

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

PASTORS AND PROFESSORS

FREEDOM IN THEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

SHIPS IN NEED OF A COMPASS

STATUS OF SPECIAL STUDIES 1968-1969

Volume 31, Number 4

March 1969

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Our Contributors

FATHER JOSEPH H. FICHTER, S.J., is the Stillman Professor of Religious Sociology at Harvard Divinity School. His article is the last of three which were published in the JEQ analyzing the data obtained through the Gerard Survey of American Jesuit Priests.

FATHER ROBERT O. BRENNAN, S.J., is the Chairman of the Physics Department at Le Moyne College. His article has been developed from a speech which he gave to a group of Jesuit Scientists last year.

FATHER WILLIAM A. SCOTT, S.J., teaches Theology at Le Moyne College and is currently on sabbatical leave at the Cambridge Center for Social Studies. His statement, published in this issue of the JEQ, has been developed from the discussions that have been in progress in the JEA during the last year on the topic of Academic Freedom and the Magisterium. The statement was written with the cooperation of Father Walter Burghardt, S.J., of Woodstock College, Fathers Christopher Mooney, S.J., and Ladislav Orsy, S.J., of Fordham University, and Father John Wright, S.J., of Alma College.

FATHER EUGENE E. GROLLMES, S.J., is completing his work for a doctoral degree in Philosophy of Education at Boston College. He has recently been appointed Chairman of the workshop which will be held in Denver this summer on "Jesuit Colleges and Universities: Their Commitment in a World of Change".

FATHER JAMES J. MCGINLEY, S.J., former Province Director of Education (Special Students) in the Buffalo Province, is the Director of the Cambridge Center for Social Studies.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

Volume 31, Number 4

March 1969

CONTENTS

PASTORS AND PROFESSORS

Joseph H. Fichter, S.J. 189

IDENTITY CRISIS FOR PRIESTS

Robert O. Brennan, S.J. 199

FREEDOM IN THEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

William A. Scott, S.J. 207

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES: SHIPS IN NEED OF A COMPASS

Eugene E. Grollmes, S.J. 212

SELF-STARTERS

James J. McGinley, S.J. 223

STATUS OF SPECIAL STUDIES 1968-1969 227

INDEX TO VOLUME 31, JUNE 1968 TO MARCH 1969 233

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>
JAMES C. CARTER, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
JOHN W. DONOHUE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
BERNARD J. DOOLEY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
E. JOSEPH GOUGH, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
HOWARD J. GRAY, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
HERMAN J. HAUCK, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
JOHN W. KELLY, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
PAUL T. LUCEY, S.J.	<i>New England 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>
JOHN F. SNYDER, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20036

COPYRIGHT, 1969

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Pastors and Professors

JOSEPH H. FICHTER, S.J.

The popular image of the American Jesuit is that of the schoolman, the professor and educator, and this is to be expected because of the large population the Society of Jesus reaches through its fifty-three high schools and twenty-eight colleges and universities. It is logical then that the people should know the Jesuits as educators since the largest number of American Jesuits are engaged in some aspect of school work. What is probably not so well known is the fact that the Society operates eighty-six parishes in this country and that many Americans know the Jesuit priest mainly as a pastor.¹

One of the interesting, and perhaps unexpected, disclosures of the Gerard survey is the indication that the Order does not have enough parishes to satisfy the apostolic inclinations of its priests. Among those who answered the questionnaire, 358 reported that their main current occupation is parish work, but 571 said that they would like to be assigned to the parishes.² Every other occupational category had more incumbents than aspirants, and this was particularly marked in the various forms of administration: 707 priests reported that they are in administrative jobs, but only 277 said that this is their personal preference.

This preference for pastoral work in the parishes raises the perennial question whether this is the only authentic "priestly" role for ordained men of God.³ The most prominent Jesuits in the United States are the specialists who have been trained in fields other than pastoral work and who have made their reputations outside the parochial occupation. They are sometimes called "hyphenated priests" as though the priest-writer, the priest-scientist, the priest-professor, were somehow functionally attenuated because he is not primarily the leader of worship services and the builder of a cultic community.⁴ Occasionally in the colleges the

1 These statistics were derived from the 1968 *Catalogus* of the New England Province of the Society of Jesus.

2 These comparisons are from Table 9, p. 10, giving the main current occupation, and Table 132, p. 137, giving their occupational preference or inclination, in Eugene Gerard and John Arnold, *Survey of American Jesuits* (1967) privately circulated.

3 For an approach to this question see William H. Dodd, "Toward A Theology of the Priesthood," *Theological Studies*, vol. 28, no. 4, December, 1967, pp. 683-705.

4 See the arguments proposed by Paul M. Quay, "Jesuit, Priest, and Scholar: A Theory of Our Learned Apostolates," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, October, 1965, pp. 98-121, who discusses three kinds of scholarship: "decoy," autonomous and apostolic.

professor is asked to do "priestly work" by helping out in the parish on Sunday, as though what he had been doing all week was secular, or "non-priestly" work.

At this point we shall leave to others the endless speculation that revolves around the theoretical contrast between professor and pastor and investigate some of the comparative and empirical data revealed in the 1967 survey of American Jesuit priests. The comparison will be limited only to the "satisfied" professors and pastors, that is, those who are content to continue in their present work and do not suggest a personal preference or inclination for some other kind of occupation within the Society.⁵

Spiritual Attraction

If one maintains that there is a secular-sacred dichotomy in the behavior of people he may assume also that the man in the parish church is performing a more sacred role than the man in the college classroom. If this is the case one may hypothesize further that "spiritual things" are more attractive to the parish priest than they are to the college professor. We have no survey data that can directly test the validity of this hypothesis, nor did we attempt to include in the survey any measures of personal religiosity. We did, however, provide a list of spiritual and devotional practices and asked that the priests indicate the extent to which these are currently "meaningful" in their religious and spiritual life (QQ. 16-24).⁶

The percentages listed in Table 3.1 represent those who answered "very much" or "quite a bit" as a judgment of the meaningfulness of these practices in their lives. The third column represents all the Jesuit priests who responded to each item, and is arranged in rank order from the most significant, the celebration of holy Mass, to the least significant, the examination of conscience. It is apparent also that the recitation of the Rosary and the reading of the Breviary are rated highly meaningful by only about one-third of all respondents. If the responses from all Jesuit priests (third column) represent an "average" judgment, the comparative statistics show that the college professors are closer to the norm than are the parish priests.⁷

⁵ We are assuming that the "satisfied" are those who gave the same answer in Q. 10, main occupation, and in Q. 57, occupational preference. For this reason many pastors and professors are not included in these comparative statistics.

⁶ See the Gerard Report, Table 26, p. 28. Here and elsewhere we have recalculated the statistics by omitting the "no answers."

⁷ With the exception of their appreciation for the annual retreat.

These comparative data reveal that these spiritual and religious practices mean more to the pastors than to the average Jesuit priest and that the differences are even greater between the pastors and the professors. Three of the practices stand out because of the enormous percentage spread between the pastors and professors: devotion to the Sacred Heart, the Rosary, and devotion to the Blessed Virgin.⁸ Like the other items on the list these may be basically explained by the degree of personal spirituality among the respondents, yet there is also the probability of a cultural influence—the fact that these three devotions have for a long time been part of the public worship services in the parish churches.

Table 3.1 Percentage comparison of pastors and professors who find these religious practices highly meaningful

	Pastors	Professors	All re- spondents
Mass	97	95	95
Annual retreat	69	58	67
Spiritual reading	65	49	51
Devotion to the Blessed Virgin	72	43	50
Devotion to the Sacred Heart	65	31	42
Meditation	43	34	41
Breviary	47	34	35
Rosary	57	25	33
Examination of Conscience	36	22	26

It is probably true that different kinds of personalities are attracted to different kinds of life careers. It would be presumptuous to suggest, however, that the “holier” and more spiritual men among the Jesuit priests are attracted to parish work, while the “less holy” among them prefer college teaching or other kinds of occupations. This kind of generalization is both a sociological and psychological over-simplification. Motivation is complex and multiple and the reasons why priests serve God and the Church in one type of ministry rather than another cannot be clearly ascertained from the findings of a research project that uses crude instruments like questionnaires.

⁸ Devotion to the Sacred Heart merits a separate section in the *Documents* of the Thirty-First General Congregation, pp. 45f., where the remarks are made that “it is no secret” that this devotion, “at least in some places, is today less appealing to Jesuits and to the faithful in general.”

Multiple Influences

Why are some Jesuits satisfied to be pastors and others to be college professors? The two categories of men we are comparing here, if faced with a choice at the present time, would choose the same occupation. Is this what they always wanted? One of the questions on the survey (Q. 56) asked them: "to what apostolic work did you feel most inclined to dedicate your life when you first entered the Society?"⁹ Table 3.2 gives the distribution of answers to this question.

Table 3.2 Comparative occupational preferences of pastors and professors when they first entered the Society.

	Pastors	Professors	All re- spondents
Parish work	27%	4%	7%
College teaching	7	47	21
Other teaching	28	19	29
Foreign missions	17	9	14
Other apostolates	5	5	7
No particular field	16	16	22
	(173)	(368)	(3533)

The first column of the Table tells us that the current pastors, more than anyone else, anticipated parish work at the very beginning of their life as Jesuits, but in the same proportion (28%) they also felt inclined to "other teaching," which in this case refers to the secondary schools of the Society. What seems remarkable about the current college professors is the large proportion (47%) who wanted to go into college teaching and the small proportion (4%) who thought they might like to be parish priests. The fact that the Order attracts prospective teachers more than prospective pastors is demonstrated by the responses of all Jesuit priests, of whom less than one in ten (7%) had been inclined to parish work while half expected that they would be in one of the teaching positions.

Another way of looking at the reasons some Jesuits are now pastors while others are professors is to search out the most important influence that got them interested in their current occupation.¹⁰ This was asked in the survey (Q. 43) with nine possible responses to be checked off, which we have collapsed into four answers in Table 3.3.

⁹ Gerard Report, Table 127, p. 132.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Table 102, p. 106.

