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Warmth and melting snow presage spring and South Bend, and with it the realization that the Program will soon be completing its sixtieth year. Fr. Cavanaugh’s bold experiment, which brought Program founder Otto Bird to South Bend in 1950, may not have become the template for all undergraduate education in the College, but it has certainly proved long-lived. Today, if one measures by faculty and student enthusiasm and by support from the Provost and Dean, the Program is as strong as ever.

Shortly after the end of last academic year, on June 5, 2009, Otto Bird died at the age of 94. He devoted much of his life to the Program, serving as midwife at the very beginning, as shepherd through the early years, and as conscience even after his retirement. Mike Crowe, Otto’s student, colleague, and friend, has contributed a memorial to this issue.

At the end of the Fall term, the Program lost another giant—Fred Crosson passed away on December 9, 2009, at the age of 83. Former O’Hara Chair of Philosophy, chair of the Program, Dean of the College, first Cavanaugh Professor of the Humanities, first Catholic president of the national Phi Beta Kappa Society, Fred played a foundational role in the Program and the University since arriving on the Notre Dame faculty in 1953. He was a model for his colleagues of intellectual rigor and integrity. He was also, as I found when first serving as chair in the early 1990s, a particularly generous colleague; Fred never turned down a request to serve the department. When asked his teaching preference, his reply invariably was “put me where I’m needed most.”

The newest member of the Program family is young Henry Jones, child of Professor Krista Duttenhaver and her husband, Coy Jones, born June 22, 2009. Although Krista was relieved of teaching duties for the Fall semester, she did direct senior theses and keep up her service commitments. We are happy to have her back in the classroom this term.

As we expected, a large contingent of sophomores, the Class of ’12, enrolled in the Program. We started with more than 70, and with the inevitable attrition that comes with the realization that a PLS education is unusually demanding, we are ending the year with over 60 students. Over the next few weeks we will see what our Class of ’13 looks like. With help from the Calcutt Family Endowment for Excellence, we have resources for recruiting (in the past, many first year students have found the combination of Great Books and pizza irresistible).

This summer will see our 12th annual PLS Summer Symposium, built this year around Pascal’s *Pensées*. It promises once again to be a marvelous intellectual and social experience. Many of those who have taken the plunge have found it an indispensable part of their summers, returning year after year. Please look at the lineup for this year’s Symposium on p. 2 and consider joining us this year.

With some sadness I’ll close by saying that this will be my last View from 215. Coming to the end of my second three-year term as Chair, I’ve asked the Dean to allow me to return to full-time teaching and research, and I’m confidently and happily turning the reins over to Gretchen Reydams-Schils. While there are many things I’ll miss about Program chair, including the pride in being the temporary leader of the department offering the finest undergraduate education at Notre Dame, I’m ready to give somebody else a chance.

Steve Fallon
Chair, Program of Liberal Studies
ANNOUNCING THE TWELFTH ANNUAL
PLS/GP SUMMER SYMPOSIUM
JUNE 6-11, 2010

“THE HEART HAS ITS REASONS”

This year’s annual PLS Alumni/ae Summer Symposium will be held from Sunday, June 6 to Friday, June 11. The main focus will be on the great seventeenth-century French thinker, Blaise Pascal, the author of the *Pensées*, who meditated deeply on scientific, metaphysical, and religious questions. Two seminars, those given by Professors Phillip Sloan and Katherine Tillman, and a preliminary lecture, given by Professor Michael Crowe, will focus on various aspects of Pascal’s thought, both in itself and in conjunction with other authors (including John Henry, Cardinal Newman, in Professor Tillman’s seminar). In addition, we will also offer seminars on twentieth-century poetry (Professor Henry Weinfield), the theologian Hans Urs von Balthasar (Professor Kevin Mongrain), contemporary physics and the philosophical issues it poses (Professors Felicitas Munzel and Matthew Dowd), and moral education (Professor Clark Power). We promise a very rich week of stimulating conversation on great books and important ideas. Here are the course descriptions:

1. **Week-long Seminars**

**From Science to Faith: The Power of Pascal’s Thought**—Phillip Sloan

This week-long summer seminar will be devoted to the French mathematician, philosopher, and religious thinker Blaise Pascal (1623–82). Although our primary focus will be on his fragmentary *Pensées*, we will take an unusual approach to this text by beginning with some of his reflections on scientific and methodological questions so as to help us avoid a reading of Pascal as one advocating fideism and who emphasizes the “heart” over “reason” in matters of religion. The seminar will begin with a lecture on Sunday evening (before classes begin) by Professor Michael Crowe on Pascal’s general place in history. The seminar itself will begin with readings in some of Pascal’s lesser-known scientific and methodological treatises, and will then move into the *Pensées*. We will conclude with a number of readings in reaction to Pascal. This seminar will be paired with parallel sessions on Pascal and Newman conducted by Professor Katherine Tillman.


**Session 3. The Struggle of Doubt and Faith: Reading: *Pensees* 60-290 (sections II-IV)**

**Session 4. Pascal’s Solution: Reading: *Pensees* 291-554. (Sections V-VIII)** (we will use selections in this portion of the reading).

**Session 5. Responses to Pascal: Short Readings to be Supplied:**
Reasons of the Heart in Modern Poetry: Yeats, Eliot, and Bronk—Henry Weinfield

Although Pascal was sometimes disparaging of poetry (“A poet, and not an honest man” is one of his aphorisms in the *Pensées*), poets have always taken to heart his dictum that “the heart has its reasons that reason does not know.” This five-day seminar will examine poems by William Butler Yeats (1865-1939), T. S. Eliot (1888-1965), and William Bronk (1918-1999) that express deep, sometimes buried, emotion and that attempt to get as close as they can to what Yeats, in “The Lake Isle of Innisfree,” called “the deep heart’s core.”

Texts: We will focus on developing close readings of only a few poems, so it’s not necessary to purchase any texts; xeroxes will be supplied. However, for those who want to get the texts, these are the standard editions: W. B. Yeats, *The Collected Poems*, ed. Richard J. Finneran (Collier-Macmillan); T. S. Eliot, *The Complete Poems and Plays: 1909-1959* (Harcourt, Brace and World); William Bronk: *Life Supports: New and Collected Poems* (Talisman House). There are also editions of *Selected Poems* by all three poets that you can purchase.

II. Shorter Seminars

Pascal and Newman: Reasoning and the Existence of God—Katherine Tillman

Although Blaise Pascal and Cardinal John Henry Newman recognize the capabilities and limits of reason with regard to our knowledge of God, they are both inclined to go much further along the route of inquiry than arguments, proofs and formal reasoning might allow. This three-day seminar will ferret out some of those broader senses of human rationality; for example, the intuitions and inferences of the heart, conscience as a way of knowing God, informal reasoning based on probabilities, the place of predisposition for reasoning and for faith. We will use the same paperback edition of Pascal that Prof. Sloan’s seminar is using. Newman’s writings are available at newmanreader.org.

Reconnecting Truth and Prayer: The Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar—Kevin Mongrain

Hans Urs von Balthasar is one of the most influential Catholic theologians of the 20th century; he has deeply shaped the theological mind of Pope Benedict XVI, who gave the homily at Balthasar's funeral in 1988. Balthasar's overall theological project was to reunite spirituality and mysticism with theological reflection. Like Pascal, he believed the heart has reasons that reason does not know, and he wanted theology to be more about the heart's reasons for faith than Reason's purely abstract propositions and proofs about faith. This is why his preferred methods of writing theology were hagiography (studies of holiness) and anthologies of the writings of mystics. His approach both affirms and radicalizes the general 20th century trend in Catholic theology away from scholasticism and toward a more biblical, patristic, and poetic-literary mode of reflection.

