenon; but, while perhaps tranquilizing some administrators, it failed to speak to the disaffected. Indeed, impressions gleaned from contact with dissatisfied students and recent graduates and from some Jesuit and lay faculty members were reinforced on the second day of the meeting by Father Andrew Greeley's report on the NORC study of Jesuit higher education, which received no convincing rejoinder.

It is not the purpose here to criticize the JEA meeting or its participants, nor to argue for or against the Society's universities, but simply to face the issue of the younger Jesuit's negative image of his own institutions. This image may be well or ill-founded, but it does exist and can no longer simply be wished away. Since it has begun to corrode morale, surely all those concerned will want the problem discussed openly rather than let it continue to fester under the surface. Therefore, in the hope of promoting better communication and understanding and of prompting a serious and satisfactory response, some of the difficulties bothering many young Jesuits are here presented.

First, the NORC study found Jesuit Universities weakest where they ought to excel—in theology. Students often object to paying hundreds of dollars yearly for non-professional, nineteenth century textbook theology that sometimes constitutes a danger to the Faith. When many live at the margin of Catholicism, they refuse to accept facile answers to complex questions and cannot submit to a form of religion which doesn't speak to their deepest needs. Many university administrators admit this failure but point to improvements now in

4 Greeley, op. cit., 113.
progress. Younger Jesuits do see the gradual improvement but with Father Greeley remain dismayed at the delay and lack of urgency in the Jesuit University’s response. This inertia causes the greatest alarm because it conjures up the image of an institution outside the mainstream of Catholic life in the 1960’s.

The approach to discipline further strengthens this image. Many Jesuit University administrators fail to recognize that students learn responsibility through its exercise and that granting a few degrees of freedom does not necessitate an abdication of jurisdiction. While Jesuit University students fight for the right to choose speakers from off campus, for freedom of their press, and while they rebel against religious compulsion, those on secular campuses, having long since won these battles, freely immerse themselves in genuine political, social, and religious concerns. Younger Jesuits believe that paternalism not only cannot be justified theoretically; it doesn’t work except to cause increasing student alienation from the University, the Society, from Catholic education, and sometimes from the Church itself. Again, the administration’s slow and grudging adjustment to this fact strengthens the image of an institution out of joint with present realities.

The answer given at last year’s JEA meeting to these and other criticisms was that most shortcomings could be remedied if more money were available. But many doubt that poor theology and repressive discipline result from a university’s financial problems. They suspect instead a failure in adjustment to Vatican II and to the needs of the present generation.

On the other hand, the financial crisis does loom as a major cause for discouragement. Even with better fund-raising techniques, how can Jesuit Universities continue to compete successfully with the wealth of publicly-supported and privately-endowed universities in the United States? The response normally points to the ever-increasing size of gifts and grants, evidence supposedly of continued improvement. But a university’s financial position can only be judged in relation to other universities. The impression is that for every additional dollar given to a Jesuit University the local state or prestige private institution gets ten. Thus, relatively the Jesuit Universities draw less and less support. The inevitable consequence seems to be a decreasing ability to compete for the best professors,

5 Greeley, op. cit., 112.
6 Reinert, op. cit., 125.
the most adequate facilities, and therefore the most desirable students.

Yet, the policies of many Jesuit Universities, in continued physical expansion and proliferation of graduate and professional departments, seem based on the assumption that successful competition is possible. Again, many take such policies as another symptom of the failure to keep contact with reality, and argue that Jesuit Universities can survive only by concentrating on undergraduate liberal arts programs, with a very few graduate schools and these specializing only in carefully selected areas and supported by inter-province cooperation.

Further, many wonder if the function of the Jesuit University in the post-Vatican and post-ghetto American Church has been sufficiently reexamined. The old ideal of every Catholic college student in a Catholic college is no longer practicable. The low tuition cost of state universities now proliferating everywhere and the prestige of the well-established private ones combine to draw off large numbers of desirable students. More important, the ideological appeal of the Catholic and Jesuit college has declined. Many better educated Catholics no longer fear the pernicious influence of the secular campus, and in fact believe that if their children's faith is to flourish at all it must take root in this secular and pluralistic world. Thus, the Jesuit college which yesterday stood on the exciting frontier of the emerging Church's engagement with the world, tomorrow will be mothering the offspring of the more protective Catholic families. These, of course, deserve attention. But many young Jesuits look to the Society's traditional role in the vanguard of Catholic movements and ask whether she ought to be playing nursemaid now.

No doubt the Jesuit University performed an important function earlier. It interpreted a strange world to the immigrant church and trained up an able generation of lay leaders. But this role may be no longer possible or necessary; not possible because the bright and promising potential leaders now desert to the secular campus where they believe the action is, even for dedicated Christians; not necessary because American Catholicism no longer needs a buffer against a hostile world. Therefore perhaps the Society of Jesus, true to its constitutional flexibility, ought to reexamine the premises on which its university commitment is based. The time may have come to return the Jesuit University to the layman and move on to other
works now inviting the Society's unique contribution. The administrator's apparent reluctance to entertain this possibility casts him as a man of parochial vision bent on the protection of vested interests.

Still another factor prompts a reevaluation of the Society's work in America. The wider avenues now open to the layman, together with widespread doubts about the religious value of celibacy, very probably indicate a continued decline in Jesuit vocations and failure to keep pace even with present institutional commitments. The Church's new-found appreciation of the dedicated lay life leads many to bypass the tradition-bound religious orders. Youth join the Peace Corps or other short-term movements and then return to prepare for a lifetime given to social work, foreign service, politics and other vastly expanding areas of Christian commitment. Even those preferring teaching find the possibilities for Catholic lay professors today, especially on the secular campus and even in theology, far more alluring and relevant than what seems to them an uneventful and predetermined career as a Jesuit in a mediocre institution. The prospect, then, is for a declining reserve of Jesuit manpower, and far-sighted policy making ought to take this likelihood into consideration.

Many Jesuits themselves feel the Society has lost much of its natural flexibility through devotion to a single apostolate. Especially today they would like to see more openness to new needs in the Church. But the main problem remains the lack of attraction for their own already-existing institutions. A survey of Jesuits now in special studies, not to mention the scholasticates, would reveal a significant percentage with no desire to teach in a Jesuit University. Some fear being shoved, like so many before them, behind an administrator's desk. The more intellectual look upon absorption into a Jesuit University as the necessary end of a scholarly career and as consignment to academic obscurity and mediocrity. Some actually seek to prolong their special studies as a last chance to do serious research, and actively pressure for permission to accept teaching posts in secular institutions where time for research is more plentiful, where the academic life seems more varied and vigorous, and where large numbers of Catholic students already await their influence.

Such feelings may indeed be quite ill-founded, but they do exist; and their existence reveals at least a failure in salesmanship. Jesuit Universities have failed to sell themselves to the very people who
can make their survival possible. Perhaps the problem has been that Jesuit administrators in the past looked upon their younger confreres as a captive labor pool. While eager enough to cultivate prospective lay professors, they have let the status recruit fellow Jesuits. Even today few of those in special studies experience any show of interest from the Universities of their own Province. The only concern is with their cash value, since every additional Jesuit eases the financial burden by eliminating one lay salary. But nothing is done to make them feel wanted, or even to guide their studies as direct preparation for programs in a particular department. Conversely, they are increasingly courted by representatives of other institutions. As a result they build up no particular allegiance to counteract the attractions of the secular campus.

The problem, then, is above all that Jesuit Universities suffer from a bad press among younger Jesuits. Administrators, perhaps recalling a simpler day when Jesuits did what they were told without question, seem to believe the problem solves itself as each individual's name appears on the status. But this is not likely to be the case. Younger Jesuits now understand that the virtue of obedience calls forth a corresponding responsibility on their part. They know the Holy Spirit moves through the whole Church and the whole Society and has to be listened for even at the grass roots. While conceding that final decisions remain with superiors, they will not sit passively by while someone else weighs their destiny in a vacuum. Mere assignment to a university will only result in declining morale, internal dissension, and defection from the ranks. The trend is already observable in some places. Where it is not, success is due to a given university's ability to create a favorable image of itself in the minds of its prospective Jesuit faculty. This calls for communication between the Jesuit University and the younger Society. It depends on the university's ability to sell itself as a going institution making a unique contribution to the Church and the world.