Table 3.3 Single most important influence which got pastors and professors interested in their current occupation

	Pastors	Professors	All re- spondents
Own idea (self-starter)	24%	48%	33%
Superior's influence	53	33	48
Other Jesuits	10	10	8
Other influences	13	9	11
	(164)	(367)	(3472)

What we mean by a "self-starter" in the above Table is the person who initiated the decision to enter on occupation by work, reading or reflection, either before or after entering the Society. By this measure and description the professors are twice as likely (48%) as the pastors (24%) to have been their own most important influence. The influence of superiors lies mainly in the fact that they assigned men to their occupation, but also to a less extent that they encouraged aged men to take up this work. Here we see that only one-third of the professors, but more than one-half (53%) of the pastors, attribute the main influence to their superiors. The third column shows exactly the opposite proportions, indicating that in general the superiors of the Society are the main reason why Jesuit priests are engaged in a particular occupation at any particular time.

Occupational Preparation

The regular course of studies in the Jesuit Order has been more or less standardized and it is not pointed at training specialists in either parish work or college teaching. "The purpose of studies in the Society is apostolic, as is the purpose of the entire training. Through their studies the scholastics should acquire that breadth and excellence in learning which are required for our vocation to achieve its end."¹¹ Although special studies are recommended for those going into parish work, this occupation was not listed among the choices in the survey of Jesuit scholastics (Q. 9) when they were asked, "if you have been assigned to study a specific field, what is your field?"¹² The fields listed were exclusively academic and could be chosen by any scholastic who anticipated becoming a college professor.

The survey data suggest that Jesuit priests go into parish work because they do not have the specialized training that would pre-

¹¹ *Documents of General Congregation*, p. 30.

¹² Gerard Report, Table 8, p. 9.

pare them for college teaching. A small minority of them (4%) do not have the undergraduate Bachelor's degree, but more than six out of ten (62%) do hold the Master's degree. This is much higher than the proportion (16%) of fulltime parish curates among the diocesan priests who have earned the Master's degree.¹³ As may be expected, the comparative statistics in Table 3.4 indicate that the doctoral degree is an important prerequisite for the college professor.

Table 3.4 Academic degrees earned or intended by pastors and professors

	Pastors	Professors	All re- spondents
Bachelor's degree or less	36%	2%	13%
Have or will get Master's	63	36	53
Have or will get Doctor's	1	62	34
	(165)	(367)	(3516)

How does one prepare himself to become an effective parish priest? While the system of training in the Jesuit seminary may now be changing in accord with the prescriptions of the Second Vatican Council, the pastors who responded to this survey had not had the benefit of those changes. Three-quarters of them feel that they have been well prepared for their current parochial occupation, but most of these say that their preparation came out of day to day experience, the kind of training that one obtains only after having been placed in the parochial situation.

Table 3.5 Extent of preparation for main occupation of pastors and professors

	Pastor	Professors	All re- spondents
Well prepared by training	14%	60%	38%
Well prepared only by experience	63	22	38
Somewhat prepared	20	16	20
Poorly prepared	3	2	4
	(173)	(360)	(3475)

The survey question (Q. 11) that asked about the extent of preparation for the current main task elicited the response that more than eight out of ten of the college professors are well prepared and that most of these attribute their preparation to previous training.¹⁴ They are obviously talking about academic train-

¹³ *Ibid.*, Table 121, p. 125. For diocesan priests see Joseph H. Fichter *America's Forgotten Priests—What They Are Saying* (New York, Harper and Row, 1968) p. 98.

¹⁴ Gerard Report, Table 11, p. 12, provides a breakdown by occupation.

ing, as indicated in Table 3.4, and they have specialized with graduate studies in the field in which they are teaching. While a kind of ambiguity still surrounds the preparatory training of parish priests, the man who is going to be a college professor knows quite clearly the preparatory stages to that occupation.

There is some indication in the data that the pastors still believe that experience is the best preparation for parish work. When they were asked (Q. 33) what improvements in the Jesuit system of training would have helped to make them more effective in their current occupation, the pastors were much more likely than anyone else to suggest "more practical experience."¹⁵ As may be expected, the college professors, more than the others, suggested "more special studies." When they were asked (Q. 31) what area of theological studies should be emphasized, both pastors and professors put holy scripture in first place, but the pastors put moral theology in second place, and the professors ranked speculative theology second.¹⁶ In the survey of Jesuit scholastics (Q. 28) it seems significant that these students rated pastoral theology second only to scripture in importance.¹⁷

The Jesuit Curriculum

Even though the great majority of American Jesuits are schoolmen they seem to get their necessary professional preparation for the educational task outside the regular Jesuit course of studies. Should one say then that the curriculum designed to educate Jesuits is primarily relevant to pastoral and parochial work, and that anyone who does not take the extra graduate and professional training is nevertheless ready to be a pastor? The general Congregation gives what appears to be a negative answer to these questions. "The education given through our studies is both general and special: the general education which is necessary for all priests in the Society; the special education which is daily more necessary for the various tasks for which Jesuits are to be prepared."¹⁸

This recommendation does not mean that some Jesuits, like future parish priests, are to have general education while others, like future professors, are to have special education. The Congregation says that "it is also desirable that each scholastic, under

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Table 87, p. 90.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, Table 64, p. 67.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Table 62, p. 65. Note that only 708 scholastics qualified to answer this question.

¹⁸ *Documents of General Congregation*, p. 30.

the direction of the prefect of studies, find some field of specialization according to his individual talent; he should work on this in the time left over from the ordinary studies, he should foster a personal interest in studies, and prepare himself remotely for his own future apostolate in the modern world."¹⁹ Lest one suppose that this does not include preparation for parish work, the Congregation recommends that "men skilled in pastoral work should also be trained with special studies."²⁰

Several questions in the Gerard survey ask the priests to make a judgment about various aspects of the Jesuit course of studies, and the resultant data allow us to make comparisons between pastors and professors. For example, they were asked about the excellence of their Jesuit teachers in the three main stages of the course: juniorate, philosophate and theologate. Table 3.6 gives the percentages of those who thought that most of these teachers were excellent, and provides also the results of the scholastics' questionnaire.

Table 3.6 Percentage comparisons of pastors, professors and scholastics who think that most of their Jesuit professors were excellent in each stage of the course

	Pastors	Professors	All re- spondents	Scholastics
Juniorate	34	23	29	20
Philosophate	20	12	15	13
Theologate	31	11	17	10

Although the parish priests are not engaged in academic pursuits they tend to have a higher regard for their Jesuit professors than do any of the others. The difference of opinion between pastors and professors is particularly large when they are talking about their theology teachers. The priest respondents have been away from the houses of studies for varying lengths of time, and in general have a higher estimation of their Jesuit teachers than is the case with the scholastics whose experience is current or recent.²¹ Since one may hope for a steady improvement in the quality of men who are teaching the Jesuit curriculum this latter finding is somewhat disturbing and deserves some further investigation.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 34. It should be noted that diocesan priests in specialized ministries also have more training and higher academic degrees than those in parish work.

²¹ *Ibid.*, Table 66, p. 69 for priests; Table 67, p. 70 for scholastics (recalculated to omit the "no answers" and not qualified).

The research design for the survey questionnaire included an attempt (QQ. 36-41) to measure some of the anticipated effects of the Jesuit course of studies.²² We have already seen (Table 2.8) the comparison of answers given by those who feel they are well trained and those who think they have been poorly prepared. Let us see in the next Table how pastors and professors differ in their estimation of the Jesuit course of studies.

Table 3.7 Percentage comparison of pastors and professors who felt that they were helped "very much" or "quite a bit" by the Jesuit course of studies on the following items

	Pastors	Professors	All respondents
To lead an intellectual life	71	71	68
To lead a holy life	76	61	66
To have happy, self-fulfilling life	70	62	63
Be effective in current work	50	47	45
To deal with lay people	49	37	40
Be aware of crucial modern problems	45	28	32

If the responses in Table 3.7 are to be interpreted as a measure of satisfaction with the general course of Jesuit studies, they suggest that parish priests are more satisfied than any of the others. We have seen in Table 3.1 that they, more than the other priests, find the spiritual and religious practices of the Society highly meaningful and we should expect that more of them (76%) than of the professors (61%) were greatly helped to lead a holy life. This item reveals a greater percentage spread of answers than any other except the last on the list, the awareness of crucial modern problems.

Is there a correlation between the "holy life" and the "happy life?" We can only speculate whether the pastors are more likely than the professors to consider their occupation genuinely "priestly" and therefore more apt to provide spiritual satisfactions. There may, however, be another significant factor in the appreciation of a "happy, self-fulfilling life." This is the matter of the pressures and the demands that an occupation makes on a man. We have seen in a previous comparison (Table 1.1) that the work demands are significantly heavier on teachers than they are on parish priests. We have also noted that parish work is

²² *Ibid.*, Table 90, p. 93.

a desirable occupation for a large number of priests who are not currently engaged in it.

In summary it should be remembered that the categories of pastors and professors discussed here are only those who make the respective occupation their first choice. We have not attempted to demonstrate which is the more "priestly" occupation, but the statistical comparisons show generally that a higher proportion of pastors than of professors find great meaning in spiritual and religious practices. The difference in degree of appreciation is particularly large on the popular devotions to the Sacred Heart, the Blessed Virgin and the Rosary.

The professors got an earlier start on their specific occupation, as evidenced by the fact that so many of them had college teaching in view when they first entered the Society. They are also more likely than the pastors to be "self-starters" as indicated by the greater proportion of them who said that it was mainly their own idea that they should embark upon this particular occupation. While special studies are now projected for those who are going into parish work, the current pastors say that they were well prepared only through experience while the college professors got their main preparation by previous training. This difference is underlined by the relative proportions in both occupations who have higher academic degrees.

The Jesuit priests in both kinds of occupations had the regular course of studies provided for all clerics in the Society but they have differences of opinion about that general curriculum. The pastors tend to have a higher regard for their Jesuit teachers in all the stages of the course: juniorate, philosophate and theologate. They also have higher estimation of the various expected effects of Jesuit training. In this sense they may be said to be more satisfied and less critical of the Jesuit course of studies.