John Milton and Isaac Newton—Steve Fallon

Newton, like Milton, is vast and complex. And their thought is related in complex ways. Both Milton and Newton are Arians, denying the coessential divinity of the Son of God. Both downplay the importance of the atonement in Christian theology. Both think of themselves, though in significantly different ways, as prophets. Both are interested in origins and both write histories, though their relations to fathers and to the political symbolism of fathers are sharply opposed. In our two sessions, we will glance at some surprising points of convergence between the seventeenth century’s greatest scientist and greatest poet. We will focus on the resonances between the two figures’ understanding of body and space. Newton’s ambivalent relation to the mathematical abstraction of space and bodies, as expressed in his interest in alchemy, recalls in surprising ways Milton’s idiosyncratic views on matter and spirit.

Moral Education: Can Virtue Be Taught—Clark Power

Focusing on contemporary moral and character education approaches, this single-session seminar will take up the question that Meno asked Socrates. The text will be Lawrence Kohlberg’s “Education for Justice.”
WHO: PROGRAM FACULTY, ALUMNI/AE, FRIENDS, AND FAMILY
WHAT: ELEVENTH ANNUAL PLS/GP SUMMER SYMPOSIUM
WHEN: JUNE 6-11, 2010
WHERE: NOTRE DAME CAMPUS
WHY: TO SHARE BOOKS, REFLECTIONS, FRIENDSHIP

Housing will be available in an air-conditioned dormitory on campus. Information on rates to follow. They should be in the neighborhood of the 2009 rates ($47 per night for single, $34/person/night for double).

We need to collect a registration fee to cover costs for the week. The cost will be $500 for the week, or $750 for two. We will try to make arrangements for those eager to attend but for whom the registration fee would be an obstacle.

If you are interested in the 2010 Symposium, please mail the form below to Summer Symposium 2010, Program of Liberal Studies, U of ND, Notre Dame, IN 46556, or e-mail the requested information to pls@nd.edu. The course is open to alumni/ae as well as friends of the Program, so if you have a friend who would jump at the chance to be involved, feel free to share this information.

2010 Summer Symposium Questionnaire

Name ________________________________________
Address ____________________________________________________________
Phone _______________________
E-mail ___________________

_______ I am interested in attending.
_______ I already know that I want to attend and I am sending a $200 deposit.

_______ I am interested in a room in an air-conditioned dormitory on campus. (We anticipate that our participants will be clustered together.) I plan to check in on June ____ and check out on June _____.

I have the following suggestion for future texts or topics. (The reading for single-day sessions should be manageable.)

You may mail this form to PLS, U of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556 or e-mail responses to pls@nd.edu.
The Opening Charge is a traditional gathering of the entire Program in which we come together as a community to renew acquaintances, welcome any visitors and guests, and also seek new inspiration for a year of study and learning from the great works of tradition. In delivering this charge, my last as a regular faculty member, I shall take some breathlessly bold steps and try to pull together some issues in philosophy, life science, and liberal education about which I have been thinking for many years, some of these for 50 years to be exact. A half century ago this fall, I was a student of biology and chemistry, planning to enter medical school. This was also the year when the University of Chicago held its great symposium celebrating the century after Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, a meeting that drew 2,500 attendees from the entire world to assess the importance of Darwin’s work after its first 100 years. Traveling on his way to that meeting was a generally unknown African physical anthropologist, Louis B. Leakey, who was to present his findings on the discovery of some stunning new fossils of an erect-walking hominid, found in the presence of primitive stone tools. This was named by him *Zinjanthropus boisei*, but since then renamed *Paranthropus* or on some classifications a species of *Australopithecus*.¹ I attended this preview of his Chicago presentation in a series of four evening lectures at the University of Utah by Leakey, and it created for me an abiding interest in the whole question of evolution, and particularly in human evolution.

This new interest led me to change my educational goals from one directed to a career in medicine to the study of evolution in the deep sea. Through my subsequent graduate study at Scripps Institution of Oceanography in La Jolla, I was initiated into the intricacies of modern evolutionary theory, particularly as it had been formulated by the great names that were the featured speakers at the Chicago symposium—Ernst Mayr, George Gaylord Simpson, Julian Huxley, H. J. Muller, Conrad Waddington, E. B. Ford, and many others. But it was a series of conversations I had with a classically-educated German physician—I only remember him as “Dr. Vogel”—on a long sea cruise in 1963 that raised for me another level of questions which eventually led to my study of philosophy and a Ph.D. in that area after I had almost completed one in Marine Biology. His comment, after I had expounded some of my evolutionary world view to him one evening in the Central Atlantic, still stays with me: he simply sadly shook his head and said “The problem with you Americans is that you have never read Kant, or you would not say such stupid things.” It took me several years of further study of philosophy, intellectual history, and then my years of teaching the great books in PLS to fully appreciate what he meant by this remark. Not that Kant solves all the issues—I have many disagreements with Kant—but he forces us to reflect on naive scientism and the assumptions behind our knowledge claims in a way that few other philosophers do. My reflections tonight, at least in part, reach back to these events of a half century ago.

¹ Accepted classifications today usually place this form off the main line of human evolution but these classifications have been thrown into some turmoil by the announcement of the discovery of the fossil *Ardipithecus ramidus* in early October of 2009 that if accepted is an erect walking primate dating from approximately 4.4 million years B.P.
We are now in the midst of another worldwide commemoration of Darwin’s achievement, the 200th anniversary of Darwin’s birth on February 12, 1809, and the 150th anniversary of the publication of the *Origin of Species* on November 24, 1859. This seems an appropriate occasion to address some issues raised by this important book and its successor, the *Descent of Man* of 1871, in many ways two of the last “great books” in science, both of which are read in the senior year in the Program. Since the late 19th century, it has been the scientific paper, not the book that has been the main vehicle of scientific presentation.

My talk will be organized into two parts. First, I shall engage the first part of my title, inspired particularly by a short essay, entitled “On the Upright Posture,”² published in 1952 by the German emigré phenomenological psychiatrist Erwin Straus, the author of such subsequent works as *Psychiatry and Philosophy* (1969), and *Man, Time and World* (1982). I will comment in this context on some of the issues that I see to be most important in assessing the relevance of Straus’s reflections for some of the issues raised by Darwin’s approach to the human question, particularly concerning the nature of defining the difference between the human and the animal in the wake of Darwin’s account of human origins.

In the second part, I will develop some brief reflections on liberal education and the relevance of the reflections of the first part of the lecture on our goals as a program devoted to the study and reflection on the great works of tradition and the understanding of the human person in the fullest meaning of that phrase.

---


---

**Part One: On Being Upright**

I first encountered the short essay by Erwin Straus in the biology manual for the freshman laboratory of our sister great books Program, St. Johns College, Annapolis. I then was led to see some new levels of importance of this essay through the use of it made by University of Chicago professor of humanities Leon Kass in his intriguing work on eating, *The Hungry Soul.*³ I have also drawn on related discussions found in Notre Dame philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre’s recently published essay, “What is a Human Body?”⁴ that makes some of the points of interest with more philosophical rigor. Generally I can pose my central question for this evening as the following: “what does it really mean to be human in an evolutionary world?”

Since so much of the public discussion of this question since 1859 has been a point of controversy in the relation of science and religion, I will discuss a statement of the late Pope John Paul II to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences in October of 1996 which gives us a baseline for thinking about this from a Catholic Christian point of view. The Pontifical Academy is a major institution that was founded by Pius IX to keep the Vatican informed of the thinking of the great scientists of the world. An address to this group is a significant index of how the official Catholic Church may be thinking about these questions.