Finally, let it be clear once more that the very negative image of the Jesuit University presented here is not claimed to represent fact. It represents instead what many younger Jesuits think are facts. The image has been formed on the basis of impressions gleaned mostly from second hand sources. Though the impression gains strength from more scientific appraisals like the NORC study, for the most part it does not derive from intimate personal experience
of the Jesuit University itself. But images are powerful shapers of human life and action, and this image of the Jesuit University is likely to have far reaching practical effects. It seems time for administrators either to dispel the image if it be ill-founded or to face the consequences if it represents the truth. Many younger Jesuits would welcome a convincing debunking of their own objections stated in these pages.
A Jesuit at Western Michigan

John A. Hardon, S.J.

A number of people have asked me to clarify the issues involved in my leaving Western Michigan after five years on the faculty of the university in its department of philosophy and religion. I am happy to do so, while suggesting that a more complete picture may be gained from The Hungry Generation (Religious Attitudes and Problems at a State University), which is being published early in 1967.

Instead of repeating what may be found in the book, I prefer here to give a chronological sequence of the events, beginning with the university's invitation in 1962 and ending with the university's reversal of position in 1966. By way of epilogue, I am adding some of my own conclusions and possible guidelines for the future.

The background of my appointment goes back to 1958, when I served as Catholic consultant to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, standardizing agency for teachers' colleges and departments of education. My work with the association was to cooperate with the Protestant and Jewish consultants in evaluating a five-year research program on "Religion and Public Education." Western Michigan was one of the pilot institutions for the project and a member of its school of education was national coordinator. One result of the study was that Western founded a department of philosophy and religion. Dr. Cornelius Loew of Union Theological Seminary became head of the department.

Early in 1962, the Provincial of the Detroit Province of the Society of Jesus, Rev. John A. McGrail, S.J., was approached by a representative of Western Michigan about having a priest teach Catholic theology on the faculty: "The priest hired would be asked to set up a program of Catholic studies. It is hoped that a four-year program might eventually result." Officials at Western called it a pioneering project.

The idea of a state-supported university hiring a Catholic theologian is a revolutionary one, and the opportunity offered to advance the cause of the Church and true religion would be enormous. Obviously the man to fill such a position would have to be a scientific theologian who was able to resist the temptation to proselytize, and in no sense would he be under the
authority of the Newman Club chaplain or have any pastoral obligation at the Newman Club.

He would be, of course, as free as any other professor to carry on any activities, pastoral or otherwise, which he might wish when he was not at the university. It is essential in the hiring of this professor that he be in no sense presented by the church or any of its agencies as an official candidate for the position.

Dr. Loew (head of the department) wishes simply to hire the best individual he can find, and the fact that he might be a priest or a member of a religious order must remain coincidental so that there would be no danger of difficulty on the Church-State question.

As a result of the invitation, I visited the university in April, during which time I had conferences with members of the faculty, the dean, and vice-president of the institution. One problem seemed insurmountable, the dilemma between sectarian teaching (which the university feared was inevitable for a Catholic) and academic freedom (to which I appealed in my conferences with the administration). One paragraph in the university's official policy on academic freedom was crucial.

The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation to his subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.

During the conferences with the administration, I was told that I would be hired if I taught Catholicism as I would teach Confucianism, by standing apart from my subject and not giving the impression of commitment. My reply was that if I could not be trusted to avoid proselytizing or was denied the freedom given others to teach what I believed and as I believed it, I was not interested. So I left Kalamazoo with no intention of returning.

By the time I reached Detroit that day to tell the Provincial of my negative decision, the administration at Western had changed its mind. They phoned the provincial residence to say that I was being offered the teaching position on "his terms."

On that assurance, I later accepted the offer to teach, besides other courses, Fundamentals of Catholic Theology and Catholic Moral Theology. The agreement was for a two-year contract,
subject to renewal. Approval by the state board of education included the rank of associate professor and a starting salary of $8,500.

The freedom of which I was given verbal (not written) guarantee was at first respected, although from the beginning certain limitations were placed on me, e.g., the university’s insistence that I pay income tax from which as a man vowed to poverty I am legally exempt. So concerned was the administration that by the end of the first week of class I was warned either to sign the tax-exemption waiver or leave the university. Similarly I was told to avoid any public ministrations as a priest.

I went along with these restrictions because, at the time, I felt the university was basically behind me and that we were engaged in a common enterprise that had great potential for the future of higher education. My classes were an immediate success. Altogether I taught nine different courses, including Hinduism and Buddhism, and Understanding the New Testament. But the most popular were the offerings in Catholic doctrine and moral. By the third semester, I was teaching more than half the students in the department, 560 out of 1,100 for the year, although seven men were on the staff.

This occasioned criticism and led to an order from the administration that my classes should be reduced, eventually to 35. Other classes became equally limited in theory, but in practice this affected only the Introduction to Religion which attracted students because it served as a required Humanities substitute, whereas my courses remained pure electives. As requests for the Introduction course increased, new faculty were hired, so that at one time or another all six Protestant ministers in the department taught this Humanities replacement.

After two years, I was offered a renewed contract for one year, at which time the president of the university wrote: “The favorable response of students to your courses, and your own energetic loyalty to the University’s intellectual task point to the advantages which would be gained” if the contract were renewed. During the third year, however, I became convinced that I would not receive tenure, and that the reason was the crucial one raised in 1962 when I asked for freedom to teach theology as a doctrinal discipline. This was the substance of a five hour meeting of the staff, met for my benefit, until 2:30 in the morning, at which I was quizzed and
contradicted on the question, "What do you think is the purpose of a religion department in a state university?" Finally I begged to be excused because I had a speaking engagement at Purdue University that afternoon.

By the end of the third year I experienced a variety of new limitations on my teaching. The course in Catholic Theology was removed from the curriculum against my wishes. The new course, in Catholic Tradition, was not to be theological but historical. Instead of teaching Catholic theology, I was to teach "descriptively about the history of Catholic beliefs." At the same time, Catholic Moral Theology was also removed, without even consulting me. When I protested that this was a second breach of contract, the department allowed a substitute with a changed name. Yet both courses were so popular with the students, Catholic and Protestant, that some told me they waited two years to get into one of my classes.

In the meantime I urged hiring another Catholic theologian to help with the course offerings in Catholicism. It would not be a priest, I discovered, because the president of the university was against it on principle. This was consistent with the attitude from the beginning; a layman would have been preferred to a priest. Moreover, as the academic vice-president said in my presence, "I was warned about hiring a Jesuit to the faculty!"

When a Catholic lay theologian was interviewed for the department, I encouraged his appointment and made a special trip to Baltimore for that purpose. After he arrived on campus, Rudolf Siebert was informed that he was hired to replace the Jesuit priest. He has since publicly protested that this was not his understanding when offered a contract by the university. In the same way, he privately assured me it was not true that the department had unanimously decided against giving me tenure. In the past year and a half he has promoted the contrary.

When a renewed contract was offered in the fall of 1964, for two more years, it was no longer as associate but only as visiting professor. On inquiry, I was informed that this was done to avoid the prospect of my acquiring permanent status on the faculty.

In view of the changed situation, I agreed to teach only one semester per year of the two-year term which expired December 31, 1966. Yet all the while I decided against leaving the university earlier because I still hoped that some kind of compromise might
be reached. Accordingly I had several private conferences with the associate dean, Cornelius Loew (former head of the department), and President Miller. But I felt they were not free to decide in my favor.

This was dramatically illustrated by two meetings of the department in the fall of 1965. First we were asked if we all wanted to teach a specified number of hours "outside the department," in some field like Art, English or History. When the response was not favorable, we were told at the next meeting that this was not a request but an order: either to comply or leave. All complied, although the head of the philosophy side of the department has since left Western Michigan. Incidentally he was a church-going Episcopalian who favored Aristotle and Aquinas in his classes.

On pressing for an explanation for this unusual intrusion, we were given to understand that the department was offered the following option: either freeze the faculty as of now, with no assured prospect of additional personnel, or permit new teachers but require newcomers to agree to teach outside the department according to specifications to be determined by the university.