Identity Crisis for Priests

ROBERT O. BRENNAN, S.J.

A by-product of recent changes in the Church has been an identity crisis for the priest. This identity crisis may be partly an emotional problem, as identity crises usually are, but it is also a phenomenon with a very real and objective basis. We have come to see the function of the priest in the church in new ways. There are signs that his role in society may take new forms. I should like to examine in particular the question of the definition of the priest and his work—and the consequences of this definition for the priest whose principal daily activity is scholarship and teaching, or administration, or other works of this kind.

The priest must be defined *in the church*, and we might note that professional theologians do not seem to think that we have a satisfactory or finished ecclesiology. Vatican II has provided insights, but not all has been worked out. What we seek then is a satisfactory working theory, hoping we may find adequate agreement between the theory and the reality it attempts to describe.

It is tempting to proceed by contrasting the church we once knew with that described by the Council. Many people have done this. I prefer to stay on the positive side and to consider the role and function of the priest in the church as we know it today. Without attempting to touch all points, or to do justice to any, we might describe the church somewhat as follows: The church is a community of believers chosen by God Himself. In this community the Spirit dwells. The community is united in love as well as in a common set of beliefs. Each member of the community is called to holiness and to a share of responsibility for the good and the work of the whole community. The community has been formed by, and its principal belief is in, the Son of God who became man and offered Himself as a sacrifice for his brothers.

Within this community, certain ones, called bishops, are set apart by a sacramental ordination to serve the community in a special way. "With their helpers, the priests and deacons, bishops have therefore taken up the service of the community, presiding in place of God over the flock whose shepherds they are, as teachers of doctrine, priests of sacred worship, and officers of

good order.”¹ Just as in this passage the priest is designated as helper to the bishop, so throughout the documents of the Council, he is described as cooperator or extension of the bishop—either the one presiding over the local church or the one who bears the primacy among his brother bishops. Hence to understand the office of the priest, we must examine somewhat more the pastoral office of the bishop.

A generic description of the bishop's service to the community is that service which is *formative of community*: “The ministerial priest, by the sacred power he enjoys, molds and rules the priestly people.”² “To the degree of their authority and in the name of their bishop, priests exercise the office of Christ the Head and the Shepherd. Thus they gather God's family together as a brotherhood of living unity, and lead it through Christ and in the Spirit to God the Father.”³ The special ways in which the bishop carries out this generic service are enumerated as three, though in different words in different places. Once they are listed as we cited above: “teachers of doctrine, priests of sacred worship, and officers of good order.” As the bishop's office is explained in detail the sections begin: “In exercising their duty of teaching, they should announce the gospel of Christ to men, a task which is eminent among the chief duties of bishops”; “In fulfilling their duty to sanctify . . .”; “In exercising his office of father and pastor, a bishop should stand in the midst of his people as one who serves.”⁴

Thus far we have cited references mainly to the bishop's office. If the priest is his cooperator and extension, we would expect the same functions for him with an obvious playing down of the role of ruling. We find this in summary in the decree on priests:

For, through the apostolic proclamation of the gospel, the People of God is called together and assembled so that when all who belong to this People have been sanctified by the Holy Spirit, they can offer themselves as “a sacrifice, living, holy, pleasing to God”. Through the ministry of priests, the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful

All quotations from Vatican Council II are taken from “The Documents of Vatican II”, Walter M. Abbott and Joseph Gallagher, America Press, 1966. The following abbreviations are used: L. G. for *Lumen Gentium* (Dogmatic Constitution on the Church); C. D. for *Christus Dominus* (Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office in the Church); P. O. for *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests). References are given to paragraph number of the document and page number of the edition.

1 L. G., 20, p. 40.

2 L. G., 10, p. 27.

3 P. O., 6, p. 543.

4 C. D., 12, 15, 16; pp. 404, 406, 407.

is made perfect in union with the sacrifice of Christ, the sole Mediator. Through the hands of priests and in the name of the whole Church, the Lord's sacrifice is offered in the Eucharist in an unbloody and sacramental manner until He Himself returns.

The ministry of priests is directed toward this work and is perfected in it. For their ministry, which takes its start from the gospel message, derives its power and force from the sacrifice of Christ. Its aim is that "the entire commonwealth of the redeemed, that is the community and society of saints, be offered as a universal sacrifice through the High Priest who in His Passion offered His very Self for us that we might be the body of so exalted a Head."⁵

What we have been attempting to sketch by reading selected passages is the function of the priest. We have not attempted a whole analysis of the bishop's relation to his local church, the whole church, questions of collegiality, infallibility and the like that do not pertain directly to the function of the priests.

To complete the sketch, we might add some things that he is not. He is not a mediator between God and man. The people themselves stand before the Father as a chosen and priestly people. The ministerial priest offers an essential service to the community as in the name of Christ he presides at the Eucharist and makes the Victim of the sacrifice present to be offered by all together.

The priest is not the sanctifier of all creation. This is the task of all Christians:

. . . the laity, by their very vocation, seek the kingdom of God by engaging in temporal affairs, and by ordering them according to the plan of God . . . They live in the world, that is, in each and in all of the secular professions and occupations. They live in the ordinary circumstances of family and social life, from which the very web of their existence is woven.

They are called there by God so that by exercising their proper function and being led by the spirit of the gospel they can work for the sanctification of the world from within, in the manner of leaven. In this way they can make Christ known to others, especially by the testimony of a life resplendent in faith, hope, and charity.

⁵ P. O., 2, p. 535.

The layman is closely involved in temporal affairs of every sort. It is therefore his special task to illumine and organize these affairs in such a way that they may always start out, develop, and persist according to Christ's mind, to the praise of the Creator and the Redeemer.⁶

On the other hand, if this is the task of all Christians, it should certainly also be appropriate to the priest, not, however, in virtue of his ordination:

A secular quality is proper and special to laymen. It is true that those in holy orders can at times engage in secular activities, and even have a secular profession. But by reason of their particular vocation they are chiefly and professedly ordained to the sacred ministry.⁷

In all we have said so far, there has been at least an implicit emphasis on *function*. I believe this is correct. The priest is ordained for service, and his *priestly service* is not to be only standing and waiting.

Having seen the function of the priest in the church, let us try to analyze the life and work of a priest whose principal activity, at least, as measured by the time devoted to it, is something secular and professional. First, I think we must admit that, when a priest is engaged in these activities, he is not functioning specifically as priest. What is normative of activity that is priestly is the criterion: formative of the community which is the church by proclamation of the Word of God, by administering the sacraments, especially the Eucharist; by ruling in some measure, possibly at the level of assisting in the discernment of spirits. Activities which do not fit this criterion may be good and holy, but are carried out in virtue of baptism, not of ordination to the priesthood.

Secondly, I believe this should be no cause for scandal. A priest in a profession is not unlike his lay colleagues. We expect a man to have a very important area in his existence outside his professional life. The demands and responsibilities of family life are a large dimension in any life, including that, say, of a genuinely Christian scholar. If we chose to use the well-worn term "hyphenated priest" for the priest-scholar, priest-educator, (or for what seems to happen also in parochial situations, priest-accountant, priest-architect) and so on, then we ought to admit that

⁶ L. G., 31, p. 57.

⁷ *Ibid.*

the hyphenated life is not the exclusive property of the priest, but belongs to every professional man.

Before passing on, in honesty, we must bring up another passage from the Council which may seem to stand against the position of the "priest with a hyphen". In speaking of the union among priests, the Council says:

For even though priests are assigned to different duties they still carry on one priestly ministry on behalf of men. All priests are sent forth as co-workers in the same understanding, whether they are engaged in parochial or supraparochial ministry, whether they devote their efforts to scientific research or teaching, whether by manual labor they share in the lot of the workers themselves—if there seems to be need for this and competent authority approves—or whether they fulfill any other apostolic tasks or labors related to the apostolate. All indeed are united in the single goal of building Christ's Body, a work requiring manifold roles and new adjustments, especially nowadays.⁸

This passage seems to make something like scientific research intrinsically priestly, not something that lies on the other side of a hyphen. But we ought to note first that the subject here is the unity among priests, and that the Council has already admitted that some priests may be engaged in secular work. The example of the worker-priest may shed light on the question. Surely it may be said that the worker-priest has taken on the non-priestly tasks previously assigned by the Council to the layman in order to be where he can render his priestly service. However, I believe the norm given earlier to distinguish the specifically priestly ministry in the church must stand. The present passage merely emphasizes the unity which must exist among priests as it blesses the priest who assumes a hyphen. There are still some nuances—I hope not contradictions—to this position which ought to be discussed. We will return to them later. I would like to continue here with a few more thoughts on the identity crisis to which I referred earlier.

I believe we have seen reasons for such a crisis and something of a solution to it, namely, the recognition and justification of a dual role which must be lived. Without this recognition, an older man might reply to a young man in his identity crisis: "The theological justification of my life as priest and scholar may be hard

⁸ P. O., 8, p. 549.

to find, but the experience of living it justifies it for me." Actually, the older man *could* be identifying himself wrongly. A happy life in his secular profession may have made him unconscious of his priestly function.

For the Jesuit, young or old, strongly conscious of his call to the priesthood, the situation might seem exceedingly bad in terms of what the recent General Congregation of the Society, picking up older exhortations, says to him:

These Jesuits, therefore, who are assigned to this (scholarly) work by superiors are to give themselves entirely and with a strong and self-denying spirit to this work, which, in one way or another, makes demands upon the whole man. They are to be on guard against the illusion that they will serve God better in other occupations which can seem more pastoral, and they are to offer their whole life as a holocaust to God.⁹

If this is to be understood in an absolutist sense, why the priesthood? On the other hand, if it is understood as a very strong exhortation to the professional competence common to scholars who also lead dual roles: scholar-fathers, there is a possibility of fitting the pieces into one picture. The Congregation continues, in fact:

At the same time they should do this in such a way that they do not lose touch with the other apostolic activities of the Society. Finally they are to strive earnestly to show themselves truly religious and priestly men . . .¹⁰

The heart of the matter, as I see it, is just this: a priest-professional truly has, and must have, a hyphen, and to find his identity he must give appropriate place to each side of the hyphen.

