

FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM  
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE TO  
PRIVATE ROOM

# *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*

---

**INTERNATIONAL CENTER OF JESUIT EDUCATION**

**THE VISION OF CHRIST AND CHRISTIAN FREEDOM—Part III**

**HOW PRODUCE MORE WRITERS IN THE SOCIETY**

**ENROLLMENT STATISTICS**

---

**Volume 30, Number 3**

**January 1968**

**(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)**



## Our Contributors

FATHER JOHN E. BLEWETT, S.J., formerly Academic Vice-President of Sophia University, is now Father General's official adviser on educational affairs and Executive Secretary of the International Center of Jesuit Education.

FATHER PATRICK H. RATTERMAN, S.J., is the Vice-President for Student Affairs at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio. His article is divided into four parts; the third part appears in this issue of the JEQ. The last part will be published in the March issue.

FATHER WILLIAM H. QUIERY, S.J., is the Director of the project about which he writes. He is on a three-year sabbatical leave from Sogang College in Seoul, Korea. He spent his first year on the project organizing the scholastic agencies and accumulating information on publishing with the help of Loyola University Press in Chicago. He is the author of *FACING GOD* (Sheed and Ward, 1967) and of *A MISSIONARY HANDBOOK ON POVERTY AND PEACE* to be published next year by Saint Paul Publications. His article is a revision and expansion of the paper that he read at the Santa Clara Conference.

MR. DONALD F. ROWE, S.J., is a second-year regent teaching Appreciation of the Visual Arts and Art History at Loyola University, Chicago.

BROTHER JAMES M. KENNY, S.J., is the Vice-President for Planning and Physical Facilities at Fordham University in New York City.

# Jesuit Educational Quarterly

Volume 30, Number 3

January 1968

## CONTENTS

### INTERNATIONAL CENTER OF JESUIT EDUCATION

*John E. Blewett, S.J.* . . . . . 131

### THE VISION OF CHRIST AND CHRISTIAN FREEDOM

#### Part III—Molds to be Broken

*Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J.* . . . . . 139

### HOW PRODUCE MORE WRITERS IN THE SOCIETY

*William H. Quiery, S.J.* . . . . . 167

ENROLLMENT STATISTICS . . . . . 175

### APPRECIATION OF THE VISUAL ARTS IN THE SCHOLASTICATE

*Donald F. Rowe, S.J.* . . . . . 181

### THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY AND LABOR UNIONS

*James Kenney, S.J.* . . . . . 186



THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands.

## EDITORIAL STAFF

### *Editor*

A. WILLIAM CRANDELL, S.J.

### *Managing Editor*

PAUL V. SIEGFRIED, S.J.

## ADVISORY BOARD

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
BERNARD J. DOOLEY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
EDWARD A. DOYLE, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JAMES E. FITZGERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
HERMAN J. HAUCK, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
ADRIAN J. KOCHANSKI, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JAMES J. MCGINLEY, S.J.	<i>Buffalo Province</i>
JOHN V. MURPHY, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
JEROME A. PETZ, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
E. JOSEPH GOUGH, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JAMES F. WHELAN, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR  
1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

COPYRIGHT, 1968  
JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY



# International Center of Jesuit Education

JOHN E. BLEWETT, S.J.

On June 29, 1967, Very Reverend Father General sent to all major superiors of the Society a copy of the following letter on my appointment as his adviser on educational affairs and as Executive Secretary of the International Center of Jesuit Education.

His litteris te certiores facio me, auditis Patribus Assistentibus Generalibus, constituisse Consiliarium Patris Generalis pro rebus educationis P. Ioannem E. Blewett e Provincia Iaponica.

Pater Blewett etiam, tamquam Secretarius executivus, praeerit Internationali Centro Educationis nostrae Societatis, quod in Curia Generalicia instituitur, ad mandandum in executionem Congregationis Generalis XXXI decretum 28, n. 31 (AR XIV 958), scilicet: "Ad adiuvandum P. Generalem in promovendo toto opere educativo, condatur secretariatus educationis, cuius munus sit colligere et distribuere informationes de apostolatu educationis Nostrorum, necnon fovere consociationes alumnorum antiquorum eorumque periodicos congressus".

Finis novi Centri, quod dependet directe a Patre Generali aut a Delegato quem nominaverit et spectat ad educationem alumnorum externorum, non autem clericorum in Seminariis et Facultatibus ecclesiasticis, nec Nostrorum in Scholasticatibus, indicatur in ipso decreto Congregationis Generalis: informationes, quae ad apostolatam educationis pertinent, colligere et distribuere; fovere et auxilium praebere ad fundandas et evolvendas consociationes regionales et nationales Nostrorum, atque cooperationem promovere inter eas et inter alia Instituta educativa Societatis et aliorum; fovere et initiare studia et investigationes scientificas de re educationis; fovere consociationes alumnorum antiquorum Societatis; promovere periodicos congressus directorum vel delegatorum consociationum tum Nostrorum tum alumnorum antiquorum, aliaque huiusmodi.

Rogo ut hanc nominationem cum omnibus Nostris in tua Provincia communices, ita ut omnes cum Patre Blewett et mecum collaborari velint ad felicem successum huius novi Centri securius assequendum.

In the following pages I would like to provide some background for the better understanding of this appointment by outlining de-



velopments that preceded it and by relating what, after the appointment, I have done and hope to do. Quite likely my account will raise as many questions as it answers. I would be grateful indeed if questions, observations, suggestions, and the like would be sent to me or to the editors of the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* so that misunderstandings may be swept away and the good intended through the appointment more effectively furthered.

### ANTECEDENTS

In the first session of the 31st General Congregation, the electors considered at length different ways of assisting Father General to govern the Society more effectively. (Their conclusions are embodied in Decree 43.) They elected, as everyone knows, four General Assistants—Fathers Dezza, O’Keefe, Swain, and Varga—and provided for the appointment by Father General of General Consultors, Regional Assistants, and Expert Consultors. He, in turn, declared that his four General Consultors would be the four men elected as General Assistants and appointed eleven Regional Assistants. Between the first and second sessions he called men from all parts of the Society to Rome to advise him on some of the major issues facing the Society. So, for example, in the first six months of 1966 meetings of experts on the following matters were held: a) the Society-wide survey; b) mass media; c) tertian-ship; d) Jesuit spirituality. Visitors from all walks of life informally shared with him their views on almost every conceivable question relating to the work of the Church and the Society.

At the end of a six-month sabbatical in the United States, I was summoned in late January, 1966, to Rome for discussions on the advisability of building up a secretariat for Jesuit education. With the help of Father William Mehok, who for nine years had been working in Rome as the official statistician of the Society, I gradually became acquainted with the types of reporting from different parts of the Society to Roman headquarters and with some of the questions on the Jesuit commitment in education which seemed to be demanding special study. Some of the flow of Jesuit visitors to Rome found their way to my door and began to open my eyes both to the immensity and to the complexity of the total Jesuit effort in education. Thus, for example, Father Joseph McKenna of the New York Province in the course of describing his work as secretary for the National Catholic Education Association of Nigeria ca-



sually mentioned that some 900,000 children in that country were receiving primary education in schools operated under Catholic auspices. A report then being prepared in final form by Father Mehok on Jesuit education in India made it clear that the large-scale commitment of Jesuit resources to secondary and higher education in that country was, in some respects, unequalled in any other part of the world.

Opportunities to meet with individuals and groups planning the establishment of a Papal Commission on Peace and Justice enabled me to glimpse some of the manifold relations between formal education and national development. Some were quite blunt in expressing their belief that the Society should be playing a more active role in socio-economic development, in line with certain emphases in conciliar documents, while others claimed to see little or no relationship between the mounting needs of peoples in the developing world and the educational work of Jesuits in their own countries. Some went so far as to wonder aloud if Jesuit graduates were not intellectually ill-equipped and psychologically ill-disposed to understand the urgency of need in "have not" countries and in certain areas within particular countries.

Discussions with Father Mehok on data-gathering procedures of the Society led me to share a conclusion which he had reached from experience: they must be updated in many particulars. Further, it became more and more clear that personnel files on individual Jesuits should be so handled that an overall view of the Society's manpower in any particular field would not depend on time-consuming, manual shuffling of papers. It came as a shock to me, educated as I was in the belief that the Society was superbly organized, to realize that it was largely innocent of the impact of all that IBM represents in the modern world.

While in the United States in the autumn months of 1965, I had learned from many Jesuits in the educational field that they were perplexed, even alarmed, that scholastics seemed to be increasingly disinclined to classroom teaching, particularly at the high school level. In other countries too, I learned, similar trends were being reported. Whatever the reasons in any particular country, it stood to reason that a continuation of such thinking would have definite implications for Jesuit educational work and planning.

Against this background, I prepared in late March, 1966, some notes on the subject of educational planning in the Society. In



early April, I prepared a somewhat lengthier statement on "The Society of Jesus and Socio-economic Development" to serve as a catalyst for thinking on a matter of major concern. Finally, in mid-May Father Mehok and I submitted to Father General and his chief consultors a statement advocating the establishment of a secretariat of education for the Society. In the following months copies of this statement were sent to regional and national Prefects of Study in all parts of the world with a request that, after as wide a consultation as possible, they indicate their views on the feasibility and desirability of such an organization.

By the time that the electors to the second session of the General Congregation began their deliberations on educational matters, these views had been collated and made available to all concerned. A summary of the 65 responses revealed the following:

1. Almost all could see some good in the proposal. Strong, though qualified, support came from Belgium, France, Italy, Spain, Latin America, Japan, India; about one-third of the respondents from the USA.
2. A large proportion of the responses from the USA stressed strongly that the Secretariat should not be considered as a decision-making body; further, that the great regional diversity in Jesuit education be truly understood and taken into consideration at all stages of planning the Secretariat.
3. Some questioned whether the expense involved in gathering statistics and having them prepared in usable form would not be out of proportion to their value.
4. The question of who should be appointed as one of the network of "experts" was raised by a good number. Are they the heads of regional Jesuit Education Associations or others? The North Americans insisted that strong regional JEA's should be developed where they do not now exist, some maintaining that this work should precede the establishment of a Secretariat.
5. The question of financing was raised, but no ready answers suggested.

The mind of the General Congregation concerning a secretariat was formulated in Number 31 of Decree 28 on "The Apostolate of Education."

To help Father General in fostering the whole work of education, a secretariat of education should be established. Its task will be to collect and distribute information about



the apostolate of education carried on by Jesuits and also to promote alumni associations and periodic conventions.

During the seven months between the end of the General Congregation in November, 1966, and the announcement of my dual appointment, I devoted a large share of my time to familiarizing myself with educational conditions in Latin America. Following on three weeks of study of Spanish in Madrid, I participated in the meeting of Jesuit Prefects of Study of Latin American Countries, held in El Salvador in early January, 1967. During most of February and March I was becoming an "instant expert" on Jesuit university conditions in several Latin American countries through visits to the institutions themselves and on-the-spot discussions with administrators and faculty. Invited by the North American Jesuit university presidents to discuss plans for the secretariat with them, I attended their meeting in Los Angeles in mid-January and, after concluding my trip in Latin America, joined their representatives on international education in Chicago on March 20 and 21 for discussions on the international activities of Jesuit universities. From April through June I spent a fair amount of time in discussions and conferences in the United States and Rome on a wide range of topics in the educational field.

### RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

In his letter of appointment of June 29 Father General brought together two directive lines of the General Congregation; namely, that he should have advisers for specific purposes and that a secretariat (entitled "International Center for Jesuit Education") should be established. A comparison of this letter and the relevant paragraph in the Decree on Education reveals that the former, in its description of the tasks of the Center, fleshes out the directive of the latter. Specifically, the work of the Center is to include the following particulars: a) improving the systems of gathering and using data; b) assisting the formation and development of regional and national Jesuit educational groupings; c) promoting cooperation among Jesuits and between educational works under their direction and those of others; d) initiating and/or fostering research work on Jesuit education; e) assisting in the organization of Jesuit alumni associations; f) convening of meetings of educators, both Jesuit and lay, and alumni.

The letter of appointment specifies that this new office is not



concerned with matters relating to the education of seminarians or scholastics. Further, it clearly if not specifically excludes any type of jurisdiction to the office.

Since the promulgation of the appointment, I have continued to be largely concerned with matters relating to the two Americas, chiefly because apart from India and East Asia Jesuit university work is concentrated in those two continents and because cooperative work at the university level seems to be especially needed. In July and early August I spent close to a month in some ten cities of the United States, gathering opinions from many sources on questions relating to Jesuit educational work in the inner city and, at a conference at St. Joseph's College on world hunger and the liberal arts college, assisting in the formulation of a specific program of cooperation between the College's Academy of Food Marketing and groups in Latin America. As preparations for a meeting of Jesuit presidents of universities in Latin America in late October included considerable paper work in Rome, many of my waking hours through late August and September were given to this task. My earlier efforts to learn Italian began to pay dividends at this time as I was able to carry on a near daily exchange of opinions on things domestic with the workmen commissioned to transform former classrooms and storage space into presentable offices for the recently established Office of Public Relations, the Mission Secretariat, and the Center. Happily, my work room in the Curia continued to serve as a reception room for many Jesuit and other guests concerned with educational work in different parts of the country; during six weeks in August and September more than forty such guests from twenty different countries interpreted their slice of educational activity for me. I mention these informal meetings, for in and through them one learns more than a printed report can convey.

To hone my tongue to Spanish for the late October meeting mentioned above I spent some three weeks in the greyness of Lima's spring, and during that time enjoyed such extra-curricular activities as being briefed on some of the realities of agrarian reform and some of the painful consequences of a 40 per cent devaluation of a national currency. Printed laments that only 2 per cent of the university graduates of Latin America are in the fields relating to agriculture ring with poignant meaning when one sees the trek of *campesinos* from the harshness of unresponsive land to



the bleak squalor of Lima's suburban slums.

Since in a later report I hope to summarize some of the conclusions of the October meeting in Lima of 22 Jesuit university presidents, suffice it here to note that they unanimously agreed on the necessity of setting up an information and service center in Latin America to help them help themselves. Since, too, the North American delegate to the international Jesuit alumni meeting of August can report on that meeting, I will do no more than mention that it brought together some 2,000 alumni for what most judged to be a successful exchange of ideas on alumni responsibility in the modern world.

### REFLECTIONS

As I review developments of the past many months I am conscious more of what has not been done than of initial accomplishments or efforts. Since the need to be and to be able to communicate precedes action, I poured more hours than I care to recall into the preparation of a period of gestation for the Center and into the study of Italian and Spanish. Out of five years as Academic Vice-president of Sophia University I drew the conclusion that undirected paper work—statistics for the sake of the computer—is a sanitized form of bubonic plague; and this conviction accounts in part for my stress on meeting men face to face and learning from them what they judge to be helpful and necessary. During the course of the coming year I hope to continue this course of action and to spend many weeks in the Near East, India and southeast Asia, as well as Africa, to reduce my ignorance of educational conditions in those important areas. Now, however, that the Center has a local habitation and a secretary, I hope to be able to follow up my personal visits by more writing on educational affairs, both for publication and for private circulation.

I hope during the course of 1968 to meet with Prefects of Study of high schools, to learn what progress has been made in implementing the recommendations made by some of them at a meeting in January, 1966, in Madrid. One may wonder what guidelines or statutes govern the working of the Center, and what the sources of financing are. At the present there are no more specific guidelines than those set forth or intimated in the appointment letter of June 29. Whether a more detailed set is advisable will become clear in the months ahead. Financing of the limited ac-



tivities of the Center has been assured by an anonymous donor for the past year, and he will continue to defray at least part of the expenses for the next few years.