This letter was part of the late Pope’s efforts to create a new kind of dialogue between Catholic thought and the natural sciences,

---


moving us past some of the tired oppositions of the past, such as the Galileo affair, developing instead a new kind of interpenetrating dialogue of scientifically-informed theology and advanced natural science. A letter the Pope wrote to Fr. George Coyne of the Vatican Observatory in 1987 on the 300th anniversary of the publication of Isaac Newton’s *Principia* is relevant. In this he set out some larger groundwork for this new kind of dialogue:

Turning to the relationship between religion and science, there has been a definite, though still fragile and provisional, movement toward a new and more nuanced interchange. We have begun to talk to one another on deeper levels than before and with greater openness toward one another’s perspectives. We have begun to search together for a more thorough understanding of one another’s disciplines, with their competencies and their limitations, and especially for areas of common ground. In doing so we have uncovered important questions which concern both of us and which are vital to the larger human community we both serve. It is crucial that this common search based on critical openness and interchange should not only continue, but also grow and deepen in its quality and scope.

What, then, does the Church encourage in this relational unity between science and religion? First and foremost that they should come to understand one another. For too long a time they have been at arm’s length.

Theology has been defined as an effort of faith to achieve understanding, as *fides quaerens intellectum*. As such, it must be in vital interchange today with science just as it always has been with philosophy and other forms of learning. Theology will have to call on the findings of science to one degree or another as it pursues its primary concern for the human person, the reaches of freedom, the possibilities of Christian community, the nature of belief and the intelligibility of nature and history. The vitality and significance of theology for humanity will in a profound way be reflected in its ability to incorporate these findings.

John Paul’s letter on evolution to the Pontifical Academy eight years later was more explicit about evolutionary biology. He referred back to the only previous official statement of 1950 by Pius XII, which said evolutionary theory could be discussed as a “hypothesis,” and then commented: Today, almost half a century after the publication of the Encyclical *Humani generis* of Pius XII, new knowledge has led to the recognition of the theory of evolution as more than a hypothesis. It is indeed remarkable that this theory has been progressively accepted by researchers, following a series of discoveries in various fields of knowledge. The convergence, neither sought nor fabricated, of the results of work that was conducted independently is in itself a significant argument in favor of this theory.6

---


6 Delivered October, 1996. Available on-line at [http://www.its.caltech.edu/~nmcenter/sci- cp/evolution.html](http://www.its.caltech.edu/~nmcenter/sci-cp/evolution.html). Since there has been some controversy about the proper translation of this paragraph, the French original reads: “Aujourd’hui, près d’un demi-siècle après la parution de l’encyclique, de nouvelles connaissances conduisent à reconnaître dans la théorie de l’évolution plus qu’un hypothèse.”
I should be clear that this letter does not, however, amount to some easy endorsement of everything proposed in the name of evolutionary biology. There are important distinctions also to be made in light of the Christian conception of the human being. As concerns the human being, the Pope has several crucial things to say:

With man, then, we find ourselves in the presence of an ontological difference, an ontological leap, one could say. However, does not the posing of such ontological discontinuity run counter to that physical continuity which seems to be the main thread of research into evolution in the field of physics and chemistry? Consideration of the method used in the various branches of knowledge makes it possible to reconcile two points of view which would seem irreconcilable. The sciences of observation describe and measure the multiple manifestations of life with increasing precision and correlate them with the time line. The moment of transition to the spiritual cannot be the object of this kind of observation, which nevertheless can discover at the experimental level a series of very valuable signs indicating what is specific to the human being. But the experience of metaphysical knowledge, of self-awareness and self-reflection, of moral conscience, freedom, or again, of aesthetic and religious experience, falls within the competence of philosophical analysis and reflection, while theology brings out its ultimate meaning according to the Creator’s plans.7

I draw our attention to the phrase “we find ourselves in the presence of an ontological difference, an ontological leap, one could say.” As JPII elaborates this point, he denies that the transition to the human has a purely naturalistic explanation, or that the human simply emerges from the forces of matter. But in more detail, how are we to understand this claimed difference? To appeal, as is common in religious discourse, to the notion of the creation of an immortal soul may be the true theological answer, but it is also a conversation stopper in discussion with the natural sciences. The sciences claim to be grounded on “experience” or “empiricism,” and not on supernaturalism of some form. Their framework is that of naturalism—meaning that no causes or entities are to be appealed to that are outside the natural order. This has led to the common assumption in the literature that we must oppose “supernatural” or “transcendental” approaches to human beings against “empirical” or “naturalistic” accounts.8

I will take another approach to this question that cannot be so easily dismissed as a “supernatural” appeal. I begin by accepting the claim that we will ground our analysis on “experience,” but then ask about the nature of our “experience” of the human being that is relevant here. This leads me to the Straus essay. Straus makes no theological or dualist assumptions and what he argues is not incompatible with what might be termed an “emergentist” position on the relation of the mental and the physical.9 But what he does do is to push the issue of “experience” to a level deeper than we find in standard scientific empiricism. What he is reaching for in this essay is to the pre-philosophical experience that stands prior to our various efforts to systematize and rationalize our experience such as we then find in the natural sciences. His starting point is with our actual

---

7 Ibid.


9 In this I see no incompatibility with what is commonly termed “non-reductive physicalism.” For some discussion of this see E. McMullin, “Biology and the Theology of the Human,” pp. 367–93, in P. R. Sloan (ed.) Controlling Our Destinies: Historical, Philosophical, Ethical, and Theological Perspectives on the Human Genome Project (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000).
awareness of ourselves. In doing this he
draws on the philosophical tradition known
as Continental “phenomenology,” a tradition
that includes such names as Edmund Husserl,
Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Martin Heidegger to
a degree, and Max Scheler. It is termed
“phenomenology” because of its concern to
return to that which is the fundamental
“given” in pre-philosophical experience. “To
the things themselves” was the original
clarion call of this philosophical movement.
Edmund Husserl, its main theorist, and one
who also had the deepest evident impact on
Straus, put some of the point of this form of
philosophy in his work, Ideas:

It is then to the world, the world in
which I find myself and which is also
my world-about-me, that the complex
forms of my manifold and shifting
spontaneities of consciousness stand
related.11

To translate this statement of Husserl’s for
our purposes, we find ourselves in an
immediate and undeniable experience, in a
life world to which we are related by
consciousness, intentionality, and self-
awareness. There are other people, animals,
objects that seem to form the primary givens
in this world. To move out from this
primordial experience in the direction of
science or philosophy means to thematize
this world in some way that involves various
kinds of abstractions from it, or impositions
of categories upon it. We can mathematize
this world, for example, and study it in terms
of mathematical physics. Or we can treat it as
a biological ecosystem; or we can develop
complex philosophical theories about it—the
Idealism of Hegel, the materialism of
Lucretius, or that of modern scientific
materialism for example. But these all

involve the subsequent application of certain
assumptions and categories, such as causal
determinism, or mathematical law, or
assumptions about the existence of atoms or
the nature of matter, to the phenomena. It
involves the selecting out of certain features
from this primordial given for intentional
study.

But of fundamental importance for my
argument is that the primordial world
remains always with us. As Husserl
comments in the Ideas, “the natural world,
the world in the ordinary sense of the word,
is constantly there for me, so long as I live
naturally and looking in its direction. . . . I am
at the natural standpoint after as well as
before, and in this respect undisturbed by the
adoption of new standpoints.”12

So what does this have to do with our upright
posture? First, using a similar argument to
that of Husserl, Straus claims that he is
interested to describe what “man actually
is”—that is, as phenomenologically given in
Husserl’s sense—rather than what might be
our theories of how the human being might
be variously thematized, such as if studied in
terms of historical origins. (140). This
givenness reveals that “upright posture is the
leitmotiv in the formation of the human
organism. . . . [it] pre-establishes a definite
attitude toward the world; it is a specific
mode of being-in-the-world” (139).