In May 1966, I received an unexpected letter from the associate dean, in which he took issue with three items in a press release about my appointment to the ecumenical commission of the Lansing Diocese: identification as associate and not visiting professor, being labeled a teacher of Catholic theology, and the implication that I was using the diocesan appointment as a wedge to stay on at Western. In reply I explained that I had nothing to do with the news release; that I had adjusted the new title in such places as Who's Who in American Education; that I had been hired to teach Catholic theology; and that I was offended by the implied charge of dishonesty. The associate dean answered with an evasive apology, to which I replied (after consultation) with a summary of the five years' infringement on my academic freedom.

At this time the Detroit News asked for a story about my leaving Western, to balance the front-page account of my appointment which the university had published in 1962. I agreed to release the story, carefully worded, and further agreed that the university should also be consulted to present its side of the case. With the news release of July 17, 1966, a new and public phase of the Western experiment began.

Briefly, I stated that the issues at stake were greater than either
my personal interests or the university's policy; that I sought to teach courses in religion that answered to the full academic demands of the subject, but at the same time were addressed to the moral and spiritual needs of the students. In all the published statements of the university, before or since the recent publicity, the critical element appears to be the role of religious studies in a state university.

According to E. Thomas Lawson, present head of the department: "The academic discipline of religion has as its basic methodological principles and presuppositions those of the community of scholars and not those of the church, sect, or cult. This means that the discipline of religion involves inquiry and the ordered presentation of the fruits of that inquiry. In no sense should this discipline be catechetical, apologetic, evangelistic, moralistic, pietistic, dogmatic, or doctrinal."

I quoted this statement of policy in my correspondence with the university, pointing out that it excludes Catholic, Protestant and Jewish doctrine from legitimate inclusion as curriculum study at Western. Instead it substitutes the principles and presuppositions of an anonymous "community of scholars," who may be agnostics, secular humanists or atheists. Moreover, it denigrates by association the teaching of doctrinal Judaism or Christianity, correlating a highly intellectual theology with catechetics, apologetics, evangelism, moralism and pietism. It also insists, with emphasis, that religion should not be taught as faith expressible in doctrine but solely as phenomena to be studied through inquiry.

"How many times and in how many ways," my letter stated, "I have argued against this monism. While freely granting that religion should be studied as phenomena through inquiry, I have urged that this should not exclude theology as the doctrine of a religious body. My whole ecumenical bent of mind has favored the teaching of Catholicism, Protestantism and Judaism; but my efforts in favor of doctrinal Protestantism were rebuffed, and in favor of Judaism by being reminded how few Jews there were on campus to pay any attention to them." The fate of Catholicism was a matter of experience.

Dr. Loew stressed the university's neutrality about the students' commitment when they enter college. As reported in the Christian Science Monitor (September 30, 1966), he argued against my approach to the teaching of religion, saying that I wished to "provide
students with a strengthening of the religious heritage which they bring with them." According to him, "this kind of buttressing of the faith of students we feel is not the demand that a secular university can rightly meet." When we discussed this privately later on, he modified the statement by admitting that such buttressing could not be the main purpose of religion at a state university, which I had never claimed. My plea was not to exclude intellectual maturation of the faith already possessed by students, while giving every encouragement to teachers who did the opposite.

Student reaction to my leaving Western gives some indication of how they view the administration's conduct towards me, and what they want and look for in a department of religion. Among the letters received by the university was a protest from a clergyman who is not a Roman Catholic, now doing his doctorate studies. He wrote to the president and the board of trustees.

I have spent five and one half years of study at Western Michigan University where I received three degrees and a teaching certificate. Nonetheless I am ashamed that my alma mater has treated Fr. Harden in such a manner. Also I have spent the past two years preparing to teach theology at a state university, but I certainly would never consider working for Western Michigan University with the reputation it has at present.

It is most interesting that Professor Loew said that Fr. Hardon "seems to feel that doctrine can be taught in a state university in the same way as in a Catholic or other religious school where indoctrination is taken for granted." Just why Professor Loew believes "indoctrination" is not a legitimate function of a state university is very difficult to understand. "Indoctrination" means simply "to instruct in doctrines, theories, beliefs or principles" according to the second edition of Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary.

The Detroit News stated that, according to Fr. Hardon, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish doctrines are not allowed to be taught at Western Michigan University. This to me is preposterous. It is the doctrines of the above-named faiths which have greatly shaped and influenced the history and culture of the United States and the world. How can a university student fully understand his country's history and culture, and that of the world, if he is not free to study the tenets of Catholicism, Protestantism and Judaism? If a student is free to study Communistic and Fascist doctrines at Western Michigan University,
then why should he not be free to study those of Catholicism, Protestantism and Judaism?

As a former student of Fr. Hardon at Western Michigan University, I can testify that he taught intelligibly and objectively, always taking care to be fair to all points of view. Few teachers in my opinion have given so much of their time and energy to teach and help students overcome their intellectual difficulties. Western has been fortunate to have him on its faculty. To dismiss him for the reasons given would not only be a grave injustice to Fr. Hardon but a tragedy for the university.

To all the letters of protest, the president of the university sent the same one-page reply. Its most significant statement says that, “The differences that presently exist between Dr. Hardon and his colleagues are of a very fundamental nature concerning the teaching of religion. I have every confidence that Dr. Loew reflects in his statements the feelings of the other members of the department.”

On request, my comment on this statement was to agree that the differences are fundamental. I also agreed with President Miller’s observation that the issue at stake was “the manner in which religion should be taught at this University.” However, on both counts I felt the differences and the issue were too crucial to be left to the judgment of a handful of men within the department. They need to be discussed openly and freely, which was the main reason I took the liberty of publicizing the fact that my contract was not being renewed.

Several conferences I have had recently with the president and associate dean strengthen my belief that the basic problem for the university is the question of church and state. How can religion, and not just the philosophy or history of religion, be taught in a tax-supported institution without violating (as I was reminded by Vice-President Seibert in 1962) the state constitution which forbids teaching sectarianism in a public university?

Whenever I suggested that secular humanism, or any other form of belief, was equally “religious” as an ultimate commitment and yet widely tolerated by state institutions, I was informed that this was not the intent of the law and that, besides, “dogmatic religion” but not “secularistic religion” favors the closed mind—whereas a uni-
versity's function is not to give answers but only to raise questions in the students' minds.

This is my fifteenth year of involvement in religion and public education, going back to 1952 when I cooperated with the Indianapolis public school system to work out a syllabus for teaching moral and spiritual values in the junior high grades. Since then I have worked with a broad variety of agencies and school systems, the latest in the spring of 1966 on invitation of the Florida state board of education.

The more familiar I become with public education, the more clearly I see that state university administrators are scarcely interested in cultivating those values which, for the Catholic, are the Church's most serious educational concern. In the words of the Vatican Council: "The Church is keenly aware of her very grave obligation to give zealous attention to the moral and religious education of all her children." ¹

Where, as at Western Michigan, a department of religion is established, its function explicitly rules out the spiritual formation of the students. If, under duress or the pressure of public opinion, the university allows a Catholic or two in the department, his role is that of a symbol. It gives token evidence that the school includes also Catholics in the department. By no stretch of the imagination does the institution wish to give Catholics (or others) a chance to deepen the religious convictions with which they entered college.

From the state university viewpoint, this is perfectly intelligible. Administrators have repeatedly said they are not in the business of improving anyone's morals or religious commitment. Moreover, officials are very sensitive to public opinion, notably of two classes of people: those with no religious affiliation and those with strong religious convictions.

Persons with no religious affiliation resent even the existence of a department of religion in a tax-supported institution. They argue that this is against the principle of church and state separation, and are willing to test their position in the courts. It was this kind of pressure which profoundly affected two state universities recently where credit courses in religion have been offered to Catholics, Protestants and Jews from religious teachers of their own persuasion.

Persons with strong commitment, who are not Catholic, are disturbed at what inevitably happens when attractive credit courses

¹ Declaration on Christian Education, 7.
in Catholicism are offered in a state university. The classes become highly popular and draw not only Catholics but Protestants, Jews and agnostics. This is in sharp contrast with courses that are "denominational" but not Catholic-oriented. Thus in a given semester, I had 160 students in two sections of the Fundamentals of Catholic Theology, compared with 10 students who signed up for the comparable course in contemporary Protestant Theology.

I have been asked what I have learned from the Western Michigan experience. There are many things, not the least of which is a growing realization that the rising monopoly of state university education is detrimental to the moral and spiritual welfare of American youth. Even with the best of intentions, which cannot be assumed, it lacks the institutional and academic freedom to communicate the basic religious values commonly associated with church-related schools.