One suggestion that was proposed in the May, 1966, Memorandum of Father Mehok and myself concerned the advisability of starting a research center on Jesuit education, to be located preferably at a Jesuit university in the United States. Although I am not yet fully persuaded that investment in such a center would be too costly, my support for it has weakened, partially because I now think that regional research centers—say, in Latin America and India—would be more productive. Perhaps a major Jesuit institution in the United States may evolve to a point that it will want to form an equivalent of Harvard's Center on Education and International Development; at the moment I know of none contemplating such a move.

If my belief in the value of a common research center has lessened, my earlier opinion on the importance of a network of a limited number of Jesuit specialists in comparative education has become firmer. Matters relating to university governance, student unrest, gradual increase in percentage of women students, the relation between centers of learning and community need—these are but a small sample of questions relevant to the Jesuit educational effort in many countries. Answers appropriate for one country or even one institution cannot be transplanted as such; but they can indicate alternatives to present practice and lead to the type of reflection which perhaps now, more than ever before, the Society is in need of. Such a small group of specialists can also help link need in one area with resources in another in ways advantageous to both sides.

My report will end where it began—with a request for questions, observations, and suggestions on the work of the International Center of Jesuit Education; and with an invitation to visit it.



# **The Vision of Christ and Christian Freedom**

## **Part III—Molds to be Broken**

PATRICK H. RATTERMAN, S.J.

Under the inspiration of the Second Vatican Council the broad outlines of a new Catholic university are perceptibly emerging. These outlines fit neither into the interstices of a paternalistic and authoritarian Catholicism nor are they accommodated to a doctrinaire, ideological concept of freedom. Laws and values are being deciphered, put to use and regulated in a way whereby the Catholic university will be able not only best to serve the Church but to find a respected place in academe. It is all happening and by no means gradually. Details of the outcome are not yet certain. However, the broad outlines of a solution are clearly developing. Both the Church and the Catholic universities are, moreover, reacting to the change with an unforeseeable calm and equanimity.

Within the past year several things have occurred which would have been not only impossible but unthinkable just ten years ago. The Father Curran affair at Catholic University last spring provides an instance. A faculty and student body, united by a common ideal and acting with remarkable self-discipline, forced the Board of Trustees to reconsider and publicly rescind their previous decision to remove Father Curran from the faculty. Many things are remarkable about the incident. Not so long ago neither faculty nor students in an American Catholic university would have thought of publicly disputing a decision expressed in the name of so many Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops. In 1967 the faculty-student action appeared unavoidable if they were to retain their academic self-respect. Formerly such a Board of Trustees would have been concerned at all costs to reflect a common front. During the Curran affair, public differences in hierarchical opinion were taken for granted even by the members of the hierarchy themselves. In an earlier day such an action on the part of students and faculty would have been thought a



manifestation of a deeper, underlying anti-clericalism. In 1967 the action was neither intended nor considered to manifest any such attitude. The issue was met, settled and by the end of the year largely forgotten without loss of faith, face or dignity on either side. The issue was clear: authority shall not act in an arbitrary manner in the university community. That settled, everybody at Catholic University resumed the more pressing everyday business.

In July, 1967, twenty-six of the best known Catholic educators in the country, including high ranking officers from some of the largest Catholic campuses, signed a statement which reads in part,

To perform its teaching and research functions effectively, the Catholic university must have a true autonomy and academic freedom in the face of authority of whatever kind, lay or clerical, external to the academic community itself. To say this is simply to assert that institutional autonomy and academic freedom are essential conditions of life and growth, and indeed of survival, for Catholic universities as for all universities."

Such a declaration would have been unthinkable by Catholic university representatives a decade ago. What is remarkable in 1967 is not so much that the statement was made by so many leading Catholic educators but that it caused so little comment in either the secular or religious press. It was not intended as an affront to the hierarchy or, evidently, considered by the bishops to constitute an unwarranted declaration of independence. Although the precise extent, or even intent, of "institutional autonomy" is not clear, there appears a realization on all sides that this is the direction in which Catholic universities must tend if they are to function as true universities.

Father Leo McLaughlin, President of Fordham University, states that "Fordham will pay any price—break any mold—in order to achieve her true function as a university."<sup>2</sup> In the realm of student affairs, what molds must be broken, or prices paid, if the Catholic university is to perform a respected function in academe?

---

<sup>1</sup> Schroth, Raymond A., S.J., "The Catholic University of Today," *America*, August 12, 1967, p. 154.

<sup>2</sup> McLaughlin, Leo, S.J., "Fordham in Transition," *Fordham*, September, 1966.



A. "THIS IS A 'PRIVATE' UNIVERSITY"

The first mold to be broken in student affairs is that as a private institution the Catholic university can conduct its internal student business pretty much as it pleases. Statements such as the following were not infrequent in both public and private school catalogs until the very recent past and can perhaps still be found.

The college reserves the right to exclude at any time students whose conduct or academic standing it regards as undesirable.

Or, still more explicitly,

The university reserves the right and the student concedes the university the right to require the withdrawal of any student at any time for any reason deemed sufficient to it, and no reason for requiring such withdrawal need be given.

As late as 1957 the Massachusetts State Court upheld the right of Brandeis University to dismiss students without a hearing.

The problem of what constitutes an appropriate reason must clearly be left to those authorities charged with the duty of maintaining the standards and discipline of the school . . . . I hold as a matter of law that the defendant [university] is not required to [hold any hearing before dismissing a student].<sup>3</sup>

Since 1957, however, several factors have entered the educational picture which make it increasingly unlikely that private universities will be allowed to continue conducting their student affairs in a manner which gives even the appearance of arbitrariness, at least where suspension and dismissal are at issue. Basically, this has come about because it is now being urged by some that a college education should be considered a right rather than a privilege in our American society.

There is a growing opinion in the United States that every young person has a right to the opportunity of a college education. A university education would be, in Dr. Friedrich's classification, a further refinement of the new third class of civil rights. The argument is that in our evolving American society a young

---

<sup>3</sup> Van Alstyne, William W., "Student Academic Freedom and the Rule-Making Powers of Public Universities: Some Constitutional Considerations," *Law in Transition*, Winter, 1965, p. 4. Quoting, *Dehaan v. Brandeis University*, 150 F. Supp. 626, 627 (D. Mass. 1957).



person who is deprived of a college education does not have a chance to achieve the other evolving civil rights—security, work, rest, leisure, adequate standard of living, and participation in cultural life.<sup>4</sup> Dr. Van Alstyne, professor of Law at Duke University, having in mind the national welfare as well as personal need, anticipates that the courts will soon adopt an attitude toward university education similar to that which they have already expressed toward primary education. In earlier court decisions, he explains,

. . . . the opportunity to acquire a university education was not widely regarded as a significant opportunity of substantial national importance. As a consequence, the courts could scarcely be expected to become exercised in reviewing the bases employed by colleges to restrict a seemingly unimportant personal privilege. Currently, however, the personal and national significance of university education enjoys unprecedented recognition. We have come to realize that the opportunity to learn in association with an academic community has enormous value for the student as an individual and for the nation as well. The right to enter into and to maintain that association is valued first of all for its intrinsic opportunities: the pursuit of knowledge, individual self-fulfillment, growth, and expression. Brigaded with these are extrinsic opportunities: to acquire useful professional skills indispensable to employment which is itself self-fulfilling and sufficient to provide an income necessary to meet one's other basic interests in food, shelter, family and leisure . . . . It is increasingly likely that (in the absence of) college preparation, employment itself becomes a remote, risky, and short-lived prospect. What the Supreme Court observed in the field of primary education a decade ago is equally applicable today at the university level: "In these days, it is doubtful that any [person] may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of a [college] education."<sup>5</sup>

No court of law has gone so far as to say that any or all young Americans have a *right* to a university education. The courts have,

---

4 Friedrich, Carl J., "Rights, Liberties, Freedoms: A Reappraisal," *The American Political Science Review*, December, 1963, pp. 842-3.

5 Van Alstyne, "Student Academic Freedom," pp. 6-7.



however, definitely determined that once a student has been admitted to a public college or university, he has a constitutional right that with respect to disciplinary matters the educational opportunity shall not be interrupted or terminated by school authorities without procedural due process. Moreover, this constitutional right to procedural due process can neither be signed away by a student entering a public college or university nor abrogated by any university or State provision to which all entering students must subscribe.<sup>6</sup> In 1961 a U.S. Court of Appeals, reversing an earlier U.S. District Court decision, required that six students be reinstated at Alabama State College because they had been dismissed without procedural due process.

The precise nature of the private interest involved in this case is the *right to remain* at a public institution of higher learning in which the plaintiffs were students in good standing. It requires no argument to demonstrate that education is vital and, indeed, basic to civilized society. Without sufficient education the plaintiffs would not be able to earn an adequate livelihood to enjoy life to the fullest, or to fulfill as completely as possible the duties and responsibilities of good citizens.<sup>7</sup>

The fifth Circuit Court in this instance reflected the indignation expressed by Harvard's Professor Warren A. Seavy four years earlier.

It is shocking that the officials of a state educational institution, which can function properly only if our freedoms are preserved, should not understand the elementary principles of fair play. It is equally shocking to find that a court supports them in denying to a student the protection given to a pickpocket.<sup>8</sup>

The effect of the Dixon (2-1) ruling cannot be overestimated. In 1963 a federal district court in Florida stated that the Dixon decision provided "the most current, explicit and applicable statement of law governing the disposition of this [a similar] case."<sup>9</sup> A comment in the *St. Louis University Law Journal* of 1966 ob-

---

<sup>6</sup> *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education*, 294 F.2d 150, 157, 5th Cir., cert. denied, 368 U.S. 930 (1961). "The State cannot condition the granting of even a [State conferred] privilege."

<sup>7</sup> *Dixon v. Alabama*, 1961, p. 157.

<sup>8</sup> Seavey, Warren A., "Dismissal of Students: Due Process," 70 *Harvard Law Review*, 1957, p. 1407.

<sup>9</sup> *Due v. Florida A & M.*, 233 F. Supp., 396, 400 (N.D. Fla. 1963).



serves, "It seems clear that the Dixon decision is now recognized by the federal courts as the law of the land."<sup>10, 11</sup>

The Dixon ruling applies explicitly only to public colleges and universities. What will its effect be on private institutions? In the Dixon decision the court explicitly noted that "private associations have a right to obtain a waiver of notice and hearing before depriving a member of a valuable right."<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, it is most unlikely that today any state or federal court would sustain the Brandeis position of 1957 whereby a private university could dismiss a student without a hearing. It may reasonably be anticipated that in the future the courts will apply the same norms for due process to private and public universities alike for the following reasons: in our American society dismissal from any university carries with it a stigma of life-long consequence; dismissal from a private institution quite often effectively denies the possibility of all future education because of the admission policies at public universities;<sup>13</sup> the educational investment (academic credit and professional preparation) is frequently non-transferable; since private schools are performing a public function they should be required to meet state requirements where fundamental rights are concerned; private schools receiving state assistance in any form are especially bound by court requirements for public schools.

Seavey strongly questions the past position of the courts which have allowed that students could be dismissed from a private university without explanation. He claims this to be a departure "from the usual rule of contracts which requires one terminating a contract for breach to justify his action."<sup>14</sup> An extensive Comment in a recent issue of *The Yale Law Journal* argues:

What is less clear is the application of constitutional safeguards, substantive and procedural, to "private" schools. The involvement of these schools in quasi-governmental activity,

---

10 Comment, 10 *St. Louis Law Journal*, 1966, p. 548.

11 In view of its undoubted importance to the law as it touches university disciplinary procedures in the future, it is interesting to note the following observation in the Dixon decision. After outlining a few basic procedures to insure "fair play," the court adds: "This is not to imply that a full-dress judicial hearing, with the right to cross-examine witnesses, is required. Such a hearing, with the attending publicity and disturbance of college activities, might be detrimental to the college's educational atmosphere and impractical to carry out. Nevertheless, the rudiments of an adversary proceeding may be preserved without encroaching upon the interests of the college. (Dixon v. Alabama, 1961, p. 159.)"

12 Dixon v. Alabama, 1961, pp. 157-8.

13 "Indeed, expulsion may well prejudice the student in completing his education at any other institution." (Dixon v. Alabama, 1961, p. 157).

14 Seavey, "Dismissal of Students," p. 1409.



the public importance of their function, and their frequently close association with state and federal government, raises the possibility of an extension of constitutional doctrines by "paraconstitutional" techniques such as have been used in other areas of the law to proliferate the purpose of constitutional doctrines.<sup>15</sup>

The following citation is interesting in this regard. Although the opinion was overruled in 1962 by a higher court it probably reflects the thinking of the future with respect to private universities.

At the outset, one may question whether any school or college can ever be so "private" as to escape the reach of the Fourteenth Amendment . . . . No one any longer doubts that education is a matter affected with the greatest public interest. And this is true whether it is offered by a public or private institution . . . . Clearly, the administrators of a private college are performing a public function. They do the work of the state, often in the place of the state. Does it not follow that they stand in the state's shoes? And if so, are they not then agents of the state, subject to the constitutional restraints on governmental action?<sup>16</sup>

Will, therefore, private as well as public universities be challenged in the future with respect to the procedures with which they handle cases involving suspension and dismissal? The following Comment probably gives the answer.

It is submitted that many of our private universities today realize that the distinction between public and private, though still accepted, rests only upon highly technical constitutional considerations and, therefore, that they must be very careful to conform to the procedures the courts have demanded of public colleges and universities in expulsion cases.<sup>17</sup>

At least with respect to suspensions and dismissals private universities can no longer say, "Because we are a private institution we can conduct our dealings with students any way we like." It would be strange indeed if Catholic universities would feel any

---

<sup>15</sup> Comment, "Private Government on the Campus—Judicial Review of University Expulsions," 72 *The Yale Law Journal*, June, 1963, p. 1381.

<sup>16</sup> Comment, 10 *St. Louis University Law Journal*, 1966, p. 546. Quoting *Gillory v. Admin. of Tulane University*, 203 F. Supp., 855, 858-9 (E.D. La. 1962).

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid*, p. 547



misgivings in this regard. Regarding due process the late John Courtney Murray wrote,

What comes to the fore today is the need that the corrective or punitive function of authority should be performed under regard for what is called, in the common-law tradition, "due process." The demand for due process of law is an exigence of Christian dignity and freedom. It is to be satisfied as exactly in the Church as in civil society (one might indeed say, more exactly).<sup>18</sup>

#### B. "HOW WOULD PARENTS HANDLE THIS?"

While it is reasonable to expect that in the future the courts will insist that in suspension and dismissal cases private as well as public universities follow procedures which adequately insure "fair play," it is less likely that the courts will question substantive issues with respect to private school policies and standards. The courts give every indication that they will continue to respect the right of the private university to establish its own distinctive educational philosophy and goals, provided the educational philosophy and goals, as well as any distinctive standards and policies, are clearly enunciated in university catalogues and handbooks. However, it is important to note that the legal basis upon which courts will continue to support institutional diversity in higher education is rapidly shifting. In this instance the mold to be broken on Catholic campuses involves the theory, long upheld by the courts, that a university exercises its authority *in loco parentis*.

Many court decisions can be cited upholding the *in loco parentis* view.