Let us think more about what is actually
given to us in this life world we inhabit. At
the moment we are temporarily no longer
erect, but seated. We are communicating
through a highly symbolic use of language
with grammatical organization, nuances of
sound, all to transmit meanings that go
beyond simply the production of the
soundwaves involved in speech. We are

10 This tradition was also important for the
philosophical thought of the late Pope himself, as
developed in his Karol Wojtyla, The Acting Person,
11 E. Husserl, Ideas as in W. Barrett and H. D. Aiken
(eds.), Philosophy in the Twentieth Century (New
12 Ibid, p. 174. For some useful extended comment
on the applicability of this methodology to the natural
sciences, see J. Kockelmans, Phenomenology and
Physical Science (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University
jointly reflecting on words and concepts, you as an audience and I as a speaker, and we are attending to one another in a face to face relationship that is transmitting meaning beyond simply the words being spoken. While even to describe this experience as I have done requires categories and systematization, we can recognize that behind these descriptions is a more primordial, pre-philosophical experience going on.

When we reassume our erect posture, we perceive how our hands are free not simply to wield clubs or sticks, but also to gesture, shake hands, hug, and so on. The relationship is that of two vertical beings meeting face to face. These relationships maintain a certain distance—usually somewhere around the length of the arm—except when people are drawn together in love or affection. The language we use is highly symbolic and multi-layered, involving not only cries and grunts, but a remarkable coordination of grammar, facial expression, eye contact, what we call “body language,” and gestures with the hands.

This mode of being we typically possess as adults—walking upright— is not, of course, immediately given. Once we leave the stage of being carried by our mothers, we begin exploration of the world on all fours, and only gradually develop the upright posture. From Rousseau in the eighteenth century to Darwin and modern sociobiology, this fact has been a strong point in favor of the argument for a continuity of the human and animal as a process of historical development. But let us look at this more closely.

I have had the opportunity in the last few years to do something with my great grandchildren that I never quite did with my own children, and this has been to observe them very carefully as they developed, with Straus’s essay, some of the writings of Jean Piaget, and the writings of evolutionary psychologists and empirical primatologists like Frans de Waal in the background.

To a certain point, when a child is crawling on all fours, one can surely find many similarities with the young of another primate. The nose tends to lead the face; eating can be simply direct; much of the exploration of the environment is simply made by placing all objects in the mouth. Both the higher primates and the human being have the ability to pick up objects with prehensile forelimbs and examine them with stereoscopic vision. There are any number of studies which have utilized comparisons of early primate and human development to explain human behavior, many of these leading to important changes in human practice, such as the work of Notre Dame anthropologist James McKenna, whose studies on sleep in infants of humans and primates has led to the redesign of beds and sleeping relations of adults and infants. The comparative approach is one of the mainstays of contemporary evolutionary psychology, and many things can be learned from it.

These studies also imply the acceptance of a conceptual distinction that I need to make here to develop my argument further. This is the distinction between two kinds of organic resemblances, known since the nineteenth century in the literature of biology as “Analogy” and “Homology.” I characterize this distinction as follows:

**Analogy:** “The similarity of parts or activities in terms of similar functions” e.g. the wing of a bird and wing of a bee.

**Homology:** “The same parts in every variety of form and function” e.g. the flipper of a whale, the wing of a bird and the forelimb of the human being.

This distinction has been crucial in the development of evolutionary biology since

---

the nineteenth century. “Analogy,” in this technical sense, denotes relations of common function. The wing of a bird and the wing of a bee have no structural components in common, but they perform the same locomotive function.

The other relationship, homology, was crucial for evolutionary accounts. This designates the “same” part in every variety of its form and function. Here the example could be the flipper of the whale, the wing of a bird and the forelimb of a human being. If the function in the first two cases is the same—locomotion—in the human being it is not, once upright posture is attained. Yet the assumption is that there is an underlying identity of these parts, with the “same” bones, muscles, and other main structures found in all three.

Darwin supplied in chapter 13 of the *Origin of Species* an explanation of such homologies that has been common in biology ever since. This was his definition of homological identity as the product of a community of descent from common ancestors. As one goes deeper into the anatomy of the organism, one finds more and more evidence of this resemblance of identity, and this is assumed to imply historical relationship. The principle of homology today is more often employed at the molecular level, with reference to common developmental pathways, clusters of genes, and so on, that are conserved through a wide range of forms, constituting developmental modules that might be seen as common to vertebrates and even between vertebrates and invertebrates back to the most primordial forms of life on earth.

This concept has taken on a crucial role in comparative behavioral and psychological studies, and it has been the keystone of the move to connect animal and human behavioral properties emphasized by sociobiology and evolutionary psychology. Homologies can then designate conserving behavioral modules that show common historical ancestry, such as grooming behavior in primates. This transfer of homology from an anatomical or structural principle—something related to skeletal properties—to homologies of the inner properties of the organism, is deeply important in understanding the contemporary impact of Darwin on the human sciences. It is also fundamental for evolutionary analyses of the origins of ethics and altruism in current evolutionary literature.

This extension from anatomical structure to human behavior forms one of the major conceptual leaps made by Darwin in the *Descent of Man* and in his later *Expressions of the Emotions of Man and Animals* (1872). A similar assumption also underlies the work in the twentieth-century of animal ethologists like Niko Tinbergen and Konrad Lorenz whose studies gave rise in the 1970s to what has since been termed “sociobiology”—the theory that human social, ethical, and behavioral characteristics could all be given an evolutionary explanation through Darwinian natural selection theory.15

---

14 The complex issue in this discussion has been the meaning of “sameness.” It has implied in the history of this concept structural identity, identities of anatomical connections, community of origin, formation on an identical plan, or similarity of action, such as the production of identical gene products. For the original formulator of this distinction in the nineteenth century, Richard Owen (1807-1892), it meant the conformation to a transcendental archetype on which all vertebrates were created. Since Darwin, it has typically meant relations defined by community of descent. As used commonly in the literature of evolutionary psychology, which is most relevant to this discussion, it implies identity due to evolutionary derivation from common ancestors.

We can follow Darwin's arguments through chapter 3 of the *Descent of Man*, which will be read at the close of senior seminar this fall, where Darwin identifies a range of emotional and behavioral properties found in humans—wonder, shame, courage, pride, timidity, rage, love, obedience, moral oughtness, even religious sentiment—as being the “same as” those properties found in other animals. They are presumed by Darwin and his contemporary successors in sociobiology to be genuine *homologies* and not simply analogies in the sense I distinguished these above. This assumption of inner mental and behavioral homology is what has made possible all the extensions of evolutionary accounts to ethics, psychology, sociology, and even aesthetics that we find so often presented today.

This transferal from anatomical homology to behavioral and even mental identities is not something that should be accepted without caution, however, and the Straus essay gives us a framework in which to question this. Pressed as far as is commonly done today, I must conclude that this transferal has led to a profound reductionism of the human to the animal, exemplified in the writings of the popularizers of sociobiology such as Desmond Morris and Robert Ardrey. To explain human properties implicitly or explicitly simply by constant reference to their animal origins carries with it an inevitable tendency to explain them away. It leads us to deny a real distinction, the “ontological leap” spoken of previously, between these orders of being.

Without denying that there are many aspects of human existence that seem attributable to other animals—anyone who has owned large dogs is, I am sure, aware of something going on within them to which we can relate—the issue concerns the strength of the homological inference as we consider the important transition in human development that takes place when the child starts to stand up. This assumption of upright posture is first halting, with many falls. Then it becomes more steady, and then anatomically necessary. As Straus describes this:

> In getting up, man gains his standing in the world. . . . There is a forceful urge toward the goal of getting up and of resisting, in a state of dangerous balance, the downward-pulling forces. . . . The natural stance of man is, therefore “resistance.” A rock reposess in its own weight. The things that surround us appear solid and safe in their quiet resting on the ground, but man’s status demands endeavor. (143).