In terms of public higher education, two possibilities suggest themselves: each made more feasible now than ever before in our history. Catholic educators should cooperate ecumenically with like-minded Christians and Jews to help all young people in state universities receive credit courses in theology from trained teachers in their own religious tradition. In the same ecumenical spirit, Catholic leaders should collaborate with believers of other persuasions towards getting a just share of tax money (state and federal) for higher education in schools of the parents' and students' own choice.

The expression I have come to use is, "the freedom to learn," which has never meant so much to me as during the past five years. It is impossible to go through what I experienced without coming to appreciate, at first hand, the limitations under which state institutions labor because of outside pressures that operate on the school administration; and the limitations under which the faculty labor because so often they can teach only a part of themselves and have to hold back on their deepest personal convictions. Yet these are preliminary to the third and worst limitation, under which those labor who desperately want—and need—to have their faith deepened, but are given little assistance in their struggle for spiritual maturity or even for religious existence.
Hard Work and Good Company

RAYMOND A. SCHROTH, S.J.

Now that the talks, tapes, reports and position papers of the JEA Los Angeles Workshop on the Christian Formation of High School Students are all readily available, all that remains to be written is a subjective personal account of what it felt like to be there.

The city itself was a sermon: part suburban Babylon, part Capri, no central city, all long thruways strung out like tangled spaghetti past gardens, stucco walls, and posh restaurants. Voices of guides and cab drivers: "That's where Jimmy Stewart lives . . . That's the church where the movie stars go . . . Look at the beatniks . . . This used to be a nice neighborhood; now it's going down . . . Hey, do you know how they separate the men from the boys in Hollywood?"

It has been suggested that what Los Angeles is today most of America will be in twenty years. The boys the delegates were working to "form" as Christians would somehow have to be at home with—or stand against—this environment.

The workshop coincided with the first anniversary of the Watts riots. While the delegates at Loyola University debated what should be done to bring more Negroes into our schools, in a far corner of the city the Los Angeles Negroes danced in the streets at the Watts Festival and marched with Sargent Shriver. They marched past parking lots that had been stores and homes before fire had gutted them, before flames and bullets had killed at least thirty-seven (some estimates exceed a hundred) citizens a year ago.

The delegates encountered Los Angeles only occasionally. They made quick runs to the beach after lunch, plunged—surrounded by the bronzed and bleached surfing youth of California—into the waves, then returned to the convention floor. They saw Sunset Boulevard and "the strip" through the bus window. On the two break days they rode frontier trains and river boats and marveled at rubber fish through submarine windows in Disneyland. They stood in solemn horror at Forest Lawn and bravely fed pigeons at old San Capistrano. Aside from these few escapes, the workshop was ten days of hard work in good company, in a friendly community, in common worship, in a sometimes tense but always charitable atmosphere of discussion.
The Worries

It was urgent work. The delegates arrived with troubles. Men who had given their lives to the Jesuit high schools had become irritated by the suggestion that some of these schools should be closed. Some felt that lifetimes of sacrifice were being brushed aside by the criticisms from the younger men. America, Commonweal and other news media had publicized the fact that more adolescents are rejecting the Faith. A series of articles in Woodstock Letters and especially the “North Aurora Questions” on the goals of our schools manifested the dissatisfaction some scholastics felt looking back on their regency experience. To a few, the Fichter Report, “Send Us a Boy . . . Get Back a Man,” had exposed a skeleton in the family closet; they wanted any hint of it kept from all non-Jesuits, particularly the hostile press. Others resented the fact that in some cases it had even been kept from interested Jesuits. To a vast majority, it was an extremely significant document revealing major accomplishments—we had trained the boys to think for themselves—and major failures—a lot of them don’t like us very much and they are pretty weak on their Christian social principles.

Some delegates arrived fired up from other summer experiences, like the Pastoral Institute at Loyola of Chicago. Others arrived apprehensive about what they considered fringe groups within the Society—extreme liturgists, New Breed, social reformers, or Old Guard—who were threatening established procedures or obstinately blocking reform. Many were worried about their own communities where the members would no longer speak openly with one another and where the feeling of alienation and unrest within the Jesuit

---

1 The fear that the attitudes of some of the younger men somehow posed a threat to the Society’s educational institutions seemed most evident in the public and private discussions of the North Aurora Questions: but this problem is only one aspect of the apparent breakdown in communication between various generations in the Society. It is not so much a split between old and young as a lack of understanding between men who have been trained differently during a period of radical world changes and who have different ambitions concerning the Society’s role in the “secular” world. The uneasiness shows through in Father John P. Leary’s address to the JEA national meeting (JEQ, October 1966) where he defends our commitment to education—describing our schools as a “family legacy.” He lists as problems Commonweal, John Leo, some scholastics and theologians, and the moral idealism of younger Jesuits who, he believes, have been too cloistered from the “bloody and jagged contours of the real.” I think Father Leary forgets that much of the criticism of our institutions comes not from the cloister but from men who have taught in our high schools and don’t want to go back, from men who have gotten advanced degrees at secular institutions, and from men who have worked in the inner city and see its desperate need. Another interesting statement is Father Edward B. Rooney’s remark in The Jesuit (September-October, 1966) that those who are eager for the more direct apostolate of preaching, counseling, and hearing confessions are playing into the hands of “the sworn enemies of Catholic education, be they Communists, atheists, or just plain secularists” (p. 3). Three other articles which might be helpful in understanding this communications gap are Joseph F. MacFarlane’s “Revolt and Reform” (Direction, Summer 1965), William P. Bruton’s “The Jesuit Scholastic in the Light of Social Psychology” (Woodstock Letters, Summer 1966) and Raymond A. Schroth’s “The Trouble with the Younger Men” (Woodstock Letters, Winter 1965).
house had seeped over into the school. And some came smarting with wounds: inadequate training in the course, bad experiences with superiors or subjects, the frustration that comes from failure, teaching a course one doesn’t believe in, or overwork.

In the earlier days of the meeting, some of the anxieties were expressed into the microphone; but, for the most part, discussion from the floor was restrained, constructive, sometimes witty, often eloquent. When one delegate complained that the Society was attracting the “feminine” type of kid and that these days one could hardly find a ball game at villa, Fr. Fichter replied vociferously that we had all been seduced by the New England Puritan cold shower cultural definition of masculinity; when a novice brings his paint set to villa instead of a baseball bat, he said, “That’s not femininity, it’s civilization!” Mike Kammer, along with other remarks on psychosexual confusion, described Christian “formation” in somewhat sinister terms: moulding the favorite student into a little Jesuit . . . who is going to get married. Then he told the assembled 122 delegates and experts that they were all second rate; otherwise they’d all be teaching in college. Fr. Tom Burke spoke so passionately on the need for community life that a special evening session was called to continue the discussion. Fr. Leo Lackamp, a fourth-year theologian, presented the controversial North Aurora Questions with a seriousness and tact that calmed what could have been an explosive session. Fr. Sponga, besides his keynote address, spoke several times from the floor. He was principally concerned with the problems of structure in the Society’s administration, organizing for interprovincial cooperation, and motivating and rehabilitating men to meet new challenges. Speaking of our apostolate to the inner city, he suggested that the Society is being offered a chance to purify itself in this confrontation with poverty.2

2 The racial-economic “mix” problem seemed to present the conference—at least the administrators—with a dilemma: True Christian formation cannot be achieved when the overwhelming majority of the students are from middle class white backgrounds, but our schools cannot be financed without the tuition money that only the bourgeois can provide. Fordham Prep, as an example, has raised its tuition to $800 in order to pay higher faculty salaries and become a great school. At the same time it has set up a scholarship committee to study how Fordham can make a deliberate effort to get a good racial-economic “mix.” Schools in poor neighborhoods, such as Brooklyn Prep, St. Joseph’s Prep and Gonzaga in Washington, have special problems and unique opportunities. Today a decision to remain and build in these neighborhoods must mean an institutional commitment to the neighborhood as well as to the students who come to the school. Gonzaga has shown this through its HAP work and its Sursum Corda project. Wouldn’t it be possible to endow one of these schools either through a drive or through an investment of the Province’s capital specifically for poor students from the inner city? To what extent is it possible to attract federal funds for an experimental high school by affiliating it with a university or with a local public school system?
The Spirit

In spite of the differences among the delegates, the workshop never split into clearly defined factions. There was no opposition party. No strong leaders arose from the ranks. It seemed to me that the chairman, Fr. Bernard Dooley, and the planning committee were anxious to achieve as broad a consensus as possible for the resolutions so that the papers would represent a truly corporate expression of this national group rather than the triumph of a mere majority. At the same time the chairman facilitated the addition of the North Aurora Questions to the agenda and the inclusion of the very significant minority report, the proposal that the Society establish a comprehensive school that would train boys to be professional men, business men, artists, and craftsmen. It was evident that the workshop had to live, talk, debate and worship as a Christian community. Only if every member left Loyola convinced that each man had really allowed himself to be educated by his fellow Jesuits could the final statements mean anything at all. This was certainly achieved.