The nuances, which I mentioned earlier, are notions related to the "official witness" idea proposed by M. J. O'Connell, S.J., some years ago.¹¹ To me, and to others, the "official witness" did not flow adequately from his beautiful analysis of the notion of priest. Yet, in a measure, it does seem to be of value in the experience of some who realize that their competence in a particular field has made manifest to their colleagues much about the nature of the church of Christ, specifically its high regard for truth and, in principle at least, its freedom from superstition. Perhaps it may

⁹ Documents of the Thirty-first General Congregation, 29 "Scholarly Work and Research", 2.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Matthew J. O'Connell, S.J., "The Priest in Education: Apostolate or Anomaly?" in *Theological Studies*, 26, 65 (1965).

be a contrived solution, but it seems possible to fit this fact into the present context by recognizing that the preaching of the Word of God is by no means confined to the homily or catechetical setting. Whether the witness of the competent priest-scholar bears more weight than that of the devoted and competent Christian scholar because of the charism of his office or the present cultural situation in which the priest is regarded as belonging more fully to the church than the layman, is another question.

The thing that strikes me is that the ideals and forms of life of a priest-professional are set up so as to make the professional side very strong and the priest side almost non-existent. In view of the total dedication to scholarship and research, or teaching, or administration, it usually works out that the "priestly dimension" of a man's life is the Mass and the Breviary. One can well ask how formative of Christian community these activities, carried out in solitude, really are. One result of this situation is often enough that the young seminarian or young priest is reluctant to undertake the life of, say, priest-scientist and ends up as, possibly, a less competent priest-theologian, living the same form of life he sought to avoid.

To compare the hyphenated priest to his colleagues who also bear a hyphen may help the solution. The father, weighed down with the responsibilities of family life, finds this burden his source of happiness because "perfect love can make" sacrifice "a joy". It may be that elements of love and priestly fulfillment, the lack of which some lament in the priest's life, would make the extra efforts not only possible but richly rewarding. A scholar often enough lives in a student community where through his participation in the Liturgy, his availability as a fatherly counselor as well as his homily mark him as a priest forming the student community into a genuine Christian community. Again, the word paraministry has recently become popular. I think it is a misnomer. What is called paraministry may be the only exercise of true ministry for some priests.

It would give me great satisfaction to be able to end on a strongly positive and hopeful note. There is no question that there is malaise in many quarters of the community of priests. Some of it may well come from the failure of the priest to find his true identity as the man ordained to serve his brothers by ministrations that form the community in Christ: by proclamation of

God's Word, by his presiding over the community in Christ's name as it gathers to offer itself in sacrifice, by his limited role of shepherd and father of souls. The priest-professional must work this out among what appear to be special obstacles. One of these obstacles has been a one-sided vision of what he is, along with a form of life in which his two sides are not readily brought to fulfillment.

Perhaps thinking on these things may change ideals, and with the new vision, new forms of life may emerge.

Freedom in Theological Research

WILLIAM A. SCOTT, S.J.

Because the style and structure of authority in the Church (not excluding teaching authority) are undergoing significant development at present, any statement on the relationship between magisterial authority and academic freedom can only be in terms of the best sources presently available and will need to be constantly reformulated in the light of continuing research and discussion.

What is said tries to strike a balance between firmness and fluidity. Certain elements in the picture seem rather solidly established and generally accepted. Other aspects are still the subject of continuing reflection and discussion. We are at a stage in the history of the Church where a certain tension exists between the thought patterns and formulations of tradition and the new thought patterns and points of view now developing. The tension should not be resolved but preserved. Each approach has much to offer in moderating and balancing the other. There is need for both conservatism and innovation.

What follows, then, is a necessarily tentative attempt to describe the kind of relationship that today's Church seems to call for, between the teaching authority of the Church and the Catholic academic community. Specifically, this statement is restricted to the issue of freedom in theological research because there the relationship of the work of the scholar to the authority of the hierarchy comes into sharpest focus and is liable to produce the most serious tensions. But what is here said should be applicable to the other academic disciplines.

With this caveat stated, what needs examination are the three elements of the academic freedom-magisterium relationship, the university that is the place of the relationship and the two partners to the relation, the magisterium and the theologian.

I. *The University*

A university may be described as a community of scholars sharing a communion of ideas and endeavors in research and education with the intention of developing the intelligence that builds a society as well as of serving "as the critical reflective intelligence of that society." Thus does it fulfill its function of advancing knowledge and of passing it on from one generation to another.

A university that is Catholic shares this character with other universities. This is its basic nature and function. What then does the word "Catholic" add?

Positively, it implies an institutional commitment of the university to the revelation of Jesus Christ as accepted and lived in the Catholic tradition. It implies also a commitment to the honest advancement of that tradition through scientific reflection and openminded dialogue with other traditions. There is need, also, to recognize that the Catholic commitment, understood rightly, seeks to identify and embrace the fulness of truth as that truth is found in all of human experience and knowledge. This will mean that a Catholic university does not conceive of its commitment to the Catholic tradition in a sense that is narrow and intolerantly exclusive of other forms of commitment to truth: rather it will be open to full inquiry into truth, interested in the consideration of evidence and value wherever they are found. In pursuit of this ideal the Catholic university will welcome the presence of other religious traditions and will manifest an openness toward all human values as those values will be represented and pursued by a variety of scholars of all beliefs or of no belief. Only in this way can a Catholic university lay claim to the universality of a true university.

Negatively, the word "Catholic" does not mean that the university is an instrument of the Church in the sense that one of the main reasons for its existence is to propagandize or proselytize for Roman Catholicism. Its purpose is, rather, the pursuit of truth wherever it may be found and the fostering of an environment where such pursuit may occur as creatively and as freely as possible.

In the light of the preceding, there is a present need for the development within the Church, in the hierarchy as well as in the other members, of a strong respect for all who seek the truth. It is for this seeking that universities exist. There is need also to recognize that if a university be Catholic it is such not because it is exclusively dedicated to the preservation, defense, transmission and advancement of Catholicism but because it maintains a strong Catholic presence which is set, however, in the context of the broadest possible commitment to the search for truth.

At the practical level, this means that the bishops need to recognize and accept the fact that they are not responsible for the nature of inquiry within the university. Nor is it their task to

supervise its commitment to truth and to insist upon adhesion to truth only as it is understood within the Catholic tradition. There is need, finally, for the realization that a Catholic university represents the insertion of the Church into the pluralism of this world, hopefully for the enrichment of both. Unless the bishops can come to see that this is the only possible understanding of the nature of any university, there can be no true university existence for any Catholic institution of higher learning.

II. *The Magisterium*

Out of Vatican II there have come a number of insights in which have developed the Church's understanding of the hierarchical magisterium. First of all, the magisterium is now seen with a new clarity as a ministry, a service to the Church. This implies a concern for knowing the people of God which it serves, their needs, their problems, their world. Corollary to this, there is also implied a willingness to enter into dialogue with the Church it serves, to recognize that the truth is reached not alone but by living in community.

Secondly, it is a teaching ministry. By their consecration bishops receive a charism of fidelity, the guarantee that, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, they will preserve the Word of God through all ages from any substantial corruption. This charism is possessed and exercised in its fulness by the episcopal college. It does not follow, however, that fidelity to the Word of God will always be present in all the teaching of the individual bishop. His is a shared charism and a considerably less certain guarantee of fidelity is attached to his teaching than to the universal teaching of the magisterium. Or, put another way, a particular bishop cannot have full theological competence in the area of the universal belief of the Church.

Implied in this teaching ministry is the bishops' responsibility to 'supervise' or 'oversee' all aspects of the life of the Church and to protect that life in a manner which does not deprive the Christian people of their liberty. In fulfillment of this responsibility theirs is the duty of teaching the Christian message of salvation and handing on the Christian Gospel. They will not themselves do all the teaching; yet it is their duty to see to it that what is taught as Catholic teaching really is such.

Thirdly, this teaching ministry, if it is to be completely faithful to its task, must also be a learning ministry. It needs to make use

of all the aid available to it for continual advance in a more profound understanding of the revelation committed to the Church. The theologian is both professionally trained and personally committed to aid the magisterium in this growing penetration of the mystery of revelation. Frequently, then, it will be the theologian who finds new insights into God's Word; it will be the bishops who authenticate these insights. There is need and room within the Church for both preservation and innovation, for the gift of stability and the gift of progress. The two do not compete but complete each other.

III. *The Theologian*

The theologian's work is both the study of divine revelation as that revelation is embodied in Scripture and Tradition, and a serious attention to the best of contemporary thought that he may understand and present revelation in presently meaningful terms. In that task several aspects call for attention.

As a scholar, he needs freedom, an atmosphere where he can pursue his scholarship without intervention or restriction from an outside agent. He requires a situation where he feels free to push ahead in search of truth even at the risk of mistake. Besides analysis and synthesis he will work through hypothesis which is not the same as truth but a quest for truth. Thus he works in a context that includes the inevitability of mistake. Yet he needs freedom to make mistakes because, through him, the people of God seek deeper understanding of the truth. His work is for the good of the whole Church. He needs, therefore, to know that he is fulfilling an important function in the Church and that the members rely on him and give him their trust and confidence.

As a scholar, he must also be a man of dedication to the Church and of careful responsibility in searching for the truth. Thus his investigation will be done painstakingly; his conclusions will be presented circumspectly and with sobriety and prudence; and his work will reflect an awareness of his own human limitations.

As a member of the Church he will manifest respect and reverence towards the magisterium, a readiness to be taught by it, a willingness to re-appraise his own position in the light of its teaching, a carefully cultivated hesitancy in deciding that the teaching of the magisterium is in error and a manner of acting that engenders in other members of the Church the same qualities of respect, reverence and openness to magisterial teaching.

Last of all, because he is expected to operate with professional competence, he should be dealt with at the same professional level. Should it happen that his work cannot be accepted by the magisterium as one representing the Catholic tradition or its legitimate development, the situation should be dealt with by first recognizing that the theologian is involved in a double relationship, one to the university, the other to the Church and the magisterium. The university fulfills the responsibility of its relationship by submitting the work in question to the judgment of his academic peers. The question to be answered here is the simple one, is it good theology. If their judgment is that his work meets the demands of serious scholarship and academic competence the university will have fulfilled its responsibility and ought then to consider its part in the matter ended.