We see in the child’s development how the remarkable skeletal structure of the human being also comes into play. The human skeletal system is coordinated for obligatory upright posture in a way that other primates do not share. The vertebral column now functions as an architectural column rather than as a cantilever bridge suspending the skull and viscera; the placement of the foramen in the skull is vertically over this architectural column rather than at the back of the skull; the face is flattened; the orbit of the eye is widened; the pelvis is expanded to assume the full weight of the torso. There is a profound coordination of form and function that relates all of this in a harmonious system of relations.

One can observe the almost sudden moment of self realization by the child that if I do this—if I stand upright—then I have these—my hands. This frees the child for all kinds of new exploration of its environment. From the point of that realization, the child no longer wants to crawl. And as the skeletal system coordinates with this development, one enters the human life-world. A human being and a dog, or even a chimpanzee, in the same room is not living in the same environment from this point on. Language begins to develop, often with the child looking intently in one’s face as it tries to communicate in a primitive jabber. Gradually then, as Jean Piaget has
described well, there is the recognition of the “I”. The image in the mirror is seen as the self. Studies on chimpanzees have shown something like this also developing, but it so quickly goes beyond this in the human child as this recognition is also coordinated with developing language and the erect posture.

When we enter this human world, I suggest that what we see happening is something profound that seems to have escaped the attention of the evolutionists. This is that properties that may have once been genuine homologies in the Darwinian sense are in effect transformed into analogies. Structures, behavioral properties, physiological processes continue to serve the same functions, perhaps, but they are all profoundly changed by self-reflection, language, and symbolization as one moves from the horizontal to this vertical world. The language of “sameness” and “homology” becomes fundamentally misleading as a result.

Consider eating as an example, an issue that Leon Kass has perceptively analyzed in his *The Hungry Soul* with some inspiration of Straus’s essay in the background. Both we and animals eat to be nourished, and we digest this food in very similar, or even identical, physiological ways. But in the human life world, a genuine meal can become an event of socialization; it can be performed with utensils and rituals of manners that keep us from directly eating off our plates as an animal or young child might do; conversation and fellowship can become more important than what is actually taken in as nourishment; there are aesthetic dimensions to the meal that are important. We engage each other face to face in polite conversation.

There is certainly a community of function here between the human and animal. But what is of interest is the profound transformation that has now taken place. I suggest that we can run through all the properties that Darwin highlights as homologous identities in the *Descent* and see similar transformations of what may have once been homologies into what become in effect only analogies as we enter this upright world. Failure to perceive this is, I feel, the great error in all the reductionisms offered by contemporary sociobiology and evolutionary psychology.

Somewhere in here—in this move to the upright posture—we have a way to think about the “ontological leap” spoken of by Pope John Paul earlier in this talk without immediately appealing to theological assumptions or various forms of dualism. One need not be a supernaturalist or theist to see this point. It only requires some greater attention to our immediate phenomenological experience than I feel is typical in scientific discussions of humans in relation to evolutionary theory. We find as a primordial given this remarkable combination of self-reflection—we are the only animal that seems to “know that we know”—coordinated with our remarkable posture, that in combination with reason and language has freed us for a new human level of existence. Our hands can wield clubs, or pick fleas, but they can also play Mozart, compose great literature, and create remarkable art. Our liberated bodies can develop the complex rhythms of dance. Certainly there is nothing here that denies that humans may have an evolutionary origin, as the anthropologists like Leakey have worked out with painstaking labor. But it opens up a new space for thinking about being human that does not exclude some kind of divine intervention that establishes at some point in time a new and transformative relationship between such a being who may stand at the end of a string of proto-human forms, and

---

God as creator and sustainer of all things as are affirmed in the Creed.

Part 2: Implications for Liberal Education
To turn to the second portion of my lecture, I would like to make a few brief comments on how the points I have developed above relating to the primacy of a human life world that seems so closely related to our posture—might relate to our education in the Program. Connecting education with some conception of human nature and even with our biological nature is a theme we can trace from Aristotle through the long tradition he has influenced. This presumes that there is a biological ground or nature which in humans manifests itself through an internal telos toward knowledge and cognition. The purpose of education in this framework is to cultivate the human self and enable it to realize its end. This idea provided some foundations for the conception of education as moral as well as intellectual formation of the individual for a long tradition into the late 19th century.

But connecting education with some conception of our biological being in the wake of Darwin and the biological science that has developed since his work presents several challenges. Biology today seems to offer little support for any theory of humanistic education. Modern evolutionary theory emphasizes chance and randomness; there is a strong commitment to genetic determinism; and the “molecular” revolution of the 1950s, associated with the names of James Watson and Francis Crick, which has now been extended into such areas as the molecular biology of consciousness, seems distant from many of our concerns. As Crick argued in an influential lecture, “the ultimate aim of the modern movement in biology is in fact to explain all biology in terms of physics and chemistry.” This “molecularization” of life, as we are well aware, has not stopped at the doors of the research laboratory. It is behind many of the deliverances of the bioprophets of our time—Francis Crick, Jacques Monod, Richard Dawkins, E. O. Wilson, Michael Gazzaniga, and Stephen Pinker. We are confronted with a constant discourse of genetic and physical determinism, and “bottom up” explanations of life as the dictates of modern biology. In this scenario, evolutionary theory presumably provides the remote explanation, and molecular biology provides the proximate explanation of life, with no significant residual. That such pronouncements go beyond scientific warrant is not difficult to argue, but the constant stream of these arguments in the public media, delivered in the name of science, overwhelms subtle distinctions between “methodological” and “ontological” naturalism, and the proper limits of scientific reason as these might be worked out by professional philosophers.

One option for dealing with all this from the side of the humanities has been implicitly or explicitly to reject or simply ignore the discussions of such scientists as philosophically naive and unworthy of serious consideration, when they move beyond their domain of specific competence. The comment of my German doctor friend may come to mind here. Such scientism can be attacked in other ways I will not try to detail here—postmodernism and social constructivism can be mentioned. But these protests seem to be having less and less effect on the social, and particularly, on the academic, sphere of discussion. The retreat of the traditional humanities in the face of the sciences has been an obvious feature of the academic landscape in the fifty years since C. P. Snow’s Rede lecture of fifty years ago drew attention to the growing rift between the sciences and humanities. We are, I would claim, presented with a profound disconnection between our biological and social selves. I suggest that we need to reconnect these together again

for the purposes of regaining some holistic sense of education.

In his *Dependent Rational Animals*, Prof. Alasdair MacIntyre’s Carus Lectures for 1997, MacIntyre decided that he had himself been in error in his earlier *After Virtue* of 1981 in thinking that questions of ethics and moral purpose could be divorced from issues of our fundamental biology. As he argues in *Dependent Rational Animals*:

...[N]o account of goods, rules and virtues that are definitive of our moral life can be adequate that does not explain—or at least point us towards an explanation—how that form of life is possible for beings who are biologically constituted as we are, by providing us with an account of our development towards and into that form of life.18

But if he is correct, as I think he is, that we cannot develop a coherent moral life, or a satisfactory educational theory, without some attention to the biological nature of who we are and those whom we educate, the crucial issue seems to be a determination of what biology is. It can be argued that contemporary biology offers us little help here.

I cannot pretend here to do more than throw out a few suggestions for a way forward beyond this impasse by pointing to some issues in contemporary biology that seem to have some relevance to our concerns as humanistic scholars interested in a holistic and integrated education. One issue is the growing attention to the notion of systems and systems approaches in theoretical biology as a way to move beyond the reductionism of molecular biophysics and strong natural selectionism that seems to dominate the scientific landscape at the moment.