College authorities stand *in loco parentis* concerning the physical and moral welfare, and mental training of pupils, and we are unable to see why to that end they may not make any rules or regulations for the government or betterment of their pupils that a parent could for the same purpose. Whether the rules or regulations are wise, or their aims worthy, is a matter left solely to the discretion of the authorities, or parents as the case may be.<sup>19</sup> As to the mental training, moral and physical discipline, and welfare of pupils, college authorities stand *in loco parentis* and in their discretion may make

<sup>18</sup> Murray, John Courtney, S.J., "Freedom, Authority, Community," *America*, Dec. 3, 1966, p. 740.

<sup>19</sup> *Gott v. Berea College*, 156 Ky. 376, 379, 161 S.W. 204, 206 (1913)



any regulation for the government which a parent could make for the same purpose.<sup>20</sup>

Even as late as 1957, the Brandeis University decision, already noted, appeared to uphold the *in loco parentis* concept.

Again, however, educational circumstances are changing. In the fall of 1966, *Time* magazine observed that "at U.S. universities this fall *in loco parentis* is suffering from rigor mortis." Van Alstyne quotes a letter from Professor Henry Steele Commager which helps to put the matter into historical perspective.

*In loco parentis* was transferred from Cambridge to America, and caught on here even more strongly for very elementary reasons: College students were, for the most part, very young. A great many boys went up to college in the colonial era at the age of 13, 14, 15. They were, for most practical purposes, what our high school youngsters are now. They did need taking care of, and the tutors were *in loco parentis*. This habit was reinforced with the coming of education for girls and of co-education. Ours was not a class society. There was no common body of tradition and habit, connected with membership in an aristocracy or an upper class, which would provide some assurance of conduct.

All of this now is changed. Students are 18 when they come up, and we have a long tradition with co-education from high school on. Students marry at 18 and 19 now and have families. Furthermore, we have adjusted to the classless society and know our way about. Therefore the old tradition of *in loco parentis* is largely irrelevant.<sup>21</sup>

Van Alstyne also observes that "When apologia of *in loco parentis* were tentatively offered in defense of university restrictions at Berkeley in 1964, a hasty retreat was taken when it was pointed out that the overwhelming majority of students were more than twenty-one years of age."<sup>22</sup>

Court decisions in very recent years do not support the *in loco parentis* position. The Dixon and Due decisions of 1961 and 1963 made explicit reference to the students' "right" to remain in a

20 *Stetson University v. Hunt*, 88 Fla. 510, 516, 102 So. 637, 640 (1924).

21 Van Alstyne, William W., "Procedural Due Process and State University Students," 10 *UCLA Law Review*, pp. 377-8.

22 Van Alstyne, "Student Academic Freedom," p. 17.



public institution of higher learning where they were in good standing. In so ruling the courts introduced a consideration which is difficult to reconcile with the *in loco parentis* concept of university administration. The *coup de grace* for the *in loco parentis* theory of college and university government, at least for state schools, was administered by the state courts of California in their judgment of a case arising out of the Berkeley disturbances of 1965. Four students, one of whom, Arthur L. Goldberg, had been dismissed and the other three suspended, sought reinstatement to the University of California through the courts. The ruling of the California Court of Appeals in the Goldberg case, unanimously affirmed by the California Supreme Court, will probably become basic to American law in the years ahead. The court refers to the University's "inherent general powers" as the basis of the authority which the public university exercises as a "constitutional department or function of state government." The court explicitly states that, "For constitutional purposes, state universities should not stand *in loco parentis* to their students."<sup>23</sup>

Although the Goldberg ruling explicitly pertains only to state universities, there are good reasons why the *in loco parentis* theory of university authority should be discarded in all private as well as public schools. Catholic universities may be more inclined than other private schools to attempt to retain the *in loco parentis* concept in view of the strong position taken by the Church with respect to parental rights in education. For instance, the Second Vatican Council insists that parents "must be acknowledged as the first and foremost educators of their children," and while the Council recognizes the duty of society to promote education in many ways, it insists that society must complete the task of education "with attention to parental wishes."<sup>24</sup>

Nevertheless, a Catholic university's first obligation must be to function as a true university, and this must be presumed to be the "parental wish." Moreover, the authority by which a Catholic university fulfills its tasks is not delegated by parents but is "inherent" in the university by virtue of its charter. In addition, aca-

<sup>23</sup> *Goldberg v. Regents of University of California*, 57 Calif. Reporter, 463, 464-5, April, 1967. It is interesting to note that in this decision a college education is defined as a state "important benefit" of which students in good standing may not be deprived without procedural due process. The Dixon and Due cases are cited as precedents.

<sup>24</sup> *The Documents of Vatican II*, Ed., Walter M. Abbott, S.J., Herder and Herder, Association Press, New York, 1966, "Declaration on Christian Education" #3, pp. 641-2.



demic and behavioral standards for students cannot be determined by family practices but must be determined by university authority according to the needs of students *as members of an academic community*. It may well happen that a private university, because of its particular educational goal, insists on student behavioral standards (by virtue of its own authority) which are not only appropriate and necessary to the academic community but which are also very much in accord with "parental wishes." The two ideals are, after all, not incompatible. The important point is that the *immediate* norm for Catholic university student behavioral standards can never be "parental wishes" but must always be the needs of students as members of a Catholic university community. It is difficult to see how a university acting on its own inherent authority and establishing standards which are appropriate and necessary for its own educational goals is acting *in loco parentis* even though "parental wishes" are being served.<sup>25</sup>

What is, then, the relationship of a university to its students? With the abandonment of *in loco parentis* as the basis of university government it is not to be presumed that the university is absolved from all responsibility for the development of students. It is just that a new, viable, realistic formulation must be found which more accurately describes the university-student relationship. Just as it is difficult to hold that the university acts *in loco parentis*, it is equally difficult to maintain that the university-student relationship is one of simple contract since there is an inherent imbalance between the two contracting parties. Seavey maintains that the relationship of the university to its students is that of a fiduciary.

A fiduciary is one whose function it is to act for the benefit of another as to *matters relevant to the relation between them*. Since schools exist primarily for the education of their students, it is obvious that professors and administrators act in a fiduciary capacity with reference to students.<sup>26</sup>

Perhaps, therefore, the university-student relationship is best

25 "I have noted elsewhere that there are many practical reasons why *in loco parentis* does not serve as a rationale for university authority in modern times. How does it apply to married students? to part-time students? to students who are totally self-supporting? and especially to students whose parents explicitly state that they want their children 'to be able to make their own decisions when they go to college?'" ("Non-Religious Activities and Spiritual Development," *Christian Wisdom and Christian Formation*, McGannon, Cooke, Klubertanz, Ed., Sheed and Ward, 1964, pp. 256-9.)

26 Seavey, "Dismissal of Students," p. 1407. Emphasis added.



understood as that established by a fiduciary contract in which the "relevant matters" are specified by the stated educational mission of the university. A fiduciary contract of this nature would necessarily entail a "limitation of authority [on the part of the university] to that required for the genuine needs of the school by its institutional responsibilities to its students."<sup>27</sup> This inherent limitation of university authority forestalls criticism that the fiduciary concept of the university-student relationship is merely *in loco parentis* in a disguised form.

The university-student relationship understood as fiduciary has a great advantage in that it provides a guideline to the reasonable consideration of so many questions which the university must face. What precisely is the mission of a university *qua* university? What specific "matters" are relevant to its educational mission? What are the limitations of the authority which the university exercises in the fulfillment of its institutional responsibilities to its students? What standards are appropriate and necessary to the fulfillment of this institutional responsibility? These are the questions which today are basic to student unrest. The questions are especially pertinent to Catholic campuses. The Catholic university which properly understands its mission *qua* university, which limits its concern to matters which are relevant to its educational mission, and which limits the exercise of its authority to that which is necessary and appropriate to fulfill its specific institutional responsibilities to its students, cannot be accused of either paternalism or authoritarianism.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Comment, 72 *The Yale Law Journal*, p. 1380.

<sup>28</sup> Several interesting observations should be added to this consideration of the demise of the *in loco parentis* concept of university authority. Hospitals will probably continue to insist, in an emergency when parents are unavailable, that a university official approve any medical procedures which ordinarily require parental permission. Civil liberty societies will probably continue to insist that "college authorities should take every practical step to assure themselves that such students (as have run into police difficulties off campus in connection with what they regard as their political rights) are protected in their full legal rights." (American Civil Liberties Union, "Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities," Revised ed., Nov., 1963). That a university should be asked to perform such functions is difficult to understand if the university is not acting *in loco parentis* or at least in some fiduciary capacity. One particular university practice which strangely enough seems to be becoming increasingly common in public as well as private schools, is especially curious in this regard. Colleges and universities are having more and more recourse to parental approval for various student prerogatives particularly with reference to coeds. It is not uncommon, for instance, for schools to allow coeds (particularly upperclassmen) to live in apartments off campus or to absent themselves from residence halls overnight or even over weekends without explanation to university authorities, *provided that* parents have given their approval. The point at issue is that the university refuses such permissiveness to coeds whose parents do not approve. Is not the university, in refusing this particular permissiveness to some students, acting *in loco parentis* with respect to those coeds who are restricted to residence halls and dormitory hours according to the wishes of their parents. Since the university allows the permissiveness to other coeds it would be difficult to argue, with respect to those restricted, that the university is enforcing standards which it judges "appropriate and necessary" to the



## C. "WE WILL MAKE THE RULES."

The third mold that must be broken on the Catholic university campus concerns "substantive" student affairs, the determination of policies, standards and rules especially in the non-academic area. For centuries on Catholic campuses it has been taken for granted, following an accepted clerical tradition, that the administration alone has the right and responsibility to determine these matters. The position is now challenged, and rightly so.

Very little has been said by the courts with respect to "substantive" as opposed to "procedural" problems on university campuses. As long as *in loco parentis* was upheld by the courts, there was no questioning the administration's right to make "any rules or regulations for the government or betterment of their pupils that a parent could make for the same purpose."<sup>29</sup> Even the 1967 Goldberg decision appears to reinforce this position.

The Regents have the general rule-making or policy-making power in regard to the University and are (with exceptions not material here) fully empowered with respect to the organization and government of the University, including the authority to maintain order and decorum on the campus and the enforcement of the same by all appropriate means, including suspension or dismissal from the University.<sup>30</sup>

However, later statements in the Goldberg ruling explain that the power of the Regents is not unlimited.<sup>31</sup> First, constitutional rights may not be needlessly and unreasonably restricted except

---

university community. Another possible explanation, if *in loco parentis* is denied, is that the university asks parents, rather than attempts itself to judge the "maturity level" of its individual students. The university implicitly enunciates the policy that certain restrictions are necessary and appropriate only for "immature" students in this particular university community. It then asks the parents to assist in judging "immaturity." Basing its decision on parental judgment, the university then places restraints on "immature students," not *in loco parentis*, but on its own authority in fulfillment of its own fiducial responsibility. The argument seems strained. It provides a curious and interesting inconsistency with respect to developments on present day campuses. The inconsistency can be solved, of course, by dispensing with all residence hall requirements for all coeds. After all, the students argue, since there are no restrictions for men living in residence halls on these same campuses, to impose restrictions on women is an obvious case of discrimination—and what university dares be guilty of discrimination in any form in this day and age?

29 *Gott v. Berea College*, 156 Ky. 376, 379, 161 S.W. 204, 206 (1913).

30 *Goldberg v. Calif.* (36), 1967, p. 468. N.B. Sections in the Goldberg opinion are numbered. Parenthetical numbers in the following text and footnotes refer to sections in the Goldberg opinion.

31 For instance, "reasonable restrictions on the (constitutional) freedoms of speech and assembly" may be imposed in view of the university's "valid interest in maintaining good order and decorum." (#12) Likewise, "conduct even though intertwined with (the constitutional freedoms of) expression and association is subject to regulation" by the university. (#13),



as required by the very nature of the educational process. (Goldberg #9) Second, the power of the university is limited to making rules which are "appropriate and necessary to the maintenance of order and propriety" in the university community and "reasonably necessary to further the university's educational goals." (#15)<sup>32</sup> Finally, the Goldberg opinion refers to the "minimum standards" of propriety in conduct which universities must impose to insure their proper functioning. (#18) In summary, the Goldberg case appears to establish the position that the power of the university with respect to student conduct is limited to determining "minimum standards" which it considers "necessary and appropriate" to assure "order and propriety" and "to further the university's educational goals." This would seem to be "freedom where possible and restraint only where necessary" as applied to the unique educational circumstance of the academic community.

What federal and state courts hold with respect to substantive matters in student affairs (policies, standards and rules) is interesting but probably of secondary importance, except where constitutional rights are involved. There is a long-standing tradition in Western society that public as well as private universities should be free to make their own determinations regarding what is "necessary and appropriate" to attain their stated educational goals. It is reasonable to assume that the courts will respect and protect this right of autonomous self-determination even where the nature of the educational enterprise requires a "reasonable" curtailment of constitutional rights. What the courts will consider to constitute "reasonable" where an infringement of constitutional rights is involved may be expected to vary widely from campus to campus depending on the nature of the respective institutions (public or private) and their expressed educational objectives.<sup>33</sup> Within these

---

32 It is interesting to note the observation of the court that "in an academic community, greater restrictions may prevail than in society at large." (#17) "The subtle fixings of (the) limits (of student freedom) should, in large measure, be left to the educational institution itself." (#17) "The University, as an academic community, can formulate its own standards, rewards and punishments to achieve its educational objectives." (#27) These latter observations may prove of particular interest in time to private education. (*Goldberg v. Calif.*, 1967).

33 A case currently under court consideration is very interesting in this regard. (*Gary Dickey v. Alabama State Board of Ed.* Decided in favor of Dickey in U.S. District Court, September 7, 1967. Appealed by Alabama Board of Ed. to U.S. District Court of Appeals.)

On August 11, 1967, Dickey was notified by the (Alabama) Troy State College Dean of Men's Office that the Student Affairs Committee "had voted not to (re-) admit him 'at this time.'" This amounted to dismissal, since Dickey had been a student in good standing through the preceding academic year. Since procedural due process had not been observed, Dickey filed a complaint in the District Court. A Student Affairs Committee meeting was subsequently held on August 25, full procedural process being observed. On August 28 Dickey was informed that the Student Affairs



limits universities themselves will probably be allowed to determine what is "necessary and appropriate" to attain their own self-determined educational goals. The courts are more liable to reflect the thinking of academe in these matters than to determine it.<sup>34</sup>

On Catholic campuses the power of administration to determine substantive student issues (and procedural matters as well) was held unchallenged for centuries. Student unrest, running the gamut of expression from mere griping to riot, was frequently enough a factor to be dealt with. However, in all cases, administration felt justified in making decisions and taking necessary action unilaterally. Faculty was not a power to be considered since

---

Committee had voted to suspend him for one academic year. Dickey then moved through the federal courts for a preliminary injunction "on the theory that his *substantive* rights of due process had been and were being deprived."

Through 1967-8 Dickey, a member of a national honorary journalism fraternity, had served as an editor of the *Tropolitan* (school paper), editor-in-chief of the school literary magazine, copy editor of the yearbook, and editor-in-chief of the student handbook. In April, 1967, he desired to run an editorial in the school paper criticizing the Governor and State Legislature for their stand in an incident which occurred on the University of Alabama campus. Both the faculty advisor to the *Tropolitan* and the President (Adams) of Troy State College forbade Dickey to run the editorial. The advisor provided substitute editorial material entitled "Raising Dogs in North Carolina." Dickey ran only the headline of the originally planned editorial, leaving the rest of the space blank, except for the word "Censored" diagonally across the open space.