Should the bishops feel that their responsibility for the preservation of the Catholic tradition calls for a response from them they ought simply to state that they believe that Catholic doctrine differs from the one held and taught by the individual theologian concerned. No attempt ought to be made by the bishops to have the university take punitive measures against the theologian. For them to so act would be to question and thereby jeopardize the autonomy and freedom of the university. In no case should the university be subject to the authority and judgment of a single bishop.

Catholic Universities and Colleges: Ships in Need of a Compass

EUGENE E. GROLLMES, S.J.

For many years it has been a common phenomenon in American higher education that changes in secular universities and colleges occur again on Catholic campuses five to ten years later. Any careful observer of the present knows that this phenomenon, though perhaps not so frequently, is still to be witnessed. However, there is now perhaps no area of higher education in which there are more changes than in Catholic higher education, and seemingly one or two of them are more than mere recurrences of what has happened in the last decade elsewhere. These changes range all the way from religious wearing lay clothes into the classroom to the inviting of laymen to serve in full membership with religious on the board of trustees. Less dramatic but recent changes would include: reconstructed and more efficient financial procedures; cooperative programs of instruction with other colleges; a larger role for the lay-faculty and student body in the governance of the institution; and the weaving of closer ties with the local community. Though all the above have caught a certain amount of the public eye, there is a much more fundamental change that has yet to receive the same public attention.

Since their founding, Catholic universities and colleges have been concerned about salvation. Lately, however, the focus of their concern seems to have shifted somewhat. Instead of the salvation of their students, Catholic universities and colleges have become more and more concerned with their own salvation. Not a little of this is owing to a lack of adequate endowment and funds and a radical drop in the number of those entering religious life. Nonetheless, there is an even more critical and difficult problem with which to deal, a problem of absolute importance, namely, what is the uniqueness of Catholic higher education? The salvation of Catholic higher education would seem to hinge ultimately on how this question is answered. As Reverend Paul C. Reinert, S.J., President of St. Louis University, noted before the National Catholic Educational Association Convention in 1964. "The preservation and development of Catholic higher education is based on the assumption that we have something unique to offer for the benefit of American society." If Catholic

universities and colleges are not different from their secular counterparts, there is little if any reason for their existence. In other words, the question to be faced is very much the same as that posed several years ago by a viewer in *TV Guide*: "I have a question regarding The Judy Garland Show, Why?"

Though the importance of being unique haunts Catholic educators and is an often-repeated theme in their recent writings and conversations, just what are the elements of this uniqueness is by no means clear. Perhaps this is simply because these elements have yet to be determined. Or, from an historical viewpoint, perhaps this is because until now so much attention has been given to gaining accreditation and professional acceptance that Catholic educators have tended to concentrate almost exclusively on the similarity and the comparable competence of their schools to secular institutions. Throughout the past century, for many Catholic schools, the need for recognition could and did serve as a working guide. There seemed little need to philosophize. Moreover, the goals seemed clear, especially when there was open and biting anti-Catholicism in neighboring institutions.

There is consequently today little to fall back on to meet the question *why Catholic higher education?* There is of course Newman, the papal documents on education, and Maritain. But Catholic higher education stands in need of some new philosophizing, some fresh thinking on how it can improve today's world, a compass that will help it both find and be true to itself.

Within the limits of a single article it is of course impossible to treat adequately such an intricate problem. Hopefully, however, the following remarks will at least suggest some lines for further thought. Consideration will be given to the community and persons to be developed on a Catholic campus, to the special, but by no means exclusive, kinds of research to be done there, and to the orientation that might make Catholic higher education unique and distinctive.

At the outset, let it be said that Catholic universities and colleges, far from being closed societies, should function in cooperation with secular institutions. However, Catholic educators would do well to take a tip from Shakespeare: "This above all: to thine own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man." Perhaps, then, the first element of the uniqueness to be sought and valued by Catholic

educators is simply the forthright and unashamed admission that theirs are Catholic universities and colleges. Curiously enough, many Catholic educators at the present time seem very self-conscious about their commitment to Christianity. Possibly this is because they have subscribed to the idea that Christ's teaching narrowed rather than expanded man's knowledge. Yet it is part of their faith that Christian revelation contains truths that could not be known by reason alone, and as Christians it is their accepted mission to bring these truths to their fellow man. For those critics who believe that in making a commitment to the truths of Christianity, Catholic institutions thereby automatically exclude themselves from being universities or colleges, then the whole question of what should constitute the uniqueness of Catholic higher education will not seem legitimate. However, in approaching this question, it is important for at least Catholic educators to keep in mind that since the universe is the handiwork of God, there is nothing authentically human or good or beautiful that is alien or excluded from the Christian view of the world. Perhaps the point to be made here is best summarized by Karl Rahner in his book *Theology for Renewal* when he says:

Christianity demands the utmost in spiritual courage and in breadth, because it embraces everything, reaching out into every human sphere: religion of the heart and folk religion; tradition and the Spirit blowing ever new; official structure, and charisma; inwardness and a bodily cult; struggle for the well-being of this life, and yearning for what can only come hereafter. No wonder many people are too narrow for it. These people then think that Christianity is narrow.¹

Hence, rather than be embarrassed, Catholic educators might well feel challenged by Christianity. And, rather than downplay their commitment, would it not be better to profess frankly their adherence to Christ's teachings and to describe in unmistakable terms what are the truths and principles that govern their particular institutions. The trustees or the president can easily make clear, as Sarah Blanding did a few years ago at Vassar on the question of pre-marital sex, that anyone who does not believe in the basic tenets of the school is entirely welcome and free to go elsewhere. As Shakespeare has already suggested, before they can be true to anyone else, Catholic educators must be true to

1 Karl Rahner, *Theology for Renewal* (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1964), p. 86.

themselves. If they honestly believe that the teachings of Jesus Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are true, then it would seem Catholic educators incur the obligation to act in accordance with this conviction, and their institutions should, naturally but unmistakably, reflect this belief.

How is this reflection to occur? First of all, it should be seen in the concern that Catholic educators have for their students. This does not mean a return to long lists of rules and regulations. Rather there is proposed to administrators and to faculty members of Catholic institutions a genuinely human concern for each student *as a person* and a constant striving by all on campus—students, faculty, administrators—towards the establishment of exemplary Christian community.

Since it is part of the Catholic faith that man was made after the image of God and redeemed by his Son, above and beyond the natural concern of an educator for his student (and how often even this seems lacking!), there should be a mutual love, respect, and concern that permeates the atmosphere of a Catholic campus. This love, respect, and concern should have its roots, first, in the Christian faith; secondly, in the liturgy of the Church (much experimentation is still needed here); and, thirdly, in the very personal ties that bind administrators and faculty and students. Hence, the elements of the atmosphere characteristic of a Catholic campus will be essentially those which spring from being brothers and sisters in Christ. Far from mere happenstance, it should be aimed at and expected that from this community of Christian love there come forth men and women possessing learning and professional competence, humble self-confidence, and at times even heroism.

If the Christian concepts of community and person are to be key factors in decision making, then it follows that the solutions to the academic and social problems that arise on campus must be in harmony with and based on Christian principles. As an example of their functioning, the concepts of community and person dictate that, in determining the size of a Catholic university or college, the institution not be allowed to grow so large or out of proportion that community and person become meaningless concepts in her decision making. Where this has already happened, remedies must be discovered.

What sort of person should be the characteristic product of Catholic higher education? There is of course no mold into which

each student must somehow or other be fitted. Every person, if he is to be treated as a person, must be left free to choose what sort of person he wishes to become. Still the whole thrust and orientation of his education should be towards prompting him to be a better Christian, towards inspiring him to be another Christ. If, as the Catholic Church teaches, Christ is perfect man as well as God, then there should be no hesitation among Catholic educators to encourage their students to pursue this ideal.

This emphasis is not intended, nor should it ever be allowed, to interfere with the primary importance of intellectual development. Nonetheless, along with unexcelled learning, there should be, as a consequence of their personal union with Christ and the love of the community that surrounds them on campus, a certain nobility in the lives of the students and graduates of Catholic higher education. The man possessing this nobility is distinguishable from the common man as Thomas More was from the jailer trying to stay out of trouble. He makes greater demands on himself; he takes greater risks. The origins of this educational ideal can be traced back as far as early Greek civilization, but it has also long been a part of American Catholicism. Speaking on the subject of leadership and excellence at an observance honoring James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop John Ireland delivered these words:

I am tired with the common; I am angry with it. If I am, myself, compelled to plod its wearisome pathways, I wish, at least, to see others shun them; I wish to see men rise far above their fellows and by their singular thoughts and singular deeds freshen human life, and give to it the power to place itself in those lofty altitudes where progress is born. The common never puts humanity forward, never begets a great movement; nor does it save humanity when grave peril threatens. The common! We are surfeited with it; it has made our souls torpid and our limbs rigid. Under the guise of goodness it is a curse. The want in the world, the want in the Church, today as at other times, but today as never before, is men among men, men who see farther than others, rise higher than others, act more boldly than others. They need not be numerous. They never were. . . . But while the few, they take with them the multitude and save humanity.²

² John Ireland, *The Church and Modern Society* (Chicago, D. H. McBride & Company, 1897), pp. 87-88.

When and if Catholic universities and colleges succeed in producing more than their share of "men among men," there will be little reason to fear for their salvation. For they will be fulfilling a most important world need, a need on which the future of civilization depends. To develop this type of person should probably be the goal of all higher education, but it seems it should be especially so of Catholic higher education, since its whole reason for being is Christ. If portions of modern society no longer want this kind of person, perhaps this only highlights the need.