The notion of organisms as hierarchical systems of coordinated relations, rather than as collections of matter or individualized parts, is, of course nothing new. Certainly there is recognition of the marvelous coordination of form and function by classical authors like Aristotle and Galen. Even more recently we can reach back into the eighteenth century where we first see the language of “organism” introduced by such important authors as Immanuel Kant. More recently, we can refer to the substantial development of these views in the interwar years by such individuals as Niels Bohr, Conrad Waddington, Alfred North Whitehead, E. S. Russell, and many others.19 These views were, however, defeated for a variety of reasons, particularly by the success of molecular biology in the post World War II period, which seemed to promise a complete “bottom up” explanation of organic life in all its aspects through the physical sciences.

But after several decades of marginalization, new attention has been forced on to the table by the failure of reductive methodologies to solve the empirical problems of developmental biology, gene regulation, organized metabolism, ecosystem analysis, and phylogenetic complexification. In many places we can perceive the introduction into contemporary biological theory of concepts like “organism,” “hierarchy,” “organization,” and “developmental systems”.20 “Organisms are back,” we might

---


19 The growth and success of biophysics and molecular biology since World War II have served to marginalize institutionally the work of developmental and organismic biologists who continued to advance non-reductive views of life—here I might cite names like Conrad Waddington, Joseph Needham, J. S. Haldane, and Ludwig von Bertalanffy as examples. I am exploring these issues in my current research. This is also being explored in part in the dissertation of my student, Erik Peterson, “Dissenters from Darwinism.”

20 Little exploration of systems theory has been made in the technical philosophy of biology, but see F. Boogerd, F. Bruggeman, J. Hofmeyr and H.
say. Such developments inevitably bring with them some attention to notions of formal and final causes, in Aristotle’s sense, and of function and teleological directedness in organic systems.

Exploring this diverse literature is too much for this brief talk, and I cannot claim that these views in any sense form a new consensus position of the kind that has entered textbooks in college biology. But these alternatives are pushing the envelope of assumptions in ways that are relevant to education.

Let me point out one way in which we can see this connection in our Program inquiry. In the cognitive development theory of Jean Piaget, which will be treated by the seniors in the third Natural Science tutorial, we see some of the importance of connecting these issues. Piaget was originally a biologist, and when he turned to the development of the child, he approached the questions of human development through his well-known stages that were developed in large measure from analogies to the stage development theories of the embryology in which he was originally trained. Piaget also made an explicit commitment to systems biology and to the conception of hierarchical and directional development in such works as Biology and Knowledge (Fr. ed. 1967).

Upon his theories we also have the development of a stage-theory of moral development worked out after Piaget by the late Lawrence Kohlberg of Harvard, whose writings are also read in the Senior Science tutorial. In this work Kohlberg applied many of Piaget’s insights to a stage theory of moral development that he claimed could be empirically-demonstrated to be cross-cultural, and that led to a moral maturation in the recognition of ethical universals, such as the demand for distributive justice. The point I wish to bring to attention is that we can see here in a practical way the interconnection of educational and ethical issues with the formulation of non-reductive biological theory.

How this connects to the theme of uprightness is complicated and I will not try to work this out in detail in this address. We can simply point to the fact that as the human person moves from the crawl, to the walk, and then to all the complex relationships of the upright world, we also see the development of the moral being with a new freedom that goes with self awareness and self-understanding. If we are biological beings, we are also beings that have developed into moral creatures, and this itself has some tie to our unusual posture. As Straus puts this,

The expression “to be upright” has two connotations: first, to rise, to get up, and to stand on one’s own feet and, second, the moral implication, not to stoop to anything, to be honest and just, to be true to friends in danger, to stand by one’s convictions, and to act accordingly, even at the risk of one’s life (137).

There are both physical and even ethical dimensions that are called to our attention by thinking about ourselves. Admittedly there can also be negative moral implications of the upright posture as we see films of goose-stepping soldiers march at the Nürnberg rallies. But our typical moral implication of attainment of this form of being suggests something uniquely human and also ethically admirable.

My central point I wish to leave with you as I close this charge to you for this new academic year is to offer a challenge. We have for a very long period of time been

---


---

dealing with a radical fragmentation of the classical conception of general education that Aristotle laid out in the opening paragraph of his *Parts of Animals*, what Aristotle termed *paideia* — the term translated into Latin as *Humanitas* — the general education for life in the polis. This he distinguished from the specialized knowledge of the exact scientific knowledge, or *episteme*. The elevation of *episteme* over *paideia*, and the resultant fragmentation of knowledge has been the product of the many “isms” of modernity, including Darwinism. Our fragmentations have shattered the ideal of a circle of integrated learning that we see symbolized in the seal of the Program, and the deeper search for wisdom that is implied in the classical meaning of “philosophy.” Perhaps what Straus’s essay, and I hope my own comments, have helped us do, is to return us to a fairly obvious starting point, to a human life world where the inquiries into philosophy, literature, science, theology, and the arts have their proper domain, with all relating back to a centeredness in the world of the intentional knowing subject who is freed by his or her unique posture to develop and expand the richness of this world in a way unavailable to the rest of nature.

In this year when Darwin is being feted over the world, I suggest that we can fully recognize Darwin and his great intellectual achievement, as we will do in a major conference here at Notre Dame in early November, if we can keep clear the fact that his science, like all science, is a way of thematizing the life world in which we as humans actually live as upright reflective beings. We can, to be sure, be trapped by these thematizations—Darwin himself was so trapped, leading him to puzzle in one of his last letters over whether if his theories were true, he could possibly trust the reasoning of his own mind to have found any of this out. But we need not be trapped in such paradox. In the world which Straus and others have tried to open up for us, we encounter the domain wherein we have the deepest experiences of what it is to be human. Living in this domain also imposes on us two kinds of restlessness. As Straus comments, “man’s status demands endeavor. It is essentially restless. We are committed to an ever renewed exertion.” But there is also another kind of restlessness, the eternal longing of the human heart for the true, the good, and the beautiful, which is what we seek most in an educational program like ours. To close with the immortal words of Augustine with which he opens the *Confessions*:

> [Man] is but a tiny part of all that Thou hast created. He bears about him his mortality, the evidence of his sinfulness, and the evidence that Thou dost resist the proud. Yet this tiny part of all that Thou has created desires to praise Thee. Thou dost so excite him that to praise Thee is his joy. For Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are Restless till they rest in Thee.

With all best wishes as you begin a new year.

---

22 “[Your] chief claim is that the existence of so-called natural laws implies purpose. I cannot see this. Not to mention that many expect that the several great laws will some day be found to follow inevitably from some one single law....Nevertheless you have expressed my inward conviction, though far more vividly and clearly than I could have done, that the Universe is not the result of chance. But then with me the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of man’s mind, which has been developed from the mind of lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy. Would any one trust in the convictions of a monkey’s mind, if there are any convictions in such a mind?” Letter of Darwin to William Graham, July 3, 1881, in *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, Including an Autobiographical Chapter* (London, 1887 as in American reprint New York: Appleton, 1888), 1: 284–85.
I want to say to all the family of Professor Otto Bird how profoundly the community who knew him and loved him at Notre Dame share your grief. We can never replace someone set deeply in our life, and his family knows that most of all. We share the common hope with Otto himself that all of our lives are in God’s hands, and that we shall see each other again. Together we shall enjoy an eternal life in the Kingdom of God.

In the words to follow I hope to answer three questions: why am I here; why is Otto here, and why are you here.