The (President) "Adams Rule" was invoked in Dickey's suspension. According to the "Adams Rule," editorials and articles critical of the Governor or State Legislature could not be published in the school paper since "a newspaper could not criticize its owners."

One's first reaction to the circumstances of the Dickey case cannot but be, "You must be kidding." The hypothesis might be advanced that Dickey, the faculty advisor, the Dean of Men, and President Adams contrived in a ridiculous set of circumstances to entice the Governor (Lurleen Wallace) and the State Board of Education into an impossible defense. Dickey's initial dismissal without procedural due process was the first effort to save him. The "Adams Rule" can be construed as a "straw man," which would be taken seriously only in Alabama, and not even there in the federal courts. The substitute editorial contributes to the absurdity. It is an interesting speculation.

The U.S. District has ruled that the "Adams Rule" is not only unnecessary "to maintain order and discipline among the students" on the Troy State College campus but constitutes an unnecessary restriction of the constitutional rights guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth amendments. "Regulations and rules which are necessary in maintaining order and discipline are always considered reasonable. (However) boards of education, presidents of colleges, and faculty advisors are not exempted from the rule that protects students from unreasonable rules and regulations. . . . State school officials cannot infringe on their students' right of free and unrestricted expression as guaranteed by the Constitution . . . where the exercise of such right does not materially and substantially interfere with the requirements of appropriate discipline in operation of the school." (Burnside v. Byars, 363 F 2nd 744, 1966). (Dickey was exercising) his constitutionally guaranteed right of academic and/or political expression."

"There was no legal obligation on the school authorities to permit Dickey to continue as one of (the school newspaper) editors. As a matter of fact, there was no legal obligation on the school authorities to operate a school newspaper. . . . The imposition of such a restraint . . . (as was imposed upon Dickey in this case) violates the basic principles of academic and political expression as guaranteed by our Constitution. . . . 'The essentiality of freedom in the community of American universities is almost self-evident.'" (Swezy v. New Hampshire, 354 U.S. 234, 250, 1957).

34 In the Dixon opinion Judge Rives cites no academic authorities. However, in the Goldberg case Judge J. Taylor expresses his indebtedness "for help in our analysis" to "many thoughtful comments" which, albeit appearing in legal journals, strongly reflect the thinking more of academe than of legal precedent. (#5, 6, footnote).



faculty on Catholic campuses was by and large made up of religious who accepted the leadership of the clerical administration as a part of their religious orientation. On Catholic campuses, therefore, administration alone decided what was "necessary and appropriate to the maintenance of order and propriety" and what was "reasonably necessary to further the university's educational goals." But once again, so much of this has changed. Lay faculty, now significantly outnumbering religious faculty members on most Catholic campuses, demand a voice in university affairs. They no longer consider themselves as employed to teach at a university belonging to some religious community, but rather as partners in an educational enterprise to which they are making an important contribution and in which they are making a considerable personal investment. The extreme faculty position, adapted from the secular educational tradition, is that faculty, not administration, should play the determining role in student affairs since education is basically a faculty-student relationship.

With the emergence of the student concepts of the "right to learn" and responsibility for self-determination, accompanied by a mistrust of "anybody over thirty," students are claiming an increasingly decisive role in all student (academic as well as non-academic) affairs. They must, they assert, bear the final responsibility for their own preparation to participate in the world which will emerge from the present social (and educational) revolution. The extreme student position is that they can trust only themselves to determine what is truly relevant and meaningful to their own welfare and the future of "their" evolving world. Perceiving administration as the immediate oppressor in the educational situation, student extremists even on Catholic campuses sometimes urge that their own student sector, necessarily autonomous in the university society, must unite with faculty to overthrow the unjust repressions of administrations. Alone or with faculty support, student power must be autonomous and must prevail. Their cause, student leaders feel, is just.

"If you don't give us what we want, we'll have half the people here on the streets within 24 hours. We'll demonstrate, we'll throw up picket lines, we'll block all deliveries. We'll bring this place to a grinding halt." The familiar manifesto has become 1967's favorite litany, emanating from black power activists, cops and firemen—even teachers.



This time the threat comes from college students. And not just a handful of wishful radicals, either, but well-groomed, articulate undergraduate leaders of 334 U.S. colleges meeting at College Park, Maryland, for the National Student Association's annual congress.

They came back to their respective campuses ready to challenge teachers, deans and the whole system of higher education in the U.S. with the rallying cry, "Student power."<sup>35</sup>

A form of university government must emerge on university campuses which provides for "meaningful" and "significant" participation by all sectors of the university community. The legitimate claims of both faculty and students in this regard cannot be dismissed either by Trustees or by their appointed university officers. Faculty is making an investment in the university enterprise which can only be adequately recognized and encouraged by their being given a proportionately important role to play in the university's decision making processes. Students *do* have a responsibility for their own self-development which can be achieved only by their being actively involved in the total university mission. It is moreover, a bit inconsistent for a university to expect students to assume very serious personal and social responsibilities in the larger society immediately after graduation but to allow them no opportunity to assume personal and community responsibilities in the university society as undergraduates.

All sectors of the university must participate in the determination of university affairs. But what shall the mixture be? And who will determine precisely how much voice the administration, faculty and student sectors should have in various decisions? There is no easy answer to these questions since circumstances will vary so much from campus to campus. If, however, the emphasis in university government was less on preserving traditional decision-making prerogatives and more on educating and encouraging others to assume policy determining responsibilities there would be fewer tensions in most Catholic universities. The unique insights of students into their own needs cannot be overlooked as a qualification for participation in university government. Student participation should be encouraged not as play acting, or as an educational experience, or worst of all, as a con-

---

<sup>35</sup> "Now It's Student Power," *Life Magazine* (Special Report), October 27, 1967, p. 91.



cession to student power. It should be respected because students through their insights have something unique and very significant to contribute to many important areas of university government.

It is by no means to be presumed that all Catholic universities will have identical educational goals for identical student bodies with identical student needs. Neither is it to be presumed, therefore, that the same policies, standards and rules will be uniformly "appropriate and necessary" for all Catholic university campuses. However, granting this diversity, the ideal of a true university will be approached on Catholic campuses insofar as each academic community in its unique circumstance is able to provide policies, standards and rules which encourage free student inquiry and expression.

What should the norm be in the future for decisions which Catholic university communities will make with respect to substantive student issues? The answer can only be: Freedom where possible, restraint only where necessary. With all sectors of the community significantly participating each Catholic university will have to decide for itself, according to the above general norm, what policies, standards and rules are "reasonably necessary to further the university's educational goals"? Where a high degree of student responsibility has already developed it is not in the least unreasonable that the university community should delegate a near total authority to the student sector in determining matters which pertain almost exclusively to the student interest. To work toward such a high degree of student responsibility should be the goal of every university community.

But will not abuses occur if students are allowed such freedom in the Catholic academic community? The only honest answer is: Yes, student abuses of freedom will definitely occur. It must reasonably be anticipated that where students are encouraged to express themselves openly and vocally they will from time to time express themselves irresponsibly. Perhaps particularly on Catholic campuses abuses of freedom of expression should be expected since there is no long tradition of freedom in Catholic pre-college education. It can be expected, for instance, that Catholic university students will at times use the opportunity provided by censorless publications to express a strong reaction to authoritarian and paternalistic, and perhaps puritanical, aspects of family,



parish and high school. Precisely because of their protected backgrounds Catholic university students may manifest a singular imprudence when first allowed a true freedom of expression. And it may well happen that student abuses of freedom in a particular circumstance may be such that it will be "appropriate and necessary" for the university community, all sectors participating in the decision, temporarily to restrict certain freedoms in view of a particular university's educational goals. However, this should be seen as an unfortunate and temporary situation.

The freedom which the academic community can with confidence allow students should always be regarded as a measure of educational achievement. One of the purposes of the academic enterprise is to educate students to a responsible use of freedom. Policies, standards and rules should frequently be adjusted by the university community to take into account the capacity of each student generation (the character of which changes almost every year) to assume freedom with responsibility.

#### *D. THE PASSIVE STUDENT*

The fourth mold to be broken on the Catholic university campus, if student affairs are to meet the standards of a true university, concerns the part students should play in their own education. Until recent times students on Catholic campuses were expected not so much to learn as to be taught. As has already been noted, "The whole thrust of the old system was in the direction of inculcating in students a previously arrived at synthesis of secular knowledge, intellectual skills, ethical values and religious truths."<sup>36</sup> If students in Catholic universities were not explicitly taught, they soon enough came to believe, that the Church had all the answers, at least all the answers that really mattered. Accordingly, if students just absorbed what the Catholic university had to teach, their proper education was assured. There was no need for students to be concerned about or involved in planning their own educational development.

Great changes have come about. Having all the answers was but one aspect of the triumphalism which the Church repudiated at the Second Vatican Council. Long before the Council, how-

---

<sup>36</sup> Gleason, Philip, "The Crisis in Catholic Universities: An Historical Perspective," *Catholic Mind*, September, 1966, p. 51.



ever, it was apparent to many Catholic educators that the all-answer syndrome of Catholic education served only to isolate Catholic universities from the many valuable mainstreams of thought in academe. The growth of Catholic graduate schools, which cannot be isolated, the influx of lay faculty from non-Catholic institutions, the professionalization of Catholic universities' faculties—all these have helped to break down the isolation of Catholic universities and have served to integrate thought on Catholic campuses with that of the larger academic community. Not the least factor in this breakdown of Catholic educational isolationism was the agitation of students on Catholic campuses to assert their "right to learn."

The student "right to learn," like academic freedom, can become an all purpose shibboleth. Basically, however, it involves two very important principles, the right of free inquiry and the right of free expression. Both are essential if students are to be allowed to play a realistically free, self-determining role in their own education. Students must be free to inquire wherever they feel any element of truth might be found. They must also be free to express their present convictions, since campus dialogue is a genuine means for seeking truth and clarifying convictions. The right to organize and join student organizations for the freer and more forceful expression of ideas, the right to invite outside speakers to campus to challenge or reinforce academic positions, and the right to express views openly in student publications are all corollaries to the rights of free inquiry and free expression. These rights are based on academic needs, needs which must be fulfilled by students who are sincere in the pursuit of truth as the basis of their own self-formation.

Students today are impatient with and suspicious of any efforts to protect them from ideas which their elders deem harmful to young minds. And perhaps understandably so. They abhor any ban on speakers and distrust whoever would impose such a ban. "Will he tell us something you don't want us to know?" they ask. "Are you afraid for us, or really for yourselves?" Editors of student publications want to know why their ideas are regarded as an impertinence if they disagree with some cherished institutional value. "Is the system more vulnerable than we suspected?" they wonder. Whatever the merits of such instruments as the Index of Forbidden Books in bygone years, the idea is anathema today.



Students suspect it was anathema from its inception and regard with deep mistrust a system of education, and those responsible for the system, which used such means to achieve educational goals. They cannot but notice that the thought of Martin Luther is today being very carefully studied by Catholic scholars and is now acknowledged to merit deep consideration by Catholic students. Yet just a generation ago Martin Luther was hurriedly dismissed on the Catholic university campus as an "adversary" along with a brief summary of his "errors." Students know today that a great deal of truth is to be found where their fathers were forbidden to search. Is there any wonder that the present student reaction of mistrust is sometimes extended to "everybody over thirty"? Total freedom appears to students to be the only ideal which can presently be reconciled with their need to inquire and express their views in the academic society.

The problems of Catholic universities in recognizing the student "right to learn" are not easily resolved after centuries of self-isolation. There are some very important responsibilities which Catholic universities feel obliged to fulfill; these responsibilities appear to run counter to the "right to learn" as it is frequently interpreted. The most basic responsibility which the Catholic university feels obliged to fulfill is that of instruction in the areas of philosophy and theology. Any instruction in these areas on the collegiate level appears inappropriate to some as jeopardizing if not completely frustrating the student "right to learn." For instance, Frederick Crosson feels that there is no place in the Catholic university for religious instruction.

The primary function of the university is not instruction but inquiry . . . . For example theology . . . . in college ought not to be doctrinal instruction but reflective theorizing. Further instruction may indeed be necessary if "literacy" is lacking, and in the case of the sciences especially it may be that the language skill necessary to read "the great book of nature" will not be mastered before graduate school. But this cannot be the excuse for an indefinite delay of critical enquiry if the student has sufficient command of the "language" to formulate meaningful questions in the area.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Crosson, Frederick, "Personal Commitment as the Basis of Free Inquiry," *Academic Freedom And The Catholic University*, Manier and Houck, Ed., Fides Publishers, Inc., Notre Dame, Indiana, 1967, pp. 89-90.



On what basis Crosson judges that students entering college can be presumed to be theologically "literate" and already possessed of "the language skill" necessary to read God's greatest book is not explained. In American universities, instruction on the undergraduate level is as necessary in the "science" of theology as in the other sciences if the study is to be truly meaningful and productive. Yet, Crosson's position merits serious consideration. If the student "right to learn" is to be taken seriously on Catholic campuses, even through the early undergraduate years, doctrinal instruction cannot be offered as the sole fare. Freshmen and sophomores do have sufficient command of the "language" to face *some* critical questions in theology. Moreover, with respect to these questions students have a right, not just to the answers proffered by Catholic teaching, but to an honest and understanding presentation of all answers which are seriously proposed today by men of thought. In other words, university students have a right to see the Catholic answers in full historical and critical context. All of this should be part of university instruction.

If the Catholic university has a responsibility for the theological instruction of its undergraduates it seems a bit difficult to argue that the Catholic university represents the "Church learning," but not the "Church teaching." At least with respect to undergraduates the Catholic university must be something of both. In providing instruction for undergraduates it is obviously performing a teaching function. Just how the teaching function of the Catholic university is to be disassociated from the teaching function of the Church, as Father John Walsh proposes, is not clear.

It is a very serious mistake to speak of the Catholic university as part of the teaching function of the Roman Catholic Church or even its teaching apostolate.

To think of the Catholic university as an instrument of the Church for the carrying out of its teaching mission leads, I think, both to serious misunderstanding of the Church's teaching mission in itself and to profound distortions of the nature of a university.<sup>38</sup>

The urge to assert autonomy for the Catholic university, un-

---

<sup>38</sup> Walsh, John E., "The University And The Church," *Academic Freedom And The Catholic University*, Manier and Houck, Ed., Fides Publishers, Inc., Notre Dame, Indiana, 1967, p. 108.



doubtedly essential in certain areas of university life, cannot be so easily extended to the instructional function of the Catholic university. A Catholic university cannot with honesty teach its own brand of Catholicism. There is only one Catholicism and this is what is passed on by the magisterium of the Church. It is almost overstating the obvious to say that students at a Catholic university have a "right to learn" the official teaching of the Catholic magisterium. The Catholic university, therefore, (and not just the local ordinary) has a corresponding responsibility to see that the authentic teaching of the magisterium is adequately presented on the Catholic university campus.

The fulfillment of this instructional responsibility in no way repudiates the dignity and even autonomy of theology as a science in the Catholic university setting. Quite the contrary, religious instruction appropriately conceived for the university situation will supplement the higher approach to theology as a science. Walsh's point is well made if Catholic university instruction is *necessarily* limited to teaching exclusively a "given set of doctrines, values, or attitudes . . . the teachings of the Church." But Catholic instruction on the university level is not *per se* so limited. As has already been pointed out, Catholic universities have a serious responsibility to present the teachings of the magisterium in a full historical and critical context. In so doing, however, the Catholic university is not disassociating itself from the "Church teaching," but rather adapting its instruction to the educational needs and "right to learn" of university students.