As an institution of higher learning, a Catholic university or college cannot be concerned solely with her students. A Catholic university or college must also have an identity and a mission in the world of scholarship. Again, if Catholic higher education is not making a unique or at least a specifically different kind of contribution to the realms of academe, there seems little justification for the blood, sweat, and tears required to keep it in existence. The time has come for Catholic educators to recognize that the identity and mission of a Catholic university or college is to be a creative center of knowledge, ideas, and opinion, and also to be a symbol and a voice of Catholic scholarship evidencing the freedom and the wisdom of the children of God. Herein lies the second major element of the uniqueness to be sought and emphasized in Catholic higher education.

Non-Catholic academicians give evidence in their writings and conversations that they are disappointed in Catholic educators precisely because they offer little that is new or different. Their universities and colleges are too content merely to supply parallel affirmations or confirmations or faint echoes of findings elsewhere. It is time for them to approach problems from their own point of view and ask some questions that are not so likely to be heard on a secular campus. Catholic universities and colleges must strive to provide the academic world with some alternative views and with some voices like those of Teilhard, Dawson, D'Arcy, Gilson, Copleston, and Rahner, expressing the insight of the Christian tradition with a scholarliness and a grasp of present-day realities that command the attention of scholarly circles everywhere.

Indeed, the range of interest of a Catholic university or college should be every bit as broad as that of its secular counterpart and, in some instances, go beyond it. For in its scholarship sig-

nificant amounts of energy should be devoted to researching the Christian tradition³ and bringing its light to bear on contemporary needs and problems. This research is nothing more than a direct and immediate consequent of the school's basic commitment. But to the present, there is surprisingly little evidence of its being done. Perhaps the virtue most needed here is the courage to be different. Why timidity among Catholic educators has prevailed for such a long time is somewhat difficult to understand. As Rahner says, again in *Theology for Renewal*:

When one sees the self-assurance with which, when it comes to the salvation of the world, recipes are bandied about which would not last fifty years even if they were to be accepted and carried out, it really does become hard to see why the Christian intellectual in public life displays so little trust and self-confidence in championing Christian principles in the lives of nations.⁴

The interest and concern of a Catholic university or college, as suggested earlier, cannot of course be confined to the limits of the campus. The community to be found there, like any other truly Christian community, must be an outwardly orientated community, a community that does not exist for itself but for others. This openness is necessary for at least two reasons. First, in this age of ecumenism and dialogue, Catholic universities and colleges can no longer be content to serve as bastions for the preservation of 13th-century theology. On the contrary, they must be centers where there is a ceaseless rethinking of the content and meaning of Christian belief. These institutions must be leaders in bringing about the reunion of all Christians. Their scholarly resources and facilities should be readily available to promote the success of this movement. Second, modern means of communication and transportation make a closed society pitifully unrealistic if not impossible. If it ever was ideal, such a society, with all due regard for Rousseau, can no longer be regarded as desirable. Moreover, the love that binds faculty and students together in a Christian community at a Catholic university or college must be a love that extends to all men, and it will do so naturally if it is truly Christian. This love will pour itself out in deeds to alleviate the needs and problems of contemporary and also future

3 As used in this paper, *Christian tradition* is an all-inclusive term referring to the teachings of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church and the theology, philosophy, literature, and history of Christianity.

4 Rahner. *op cit.*, p. 89.

society. Though many, and perhaps the most important, of these deeds will be those ordinary to a university or college, namely, study, teaching, and research, they need not be exclusively such.

However, before many, if not all, of these deeds can be performed, there must be an acute awareness of that which is needed *now*. Thus, realizing that the effectiveness of their students in the improvement of society largely depends on it, Catholic educators will do everything possible to bring their students to an understanding and appreciation of the questions, problems, and dreams of twentieth-century man. To fail in this would be almost to fail completely.

Before such education can be offered, the faculty of a Catholic university or college has to be steeped in the questions and problems and dreams of contemporary man and also, of primary importance, the faculty in at least varying degrees has to have approached and dealt with these questions and problems and dreams in terms of the Christian tradition. If Catholic educators are to be true to themselves, they must be at the center of contemporary society wrestling with its problems. They must be there not only learned in secular knowledge but also aware of the Christian tradition and prepared to bring revelation to bear wherever possible. Hence, underlying and involved in the problem-solving endeavor of bringing Christian tradition to bear, there is another kind of research. This is, of course, the all important task of relating the Christian tradition to secular learning and secular learning to the Christian tradition. Along then with analyses in all fields, Catholic educators should be seriously, if not always, concerned with developing a synthesis, from their own and others' findings, that provides a very relevant Christian perspective. If this perspective has the penetration and depth desired, it will provide a sense of direction in contemporary life and, in so doing, will add to the choices available to man. Perhaps the best example of the work to be done here is that of Teilhard de Chardin.

Thus, there are two forms of research that should be characteristic of Catholic institutions of higher learning: the first bringing Christian tradition to bear on contemporary problems; the second providing a synthesis between secular learning and Christian tradition. There remains a third, that is, scholarly and efficacious interpretations of the Christian message itself. To completely fulfill its task, a Catholic university or college should bring

its resources to bear on making the teachings of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church meaningful and significant to contemporary man. This aspect of its research, which might well be the most important and most striking feature of its uniqueness, may require at times the resources of all the Catholic universities and colleges put together. But it is a work Catholic universities and colleges dare not leave undone. For if they do not attempt it, the question immediately arises: Who will?

In its application of Christian principles to contemporary problems, in its presentation of a perspective to modern man, and in its interpretations and re-interpretations of Christianity, a Catholic university or college, if it be truly a center of independent thinking, will of course be a controversial institution. Added to the above sources of controversy will be another, namely, its struggle with the future of man. The object here is to grasp this future, shape it, and interpret it even though other universities may still be wholly mesmerized by or lost in today's or yesterday's problems. Yet, despite those who may be disturbed and disagree with its emphasis and orientation towards the future, an ideal Catholic university or college might well offer courses on, for example, "Theory of the Future of Extra-Sensory Perception and Christian Ethic," "Space Exploration/Settlement and Christian Social Principles," "Christ and an International Government of Nations." Such courses should be a projection of present phenomena and an overflow of the current research and thought on campus. For a Catholic university or college, an abiding and deep concern for the future of man is but a natural consequent of its being an institution of higher learning and of its being Catholic.

As an institution of higher learning it cannot bind itself simply to the present but must consider its province to be past, present, and future. As a Catholic institution, it knows that Christian perspective, fixed by both Scripture and tradition, has always been and will always be orientated towards the future. However, horrified by any prospect of thinking that it can serve the future of man by neglecting the present, the primary and major thrust of a Catholic university or college must be towards the contemporary. Nevertheless, in its very obligation to contemporary man and in its very obligation to Christ, who set before man the ideal, "Be you perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect," the Catholic university or college has another duty. This is to do whatever it

can to guarantee that the future of man will be better than the present.

By its research and thought on the future, not merely by the courses it offers, a Catholic institution of higher learning will hope to accomplish the above task. The courses will be but a means to clarify this thought, to stimulate some students to engage in it, and to make all deeply conscious of and concerned about the future of man. In proposing steps to future progress and solutions to future problems, a Catholic university or college will characteristically try to do so, where possible, in terms of Christ, for it is convinced that if it were not for his message, there would be no reason for its being. By their research and thought, these institutions will hopefully make it possible for modern man to have a Christian view in his determination of the future and, moreover, solve some of his problems even before they arise! If modern man chooses to reject this view and the proposed solutions, it is his privilege. But at least the alternative will be there.

If the constant efforts to relate the contemporary world to Christian tradition are meaningful and serious, it seems only natural that these efforts will be reflected in the curriculum of a Catholic university or college, particularly on the upper class and graduate levels. Just as naturally, if these institutions are true to themselves, they will gradually emerge in a position where they can dialogue, supplement, and add a dimension to secular universities and colleges and, in turn, be similarly strengthened by them. The Catholic institutions, interested in all knowledge, would be interested in the characteristic research of the secular institutions, and, if the reception of Teilhard's work is any indication, the secular institutions would be interested in the characteristic research of the Catholic institutions. That Catholic and secular institutions should be closed societies and not work in cooperation with one another in the future is inconceivable. In an ideal relationship, they would enrich one another by their research, as well as by numerous interchanges of faculty and students. At present, however, there is too little difference to enable many secular institutions to profit very notably from the presence of Catholic institutions. The fact is, too many Catholic institutions are but amateurish imitations of secular institutions. Being untrue to themselves, they open the door, as is usually the case, to being of little importance to anyone except themselves. There is no

future for them in striving to be as secular as the secular schools.

If Father Reinert, quoted at the beginning of this paper, is correct in believing that the preservation and development of Catholic higher education depends on its uniqueness, then it would seem imperative that a Catholic university or college do the practical thing of recruiting and attracting to itself administrators, faculty, and students, who are both desirous and capable of participating in the study, research, and development on which the uniqueness of Catholic higher education not only depends but in which it consists. Without the right personnel, the community, the research, and the orientation towards the future suggested here become impossibilities. Hence, every possible cooperative effort between Catholic institutions and between religious orders should be made to achieve the uniqueness necessary for a merited survival of Catholic higher education. Unfortunately, it seems unlikely that there will be sufficient personnel to maintain the present number of institutions that come under the heading "Catholic university" or "Catholic college." However, there is no disgrace involved in resolving to conduct only as many Catholic universities and colleges as are worthy of the name. There is, hopefully, enough pride in Catholic educators to keep them from being unauthentic, to make them shun mediocrity, and to give no apologies for their faith.

In conclusion, it is fundamental to the survival of Catholic universities and colleges that those who conduct them be always mindful and think in terms of both parts of the term *Catholic university* or *Catholic college*. The community, the research, the orientation towards the future described in this paper all ultimately depend on this consciousness. Given this consciousness, the courage to be different, and the features described above, at least some of the ships in the present fleet can make ready and sail with colors flying.

Self-Starters

JAMES J. MCGINLEY, S.J.

What is the Cambridge Center for Social Studies all about? I have been trying to formulate a brief but adequate answer to that question ever since my appointment last fall as the Center's new Director.

There are a number of reasons why this proved to be no easy task. The present Center includes both old and new elements. It suffers from a kind of "remoteness" which often characterizes Assistancy projects. Its members are specialists working in a relatively wide variety of social areas. And like all the Society's ministries during this period of renewal, its structure and purposes are doubtless due for careful reappraisal.