The Los Angeles Times, after a press conference with six delegates at the Ambassador Hotel, headlined its editorial section of Tuesday, August 16th: "Jesuit Schools Accept Teen-Age Revolution. Educators, Ending Workshop Here, Aim to Cater to Turbulent Youngsters." The United Press picked up the story and put it on the national wires. Perhaps an occasional city editor across the country shook his head and wondered how much all this meant in terms of substantial change in Jesuit secondary education. It all depends on what happens back in the schools. How much will we renew our community life? Will there be less compulsion in getting the boys to Mass and on retreat? Will forming the "ideal" graduate mean freeing him to know and become himself and to become a creative personality? Will we set up experimental schools in particular areas staffed by the best men from all over the assistancy? Will we make our institutions part of this nation's ongoing social, racial and educational revolution? Not everyone left Los Angeles with those ideas; but those ideas were very much in the air, and no man left the workshop the same man he was when he came in.
Film Study in the Novitiate?

ANTHONY J. PETERMAN, S.J.

It was hot and humid at Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio, on Sunday evening, August 14, 1966. But it was pleasantly cool in the refectory where the entire community had gathered to see and discuss "Mafioso," an Italian film directed by Alberto Lattuada in 1963. The novices, juniors, and junior brothers were already a week into a film seminar. But why a film seminar, and in the Novitiate, at that? It was an effort, and a successful one, to begin a new program of training for an apostolate in today's world.

It is now well recognized that film is a powerful force in the modern world. It is a language—a language understood by people of every nation, by the illiterate as well as the literate. It is a medium to which, through television and in movie theaters, the young people of today devote millions of hours each week. Of course, speech and the printed word still influence people strongly. But there is something unique, something different about communication in our time.

Today the image is everything. Modern man lives in a culture in which film and television are the most important means for the communication of ideas, knowledge, attitudes, values, and ideals to the masses of people in contemporary society. Jesuits cannot ignore the socio-cultural revolution brought about in our time by modern techniques of communication. It is our job to prepare our students for real life, for the steady flow of mass communication that influences their ideas and ideals, their attitudes and values.

The Image Culture

Very Reverend Father Peter Arrupe and the 31st General Congregation are very much aware of our responsibility. On July 1st, 1965, the Congregation approved a decree which takes the form of a statement on mass communication media, together with a special recommendation concerning Vatican Radio. This decree recognizes that the influence of radio, television, and film is becoming ever greater. It states that "the influence they wield is all-embracing and they determine what modern man thinks and how he acts." "Consequently," it continues, "given the present state of man's
cultural evolution (which is sometimes called the 'culture of the image'), we can no longer afford to look on the means of communication primarily as sources of relaxation. They must be considered rather as means of spreading opinions and of intercommunication between men." Then the decree goes on to commend several points concerning our apostolate of these new means of communication. These points urge us, among other things, to use the modern means of communication "as particularly efficacious instruments in many of our ministries, and especially in preaching and in the education of youth."

More than ten years ago Father Janssens spoke realistically about the use of motion pictures in our apostolate. He was concerned that we teach people to use the screen as intelligent men, as authentic Christians. In his letter of 1955 to the whole Society, he wrote that film education "is, unless I am mistaken, often neglected. It is necessary to teach our pupils, the faithful, our own young religious, how they should draw profit from the cinema . . . They must be taught to bring a critical sense to this means of communication."

Critical Consumers

But how implement the recent decree of the 31st General Congregation at the various levels of our educational system? Acting for Father General, a committee of the North American Commission for Mass Media has begun work on a curriculum to train all Jesuit scholastics to ordinary competence in the use of mass media. By ordinary competence is meant that every Jesuit be able to use the mass media intelligently, critically, to live intelligently in a culture dominated by the mass media. Every Jesuit should have information on the different aspects of mass media. This is necessary in order that he understand how the new techniques influence the consumer. All Jesuits ought to be formed in the culture of the image so as to influence their own personal development and their apostolic activity. Moreover, they ought to acquire the ability to teach others to be intelligent, critical consumers of mass media. Finally, they should know how to use the new techniques in teaching, preaching, and giving the Spiritual Exercises, and in all pastoral work.

Curriculum—Phase One

During the spring of 1966 the committee proposed Phase One of a curriculum of Communication Arts for all the Jesuit scholasticates
of North America. This Phase One was for the two years of Novitiate only. It proposed a simple course in three areas: 1) Voice and Diction; 2) Oral Reading; and 3) An Introduction to Film Appreciation. And it was suggested that this Phase One be begun in September, 1966. The committee realized that each scholasticate would have to adapt the curriculum to fit local circumstances and needs. The curriculum is a tentative program, a pilot project based on what has been found workable in the Detroit and Chicago Provinces. At Milford Novitiate, Father Lawrence Flynn had for ten years been successfully teaching the first two areas, Voice and Diction, and Oral Reading. The third area, An Introduction to Film Appreciation, was taught for the first time by Mr. William Hagerty and Father Anthony Peterman, both of North Aurora, from Monday, August 8th to Saturday, August 20th, 1966. This film seminar was equivalent to a one-semester-hour credit course. When added to one of the regular speech courses taught by Father Flynn, the film seminar brought the total up to a three-semester-hour credit course in Communication Arts, Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Father Peterman first approached Father Robert Murphy, Master of Novices, in the spring of 1966. From the outset Father Murphy was eager that his novices and he himself study film. Soon Father Joseph Pendergast, Dean of the Juniorate, asked that the juniors be included; and his cooperation contributed much to the success of the seminar. Eventually the junior brothers attended the entire seminar, even though this meant that they drop their classes in Cincinnati for two weeks!

A bibliography was sent to the Novitiate well ahead of time, and the books were obtained by Father Pendergast for reading before and during the seminar. There were two lectures each morning, one by Mr. Hagerty, the other by Father Peterman. These lectures covered four areas: 1) Grammar of Film; 2) Business and Technology of Film; 3) Aesthetics of Film; and 4) History of Film. Short films were used during most of the lectures to illustrate the material of the lecture. During the afternoons all were free to read and recreate. Then, after the evening meal, all gathered either for a full length movie with a discussion, or for several short films and discussion. Finally, Father Pendergast and Father Peterman arranged that this concentrated seminar be followed by an extended seminar of films to be shown and discussed during the next two years.
A Concentrated Seminar

During the concentrated seminar, August 8th to 20th, we were able to show thirty-seven films; seven of these were full length movies. Twenty of the thirty-seven films were obtained from commercial distributors at a rental cost of less than $350. The other seventeen films were obtained free of charge from the Cincinnati Public Library.

The seven full length movies shown during the two-week seminar were "Film and Reality," "This Sporting Life," "Lonely Are the Brave," "Mafioso," "High Noon," "Citizen Kane," and "On the Waterfront." The thirty short films ranged from five minutes to thirty minutes in length. The use of short films during the lectures helped the study of film in greater depth. For instance, a thirty minute film, from the University of Southern California, was shown three times, on three consecutive days, to study film editing. The "Olympia Diving Sequence" and "Critic and Great Expectations" were just two of the short films shown to illustrate the Aesthetics of Film. Every effort was made during the lectures on the History of Film to get away from a dry treatment. For instance, the twenty-five minute film, "Night Mail," was used as an example when we came to the Documentarv Film. Moreover, reference was made to recent films whenever possible; this helped show how today's film makers are related to and depend upon such men as D. W. Griffith and Sergei Eisenstein, the great directors of forty, fifty years ago.