What is the responsibility of the Catholic university "to guide" students and how can guidance be reconciled with the students' personal responsibility of self-determination? Is not any effort to guide students bound to prejudice the presentation, predetermine the answer, and consequently destroy the students' independent "right to learn"? The true Catholic university, John Cogley seems to assert, not only has *no* responsibility to guide its students but as a university has a responsibility precisely *not* to guide students. Its primary responsibility, Cogley holds, is to open up to students all possible avenues of speculation and choice.

I think that today every university has a duty to teach its students what Freud had to say, *precisely as Freud wanted to be understood*. It also has the duty to teach its students



what Freud's critics had to say, precisely as *they* wanted to be understood. The same goes for Marx, Neitzsche, for Hume, Spengler, Wittgensten, Bertrand Russell, as well as for St. Thomas, Niebuhr and Sartre. I do not believe that any university, precisely because it is a university, can play favorites among these giants. I do not believe that any university should indoctrinate its students in the teachings of any of them. By the same token, every university is bound to expose its students to the thought of all of them and be committed institutionally to none.<sup>39</sup>

In Cogley's view "universities cannot play favorites." His further comments are extremely relevant to a clear understanding of his argument.

This demand can be made on all universities precisely because they are universities. I do not believe that today *any* university can be uncritically committed as an institution to a particular philosophy, political system, to any one religion or anti-religion. By the same token, the university can not exclude from thoughtful consideration any ideology, philosophy, political system or religion which living men of learning, by common agreement, deem worthy of consideration.

Obviously, this means theology belongs in every university—whether it is called Catholic, Protestant, or secular. In a certain sense, then, a "secular" university is as anomalous a term as "Catholic" university.

As Miss Stein might have put it, a university is a university is a university.<sup>40, 41</sup>

Cogley's argument is honest. The world and our nation have

---

<sup>39</sup> Cogley, John, "The Future Of An Illusion," *Commonweal*, June 2, 1967, p. 313.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid*, p. 313-314

Cogley proposes and answers what he feels to be the most serious objection to his concept of the true (Catholic) university. "Then, one must ask: Can the university-as-such 'believe in God'?" Are those who do not, or have ceased to, believe excluded from the university community? Moreover, should the university-as-such "reflect that belief in every aspect of its operation"? Here, I realize, is a difficult problem. But if one replies yes, what happens to agnosticism and atheism on such campuses? Should they be outlawed as unworthy of consideration?—are they to be triumphantly confuted?—is the argument settled before it begins?

<sup>41</sup> St. Thomas begins the *Summa* with the question: *An Deus Sit?* and takes the question seriously. If a university seriously asks its students the same question (and every university should) can it then carry on as if the question is not a real one, only one answer is intellectually tolerable? "The fool has said in his heart there is no God" is a Biblical judgment. But like Saint Thomas, the university can not carry on as if all who question God's existence are patently foolish and unworthy of consideration: even the Scriptures are not self-evident.



need of such universities as Cogley describes. Since "some great minds have addressed themselves to the ultimate questions that are put under the heading of theology," it might well be argued that public universities have a responsibility to provide "genuinely pluralistic" departments of philosophy and theology,<sup>42</sup> not just courses in the history of these disciplines. Professional learned and civil liberty societies might well address themselves to seeing that the student "right to learn" is fulfilled in this regard on public campuses. And if the present interpretation of our national constitution precludes such a possibility (to the extreme detriment of public education, it would appear), perhaps some private schools should address themselves to the fulfillment of this obvious public need.

However, it is only reasonable to point out that in order to achieve Cogley's ideal, which requires that the university play no favorites with particular philosophies and theologies, it would appear necessary that the campus atmosphere be neither religious nor a-religious. What is perhaps more to the point, any guidance of students beyond an advanced instruction in how to read and how to study, however well intentioned, would destroy the neutrality which is essential to this type of university. If the student choice is to be absolutely free, personal influence of every kind both inside and outside the classroom would have to be carefully avoided. It is only fair to ask, Is such a university possible? Would only this type of campus really provide the necessary circumstances for a truly effective search for truth? Is such a campus necessary, or ideal, to fulfill the student "right to learn"?

In the present existential circumstance, at least, it would seem that Catholic universities can play another more productive role in higher education. This is not totally to disregard the Cogley ideal. It is only to say that at the present time it is more realistic to regard the total academe as the universal university Cogley en-

---

<sup>42</sup> The charge of indoctrination is so frequently raised in criticism of Catholic education. I have noted elsewhere that, "To fulfill its purpose and achieve its mission, the university must be allowed, even by the State and Church which authorizes its existence, a great deal of independence and freedom. The State cannot use the public university to mold jingoistic patriots, nor can the Church use Catholic universities to form "pious, passive believers," without completely frustrating the main educational mission of the university itself. The university neither fulfills its own purpose nor best serves the State and Church if it allows its mission to be subverted to immediate and shortsighted needs of the State and Church." ("Student Rights and Freedoms on the Catholic University Campus—Background Considerations and Norms." *National Catholic Educational Asso. Bulletin*, August, 1966, p. 229).



visions and to say that within this total academe the Catholic university has a unique service to perform.

The Cogley concept of the ideal (Catholic) university fails to consider, it would appear, the nature and importance of religious faith in a student's life. If it is presumed that the choice of ultimate beliefs is purely a rational choice, Cogley's university would unquestionably be the only true ideal. If the minds of students upon entering a university were *tabula rasa*, or even if in an ideal order it were best that upon entering the university the minds of students were as "*rasa*" as possible, again Cogley's university would be the ideal. But it is neither a fact that the minds of students are *tabula rasa* when they enter the university nor is it an ideal that they should be. The important factor of religious faith must be taken into consideration.

Students entering a university are already persons; this is saying a great deal. The most important aspect of their personhood is that through seventeen or so years they have encountered God's own Self in their every free decision. In a different measure for each freshman God has elicited from each of them a trust and faith. In different measure and in different ways they believe in God—and this is the most important thing about individual freshmen. With respect to ultimate values and ultimate beliefs, with respect to God Himself, the minds of students entering the university are not *tabula rasa*, however much such a religious condition might appear to exist even to individual freshmen themselves.

Is it so wrong that students of like faith, of like relationship to God, should freely choose to search for truth in an academic community of men who share their faith? Does faith itself, or an association with men of like faith, automatically and *per se* preclude the possibility of a free and unprejudiced search for truth? Might it not be that for some students the search for truth and the possibility of self-fulfillment will be positively aided by an association with men who share the insights which a common religious faith generates? To provide a milieu for those Catholic (and non-Catholic) students who conscientiously feel that they can most freely and effectively seek further truth and their own personal self-fulfillment in such an association is the mission of the Catholic university.



To say all this about the mission of the Catholic university is not to say enough. The mission will almost necessarily be misunderstood and misinterpreted unless the necessary relationship of the Catholic university to the total academe is clearly perceived. This relationship is one of both need and service.

Only at its own peril can the Catholic university seek to fulfill its internal educational function in isolation from the rest of academe. If the sciences of philosophy and theology are to be "genuinely" pursued on the Catholic campus, there must be a constant exchange with philosophers and theologians on other campuses throughout all of academe. There must be an understanding response to suggestions and criticisms from academe to philosophical and theological developments (or the lack thereof) on the Catholic campus. The Catholic university must recognize its dependence for the knowledge it must obtain from academe in allied sciences—anthropology, ethnology, psychology, sociology, comparative religions, etc.—in order to develop the sciences of philosophy and theology on its own campus. In these and many other ways the Catholic university must accept and appreciate its desperate need to function not in isolation but in continual contact with all other colleges and universities.

On the other hand the Catholic university must recognize the unique service it is called upon to provide academe.<sup>43</sup> It is the mission of the Catholic university, and of all private universities that search for new truth with the unique insights which a community commitment provides, to suggest possible new approaches to the problems which confront the larger academic community.

Can the student "right to learn" be properly respected in a Catholic university so conceived? Most definitely, provided that both instruction and guidance direct students to a perception of their religious faith and the insights it provides not only in full historical and critical context but in the perspective of the current pursuit of related truth in the larger academic society. For some students the "right to learn" can only be adequately provided in such an educational milieu. These students will undoubtedly

---

<sup>43</sup> Richardson, William J., "Pay Any Price? Break Any Mold?" *America*, April 29, 1967, p. 625. "In the world of Academia, then, where institutions live together as so many corporate persons, it is altogether fitting that there be institutions among them that incorporate the values of Christianity in general and of Catholicism in particular. In a word, the role of a Catholic university today is to represent the Church in Academia, i.e., to serve as that corporate person through which the Church becomes present to the community of academic institutions and they to it."



pursue new truth most effectively and achieve their greatest self-fulfillment in a Catholic university community which is

dedicated to a courageous, unrelenting and radical reflection on the cosmic meaning of Christendom's dedication to Christ.<sup>44</sup>

(The fifth "mold to be broken" on the Catholic university campus, that which pertains to the religious development of students, will be considered in the fourth section of this article.)

---

<sup>44</sup> Grosson, "Personal Commitment," p. 90.



# How Produce More Writers in the Society

by

WILLIAM H. QUIERY, S.J.

A distinguished Jesuit in Chicago who did his only book ten years ago—it is now published in French, Spanish, Italian, Japanese, and Portuguese—told me recently that the agony of writing his book was so great he would probably never do another. “The only way I can imagine myself doing another book would be, say, if the Society would give me a year in Hawaii. In those circumstances—and they are most unlikely—I think I could write another book. But without something like that, I don’t see how I could ever get myself to do it.”

Other writers will know exactly what he means. Writing is the hardest kind of work. That is one reason why Jesuits (and others) write so little, even though the number of Jesuit books and translations published each year in America is impressive: 71 in 1966, 98 in 1965, 57 in 1964. Yet many who could write are not doing so. At present our Jesuit pattern of life does not usually take into account the unique agony of writing. As a result, we are much less productive than we should be, though most of us are ready to admit that writing is work of the first importance. (It was Michael Harrington’s book *The Other America* that triggered the War on Poverty, according to one report published recently. And this is a good model that Jesuit poverty-workers could imitate: practical experience bringing insight, then this made available to others through writing.)

Opportunities for writers are greater than ever before. “No publisher has enough manuscripts,” a literary agent told me recently. Book production is on the increase every year. This is especially true in fields related to religion. All the communication arts, in fact need writers and would welcome Jesuit writers. There are 8,000 daily newspapers in the U.S., 22,000 periodicals, 1,000 television and 12,000 radio stations, 170,000 cinemas. But Jesuit communicators must be formed and developed for these media, or rather, allowed and urged to develop *themselves*, especially when they are young. This means that we have to create a climate that will be friendly to create gifts long before they are fully ma-



ture, a climate that stimulates the mature as well. A changed atmosphere changes everything, as Marshall McLuhan insists on every page of his books.

### *ACTION NOW*

We have recently taken a number of steps in this direction. The bold changes in the structure of the course, the moves to university campuses, the plans to intensify community living—all of these should set the stage for some increase in productivity by improving the creative climate among our scholastics. But this new vitality and potential productivity will not take the proper direction automatically. We could end up with fewer writers than ever. If we are to carry out the Ignatian principle “The more universal the benefit, the more divine the work,” and get our men to devote themselves to the more important works such as writing rather than to what is “merely urgent,” we have to pay the price of developing people deliberately for these works—as we have done in many areas in the past, not, however, in the area of writing. Our Chicago Jesuit mentioned above would be the first to admit that he was never educated to be a writer. His education, like that of most of us, was centered on reading and on listening. Some educators are saying the emphasis should be totally reversed, should concentrate once again on writing and speaking. Most of us, I think, would agree.

### *AGENCIES FOR WRITERS*

I have been given the job of starting a national service office for Jesuit writers, and this agency should help somewhat in forming Jesuit writers of the future. Each of our major scholasticates, ten in all, now has, or has planned, a local “agency for writers” run by the scholastics themselves, but working in close touch with our national office (called Jesuit Writers’ Service, and located at 211 East 87th Street, in New York.)

These local offices are not writers clubs or seminars—though such are to be much encouraged. The local agencies simply lower the barriers for young writers by expediting censorship, arranging for typing help (usually paid for out of a percentage of earnings), providing lists of places to publish and marketing know-how, and, in most cases, offering a mailing and re-mailing service



of the sort many free-lance writers have to pay for. They also make sure that acceptance letters go up on the bulletin board and this encourages others to write. ("If he can do it, I can.") In some cases magazine editors send article requests to the local agents, and these requests are farmed out to men willing to write. But the stress is put on looking in the direction of publication when writing a paper for ordinary classwork.

Part of the work of the new national office is to see to the continuance of these agencies, give them guidance and information, and help them, by a newsletter, to share leads and news of success. The local agencies should be given every encouragement by teachers and officials in the houses of study. The national agency's main task is to be an "information bridge" between all Jesuits willing to write and the editors and publishers in need. The office is gradually making other services available also, like contract consultation, experienced assistance in working material through the press, contact with commercial agencies, and in some cases typing help. Gradually this office will accumulate information about writing and from time to time publish material valuable especially to Jesuit writers "on their way up" or to graduate students doing dissertations. Expansion of the national agency into media and other services is also a definite possibility, with the aim of penetrating the established structures of communication such as films, TV, radio, and the large and influential magazines. We are beginning however, with the publishing aspect.

### *WHAT JWS HAS BEEN DOING*

At this writing, less than three months since we made our first announcement that we are "open for business," results are promising. We have read (or have given others to read) some thirty book manuscripts, have passed some on to publishers, given advice on others. A Jesuit physicist, for example, consulted us on a book he has done on the philosophy of science. He is an Italian and knew nothing about the American publishing scene. By consulting a commercial agent in New York who specializes in this field (who, incidentally, handled two books by Harvard professors in this same field this year), we were able to direct the manuscript to the most appropriate publisher, with a suggestion for the next two publishers who might be interested should the first publisher



reject the manuscript. We have another excellent manuscript done by an American Jesuit in Argentina, and will take it progressively to the six University presses who, in answer to our query, expressed an interest in it. For another example, we are helping with the English edition of what one reviewer of the German edition called "one of the two great books on Heidegger"—but the Jesuit author is a College president and would not have time to see the book through to publication himself, especially since it is a scholarly work and therefore relatively unprofitable. Commercial agents could not therefore get interested in such a book.

In perhaps ten cases, publishers have passed book ideas on to JW and we are busy finding authors for them: four have been found, and one book has actually been finished and is in the hands of the publisher—one of the few publishers, incidentally, who could have done the book properly, since it had to be in paperback and hurried into print by next spring. We have been asked to help on contracts in a few cases, and in one case found that the publisher was being far from fair to the Jesuit author. In other cases we have been able to calm suspicions of unfairness rising out of the unfamiliarity with the publishing world—a problem with Jesuits and with almost everyone else. In a number of cases, we had to return manuscripts to the authors (especially dissertations) with those disheartening words: "in our opinion, unpublishable." Had the author consulted a publisher before he began his work—as he should have done, some of these might have been saved.