Given these somewhat limiting conditions, I feel that the best way to begin is to "tell it like it is."

Here at the Center scholarly research and writing on significant social issues are the preoccupation and daily diet of each member of a small community of Jesuits. Each member works with persons having related aims and concerns. Each finds an alert and far from inarticulate audience for the ideas he is trying to formulate. Accordingly, in this situation everyone proves to be a resource person to everyone else.

Our offices and residence are immediately adjacent to the libraries, laboratories, and lecture halls at Harvard. Some members take advantage of "adjunct professor" opportunities at Boston College, Harvard, M.I.T., or other universities in the Boston-Cambridge area. We do not, however, have any corporate affiliation with any university and have no administrative burdens or regular teaching obligations. This freedom has proved to be a valuable asset since it provides for complete, uninterrupted concentration on study, research and writing as a full-time career.

What kinds of research are typically conducted by members of the C.C.S.S.? A glance at past and present projects indicates that they run the gamut from highly theoretical and academic investigation to action oriented studies designed to provide the necessary factual information required for informed policy determination. Hence they include the analysis and evaluation of the work of others, as well as the formulation and conduct of empirical studies in the field. For example, we find members of

the Center involved in research, writing and lecturing on various aspects of labor-management problems, unemployment compensation, business ethics, integration, Church-State relations, demography and theories of human sexuality.

At any given time the Center is much more than the sum of its various funded projects. This must be the case, because the Center's policy is to promote research on those social issues judged significant by its members, and some of these projects may not currently appeal to available funding agencies.

In short, C.C.S.S. aims to embody and implement the Society's longstanding conviction that concerted thinking about the problems of contemporary society on the basis of facts supplied by the social sciences and within the conceptual framework of our essential Christian values constitutes not only a valid but an indispensable apostolic task. C.C.S.S. aims to keep some Jesuits wholly committed to this work, as a full-time occupation. In other words, the Center aims to help clarify the factual and value components involved in the making of crucial policy decisions; for it maintains that rational programs of action are practical conclusions based on relevant premises of values as well as upon pertinent facts.

This is what makes C.C.S.S. so completely different from a "house of writers," the difference, namely, made by the central theme in all our work: research in the social sciences and in related areas of investigation. This is the unifying, intellectual, theme. Because it is a theme common to all members in some functioning measure, it redounds to the life and growth of each member of the Center.

Hence the representative participant in C.C.S.S.: has the terminal degree in his field; works in the social sciences broadly conceived; is experienced in the classroom and on the lecture platform; wants to increase his competency by study and research; and has a spiritual vigor which will support the self-denial of a truly intellectual life in this apostolate of the Society of Jesus.

There are additional factors of value in a permanent "Research Associate" at the Cambridge Center.

He should be a self-starter—a man with a project. He should want to work in a group like C.C.S.S. This does not imply participation in team research, necessarily, but it does mean sharing ideas in an intellectual kinship dedicated to the efficient

pursuit of truth by everybody.

We work at the ideas rather than the techniques. Hence the consolations of involvement in applied social action are seldom available; but the discovery and presentation of guidelines for those so involved is possible.

There are usually some C.C.S.S. persons here on a temporary basis who are engaged in particular projects related to the work of the Center. We welcome them as "Visiting Fellows," in addition to the permanent nucleus of Research Associates. We also regularly have Summer Visiting Fellows.

Thus C.C.S.S. can provide an opportunity for that hard-working Jesuit who has given his all in teaching a social science for some years and now wishes time and leisure to study and write up ideas he has always wanted to put on paper. The Center can give him a climate and a situation in which to produce "that book."

There really are books and articles by Jesuits which would never have appeared except for C.C.S.S. (and its predecessor The Institute of Social Order). What some see as "time off" from the classroom is really "time on" at C.C.S.S. It is time on for study and research in areas of tremendous concern to the *populus Dei* and all of human society.

Because they are engaged in areas and problems realistically related to the social sciences, an occasional theologian and/or philosopher is welcome—at least as temporary co-workers. They enrich any investigation of truth today, especially our type of investigation and truth, and we think the experience is mutual.

In social science research, moreover, the accent has changed over the years. The primary emphasis used to be economics and/or industrial relations. The attention of scholars was on the problems of distribution; on welfare as opposed to production; and on the effectiveness of industrial employment as a means for more and more families to acquire enough of the earth's goods for adequate living.

In our times of inflation, questions revolve around pools of poverty in the midst of affluence; around challenges to learn how to use leisure made available through technological progress; and around the values which a man-made economy actually is pursuing. Above all, our times need deep study of the sociological and psychological consequences of relentless urbanization. They need study of the requirements for economic, political and

social assimilation of minority groups in both fostering and profiting from the common good of civil society.

The preoccupation now is with minorities, with the social consequences of technological change, and with the problems of development throughout an unevenly developed world. As the questions have changed, so too, have the disciplines.

Although it is hard to settle on an *a priori* central theme, much of the work at C.C.S.S. has had a value orientation. This work has not been normative or moralistic; rather the fields selected for investigation have usually had a large value component. Minority employment is an example. So is the broad field of business ethics.

The Center, evidently, will grow in various directions, and these will be clarified by the developing interests of its members as time goes on.

Status of Special Studies 1968-1969

Four hundred and five Jesuits in the current academic year are devoting full-time to programs of studies which lead to the doctorate: 338 Priests, 66 Scholastics and one Brother. The total of 405 is an increase of 55 over the corresponding figure of 350 for the previous year. The increase is all the more remarkable in that the total number of Jesuits in the ten Provinces decreased at the same time from 8,056 to 7,775.

For the first time in the twenty-seven year history of these surveys of special studies, the survey this year is restricted to *doctoral* students. Because of the changing nature and locale of the collegiate and master's programs for scholastics, the term Special Studies has lost meaning at these levels. The surveys will continue but they will hereafter include only students in programs which lead to the various doctoral degrees or their equivalent.

Data from the previous surveys have made possible the record presented in Table 1 which shows the steady growth in numbers of Jesuit doctoral students from 145 in 1955-56 to 405 in 1968-69. Numbers for the short-lived Buffalo Province have been combined with those for New York. Prior to 1965, with the exception of only one year, New York Province regularly had the greatest number of men in doctoral studies. From 1965 to the present New England Province has increased significantly the number of its doctoral students and has easily led the ten Provinces in each of these four years.

In Table 2 the numbers for the present year are divided among Priests-Scholastics-Brothers and also among New and Continuing students. Previous surveys provided no such break-down for specifically doctoral students and hence no comparisons with previous years are possible. It seems probable, however, that numbers of pre-ordination doctoral students have decreased while numbers of post-ordination doctoral students have greatly increased. Twenty-two new students, however, are among the total of 66 Scholastics in doctoral programs; these 22 represent eight of the ten Provinces.

In Table 2 only two Provinces, Chicago and Detroit, show a decrease in the number of doctoral students since last year, Maryland shows no change, and the other Provinces all show increases. Missouri shows the greatest increase (14) within the past year in the number of doctoral students. But New England con-

tinues to record the largest number of new students (26) and the greatest total (74) of the ten Provinces.

The 405 Jesuit doctoral students are distributed among 55 academic fields which are listed in Table 3. Doctoral programs in Theology claim 119 or 29 percent of the total. Theology is followed by Philosophy (38), History (29) and English (27). These four fields enroll 213 students or 53 percent of the total number.

The 405 Jesuit doctoral students are enrolled in 104 universities or institutions of higher education, 30 of which lie outside the United States. Fordham University continues to enroll the highest number of Jesuit doctoral students (23); these 23 men represent every American Province except New York. Catholic University is a close second with 22, followed by Gregorian (21), Chicago (18), Harvard (18), Yale (15) and Georgetown (14).

TABLE 1
JESUIT DOCTORAL STUDENTS
COMPARATIVE DATA, 1955-1968

	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Ore.	Wis.	Totals
1955-56	14	12	12	20	9	20	12	30	8	8	145
1956-57	18	12	15	26	8	22	8	31	7	12	159
1957-58	23	9	14	30	9	16	7	27	7	13	155
1958-59	27	12	18	26	15	21	7	30	8	22	186
1959-60	26	17	18	22	16	22	10	39	11	22	203
1960-61	25	21	21	19	17	23	10	35	11	29	211
1961-62	29	26	20	21	16	29	9	39	11	35	235
1962-63	26	22	19	20	14	28	9	45	17	33	233
1963-64	22	20	16	22	15	34	11	47	16	30	233
1964-65	30	25	25	24	24	31	13	50	18	32	272
1965-66	28	28	25	32	24	49	17	44	25	28	300
1966-67	33	26	25	39	30	48	21	40	24	25	321
1967-68	38	30	18	53	25	64	25	53	21	23	350
1968-69	40	29	17	53	39	74	36	57	28	32	405

TABLE 2
DOCTORAL STUDENTS, 1968-1969

	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Ore.	Wis.	Totals
Totals	40	29	17	53	39	74	36	57	28	32	405
Priests	36	23	14	39	38	62	23	46	28	29	338
Scholastics	4	6	2	14	1	12	13	11	—	3	66
Brothers	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
New	12	5	8	18	19	26	14	22	11	12	147
Continuing	28	24	9	35	20	48	22	35	17	20	258
Total 1967-1968	38	30	18	53	25	64	25	53	21	33	350
Total 1968-1969	40	29	17	53	39	74	36	57	28	32	405
Increase/Decrease	+2	—1	—1	0	+14	+10	+11	+4	+7	+9	+55