Of course, the Milford seminar is just one way of implementing the proposal that we begin the study of film in the Novitiate. For instance, the Novitiate of the Detroit Province decided that two weeks could not be set aside for film study alone. So Father James Serrick, Socius to the Director of Novices, has arranged another way of implementing the proposed program. He is taking several weekends throughout the year and devoting these to film study. His plan is similar to one instituted at Regis College, Toronto, Canada, by Father Richard Ellis and Father William Davis. The Canadian program is done in twelve week-end sessions. These are preceded by a one-to-three day session in a film studio so that our scholastics may learn how a camera operates.

Men Capable and Available

There are now many priests and scholastics throughout the country capable of directing such a simple film seminar. Last summer
some thirty-five Jesuit priests and scholastics attended the Film-
Television Institute and Workshop at the University of Detroit. 
These men came from all parts of the United States and Canada; all 
of them and many others, known to each Province Secretary of 
Communications, are capable of teaching our novices and juniors 
an introductory course in film appreciation.

A whole world of significant spiritual experience awaits our study 
in the field of film. There are profound literary, ethical, philosophi-
cal, and theological themes to be found and studied in serious mo-
tion pictures. When we begin to discover the treasures inherent in 
such films, we become more intelligent men, more fully Christian. 
We will then be able to teach our pupils how they should draw 
profit from motion pictures; we will appreciate how films can be 
used in all areas of our apostolate.
Enrollment Statistics

Scholastic Year 1966-1967

At the start of the current academic year there were 187,305 students enrolled in the 113 Jesuit institutions of the American Assistancy. This figure represents a modest growth in enrollment of 1.8% as compared with 1965-66 statistics. College enrollments increased by 1.7%, High School enrollments by 3.6% and Minor Seminaries by 5.8%. Enrollments in Jesuit Houses of Study and Formation dropped by 16.3%. This substantial decline is due in large measure to the reduction of the Philosophy course to two years but a decrease of 10.9% is noted at all other levels of our Jesuit training and formation.

Enrollments increased in nearly all Departments and Schools of our Colleges and Universities ranging from 8% in Engineering to 0.2% in Nursing. Decreases occurred in Social Work, Education and Pharmacy. The decrease in enrollment in Social Work is much smaller than the table indicates; the large decrease shown in the table results from a change of classification of Social Work majors in one of our large institutions to the more general classification of Graduate Students. Full-time enrollment was up 3%; part-time enrollment decreased 0.6%; summer school enrollment grew 3.8%; freshman enrollment declined 3.4%.

In grand total enrollment our five largest colleges are Loyola (Chicago), Marquette, Detroit, St. Louis and Fordham. If full-time enrollment only is considered the top five are Marquette, Boston College, St. Louis, Loyola (Chicago) and Fordham. Full-time enrollment in the College of Arts and Sciences is largest at Loyola (Chicago), Marquette, St. Louis, Fordham and John Carroll.

Under the category of miscellaneous are counted Jesuit Seminarians registered in our colleges, Nuns in the Sister Formation Program and students majoring in Architecture, Foreign Service, Language and Linguistics, Journalism, Speech, Music, Medical Technology, Dental Hygiene, Physical Therapy, Pre-Clinical Nursing, and Aeronautical Technology as well as students in the Junior-Year-Abroad Program.

There are 42,083 coeds in our Jesuit institutions constituting 28.3% of the total enrollment. Non-Catholic students number 24,071 or 16.2% of the total enrollment.
A new Jesuit high school, Bishop Connolly of Fall River, Massachusetts, opened its doors this fall to Freshmen only; St. John's High of Toledo and Walsh Jesuit High of Cuyahoga Falls began their second year of operation and Jesuit High of Sacramento enrolled its first Senior Class. Between them, these four schools accounted for 682 of the 1,269 increase in our high school enrollment.

Twenty-eight of our high schools reported growth in enrollment, twenty-five declined slightly and one, St. Ignatius of Cleveland, enrolled exactly the same number of students for 1966-67 as they had for 1965-66 — 1,148. The category of “Specials” is made up almost entirely of students in the upper elementary grades. Our five largest high schools are Loyola of Wilmette, Boston College High, Xavier of Cincinnati, St. Ignatius of Cleveland and St. Ignatius of Chicago.

The Juniorate of the California Province has moved to the campus of Loyola University of Los Angeles where the Juniors are enrolled for their courses. Milford reports that all Juniorate classes are held at Xavier University in Cincinnati. Some Juniors from Clarkston and Florissant attend classes on the campus at the University of Detroit and St. Louis University respectively. The second-year Juniors at Grand Coteau are all enrolled for some courses at the University of Southwestern Louisiana in Lafayette.

The grand total of all students in the 113 schools administered by Jesuits of the American Assistancy in the scholastic year 1966-67 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>148,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 High Schools</td>
<td>36,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Houses of Formation</td>
<td>2,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Minor Seminaries</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 School for Delayed Vocations</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Jesuit Institutions</td>
<td>187,305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Jesuit Educational Association
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**TABLE ONE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Specials</th>
<th>Totals 1966-67</th>
<th>Totals 1965-66</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellarmine College Preparatory (San Jose)</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>+ 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellarmine Preparatory School (Tacoma)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>+ 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Connolly High (Fall River)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>+ 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop's Latin School (Pittsburgh)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College High School</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>+ 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brebeuf Preparatory School (Indianapolis)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>+ 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Preparatory School</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>+ 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brophy College Prep School (Phoenix)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>+ 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion Jesuit High School</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius High School</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>+ 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain Kapaun Memorial High (Wichita)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>- 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheverus High School (Portland, Me.)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellarmine College Preparatory (San Jose)</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>+ 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brophy College Prep School (Phoenix)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>+ 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius High School</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>+ 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Connolly High (Fall River)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>+ 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop's Latin School (Pittsburgh)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College High School</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>+ 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brebeuf Preparatory School (Indianapolis)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>+ 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Preparatory School</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>+ 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brophy College Prep School (Phoenix)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>+ 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius High School</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>+ 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Connolly High (Fall River)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>+ 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop's Latin School (Pittsburgh)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College High School</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>+ 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brebeuf Preparatory School (Indianapolis)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>+ 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Preparatory School</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>+ 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brophy College Prep School (Phoenix)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>+ 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius High School</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>+ 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Connolly High (Fall River)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>+ 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop's Latin School (Pittsburgh)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College High School</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>+ 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals 1966-67**