Many article manuscripts have come in also, and those we judged publishable have been sent to one scholasticate agency or another for circulation to the journals and magazines that should be interested. As a general rule, we have stayed away from strictly scholarly articles, since these should be handled by their authors—but we have occasionally sent along information that may be a value to the writers. Our JWS office has adequate secretarial help as well as access to the Jesuit Press typing pool (thanks to Jesuit Missions, Inc.). But submission by Jesuits are so definitely on the increase here that a lay assistant has been brought in to share the burden of preliminary reading, judging, and advising. It is safe to predict that by next September we will need the full-time services of some expert with long experience in book agenting and perhaps another "first reader." In the meantime we



will get the expert help we need piecemeal, limiting our work to our available resources of time and money.

One other item of some interest is a convention planned for the ten scholastics who now run the local agencies. The meeting will be held in New York, December 28-30, and we hope it will be productive of some new ideas to replace the rather primitive and experimental systems we are now using.

### SUGGESTIONS

But formation of more and better Jesuit writers will require a great deal more than this. I recently queried many of our most prominent writers on this subject, and while virtually all agreed that a national agency would be a worthwhile experiment, many other suggestions came in. Everyone agreed on the need for the normal help on the local scene: give writers time to write, provide typing help, speed up and simplify censorship (perhaps make it fraternal and voluntary rather than a rule), and celebrate a bit when the book comes out. Some stressed certain basic needs during the course; a relentless program of essential books (North), stress on the liberal arts in pre-regency days (Gannon), self-discipline in use of time and application to study (Bannon), exercises and experience in re-writing (McFarlane), and many urged far more attention to motivating potential writers early (Hallett, Guentner, McNamara).

Other suggestions were more novel: try to provide some scholastic teachers who are themselves writers (Grollmes), encourage book reviewing by the younger men (Klubertanz), send men to summer writers' conferences (Farrell, Faherty), have meetings occasionally for Jesuits who write (Sweeney), get men into print early somehow (Twomey, Fichter), encourage even the novices to write for less important publications (Cervantes, Le-Saint), make writing for publication part of course work (Kane) introduce annual awards for the best scholastic writers, working through local agencies (Moynihan).

### ALMA SUGGESTIONS

In 1960 one of the famous Town Halls at Alma College produced a report that covered this subject unusually well. In this report the scholastics suggested that writing be incorporated into our



academic program much more seriously. They asked for less class hours in exchange for much more supervised writing. They praised their own Juniorate course and recommended that papers done by scholastics be always carefully read and commented on. They asked for more incentives for writing for publication and for more encouragement in writing from their teachers as well as a vigorous reading program. And from themselves they asked for more self-discipline, deeper motivation, and for a mental attitude that accepted the risks of committing one's self to paper.

Personally, I have often thought it might also help if prominent writers, including Jesuits, were systematically invited to speak or run workshops in our novitiates, to talk about how they do their writing, how they keep notes, what is particularly or unexpectedly rewarding about their work. This is done in some places and certainly helps. Novices should master typing and, in some cases, shorthand and dictaphone techniques. Some should have personal subscriptions to magazines and newspapers. A novice experiment for some might be to work as writers for a month, doing reporting, research, editing, and re-writing.

### *AFTER NOVITIATE*

As time goes on the scholastics should, under direction, practice all forms of communication (as many do already): reading and imitating the most influential columnists and book reviewers, producing radio "talk programs" and TV panels, with cameras available for experimental film-making. Much of this could grow out of, or be part of, normal course work.

Our scholastics who write should be encouraged to subscribe to the more important journals in their field and to other key periodicals in which they would like to place articles. This is simply a way of "studying your audience" and every writer has to do it. Clipping and filing articles of special interest is excellent preparation for writing. Vance Packard did *The Hidden Persuaders* from a well organized collection of clippings, dictating the substance of the book in only three weeks.

Personal encouragement often makes the difference. Even the Fathers Provincial might take on the task of urging specific men to write—including scholastics—assuring them of assistance, time, and the Provincial's personal interest. Rectors should urge their



men to write also—and here it would help if the proceeds from books were credited to the houses and not to province projects. (I have never understood why book royalties should be singled out and made payable to the province. The present system seems to work directly against the production of books—in other words, against itself. Would not a slight change in our tax system produce more writing and actually not cost anything?)

### GOAL GRADIENTS

If writing is so difficult—and all the evidence indicates that it is—we might remedy this to some extent by reference to what psychologists call the “goal gradient.” The goal gradient is simply a goal immediately in front of you that makes work easier somehow. High jumpers do much better with a crossbar in front of them than without it. Runners run faster and get less tired when someone is pacing them. Farm workers have been found to work much harder when paid each day, and even more when paid at the end of a row. This latter experiment is inhuman, of course, but it brings out an interesting fact of psychology.

We might try to supply more goal gradients for writers—including scholastics. And this means rewards, special consideration, privileges, if you will. Most writers would be happy if the reward for writing were just more time to write. But most ask something less: just the convenience that will help them use their present time efficiently. These conveniences would be things like secretarial help, dictaphones, long-distance phone privileges, money for buying books, for travel, for office equipment like electric typewriters and tape recorders.

Some of this is already done. I have heard of a number of cases where a Jesuit was permitted to “invest in research and development” of his specialty and use for this purpose his earnings from writing. One Jesuit told me recently that he was given permission to finance his own apostolic project as long as he didn’t beg, and he immediately sat down and wrote a very useful, and profitable book—his first. “Nothing in the world turned me on,” he said, “the way that permission did.” The arrangement has been permitted to certain scholastic writers also, and I believe it deserves further expansion.



*STILL MYSTERY*

But in the final analysis, most writers cannot explain what "turns them on," what makes them want to work at writing, much less what might make some other man write. The chemistry of a creative atmosphere is still mostly mystery. We can, however, try to improve the situation. And trying to improve it probably *will* improve it. In the well known Hawthorne experiment in Chicago, psychologists found that adjusting the lights in a workroom made everyone work harder, whether the adjustment solved the work problems or not. Few Jesuit writers will not find it encouraging simply to know that our superiors are taking an interest in this particularly dark workroom of ours.



# Enrollment Statistics

SCHOLASTIC YEAR 1967-1968

One hundred and ninety thousand, seven hundred and four (190,704) students were enrolled at the beginning of the current scholastic year in Jesuit colleges and universities, seminaries and high schools in the United States. This represents an enrollment increase over last year of 4,488 students, a growth of 2.4%

Although there was an increase (3,802) in the grand total of enrollments, exclusive of summer sessions, in the colleges and universities, decreases were noted in the evening division of Liberal Arts (533), in Education (616), in Engineering (188), in Nursing (159), in Pharmacy (4), in the evening division of Law (103), and in extension and low-tuition courses (2,225). Summer session enrollments, not included in the grand totals of this study, increased by 2,766 (4.7%). Freshman enrollments increased by 1,000.

Loyola (Chicago) still leads all other Jesuit institutions in total enrollment followed by Marquette, Saint Louis, Fordham and Detroit. The order is changed slightly if we consider only full-time enrollments. In this category Marquette leads all others followed by Boston College, Fordham, Saint Louis and Loyola (Chicago). Enrollment in Liberal Arts Colleges is highest at Loyola (Chicago), Marquette, Fordham, Saint Louis and John Carroll.

The category of "Miscellaneous" includes Jesuit seminarians, nuns in the Sister Formation program and students majoring in Architecture, Dental Hygiene, Foreign Service, Journalism, Language and Linguistics, Medical Technology, Physical Therapy and Speech. It also includes students in the Experimental College at Fordham, in the Rome Center of Loyola (Chicago), in Parks College of Saint Louis University and students working toward an Associate's Degree or Commercial Certificate at Saint Joseph's College in Philadelphia.

The number of coeds in our Jesuit institutions has decreased slightly to a total of 41,809 or 27.6% of our total enrollment. A very slight increase in the number of non-Catholic students brings the total in this category to 24,148 or 16.0% of the total enrollment.



Enrollments in our high schools remain fairly constant. The increase of 1009 students is accounted for mainly by the incoming freshman classes at our four newest high schools (Bishop Connolly, DeSmet, Saint John's in Toledo and Walsh Jesuit High School) none of which has as yet enrolled or graduated a senior class. Enrollment increases were noted in 33 of our high schools; 21 reported decreases and one (Seattle Preparator School) remained the same. Freshman enrollment decreased by 107 students. The upper elementary grades are taught in a few of our high schools. Students registered in these grades are listed as "specials".

Loyola of Wilmette continues to be the largest Jesuit high school in the United States followed by Boston College High School, Saint Xavier's of Cincinnati, Saint Ignatius of Cleveland, Saint Ignatius of San Francisco and Saint Ignatius of Chicago. All these schools have enrollments in excess of 1,000.

It is difficult to determine the changes in enrollment at our seminaries because of the new programs of studies which are now evolving, and the enrollment of many scholastics in our colleges and universities. The statistics received from Tertianships, Theologates, Philosophates, Juniorates and Novitiates indicate a drop in enrollment of 228. The three minor seminaries conducted by the Society for candidates for the diocesan priesthood report a decrease in enrollment of 40.

The grand total of all students in the 110 schools administered by Jesuits of the American Assistancy in the scholastic year 1967-1968 is as follows:

28 Colleges and Universities . . . . .	151,363
55 High Schools . . . . .	37,327
24 Houses of Formation . . . . .	1,817
2 Minor Seminaries . . . . .	152
1 School for Delayed Vocations . . . . .	45
<hr/> 110 Jesuit Institutions . . . . .	<hr/> 190,704



## High School Enrollment 1967-1968

TABLE ONE

	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors	Specials	Totals 1967-68	Totals 1966-67	Increase or Decrease
Bellarmino College Preparatory (San Jose) . . . . .	285	265	235	214	0	999	949	+ 50
Bellarmino Preparatory School (Tacoma) . . . . .	162	127	105	103	0	497	468	+ 29
Bishop Connolly High (Fall River) . . . . .	101	107	0	0	0	208	120	+ 88
Bishop's Latin School (Pittsburgh) . . . . .	40	27	32	20	0	119	132	- 13
Boston College High School . . . . .	359	339	318	291	1	1,308	1,341	- 33
Brebeuf Preparatory School (Indianapolis) . . . . .	215	179	147	142	0	683	653	+ 30
Brooklyn Preparatory School . . . . .	288	257	226	218	0	989	950	+ 39
Brophy College Prep School (Phoenix) . . . . .	161	161	123	101	0	546	577	- 31
Campion Jesuit High School . . . . .	157	160	131	126	0	574	589	- 15
Canisius High School . . . . .	237	258	212	217	0	924	925	- 1
Chaplain Kapaun Memorial High (Wichita) . . . . .	142	134	128	93	0	497	514	- 17
Cheverus High School (Portland, Me.) . . . . .	108	112	100	74	2	396	373	+ 23
Colegio San Ignacio (Puerto Rico) . . . . .	154	144	132	87	266	783	773	+ 10
Cranwell School (Lenox, Mass.) . . . . .	53	63	67	57	4	244	240	+ 4
Creighton Preparatory School . . . . .	247	230	223	198	1	898	930	- 32
DeSmet Jesuit High School (Saint Louis) . . . . .	245	0	0	0	0	245	...	+ 245
Fairfield College Preparatory School . . . . .	211	218	214	147	0	790	788	+ 2
Fordham Preparatory School . . . . .	188	231	190	218	0	827	878	- 51
Georgetown Preparatory School . . . . .	86	92	76	67	0	321	311	+ 10
Gonzaga High School (D.C.) . . . . .	200	198	167	181	0	746	770	- 24
Gonzaga Preparatory School (Spokane) . . . . .	208	200	194	177	0	779	801	- 22
Jesuit High School (Dallas) . . . . .	171	128	125	117	0	541	548	- 7
Jesuit High School (El Paso) . . . . .	112	95	72	84	22	385	394	- 9
Jesuit High School (New Orleans) . . . . .	236	221	212	177	97	943	910	+ 33
Jesuit High School (Portland) . . . . .	166	118	116	112	0	512	470	+ 42
Jesuit High School (Sacramento) . . . . .	141	136	102	85	0	464	418	+ 46
Jesuit High School (Shreveport) . . . . .	82	86	69	71	23	331	322	+ 9
Jesuit High School (Tampa) . . . . .	167	144	119	89	0	519	460	+ 59
Loyola Academy (Wilmette, Ill.) . . . . .	508	439	350	360	0	1,657	1,559	+ 98
Loyola High School (L.A.) . . . . .	262	232	227	234	0	955	974	- 19
Loyola High School (Missoula) . . . . .	40	34	32	34	0	140	129	+ 11
Loyola High School (Towson, Md.) . . . . .	190	168	170	142	0	670	671	- 1
Loyola School (N. Y.) . . . . .	53	43	47	43	0	186	176	+ 10
Marquette University High School . . . . .	272	235	219	246	0	972	947	+ 25
McQuaid Jesuit High School (Rochester) . . . . .	208	209	163	165	60	805	723	+ 82
Regis High School (Denver) . . . . .	177	137	116	132	0	562	583	- 21
Regis High School (N. Y.) . . . . .	171	155	143	136	0	605	594	+ 11
Rockhurst High School . . . . .	220	203	193	189	0	805	798	+ 7
St. Ignatius High School (Chicago) . . . . .	262	272	261	249	0	1,044	1,091	- 47
St. Ignatius High School (Cleveland) . . . . .	303	287	276	241	0	1,107	1,148	- 41
St. Ignatius High School (San Francisco) . . . . .	292	275	239	262	0	1,068	990	+ 78
St. John's High School (Toledo) . . . . .	220	221	207	0	0	648	473	+ 175
St. Joseph's Preparatory School . . . . .	228	232	172	191	0	823	819	+ 4
St. Louis University High School . . . . .	229	216	216	204	0	865	860	+ 5
St. Peter's Preparatory School (Jersey City) . . . . .	244	251	232	272	0	999	1,014	- 15
St. Xavier High School (Cincinnati) . . . . .	344	330	310	274	0	1,258	1,253	+ 5
Scranton Preparatory School . . . . .	157	150	95	85	0	487	457	+ 30
Seattle Preparatory School . . . . .	144	149	119	117	0	529	529	...
Strake Jesuit College Preparatory (Houston) . . . . .	106	103	99	82	0	390	418	- 28
University of Detroit High School . . . . .	232	259	243	242	0	976	1,043	- 67
Walsh Jesuit High School (Cuyahoga Falls, O.) . . . . .	179	178	150	0	0	507	358	+ 149
Xavier High School (Concord) . . . . .	114	105	93	98	0	410	399	+ 11
Xavier High School (N. Y.) . . . . .	265	244	233	225	0	967	975	- 8
Colegio San Jose (Peru) . . . . .	80	65	63	56	36	299	273	+ 26
Colegio San Mateo (Chile) . . . . .	36	23	12	9	445	525	460	+ 65
Totals 1967-68 . . . . .	10,458	9,645	8,513	7,754	957	37,327	36,318	+ 1,009
Totals 1966-67 . . . . .	10,565	9,186	8,165	7,554	848	36,318		
Increase or Decrease . . . . .	-107	+ 459	+ 348	+ 200	+109	+1,009		