I am here because Otto asked me to preach at his funeral some fifteen or maybe twenty years ago. Otto was provident if nothing else, and there was much else. I was having lunch at Señor Kelly’s, a cozy inexpensive restaurant in the same building where the up-scale Noma restaurant now entertains. Otto had forgotten his wallet, eaten his lunch, and saw me. I paid for his lunch and insisted it was my pleasure. Some weeks later I was invited to his home on Ponander Drive for a home-cooked lunch and a tour of his library. It was my only visit, I am sorry to say, but one I have never forgotten. Nor did he forget our conversation.

Why is Otto here is my second question. Otto came to Notre Dame because Fr. John Cavanaugh, CSC, president of Notre Dame before Fr. Hesburgh, invited Otto to start a Great Books Program, appropriate and tempered to a Catholic university. Professor Bird was a colleague of Mortimer Adler, and the Great Books movement was centered at the University of Chicago where Otto was also working on the Encyclopedia Brittanica multi-volume edition of the Great Books. The General Program of Liberal Studies was born at Notre Dame in 1950 and celebrated its 50th anniversary in part in the family home of the Birds on Angela Boulevard, courtesy of the present residents, Professor Dolores and Judge Jerome Frese. Of his family life then and there, would that the walls could speak. I was imagining the “Sound of Music” and Captain Von Trapp. His many children will have to fill out the story of Otto as husband and father. He himself tells us much of his academic life, with its challenges and victories, in his autobiography written many years ago.

Why you are here is the third question that remains. You are here no doubt to honor and celebrate Otto’s earthly life and the eternal life that we hope for him as well as ourselves. Perhaps you anticipated a fuller eulogy of Otto’s accomplished life, but I think you are here even more to listen to what Otto wants to say to you. He asked me to say, but he did not tell me what to say. He trusted me to know, I think, and I conclude that he did not want his funeral to be all about him, but more about what God is doing in all of us, and what God had done for Otto. Were I to go on in extraordinary praise of Otto, I hear him say it was all by God’s grace. Were I to ask him what should I say, I hear him say this. Tell them they have an eternal soul that will never die, and that they are invited into an eternal friendship with the Triune God who created them out of love and died for them in the crucifixion of the Word of God made flesh. Even now in the Church that Jesus gave us the Holy Spirit courts us in our mind and heart to respond to God’s invitation of an
everlasting friendship with God face to face. Tell them of the miracle at the wedding feast of Cana and how Jesus loved good wine. Tell that about the “love that moves the sun and stars,” a love to which we journey.

Otto’s whole life was about the pursuit of truth, the pursuit of God who is truth and the truth that is God. Our human version of the truth is looking into a mirror dimly, but there is some light for both our faith and our reason, and much of that light was earned in conversation, in dialogue and argument, by the most serious and gifted of human minds that have been recorded in writing. We can access wisdom in the Great Books of the Bible and the Great Books of the World. Otto knew that and loved that pursuit of truth. He knew, as few of us know, both the pursuit of happiness and the researcher’s happiness of pursuit.

All of us professors at Notre Dame play the game, but there are only a few that play in the major leagues. Otto is one of them. We stand on his shoulders. He was a coral reef for the intellectuals of the Catholic tradition, who stood in the face of the waves of skepticism and doubt. The “Index of Forbidden Books” held reign in the Notre Dame Library when Otto arrived over a half-century ago. We feared our students could not swim in that turbulent water. The Great Books buffered by minds like Otto’s allowed students to learn from all the great authors, whether from their errors that were partly true, or from their truths that were inevitably incomplete. He read them all. He read the critics and the skeptics, the opponents of reason and the opponents of faith, and he was for all of us a protecting wall. We knew he wrestled with texts and ideas that we had not touched, and that he lived to tell about it with faith, hope, and love. I doubt we appreciate enough how lonely and difficult it remains for one man, even with the help of colleagues, to stand against the tide. As he was father to his children, Otto was father to many students and many young professors, who could grow up intellectually in some peace because Otto had given his life to looking at it all, not flinching, and keeping the faith in the pursuit of human wisdom.

In closing, I want to pay tribute to Otto’s love of Latin. By his bedside I picked up the other day the Divine Office in Latin. He prayed it daily. I want to pray to the Holy Spirit, known to us all from the Pentecost Liturgy. I will pray in Latin, with your indulgence, and I will translate it with Otto’s indulgence. I hope he would find it my gift to him, all unworthy of him as it may be.

Veni Sancte Spiritus et emitte coelitus lucis tuae radium
Veni pater pauperum, veni dator munerum, veni lumen cordium
Consolator optime, dulcis hospes animae, dulce refrigerium
In labore requies, in aestu temperies, in fletu solatium
O lux beatissima, reple cordis intima tuorum fidelium
Sine tuo numine, nihil est in homine, nihil est innoxium
Lava quod est sordidum, riga quod est aridum, sana quod est saucium
Flecte quod est rigidum, fove quod est frigidum, rege quod est devium
Da tuis fidelibus, in te confidentibus, sacrum septenarium
Da virtutis meritum, da salutaris exitum, da perenne gaudium.

Come Holy Spirit and emit the ray of your heavenly light
Come father of paupers, come giver of gifts, come light of hearts
Consoler optimal, sweet guest of the soul, sweet coolness
In work rest, in heat relief, in weeping solace
O light most happy, fill the intimate hearts of your faithful
Without your overshadowing, nothing is in the human, nothing is not noxious
Wash what is sordid, water what is arid, heal what is sick
Flex what is rigid, warm what is frigid, rule what is devious
Give to your faithful ones, in you trusting, the sacred seven-fold
Give the merit of virtues, give the outcome of salvation, give perennial joy.
TRIBUTE TO PROFESSOR OTTO BIRD
by
Professor Michael J. Crowe

When on 5 June 2009 Professor Otto Bird died, the Program of Liberal Studies lost its founder, first director, and an inspiring and challenging teacher. The University of Notre Dame lost one of its premier faculty members, in fact, the first professor chosen for the University’s Faculty Award. The Great Books movement lost one its most significant leaders. American education lost a scholar above all distinguished by his ability to combine breadth and depth. The Catholic Church lost one of its most influential educators. And his eight children lost their caring and proud father.

In 1950 Notre Dame President Rev. John Cavanaugh, C.S.C. took the controversial action of bringing Otto to Notre Dame to direct a bold educational innovation: a great books program set within a Catholic university. Because this new program, although championed by some faculty, was resisted or ignored by other faculty, Otto faced challenges far beyond those typical of department chairs, including even his PLS successors. It was above all the intensity of Otto’s conviction of the superiority of its educational materials, curriculum, and pedagogy that drew both faculty and students to join him on the journey. The first decade and more was a period when our faculty faced the fear that the General Program of Liberal Studies (its original name) might be forced to close its doors. Although a university must have departments of history, English, philosophy, etc., no such expectation protected this program. Problems of student (and sometimes faculty) attrition required leadership that was responsible and responsive, committed and courageous, and forceful yet flexible. These virtues Otto exhibited, even as he established a presence in the college as a scholar of true distinction. Most important was the wisdom and insight he showed in attracting to our department the great teachers who contributed so much to making the program a striking success. Many close to him believe that his choice would have been to work primarily at his desk as a scholar, rather than the departmental chair. Students and colleagues experienced him as a person with deep commitment to liberal learning, passion for the education of his students, and humility in dealing with the array of challenging texts characteristic of the program.

The University of Notre Dame gained in Otto a person whom the philosophy department sought to teach graduate courses, who as a trained medievalist strengthened this special aspect of Notre Dame, and who, although committed to Thomistic philosophy, developed teaching and research interests in mathematical logic and C. S. Peirce. And he emerged as a person who transcended the shallow disputes that at times beset all universities. There can be few scholars to rival his range—his books include Syllogistic and Its Extension (1964), The Idea of Justice (1967), Seeking a Center: My Life as a “Great Bookie” (1991), From Witchery to Sanctity: The Religious Vicissitudes of the Hawthornes (2005—co-authored with his daughter Katharine Bird), and what I believe to be his most important book Cultures in Conflict: An Essay in the Philosophy of the Humanities (1976).