| 10,565 | 9,186 | 8,165 | 7,554 | 848 | 36,318 | 35,049 | +1,269 |

**Totals 1965-66**

| 10,115 | 8,804 | 7,936 | 7,611 | 583 | 35,049 |

**Increase or Decrease**

+450 +382 +229 -57 +265 +1,269
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>2,124</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>2,382</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>2,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above shows the enrollment data for various categories over the years 1966-1967 to 1978-1979. The categories include Liberal Arts, Business, Education, Law, Engineering, and Total. Each year's enrollment is listed alongside the previous year's for comparison.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE THREE</th>
<th>1966-67</th>
<th>1965-66</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>freshman</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>freshman</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>9,568</td>
<td>9,526</td>
<td>+ 42</td>
<td>+ 0.4</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>+ 49</td>
<td>+ 3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius College</td>
<td>3,361</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>+ 424</td>
<td>+14.4</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>+105</td>
<td>+14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton University</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>3,891</td>
<td>+ 189</td>
<td>+ 4.9</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>+ 43</td>
<td>+ 5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield University</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>+ 144</td>
<td>+ 6.1</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>+ 37</td>
<td>+ 8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>10,873</td>
<td>11,018</td>
<td>- 145</td>
<td>- 1.3</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>+ 98</td>
<td>+ 7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>7,591</td>
<td>7,676</td>
<td>- 85</td>
<td>- 1.1</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>- 25</td>
<td>- 2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga University</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>- 105</td>
<td>- 3.9</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>- 44</td>
<td>- 6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross College</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>+ 131</td>
<td>+ 6.2</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>+ 55</td>
<td>+ 9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carroll University</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>+ 14</td>
<td>+ 0.3</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>-142</td>
<td>-10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Moyne College</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>+ 40</td>
<td>+ 2.5</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>- 12</td>
<td>- 2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola College (Baltimore)</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>+ 222</td>
<td>+7.7</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>- 71</td>
<td>-16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University (Chicago)</td>
<td>13,798</td>
<td>13,491</td>
<td>+ 307</td>
<td>+ 2.3</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>-87</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University (Los Angeles)</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>+ 30</td>
<td>+ 1.2</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>- 44</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University (New Orleans)</td>
<td>4,887</td>
<td>3,956</td>
<td>+ 931</td>
<td>+23.5</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>+333</td>
<td>+48.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>13,042</td>
<td>13,789</td>
<td>- 747</td>
<td>- 5.4</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>-87</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis College</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>+ 29</td>
<td>+ 2.8</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>- 0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhurst College</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>- 22</td>
<td>- 0.9</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>- 44</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph's College</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>7,183</td>
<td>- 133</td>
<td>- 1.9</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>-311</td>
<td>-18.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>11,148</td>
<td>11,011</td>
<td>+ 137</td>
<td>+ 1.2</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>- 1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter's College</td>
<td>3,693</td>
<td>3,201</td>
<td>+ 492</td>
<td>+15.4</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>+ 86</td>
<td>+ 0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle University</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>- 575</td>
<td>-13.8</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>-108</td>
<td>- 8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill College</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>+ 82</td>
<td>+ 6.5</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>- 39</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Detroit</td>
<td>11,364</td>
<td>11,593</td>
<td>- 229</td>
<td>- 1.9</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>-364</td>
<td>-24.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>6,183</td>
<td>5,661</td>
<td>+ 522</td>
<td>+9.2</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>+117</td>
<td>+12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Santa Clara</td>
<td>4,804</td>
<td>4,782</td>
<td>+ 22</td>
<td>+ 0.5</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>-133</td>
<td>-16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Scranton</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>+ 210</td>
<td>+ 7.3</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>-22.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling College</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>+ 65</td>
<td>+ 8.8</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>- 8</td>
<td>- 2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier University</td>
<td>5,758</td>
<td>5,231</td>
<td>+ 527</td>
<td>+10.1</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>-160</td>
<td>-19.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>148,650</td>
<td>146,131</td>
<td>+2,519</td>
<td>+ 1.7</td>
<td>22,670</td>
<td>23,479</td>
<td>-809</td>
<td>- 3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Jesuit Houses of Studies Enrollment 1966-1967

### TABLE FOUR 1967 Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERTIANSHIPS</th>
<th>1966-67</th>
<th>Totals 1966-67</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auriesville</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>- 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>- 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomfret</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Townsend</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>- 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>- 13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEOLOGATES</th>
<th>1966-67</th>
<th>Totals 1966-67</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>- 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Aurora</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>+ 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>- 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>- 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>643</strong></td>
<td><strong>678</strong></td>
<td><strong>- 35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHILOSOPHATES</th>
<th>1966-67</th>
<th>Totals 1966-67</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>- 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Aurora</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>- 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub Oak</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>- 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>- 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>- 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>518</strong></td>
<td><strong>728</strong></td>
<td><strong>-210</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOVIITATES AND JUNIORATES</th>
<th>1966-67</th>
<th>Totals 1966-67</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarkston</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>- 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florissant</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>- 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Coteau</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>- 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>± 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>- 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>- 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plattsburg</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>- 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poughkeepsie</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>- 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bonafacius</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>- 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>- 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowbrook</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>- 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>- 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub Oak</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>- 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>- 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wernersville</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>- 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>391</strong></td>
<td><strong>741</strong></td>
<td><strong>-139</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINOR SEMINARIES</th>
<th>1966-67</th>
<th>Totals 1966-67</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aibonito</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>+ 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>+ 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Philip Neri (Boston)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>- 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>292</strong></td>
<td><strong>276</strong></td>
<td><strong>+ 16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Large decrease partially explained by the discontinuance of third-year philosophy
1 Juniors at Los Gatos
2 Juniors at Poughkeepsie and Wernersville
3 Juniors at Sheridan
# Includes 22 in Junior College
## Includes 18 in Junior College
ANTHROPOLOGY

ARCHEOLOGY
BODNAR, EDWARD W. (Novitiate of Saint Isaac Jogues) "A Note on I.G., II², 7155," *Hesperia*, XXXIV, 3 (Fall 1965), 164-166 and plate 42, b.

NORTH, ROBERT (Wisconsin Province) "Keeping Up-to-date on Biblical Excavations," *The Bible Today*, XVI (February 1965), 1061-1066.


ASTRONOMY


BIO-CHEMISTRY
SULLIVAN, WILLIAM D. (Boston College) (with Mother Frederick Mary Rice) "The Effects of Ultraviolet and X-ray on Isocitric Dehydrogenase Activity and Protein Concentration of Synchronously Dividing Cultures of Tetrahymena pyriformis GL." *Broteria*, XXXV (May 1966), 93-107.

BIOLOGY


PANUSKA, JOSEPH A. (Georgetown University) (with A. E. Cavicchia) “Cardiovascular Effects of Vagal Stimulation and Bilateral Vagotomy During Hypothermia,” Georgetown University Medical Bulletin, XIX, No. 1 (August 1965), 32-35.

———, (Georgetown University) (with V. P. Popovic) “Critical Temperature for Instrumental Response Acquisition in Hypothermic Rats,” Journal of Applied Physiology, 20, No. 6 (November 1965), 1275-1277.


BUSINESS

CANON LAW


O’CONNOR, JAMES I. (Bellarmine School of Theology) “Investing Administrative Authority,” *Hospital Progress*, XLVI (June 1965), 66-79.

———, (Bellarmine School of Theology) “The Relationship of Superior and Administrator,” *Hospital Progress*, XLVII (March 1966), 58-64, 82.


CHEMISTRY


———, (Detroit Province) (with Bruno Jaselskis and J. L. Huston) "Preparation and Properties of Monocesium Xenate (CsHXeO₄)," Journal of the American Chemical Society, LXXXVIII (May 1966), 2149-2150.


COMPARATIVE LITERATURE


ECONOMICS


EDUCATION


ENGLISH


CLARK, ROBERT B. (Weston College) “Hopkins’ ‘The Shepherd’s Brow’,” The Victorian Newsletter, No. 28 (Fall 1965), 18-20.


KELLY, EDWARD E. (Missouri Province) “Newman’s Catholic History as Background of the Apologia,” The Personalist, XLVI (Summer 1965), 382-388.
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———, (Saint Louis University) "Literature, Threat and Conquest," College English, VII, 8 (May 1966), 620-623.


SURTZ, EDWARD (Loyola University, Chicago) "Shakespeare and Christ," Drama Critique, VII (Winter 1964), 53-59.

———, (Loyola University, Chicago) "Sources Parallels, and Influences: Supplementary to the Yale Eutopia," Moreana, IX (February 1966), 5-11.


HISTORY


———, (Weston College) "Roman Catholic Church" (in the United States), Americana Annual (Encyclopedia Americana), 1966. P. 588.


SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS OF JESUITS


———, (Marquette University) “Reluctant Witness to Pluralism in Early America,” Theological Studies, XXVI, 3 (September 1965), 375-392.


Scholarly Publications of Jesuits


SMYTHE, DONALD (John Carroll University) “Pershing’s Great Personal Tragedy,” Missouri Historical Review, LX (April 1966), 320-335.

HISTORY OF IDEAS


LANGUAGES, CLASSICAL


**LANGUAGES, MODERN**


**LAW**


LINGUISTICS


LITURGICAL MUSIC


MATHEMATICS


WHITMAN, ANDREW P. (Loyola University, New Orleans) (with Lawrence W. Conlon) "A Note on Holonomy," Proceedings, American Mathematical Society, XVI (October 1965), 1046-1051.

PATRISTICS


PHILOSOPHY


COOPER, HAROLD L. (Loyola University, New Orleans) "The Uses of Philosophy for the Scientist," Bios, XXXI (December 1965), 155-160.


Scholarly Publications of Jesuits

———, (Fordham University) “Teilhard de Chardin: Scientist or Philosopher?” International Philosophical Quarterly, X (May 1965), 248-266.


MCNEILL, JOHN J. (LeMoyne College) “Martin Buber’s Biblical Philosophy of History,” International Philosophical Quarterly, VI, 1 (March 1966), 90-100.


POTTER, VINCENT G. (Loyola Seminary) “Pierce’s Analysis of Normative Science,” Transactions of the Charles S. Pierce Society, II (Spring 1966), 5-32.

REICHHMANN, JAMES B. (Seattle University) "Logic and the Method of Metaphysics," The Thomist (October 1965), 341-395.