# Jesuit Educational Association College and University Enrollment, 1967-1968

TABLE TWO

	Liberal Arts		Commerce		Education	Engineering	Nursing	Pharmacy	Social Work	Dentistry	Law		Medicine	Graduate	Miscellaneous	Full Time Totals	Part Time Totals	Full and Part Time Totals	Extension Low Tuition	Grand Total	Summer School	
	Day	Evening	Day	Evening							Day	Evening									Undergrad	Graduate
Boston College.....	2,359	592	1,857	324	1,193	...	591	...	122	...	545	...	...	2,009	137	8,125	1,604	9,729	...	9,729	1,270	1,113
Canisius College.....	1,514	441	441	444	26	...	124	...	...	...	...	...	...	700	...	2,527	1,163	3,690	13	3,703	723	394
Creighton University.....	2,243	49	424	...	...	...	146	138	...	186	246	...	288	394	...	3,491	623	4,114	...	4,114	525	526
Fairfield University.....	1,661	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1,077	...	1,721	1,017	2,738	...	2,738	372	810
Fordham University.....	3,376	403	1,048	244	1,500	...	...	238	...	...	517	266	...	2,694	164	7,897	2,553	10,450	812	11,262	1,912	2,034
Georgetown University.....	1,652	...	474	3	...	...	294	...	...	369	868	364	438	1,461	1,557	6,509	971	7,480	...	7,480	4,205	917
Gonzaga University.....	1,912	...	144	...	5	68	117	...	...	...	135	...	...	84	227	2,306	386	2,692	...	2,692	438	326
Holy Cross College.....	2,317	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	...	2,312	9	2,321	32	2,353	...	...
John Carroll University.....	2,347	1,106	181	100	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	725	...	3,049	1,410	4,459	145	4,604	2,503	1,084
Le Moyne College.....	1,545	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1,508	37	1,545	73	1,618	501	...
Loyola College (Baltimore).....	937	1,337	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	704	...	1,021	1,957	2,978	...	2,978	858	696
Loyola University (Chicago).....	4,126	2,930	829	...	...	...	350	...	...	362	251	140	360	2,748	312	7,208	5,200	12,408	1,700	14,108	5,651	2,162
Loyola University (Los Angeles)	1,107	...	212	...	...	175	...	...	...	...	358	316	...	296	...	1,770	694	2,464	...	2,464	1,170	407
Loyola University (New Orleans)	1,259	...	543	1,103	...	...	...	...	...	224	466	...	...	541	198	2,081	2,253	4,334	...	4,334	...	...
Marquette University.....	3,939	649	909	647	...	1,377	409	...	...	461	298	...	399	1,360	1,040	8,638	2,850	11,488	1,416	12,904	2,721	1,327
Regis College.....	354	130	211	37	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	261	801	192	993	...	993	...	...
Rockhurst College.....	679	...	338	1,473	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	965	1,525	2,490	...	2,490	799	...
St. Joseph's College.....	1,842	502	...	1,617	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	215	2,581	2,500	4,257	6,757	235	6,992	2,468	55
St. Louis University.....	3,375	387	670	420	...	346	549	...	155	235	217	128	452	2,987	757	7,685	2,993	10,678	823	11,501	2,689	2,620
St. Peter's College.....	1,615	693	571	1,105	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2,358	1,626	3,984	313	4,297	1,921	...
Seattle University.....	1,746	...	424	...	539	194	222	...	...	...	...	...	...	380	346	3,050	801	3,851	...	3,851	1,273	235
Spring Hill College.....	1,236	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	964	272	1,236	...	1,236	811	...
University of Detroit.....	2,232	810	880	1,289	...	1,139	...	...	...	321	189	120	...	1,493	330	5,154	3,649	8,803	2,294	11,097	1,817	1,301
University of San Francisco.....	1,921	1,006	465	788	...	...	320	...	...	...	221	139	...	846	638	3,911	2,433	6,344	152	6,496	3,455	398
University of Santa Clara.....	1,976	...	618	...	...	301	...	...	...	...	175	58	...	1,986	...	3,432	1,682	5,114	320	5,434	485	825
University of Scranton.....	994	325	399	254	281	28	28	...	...	...	...	...	...	772	...	1,722	1,359	3,081	...	3,081	1,013	694
Wheeling College.....	819	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	795	24	819	...	819	218	25
Xavier University.....	1,632	563	709	405	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2,643	43	2,720	3,275	5,995	...	5,995	1,491	2,010
Totals 1967-1968.....	52,715	11,923	12,347	10,253	3,544	3,628	3,150	376	277	2,158	4,351	1,666	1,937	26,119	8,591	96,220	46,815	143,035	8,328	151,363	41,289	19,959
Totals 1966-1967.....	50,170	12,456	12,154	8,794	4,160	3,816	3,309	380	252	2,108	4,011	1,769	1,904	24,470	7,255*	92,569*	44,439	137,008*	10,553	147,561*	40,606	17,876
Increase or Decrease.....	+ 2,545	- 533	+ 193	+ 1,459	- 616	- 188	- 159	- 4	+ 25	+ 50	+ 340	- 103	+ 33	+ 1,649	+ 1,336	+ 3,651	+ 2,376	+ 6,027	- 2,225	+ 3,802	+ 683	+ 2,083
Percent.....	+ 5.1%	- 4.3%	+ 1.6%	+ 16.6%	- 14.8%	- 4.9%	- 4.8%	- 1.1%	+ 9.9%	+ 2.4%	+ 8.5%	- 5.9%	+ 1.7%	+ 6.7%	+ 5.6%	+ 3.8%	+ 5.1%	+ 4.3%	- 2.4%	+ 2.5%	+ 1.7%	+ 10.5%



## Composite College Statistics, 1966-1967, 1967-1968

TABLE THREE	Grand Total		Increase Decrease		Freshman Enrollment		Increase Decrease	
	1967-68	1966-67	Numerical	Percentage	1967-68	1966-67	Numerical	Percentage
Boston College.....	9,729	9,568	+ 161	+ 1.7	1,701	1,666	+ 35	+ 2.1
Canisius College.....	3,703	3,361	+ 342	+10.2	879	826	+ 53	+ 6.4
Creighton University.....	4,114	4,080	+ 34	+ 0.8	827	846	- 19	- 2.2
Fairfield University.....	2,738	2,506	+ 232	+ 9.3	503	483	+ 20	+ 4.1
Fordham University.....	11,262	10,873	+ 389	+ 3.6	1,427	1,435	- 8	- 0.6
Georgetown University.....	7,480	7,591	- 111	- 1.5	1,030	951	+ 79	+ 8.3
Gonzaga University.....	2,692	2,573	+ 119	+ 4.6	690	594	+ 96	+16.2
Holy Cross College.....	2,353	2,246	+ 107	+ 4.8	612	652	- 40	- 6.1
John Carroll University.....	4,604	4,233*	+ 371	+ 4.0	825	909*	- 84	- 9.2
Le Moyne College.....	1,618	1,625	- 7	- 0.4	358	392	- 34	- 8.7
Loyola College (Baltimore).....	2,978	3,095	- 117	- 3.8	356	372	- 16	- 4.3
Loyola University (Chicago).....	14,108	13,798	+ 310	+ 2.2	1,945	2,160	- 215	-10.0
Loyola University (Los Angeles)...	2,464	2,588	- 124	- 4.8	347	370	- 23	- 6.2
Loyola University (New Orleans)...	4,334	4,497*	- 163	- 3.6	503	625*	- 122	-19.5
Marquette University.....	12,904	13,042	- 138	- 1.1	1,704	1,607	+ 97	+ 6.0
Regis College.....	993	1,078	- 85	- 7.9	202	279	- 77	-27.6
Rockhurst College.....	2,490	2,335	+ 155	+ 6.6	289	286	+ 3	+ 1.4
St. Joseph's College.....	6,992	7,050	- 58	- 0.8	2,028	1,388	+ 640	+46.1
St. Louis University.....	11,501	11,148	+ 353	+ 3.2	1,683	1,660	+ 23	+ 1.4
St. Peter's College.....	4,297	3,693	+ 604	+16.4	1,256	999	+ 257	+25.7
Seattle University.....	3,851	3,237*	+ 614	+19.0	786	760*	+ 26	+ 3.4
Spring Hill College.....	1,236	1,348	- 112	- 8.3	289	274	+ 15	+ 5.5
University of Detroit.....	11,097	11,364	- 267	- 2.3	1,362	1,131	+ 231	+20.4
University of San Francisco.....	6,496	6,183	+ 313	+ 5.1	968	1,076	- 108	-10.0
University of Santa Clara.....	5,434	4,804	+ 630	+13.1	854	677	+ 177	+26.1
University of Scranton.....	3,081	3,087	- 6	- 0.2	403	376	+ 27	+ 7.2
Wheeling College.....	819	800	+ 19	+ 2.4	228	269	- 41	-15.2
Xavier University.....	5,995	5,758	+ 237	+ 4.1	676	668	+ 8	+ 1.2
Totals.....	151,363	147,561*	+3802	+ 2.6	24,731	23,731*	+1,000	+ 4.2

Adjusted 1966 figures



## Jesuit Houses of Studies Enrollment 1967-1968

TABLE FOUR	1968				Totals 1967-68	Totals 1966-67	Increase Decrease
	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year			
<b>TERTIANSHIPS</b>							
Auriesville.....	36	..	..	..	36	32	+ 4
Clarkston.....	14	..	..	..	14	31	- 17
Decatur.....	24	..	..	..	24	25	- 1
Pomfret.....	24	..	..	..	24	34	- 10
Port Townsend.....	22	..	..	..	22	21	+ 1
Totals.....	120				120	143	- 23
<b>THEOLOGATES</b>							
Alma.....	25	28	27	26	106	107	- 1
North Aurora.....	28	30	21	22	101	101	..
Saint Louis.....	33	31	36	32	132	150	- 18
Weston.....	16	18	20	18	72	79	- 7
Woodstock.....	48	45	48	52	193	206	- 13
Totals.....	150	152	152	150	604	643	- 39
<b>JUNIORATES AND PHILOSOPHATES</b>							
Clarkston.....	9	9	..	..	18	31	- 13
Florissant.....	10	14	..	..	24	32	- 8
Los Angeles.....	23	25	..	..	48	50	- 2
Milford.....	8	17	..	..	25	36	- 11
Mobile.....	9	13	24	18	64	69	- 5
North Aurora.....	..	..	26	30	56	69	- 13
St. Bonifacius.....	16	21	..	..	37	45	- 8
Saint Louis: Fusz.....	..	..	53	59	112	130	- 18
Shadowbrook.....	14	..	..	..	14	20	- 6
Shrub Oak.....	..	30	62	43	135	181	- 46
Spokane.....	12	12	35	47	106	119	- 13
Weston.....	..	19	30	32	81	86	- 5
Totals.....	101	160	230	229	720	868	-148
<b>NOVITIATES</b>							
Clarkston (Buff).....	7	8	..	..	15	21	- 6
Clarkston (Det).....	12	10	..	..	22	24	- 2
Florissant.....	16	15	..	..	31	28	+ 3
Grand Coteau.....	14	15	..	..	29	30	- 1
Los Gatos.....	21	15	..	..	36	45	- 9
Milford.....	20	18	..	..	38	37	+ 1
Poughkeepsie.....	31	19	..	..	50	50	..
St. Bonifacius.....	15	21	..	..	36	45	- 9
Shadowbrook.....	25	20	..	..	45	41	+ 4
Sheridan.....	24	7	..	..	31	30	+ 1
Wernersville.....	22	18	..	..	40	40	..
Totals.....	207	166	..	..	373	391	- 18
<b>MINOR SEMINARIES</b>							
Corpus Christi.....	22	15	7	31#	75	79	- 4
Fresno.....	10	13	20	34##	77	88	- 11
St. Philip Neri (Boston).....	..	..	..	..	45	70	- 25
Totals.....					197	237	- 40

# Includes 16 in Junior College  
 ## Includes 23 in Junior College



# Appreciation of the Visual Arts in the Scholasticate

DONALD F. ROWE, S.J.

In accord with the decree of the 31st General Congregation on "Cultivating the Arts in the Society" (Chapter V, Section 30, pp. 98-99), it seems fitting that courses in the Fine Arts be planned that will aim at the goals set before us. In the words of the document, "During their training Jesuits should be given the opportunities to become acquainted with and to appreciate the arts as a part of their general education so that all may be better prepared for the apostolate in today's world." While the intention of this decree extends to theatre, ballet, music, opera, and so forth, the purpose of this particular article is to describe how the norms of the document were applied to a course in Appreciation of the Visual Arts that was taught to the Novices and Juniors at Milford Novitiate in the summer of 1967.

Prior to the course, the Meier Art Judgment Test was administered to thirty Novices, thirty Juniors, and five Junior Brothers. The norms for this test have been obtained from students taking art in junior and senior high schools in twenty-five different localities involving more than thirty-three hundred cases. The scores for the Jesuits were the following:

<i>Juniors</i>	High	— 85%ile	<i>Novices</i>	High	— 85%ile
<i>&amp; J.B.s</i>	1st Quarter	— 50%ile		1st Quarter	— 46%ile
	Median	— 28%ile		Median	— 25%ile
	3rd Quarter	— 25%ile		3rd Quarter	— 13%ile
	Low	— 01%ile		Low	— 03%ile

While the norms are derived from students who are already interested in art, we must consider that these are high school students. Furthermore, the comparative percentiles of the Novices and Juniors differ very little and show that there has been scarcely any growth in this area during their regular liberal arts studies. And so some sort of instruction in the arts seemed to be called for.

The period of art classes at Milford ran concurrently with the normal summer school sessions at Xavier University in Cincinnati which a number of the Juniors attended. For various reasons a



full three-hour undergraduate course was not possible. And so there was a total of twenty hours of class.

The group was divided into three sections so that class discussions could be more free and since there would have been schedule conflicts if the classes had been offered at only one time. Each group met three times a week for an hour and fifteen minutes. Since it is impossible in such a short time to give any overall perspective of art history and since the principles of judgment seem to be initially more important than historical continuity, the foundational principles of line, color, and composition were presented to them as the very core of the course. However these relationships cannot be effectively explained in the abstract and so a historical series of works of art was taken up, but considerably abbreviated from the usual pyramids-to-Picasso type of thing. The course began with a study of the Parthenon and Chartres Cathedral, viewing them as manifestations of very different worshipping communities, and comparing and contrasting them in their architectural form. Giotto and van Eyck were examined as initiators of the artistic Renaissance in their respective countries and developers of new forms that profoundly influenced the development of western art in the ensuing centuries. Raphael and Michelangelo, two of the greatest artists of the Renaissance, were seen to have epitomized tendencies that had their beginning in Giotto and as having prepared the way for the new form in art called the Baroque. El Greco was studied as the apogee of Mannerism. The Society's important position in the arts from the time of the commissioning of the Gesu in Rome until the time of the Suppression was developed. The post-Reformation spirit of the 17th century was seen as expressed in Rembrandt, as was the break-away from neo-classical and academic traditions in Monet and the new 20th century feeling for pure form, color, and composition in Frank Lloyd Wright and Picasso. Each of these subjects was explained in terms of the objective principles their art involves and in relation to the pertinent theological, philosophical, economic, and social background of their respective periods. These discussions helped the students to relate art to the other disciplines they had already studied and to see that the humanistic goals of understanding other men's ideals and entering into historic dialogue with them can be approached in other than verbal terms. The discussions also served to make the works of art



intelligible as logical products of their age and thus relevant to any thorough study of history.

Lectures were accompanied by the appropriate slides projected alternately by two projectors. This method allows for comparing and contrasting the visual material and for each slide to remain on the screen long enough to impress itself on the student's mind. This method also facilitates an easy and uninterrupted flow in the lecture, since the projectors were handled by a student responding to a set signal.