TABLE 3
FIELDS OF JESUIT DOCTORAL STUDIES, 1968-1969

	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Ore.	Wis.	Total
American Studies	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	2	---	3
Anthropology	---	---	---	---	1	2	---	1	---	---	4
Arabic	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Architecture	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Art, Fine Arts	---	---	1	---	---	2	1	---	---	---	4
Astronomy	---	1	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1	3
Bio-Chemistry	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Biology	---	---	1	1	---	1	1	2	---	---	6
Business Administration	2	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	---	---	4
Chemistry	---	---	---	2	---	---	2	1	---	---	5
Classics	---	---	1	1	---	---	---	3	1	4	10
Communications	1	1	---	---	2	1	---	1	---	1	7
Comparative Literature	---	---	---	---	2	1	---	---	---	---	3
Comparative Religion	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	2
Computer Science	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Counseling	---	---	---	1	1	---	---	---	---	---	2
Criminology	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1
Drama	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	---	---	2
Eastern Studies	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Economics	1	---	1	---	---	1	1	---	1	---	5
Education	2	---	---	2	2	3	3	1	2	2	17
Engineering	---	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	2
English	2	2	1	5	3	4	3	2	3	2	27
French	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Geology	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Geophysics	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
German	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Guidance	---	---	---	---	1	1	---	---	---	---	2
History	3	3	---	5	2	2	6	4	1	3	29
Humanities	1	---	---	---	---	2	---	---	1	---	4
Human Relations	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Industrial Management	---	---	1	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	2
Law	1	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	---	---	3
Linguistics	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	1	---	---	3
Mathematics	---	---	---	2	1	2	1	---	---	1	7
Medicine	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1
Music	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1
Near Eastern Studies	---	1	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	2
Patristics	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	1	3
Philosophy	5	2	1	4	5	9	4	2	4	2	38
Physics	---	1	---	3	---	1	2	1	---	---	8
Political Science	1	1	2	4	1	1	---	2	2	1	15
Psychology	3	2	---	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	17
Public Health	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1
Russian Studies	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Sacred Scripture	---	2	---	---	2	---	---	---	2	---	6
Semitic Languages, Semitics	2	---	---	---	---	4	---	1	---	---	7
Slavic Language & Literature	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	---	---	2
Social Studies	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Social Work	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Sociology	3	2	---	---	2	1	1	2	---	1	12
Spanish	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Speech	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1
Theatre Arts	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Theology	10	10	7	16	12	23	4	23	5	9	119
TOTALS	40	29	17	53	39	74	36	57	28	32	405

TABLE 4

UNIVERSITIES ATTENDED BY JESUIT DOCTORAL STUDENTS, 1968-1969

	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Ore.	Wis.	Total
American	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Arizona	1	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	2
Biblical Institute*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	2
Bonn*	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Boston College	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	2
Boston University	---	---	---	---	1	1	---	1	1	---	4
Brandeis	---	1	---	---	---	---	2	---	---	---	3
Brown	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	---	1	---	3
California (Berkeley)	2	---	---	---	---	---	1	2	1	1	7
California (L.A.)	1	---	1	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	4
California Western	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	2
Cambridge*	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	2	3
Catholic University	---	2	1	5	3	1	---	5	---	5	22
Chicago	2	4	2	4	---	1	1	3	1	---	18
Chicago Theological	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	---	---	---	2
City U. of New York	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Colorado	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1
Columbia	---	---	---	1	---	2	1	---	---	2	6
Cornell	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	---	3
Detroit	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Duke	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Emory	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Fairleigh Dickinson	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1
Florida	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Fordham	2	6	2	1	1	3	4	---	2	2	23
Fribourg*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1
George Washington	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Georgetown	---	3	1	4	---	4	1	1	---	---	14
Georgia	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Georgia Inst. of Tech.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1
Grad. Theol. Union	---	---	---	2	---	---	---	---	---	1	3
Gregorian*	7	---	---	2	4	5	1	1	---	1	21
Harvard	1	2	---	3	1	5	---	6	---	---	18
Heidelberg*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1
Illinois	---	---	---	---	1	1	---	---	1	---	3
Illinois Tech.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Indiana	---	---	---	---	1	---	1	1	---	---	3
Innsbruck*	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Institut Catholique*	1	2	---	---	1	1	---	4	---	1	10
Iowa	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Johns Hopkins	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	3	---	1	6
London*	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	---	---	2
London S. of Economics*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Louisiana State	---	---	---	---	---	---	3	---	---	---	3
Louvain*	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	---	3
Loyola (Chicago)	---	1	---	---	1	1	2	---	---	1	6
Marquette	---	---	1	1	---	---	---	1	---	---	3
Maryland	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Massachusetts	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
M.I.T.	---	1	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	2
McGill*	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Michigan	---	1	---	1	2	1	---	1	1	---	7
Michigan State	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	2

	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Ore.	Wis.	Total
Minnesota	2	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	3	6
Missouri (Kansas City)	---	---	---	---	2	---	---	---	---	---	2
Montreal*	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Munster*	---	---	---	2	1	---	---	---	---	---	3
Nebraska	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1
New Mexico	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
New York U.	5	---	---	4	---	2	---	1	1	---	13
North Carolina	1	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	1	1	5
Northwestern	---	---	---	1	1	1	---	---	---	---	3
Notre Dame	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	---	---	---	2
Ohio State	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	2
Oriental*	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Ottawa*	2	---	1	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	4
Oxford*	1	---	---	---	---	2	---	2	---	---	5
Paris*	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	---	---	---	2
Pennsylvania	---	---	---	2	2	3	1	1	---	---	9
Pennsylvania State	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Pittsburgh	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	---	---	2
Pont. Istituto Biblico*	---	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2
Princeton	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1
Princeton Theol. Sem.	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Rochester	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Rome*	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
St. Georgen (Frankfurt)*	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
St. Louis	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	2	3
St. Paul's, Ottawa*	---	---	---	---	2	4	---	1	---	---	7
San Fran. Theol. Sem.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	3	---	3
Sorbonne*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Southern California	3	1	---	1	1	1	1	1	1	---	10
Southern Methodist	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Stanford	1	---	---	1	1	1	---	1	2	---	7
Strasbourg*	1	---	---	---	1	---	---	3	---	---	5
Syracuse	---	---	---	---	---	2	1	2	---	---	5
Temple	---	---	---	3	1	1	---	---	---	---	5
Texas	---	---	---	1	1	---	---	1	---	---	3
Tokyo*	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Toronto*	---	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	---	1	3
Trier*	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Tubingen*	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	3	---	---	5
Tulane	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	1	---	3
Union Theological	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Vienna*	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Virginia	---	---	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	---	2
Washington U.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	2
U. of Washington	---	---	---	---	1	1	---	---	3	---	5
Wayne	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Western Behavioral	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1
Western Reserve	---	---	---	---	1	2	---	---	---	1	4
Wisconsin	1	---	---	2	---	1	---	1	1	1	7
Wurzburg*	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Yale	3	---	1	1	2	4	3	1	---	---	15
TOTALS	40	29	17	53	39	74	36	57	28	32	405

*Non-United States Schools

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Index to Volume 31

June 1968 to March 1969

"And Writing Maketh . . .": Edward J. Bartley	166
Barth, J. Robert, S.J.: Theology and Literature	116
Bartley, Edward J.: "And Writing Maketh . . . "	166
Blewett, John E., S.J.: Jesuit Institutions of Higher Education in Latin America	106
Brennan, Robert O., S.J.: Identity Crisis for Priests	199
Burghardt, Walter J., S.J.: Freedom and Authority in Jesuit Education.....	3
Casey, Thomas J., S.J.: Curricula for a Humane Education	177
Catholic Universities and Colleges: Ships in Need of a Compass: Eugene E. Grollmes, S.J.	212
Curricula for a Humane Education: Thomas J. Casey, S.J.	177
Daly, Lowrie J., S.J.: A Suggestion for the Academic Counseling of Jesuits	101
Drane, Joseph K., S.J.: Juridical Substructures of American Jesuit Educational Institutions	67
Enrollment Statistics—1968-69	159
Episcopacy and Theology: George C. McCauley, S.J.	17
Fichter, Joseph H., S.J.: Pastors and Professors	189
Preparation of the Jesuit Professional	148
A Survey of American Jesuit Priests	91
Freedom and Authority in Jesuit Education: Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.	3
Freedom in Theological Research: William A. Scott, S.J.	207
Government Financing of Education: Jerome A. Petz, S.J.	23
Grollmes, Eugene E., S.J.: Catholic Universities and Colleges: Ships in Need of a Compass	212
Identity Crisis for Priests: Robert O. Brennan, S.J.	199
Jesuit Institutions of Higher Education in Latin America: John E. Blewett, S.J.	106
Jesuit Secular Campus Experiment, A: John F. Talbot, S.J.	172
Jesuits and the University: Walter P. Krolikowski, S.J.	131
Juridical Substructures of American Jesuit Educational Institutions: Joseph K. Drane, S.J.	67
Krolikowski, Walter P., S.J.: Jesuits and the University	131
McCall, John R., S.J.: Santa Clara and the Jesuit Educational Apostolate..	53

McCauley, George C., S.J.: Episcopacy and Theology	17
McGinley, James J., S.J.: Self-Starters	223
McNaspy, C. J., S.J.: Notes on Jesuits in the Fine Arts	143
Notes on Jesuits in the Fine Arts: C. J. McNaspy, S.J.	143
Orsy, Ladislav M., S.J.: Statement on Academic Freedom at a University	12
Pastors and Professors: Joseph H. Fichter, S.J.	189
Petz, Jerome A., S.J.: Government Financing of Education	23
Preparation of the Jesuit Professional: Joseph H. Fichter, S.J.	148
Ratterman, Patrick H., S.J.: Student Rights and Freedoms: A Commentary on the Joint Statement	34
Santa Clara and the Jesuit Educational Apostolate: John R. McCall, S.J.	53
Scott, William A., S.J.: Freedom in Theological Research	207
Self-Starters: James J. McGinley, S.J.	223
Short-Term Exchange of Jesuit Personnel	184
Statement on Academic Freedom at a University: Ladislav M. Orsy, S.J.	12
Status of Special Studies 1968-1969	227
Student Rights and Freedoms: A Commentary on the Joint Statement: Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J.	34
Suggestion for the Academic Counseling of Jesuits, A: Lowrie J. Daly, S.J.	101
Survey of American Jesuit Priests, A: Joseph H. Fichter, S.J.	91
Talbot, John F., S.J.: A Jesuit Secular Campus Experiment	172
Theology and Literature: J. Robert Barth, S.J.	116