PHYSICS


(This volume is proceedings of International Symposium on Boron, held at Paris, 1964.)

CALLAHAN, WILLIAM R. (Weston College) (with W. A. Hovis, Jr.) “Infrared Reflectance of Igneous Rocks, Tuffs, and Red Sandstone from 0.5 to 22u,” *Journal of the Optical Society of America, XVI* (May 1966), 639-643.


**POLITICAL SCIENCE**


**PSYCHOLOGY**


MAHER, TRAFFORD P. (Saint Louis University) “How Long Does it Take to Form a Person for the Modern Apostolate?,” *Hospital Progress*, XLVII (March 1966), 51-57.


**SCRIPTURE**


SEISMOLOGY


SOCIOLOGY


SPEECH


THEOLOGY


GELPI, DONALD L. (New Orleans Province) "How Secular Is a City?," *The Current,* VI (Fall-Winter 1965), 32-38.


NORTH, ROBERT (Wisconsin Province) "The Scope of Infallibility," Continuum, II (Winter 1965), 555-574.


———, (Woodstock College) "Tyrrell: the Nature of Revelation," Continuum, III, 2 (Summer 1965), 168-177.

O'DONOVAN, LEO J. (Woodstock College) "Encounter with Holiness: John Chrysostom and Rudolf Otto," The Personalist, XLVII, 2 (Spring 1966), 248-263.


QUAY, PAUL M. (Loyola University, Chicago) "Jesuit, Priest, and Scholar: A Theory of our Learned Apostolates," Jesuit Educational Quarterly, XXVIII (October 1965), 98-121.


SMOTHERS, EDGAR R. (Bellarmine School of Theology) "The Bones of St. Peter," Theological Studies, XXVII (March 1966), 79-88.


———, (Wisconsin Province) "The Commitment of Faith: A Catholic View," The Ecumenist, III (September-October 1965), 102-104.

WASSMER, THOMAS A. (St. Peter's College) "Natural Law and Theology," Philosophy Today, IX (Winter 1965), 250-257.

Father Celestin J. Steiner, S.J., former President and, until recently, Chancellor of the University of Detroit has been appointed by Father General to establish and administer a National Office of the North American Commission of the Society on Mass Media. Headquarters of the Commission are at 1625 I Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. Father Steiner is also the representative of the United States and Canada on the Society's International Commission for Social Communication. The general objective of the Commission is to educate toward more effective living in cultural environments much modified and shaped by the media of social communication.

The Maryland Province has opened a new residence in Philadelphia for students attending the University of Pennsylvania. It has been named the Farmer House; this after the Jesuit, Ferdinand Farmer, who was a trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, a pioneer in Society work in New York City and the Hudson Valley. He was the founder of St. Peter's Church, Barkley Street, in 1784.

Fordham University has received a bequest of $1,225,000 from the estate of Cornelia B. Lydon of New York City. Scholarships in memory of Richard P. Lydon, a justice of the New York Supreme Court will be established at Fordham College in accordance with a discretionary request in the will of Miss Lydon, who died October 29, 1965. It is the second largest bequest received in the history of Fordham University.

Fordham Preparatory School will increase tuition in 1967 to finance an up-dating of its academic structure. The prospect is to place it firmly among the top secondary schools in the country. A letter to parents dated August 5 from Father Leo McLaughlin, S.J., President of Fordham University and of the Prep, outlined goals of increased scholarship aid, a lowering of the teacher-student ratio to 1:12, and an increase in faculty salary standards as compelling reasons for tuition increases over a five-year span. The number of student scholarships offered will be increased four times when the program is in full effect so that no student currently enrolled in the Prep will be forced to leave as a result of the tuition increase.
Fordham inaugurated a separate 3-3 Program last summer which telescopes a traditional four-year high school and four-year college program into six years to achieve a baccalaureate degree. Summer studies include two trips to foreign countries.

Georgetown University plans to build a $10.8 million hospital wing with the most up-to-date facilities for the acutely ill and the care of disaster victims. This unique hospital is the first of its kind planned in the nation and is expected to be a forerunner of similar facilities elsewhere. The federal government has granted $7,130,000 in planning and construction funds. Georgetown University will provide $3.7 million in matching funds. Construction is scheduled to begin in the summer of 1967. A target completion date of the fall of 1969 has been set. The new unit will be a part of the multi-million dollar Georgetown University Medical Center expansion. The new hospital unit will have 246 intensive care beds. Other features are 24 underground infection-guarded operating and special procedure rooms, augmented by emergency and fallout-proof shelter areas. Specifically trained lifesaving teams will be on instant call to handle cardiac, kidney, cancer and other emergencies. On each floor, each team will have a corresponding research laboratory to meet patient requirements. Another advantage is continuous, automatic monitoring permitting immediate electronic-notification of changes in each patient's condition.

Sixteen Latin American free trade unionists have begun studies in labor economics at the Inter-American Center of Loyola University (n.o.). The new program, a project of the American Institute for Free Labor Development, is designed to prepare students for positions of leadership in the social and economic development of their nations. The courses will stress the role of the labor movement in economic programs within the existing institutional framework in Latin America. Since 1962, AIFLD, a unique organization supported by labor, business and government, has conducted education programs in parliamentary procedure, collective bargaining and the democratic processes in Latin America.

Marquette University is about to enter the largest building period at any one time in its 85-year history. One major project has already begun, and three more are scheduled to begin later this year and
early in 1967. Total cost of the four projects will be about $7.7 million. The construction boom includes a men’s residence hall, a legal research center and a modern languages building. In addition, the existing Science building at 1217 W. Wisconsin Avenue will be remodeled to accommodate faculty and administrative offices and classrooms. These projects, plus three completed within the past year—Todd Wehr Chemistry building, Schroeder men’s residence hall addition and Cobeen women’s residence hall remodeling—represent $13 million worth of construction on campus. This is one-third of the $39 million in construction proposed under Marquette’s campus redevelopment project.

Many college administrators are ill equipped to do their jobs. Those who are successful often succeed through costly trial and error methods. This criticism comes from George F. Donovan, new chairman of the education department at Marquette University. Dr. Donovan is a former president of Webster College, Webster Groves, Mo., and former director of the higher education program at Catholic University in Washington, D.C. Without adequate preparation, many college presidents and others are faced with the awesome task of directing multi-million dollar academic and building programs. “There is no reason why these college and university administrators should not be trained specifically for their work,” he said. He suggested that about 30 schools with strong doctoral programs in higher education could provide a sufficient number of trained administrators to meet the ever increasing need.

In line with Dr. Donovan’s philosophy, Marquette will offer three new graduate courses in higher education next summer. This will be in addition to an already established course in the history of higher education. Among the new courses will be one designed to provide some insights into the nature, development and influence of higher education under communism. Dr. Donovan hopes to be able to expand this program in the not too distant future.

A new program bringing 12 university students from Colombia to live in St. Louis for ten weeks is in progress at St. Louis University. The students in the “Students for Understanding” program will live with St. Louis families during their stay in this country. They will have intensive training in English in their first three weeks. They will attend lectures on American life, history,
government and culture given in Spanish by University faculty members. They will tour various St. Louis businesses and institutions and visit the Red Cross offices, a union meeting, and attend court sessions. They will attend performances of the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra and other cultural events. Most of the students attend the Javeriana University in Bogota, Colombia. Next summer St. Louis University students will go to Bogota, as the second part of the exchange program. They will live in Colombian homes and participate in programs at the Javeriana University. They will also work in a social action project.

Among the 32 winners of the 1967 Rhodes Scholarships are two from Jesuit Institutions—Richard J. Pedersen of Holy Cross College and Creighton Preparatory School and Daniel I. Twomey of the University of Santa Clara. Pedersen, a 21 year-old English major, graduated first in his high school class and has maintained a straight A at Holy Cross since his freshman year. He is the second Rhodes Scholar to come from Holy Cross in the last two years and in the history of the college.

At the 49th Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education, Father Joseph A. Sellinger, S.J., President of Loyola College, Baltimore, was elected Vice-Chairman. A voluntary, non-governmental body, ACE has a membership of 1,437 colleges, universities and educational associations.

Georgetown University is receiving more than $7 million in Eastman Kodak stock for student scholarships from the estimated $19 million estate of Florence M. Dailey, a Rochester, New York, bank secretary.