Additional types of instructive matter were also made available for them. There was a weekly showing of films borrowed from the Cincinnati Public Library on the lives of various artists, techniques of painting or sculpture, background history of a period, and so forth. A number of small-group discussions were offered for those interested in various facets of aesthetic theory. And, of course, there was a basic reading list for the students to get through in the hour and a half of study asked for each class period. H. W. Janson's book, *The History of Art*, was used as the basic text and Erwin Panofsky's paperback, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, was the principal supplemental reading. Milford is fortunate in having a very fine library and several books were requested before the course that filled out the art history section nicely and made it a fine reference collection.

The attitude of the group was very interesting. Initially they were divided into those who knew they did not know anything about art and who wanted to find out what it was all about and those who thought art was somewhat "sissy," the foolish hobby of the wealthy, an affectation of subjective judgments, something, in short, to be suspicious of. In fact, one of the Novices mentioned that he and some others had privately thought that the course had been scheduled as a kind of academic probation, to mortify them and test their vocations.

So some came to the course to learn, some to be convinced. In the beginning their reception of the material with more or less enthusiasm was in proportion to their attitudes. This was to be expected. Yet in approximately two weeks, or six classes, all of them seemed equally open and ready to learn. Surprisingly enough, it was the very people who had been rather unhappy about the idea of the course who came and explained their previous attitudes. Novices and Juniors both began to seriously dis-



cuss this art that they now thought "cool" and to bring up questions that had arisen in these conversations. And they started to notice some of the pictures around the house and question their value.

Their individual reactions and development were borne out by the tests administered every third class or so. Basically this testing was divided into five types that indicated the students' progress:

- 1.) The first few tests asked them merely to recognize and date a given work which had been discussed in class and to analyze it in the manner suggested in class. Their aptitude for this kind of test indicated whether they had reviewed the material and whether they had understood the matter as it was presented.

- 2.) The second type of quiz asked not only names and dates of works discussed in class, but required them to compare and contrast works of various periods that had been rather boldly juxtaposed. These works called for their recognizing that there may be multiple solutions to a single artistic problem, or that a single formal solution satisfies the requirements of two works that seem radically different, or, finally, that there may be similar artistic intention in works that are not ordinarily associated with one another.

- 3.) This form of testing consisted in asking the student to identify by style works of art that had not been discussed in class, but which were typical of an artist whose works had been studied. And they were also asked for a formal analysis of these works.

- 4.) The fourth kind of testing required them to recognize the period and give a formal analysis of works of art by artists that had not been studied in class, but whose works manifested a spirit or style that had been studied.

- 5.) The last type of examination, included in only the mid-semester and the final tests, consisted in offering the student a choice of topics to measure his comprehension of the historical perspective for the various periods or artists.

While this may seem to be quite a bit to ask in such a short course, it seemed worth while to see how the students would respond to the basic types of questioning. Their more and more astute responses to these tests were very encouraging. And it can be honestly said that their discernment improved radically from the beginning to the end of the course.



There are several improvements though that could well be incorporated into such a course. It certainly seems that these Jesuits should have the same three-hour college-credit course that their peers at Columbia or Yale are receiving. With this would come the additional study time that one could expect to have them do further readings in basic art history and theory texts. Furthermore, they could be asked to do a short paper that would necessitate their direct confrontation with a work of art in a local museum and would introduce them to museum-going and to approaching works and styles never before studied in an intelligent and analytic way.

It would also be highly beneficial if these Jesuits had the opportunity of receiving practical instruction in creative arts from a qualified artist-teacher for at least a few weeks of any session. This would help them to understand how difficult it is to create a work of art and to allow them to experience the expansion and expression of the creative activity. Moreover, even this basic familiarity with the different media and creative techniques would heighten their aesthetic perception.

In order that this art course would not be isolated in a single summer session, it was important that there be a follow-up in the subsequent school year. This was accomplished at Milford in the form of a monthly hour of films similar to those shown weekly during the course. These are rented from the large collection at the University of Indiana and will hopefully serve to give the students new insights into artists and art forms. Also developing from the course was the buying and attractive framing of a historical survey of great art in the media of fine prints. These replace the "religious" pictures of dubious aesthetic value that hung in the building.

With the summer's classes and the continuing plan for art education, the Congregation's expressed desire for development in this area seems on the way to fulfillment with this group at Milford. Hopefully it will have the effect that the decree of the Congregation calls for: "Indeed in our day especially works of art can exert a vast influence, whether it be with respect to the growth and unfolding of human personality, or to the development of civil society, or to the mutual union of men, a union that paves the way to union with God."



# The University Community and Labor Unions

JAMEES M. KENNY, S.J.

Private educational institutions are well known for their failure to follow enlightened personnel practices for their semi-professional and service employees. During the past decade, some progress in the treatment of these groups of employees has been made as the by-product of the faculty drive for better salaries and benefit programs. Whenever progress in personnel practices is found, it is usually in urban institutions where competition for workers in the local market has forced upgrading of wages and benefit programs. Publicly supported institutions, whose wages and benefits are tied to civil service standards, have also influenced the practices in the private school sector.

Failures to be realistic and the ignoring of responsibility for the welfare of service personnel have done much to open the door to the invasion of campuses by labor unions. Labor unions were first successful on college campuses in organizing workers in the highly sensitive area of food services. The employment of concessionaires to operate college food services was the immediate means by which unions were introduced on campus. Building maintenance unions quickly followed this pattern. Most smaller schools in which the number of employees is limited remain untouched by the usual organizing activities because the union dues collected will not support the cost of local union programs. It is also true that in many of these smaller schools there will be found loyal but poorly paid plant employees who have for years constituted the undermanned staff so characteristic of these institutions.

The reasons which underlie this failure by administrators to provide adequate wage and fringe benefits for their non-academic employees are not the reasons usually voiced. The rationale most frequently proposed is: "We just don't have the money." But nonetheless, as non-academic employees can easily see, the faculty, through the efforts of their AAUP organization, have consistently succeeded in reducing their work-loads while increasing their annual salaries to a level which places them among the better paid professional groups in the nation today. It is logical, therefore, to ask why, if institutions have the money to respond to these



faculty demands, they cannot do at least somewhat more for the non-faculty employee? The honest answer is simple and unattractive. As administrators we have responded to that group which could put the most effective pressure on us.

In the absence of similar organized pressure from employees, educational administrators are prone to ignore the problems and complaints of staff employees as relatively unimportant in comparison to those of the faculty and professional groups. With the advent of the professional concessionaires and the increasing shortage of personnel, the situation is changing rapidly.

The non-profit status of our business has historically protected us from the forceful attentions of most non-academic organized labor groups. We seem to have taken full advantage of this circumstance to defer any serious effort to up-grade the salaries of our non-academic employees. In this respect, we have failed to meet one major obligation of good administration. Too many private colleges and universities have been doing what they have *had* to do rather than what they *ought* to be doing about the wages for that segment of their employees not eligible for membership in the AAUP. But the time has long since passed when any employees of our institutions can be treated as second-class citizens. If a man is treated as he is, he will stay as he is, but if he is treated as if he were what he ought to be, and could be, he will become a bigger and better man. The only realistic way to develop and sustain a satisfactory labor relations program among the staff and service personnel, both skilled and unskilled, is to recognize fully that adequate and competitive salaries and wages are an essential part of our economy on campus as well as in the community. Terms and conditions of employment must be comparable to those generally regarded as contemporary standards.

Some of our failures in this regard have now been corrected for us. Additional corrections are going to extend far beyond anything we have imagined, if current proposals now being considered by legislatures at both state and national levels are finally enacted into law. There are many new developments, also, in the whole area of labor relations which need careful study by institutional administrators and particularly by those officers concerned with colleges and universities. For, after all, if our institutions hope to remain immune from harassment by union and labor organizers,



they must remain competitive by offering employees as much as, if not more than, they are offered by outside union membership.

I should like, now, to probe a little more deeply into the situations created for our institutions by factors of governmental and union activities and the budgetary problems to which such activities must give rise.

The Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1966 put an end to any illusion that colleges and universities were or were not covered by fair labor laws. Institutions of higher education are specifically covered by the new amendments. Some few institutions, Harvard for example, assumed since 1950 that they might be covered by the law, so the effect of the new amendments on their operations will not be too drastic. Unfortunately, this is not the case with most institutions. The strain on the budgets of many private schools during the next five years of annual escalation in the minimum wage and the change in overtime pay minimums will be very great.

Private school tuition and fees have been increased regularly, but chiefly to keep pace with the increases in faculty salaries and new educational programs. Fund raising efforts have all been devoted to improving and expanding the physical plant. It is true that some small increases for service personnel have been made but without any realistic percentage relationship to increases in faculty salaries. The fact that competition for faculty is in a national market whereas the competition for service personnel is in a local market helps to explain this difference, but it does not excuse it.

Schools are now being compelled to provide the funds to meet these mandatory adjustments without any ready means for increasing income to do so. Tuition and fee charges have just about reached a plateau for most schools. Any increases in income which it may be possible to realize will continue to be demanded for further faculty increases. It will be hard to sell annual alumni giving programs or drives on the basis of supplying funds for increases to the janitorial staff or business staff, for that matter. In the absence of increased endowment revenues, and the unlikely advent of public funds being made available for private institutions, the means to meet this first requirement for wage increases will have to come from within current budget limitations. This is



not going to be easy. The important thing is for us to look ahead and to prepare for the inevitable.

It may be true as charged that our colleges have far too many incompetent service personnel, largely because of low wages. For these persons the mandatory increases in minimum wages are a real advantage. Unfortunately, increasing the cost for their services does not increase the quality of their work. However, the increased wage level may make it possible to attract a somewhat better quality of workers. That is not as easy to accomplish as it sounds. A favorite notion of many hopeful college business officers is that the same job can be done with fewer workers if they are better qualified. Unfortunately, there just are not going to be replacements ready to move in to take the places of the less able. And there is an even more dismaying prospect. If workers become unionized, the inefficient, less able ones usually prove to be the greatest source of complaints and labor problems.

These considerations can lead to but one conclusion. If institutions hope to meet competition for trained workers, they will have to subscribe to an enlightened attitude toward service personnel benefits. This means some changes in habits of thought and practice. For although it is not easy to face the fact, the extension of much of the current social legislation to educational institutions was the direct result of the failure by institutions to recognize their obligations to the semi-professional and service employees, or by their unwillingness to meet those obligations.

Even though Harvard was aware as early as 1950 that it would be required to conform to minimum wage regulations, it still permitted its labor practices to provide a fertile field for union activities so that this university now has at least twenty-eight union contracts. Is this an indication that labor union leaders were able to negotiate working conditions for their membership which were better than enlightened Harvard was able or willing to provide on its own initiative? Whatever the answer, it is not likely to be complimentary to Harvard's administrative officers.

It would be interesting to learn the advantages offered employees of New York University by the twenty-two labor unions with which they have a contract. It might be more interesting to know whether or not New York University would have had any unions on campus had their wages and fringe benefits been approximately those promised by the unions. Union promises usually



are approximately those of the current labor market outside the university.

Private higher education in New York State is now confronted with potential labor problems of unprecedented proportions. A bill (#100) dated May 8, 1967, was introduced by Mr. Frank Corbett in the New York State Legislature and was referred to the Committee on Labor, Civil Service, and Public Pension. Mr. Corbett's Bill proposes constitutional changes leading to a labor bill of rights which is almost unbelievable in scope. Essentially, the bill is designed to guarantee economic security and prosperity for all workers. It seeks to provide them complete protection against any social or economic risk by requiring the state, if necessary, to assure the existence at all times of employment opportunities for all adult residents. Not only must the state guarantee work for all, but it is being asked to guarantee wages at prevailing rates in the localities in which the individuals reside. As part of these guarantees, the law would control working hours, remuneration for overtime, vacation, systems of workmen's compensation, disability benefits, unemployment insurance, guarantee to all employees and their families protection against the hazards of want, dependency, injury, disability, unemployment, and assure their right to adequate standards of living.

The bill of rights goes on to include the establishment of a system of health insurance as a matter of legal right. Finally, and of greatest significance to us, the bill requires the state to ensure and protect employees in the exercise of full freedom of association, in the designation of representatives of their own choosing for the purpose of collective bargaining, and to preserve their right to engage in concerted activities for their mutual aid, protection, and maintenance of bargaining power equal to that of employers.

Although it is inconceivable that such a far-reaching bill of rights could be adopted in its entirety at this point in time, the very fact that such a bill could be seriously introduced indicates clearly the direction in which we are moving. It seems inevitable that some form of such a bill of rights will be adopted in the future. The exemption by private institutions from collective bargaining will undoubtedly be removed in the State of New York. When that takes place, there is no reason to believe that all



private schools will not find themselves compelled to adjust their pay scales to a level fully comparable with local markets.

Of course, there are economic implications for all of us in adjusting to these dislocations in our operating budgets. But we must remember that such adjustments are consistent with what faculties have achieved for themselves through their organizations during the past ten years.

The time has clearly come for university administrators to re-examine their non-academic personnel programs and practices with a view to matching, if not bettering, the programs offered comparable employees by business and industry. Only by such a realistic approach can institutions hope to avoid constant stress and strain from labor agitation and employee dissatisfaction. Our campuses are overflowing now with unrest and agitation among students and faculty. We can ill afford to compound this situation by our failure to cope with potential problems among the non-academic staff.

It is urgent that we review our wage and salary schedules for service, clerical, and semi-professional personnel. It must be placed on a comparable basis with similar employees in the local labor market and a projection made to determine the added cost that will be involved. Of even more importance, we should consider *now* how these inevitable large increases are going to be met from the limited revenues which are expected to support escalating budgets. Finally, all college and university administrators are face to face with the new challenge of increasing efficiency while reducing overhead. This has been described as exercising management skills. There never was a time in the history of higher education when the need for down-to-earth realism concerning the labor problems facing us all was in such demand.

The key to gaining acceptance of the salary scale, insurance and retirement plans and other fringe benefits is largely dependent upon day to day communication and application. High employee morale is not a result of "being nice to people" or plying them with favors. Good morale and good results are not mutually exclusive. They are two aspects of the same thing—sound organization and capable leadership.

Along with the obligation which is placed on management there should be an equal obligation placed on the members of the staff. The old-fashioned word "duty" is too seldom used in our



times. Good working conditions, proper placement, and fairness and consistency of treatment are essential obligations of the enlightened *employer*. An honest day's work performed with all possible zeal, faithfulness, loyalty and capability—this is the responsibility of the *employee*. No personnel program can be fully successful which fails to give both obligations equal stress.

If an administrative officer is confronted with a request for union recognition, he is strongly urged to seek advice of legal counsel, and if possible, from a specialist in labor relations. May I remind you that if the institution should decide to grant recognition to and if it enters into a contract of employment with the union, the institution will be bound by the provisions of the contract under the rules of contract law. The University of Chicago learned this as long ago as 1949.

Finally, let me note briefly that there may also be new problems if the efforts of union organizers continue to be directed toward college and university personnel. We have seen evidence of these in the strikes in recent months by teachers in colleges across the country.

Even if these disorders never occur, there are still certain matters which call for thoughtful attention on campus. The most urgent of these include:

- a. Specific security programs
- b. Sounder salary administration
- c. Better promotional policies
- d. Better training for present jobs as well as for future promotion
- e. A stronger sense of participation
- f. An effective grievance procedure

Nowadays we must meet these problems much as industry and business do. The approaches may differ accidentally but the problems are substantially the same and need the same solutions. In all our institutions there is need for new thinking on matters such as these and for action as the thinking points the way.