Otto’s role in the nationwide great books movement was noteworthy. He was a key figure in the preparation, editing, and publication of the 54-volume Great Books of the Western World series, especially its
Although much of his contribution in this area came before his arrival at Notre Dame, during his years here he authored many fine essays for the *Great Ideas Today* series and for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

With Otto’s death, the Catholic Church, to which he had converted, inspired partly by *Don Quixote*, lost one of its most intellectually alive members and also a devout, practicing Catholic. Two of his goals in retirement were to read the entire *Summa Theologica* in Latin and to grow grapes for altar wine.

In closing, two personal remarks. I feel privileged that while I was a student in PLS he taught three of my courses, that in 1961 he hired me for its faculty and then mentored me for many years, and that I have spent my entire teaching career in the wonderful program he founded. And secondly, on behalf of my colleagues, I wish to extend our condolences to his eight children, and to all the extended family of this very special person. *Requiescat in pace.*

---

**Some Recollections in Appreciation**

by

Walter Nicgorski

I offer just a few further words that largely reinforce from my experience what Michael Crowe has written so elegantly above. I did not know Otto as a teacher as Michael did. Nor was Otto actively present in the Program for more than a dozen or so of the years since I joined the Program in 1969. While a young political theorist in need of additional income and before I came into the Program, Otto called on me to help with the research for the *Syntopicon*’s references to justice and for what turned out to be his book on *The Idea of Justice*. This experience put me in contact with a mind marked by a range and synthetic powers that I had rarely known; it contributed to my disposition to want to join the Program’s faculty. As a colleague, Otto’s leadership was constantly on the side of rigor and challenge for us faculty and for our students; one sensed that he was ever on the watch that the discussion mode of pedagogy and the close contact with undergraduates in the Program did not slip into a tolerance of friendly intellectual “fuzz.” As we faculty picked books for the seminar lists he insisted that we read an author’s most significant work, like Marx’s *Das Kapital*, rather than seeking out a reading that might be more appealing and easier for our students as well as ourselves.

It is with much appreciation for the kind of teaching I have been able to do and for the kind of community he was instrumental in creating that I toast his leadership and courage. Over the years, I had several opportunities to introduce Edward Cronin to one audience or another and when I did I was wont to mention that he was part of the founding faculty of the Program. He regularly corrected me on these occasions, saying Otto was the true and sole founder. He had the ideas; he bore the responsibility, and he took the heat.
What to say at moments like this? We offer condolences to the family and friends. We know words fail, but yet we must speak. This moment in the funeral mass demands a reflection on the gospel as well as some well saying of the dead. It would be easier to give a eulogy of Fred, though I am not well enough acquainted to do him justice. He, however, does not need praise; we need here and now a way to go on with our lives without him with us, and we need to face the music that we must also on a given day, sooner or later, die and in circumstances anywhere from happy to grim. What can I say in praise of Fred and in hope for us all? Let me speak of Fred and his living of the Gospel. He can be example and encouragement for us.

As the Gospel urges, Fred endeavored to love God with all his heart, all his strength, all his soul, and all his mind, and his neighbor as himself.

With all his heart: he did not say no very often. He took care of his family, his children, and especially his wife in her own time of trial. He loved academia and not its fame. He cared enormously about the University of Notre Dame, whom he loved for its truth, its beauty, and its goodness. We could go and do likewise in our own way.

With all his strength: I can still see Fred bounding up the stairs to the fifth floor of Flanner Hall in the years before his accident. He was willing to teach in his retirement years. He was a citizen of the university community to the end. His years as the first lay-dean of the College of Arts and Letters, and his years in the Philosophy Department and the Program of Liberal Studies testify to strength infused with generosity. We are called to do the same.

With all his mind: Fred wrote a great deal about the philosophy of religion. He was a philosopher who knew his theology. He was a Great Books devotee, and he reviewed books by the dozen for Phi Beta Kappa, for whom he was also the first Catholic to be elected to its presidency. He helped students, both undergraduate and graduate without count, and he served on many higher-education accreditation committees of the mid-west. He loved God with his mind, and to that all of us at the university are invited to follow in his steps.

With all his soul: I can yet see Fred in the pews of this Basilica, and on a weekday, and often at the Eucharist. He embodied what it might be to be a Catholic University in the flesh of one body and soul – loving God with all one’s soul, all one’s strength, all one’s heart, and all one’s mind. He came to serve with wit and wisdom in the tangle of academic confusion and incomprehension. Fred in the hospital reminded me of Jesus limited in Nazareth. Fred without voice in a wheelchair reminded me of Jesus carrying his own cross.

Fred knew well and loved well the writings and life of Saint Augustine. His own best writing enhanced our reading of Augustine. I opened Augustine’s *Confessions* at random as Augustine opened the letters of Paul to find what he needed to hear. I quote from the beginning of Book Ten:
“Let me know Thee who knowest me, let me know Thee even as I am known. O Thou, the Power of my soul, enter into it and fit it for Thyself, that Thou mayest have it and possess it without spot or wrinkle. This is my hope, this is my prayer, and in this hope do I rejoice when I rightly rejoice. But as for the other things of this life, the more we weep for them, the less they deserve our tears, and the less we weep for them, the more we should weep. For behold Thou lovest the truth, and he that does the truth comes to the light. I wish to do it in confession, in my heart before Thee, in my writing before many witnesses. … For whatever good I utter to men, You have heard from me before I utter it; and whatever good You hear from me, You have first spoken to me.” (Book Ten, Paragraph One and Two).

Fred prays with us today before the face of God. Such is our hope. The life of God’s grace given to Augustine, given to Fred, is likewise given to us in this moment and in this Eucharist. We must grieve our loss; yet we are encouraged by Fred’s life to embrace the Gospel and try to love the Truth in all its manifestations, from university life of mind, soul, heart, and strength, to the Word made flesh among us – “our way, our truth, and our life.” How true: there be many mansions in the Kingdom of God, and many holy men and holy women.
REMEMBERING PROFESSOR CROSSON
by
Walter Nicgorski

Frederick Crosson, Cavanaugh Professor of the Humanities Emeritus in the Program of Liberal Studies, died on December 9th at the age of 83. Nearly two years earlier he had suffered a brain-damaging fall that left him confined and weakened in ways that painfully removed him from normal communication with family and friends. In full health, he had not only been a remarkably warm and gregarious person marked by a probing and ranging intellect and a rich spirituality, but also one who especially delighted in the significant exchanges and the specific public trust of academic life. Deeply respected and loved by the students who came his way, he was among a handful of the intellectual and moral leaders on the faculty of Notre Dame in the second half of the twentieth century.

Fred was hired and developed as a teacher and scholar in Notre Dame’s Great Books program from 1953 until 1976. He then held the O’Hara Chair in Philosophy before returning to the Program of Liberal Studies as the first Cavanaugh Professor in the Humanities in 1984. He published more than forty-five scholarly articles, edited five books and reviewed countless books, the latter especially in his capacity over many years as Philosophy and Religion reporter for national Phi Beta Kappa’s The Key Reporter. He was elevated in time to the presidency of the Phi Beta Kappa (1997-2000), the first Catholic to hold that office.

His scholarly interests and publications covered a spectrum that included cybernetics, philosophy of mind, philosophy of science, political philosophy and philosophy of religion at the center of which was his focused and devoted interest in St. Augustine. He has clearly made a singular contribution to the interpretation of Augustine’s writings.

During his tenure on the faculty Fred served as Dean of the College of Arts and Letters, the first layman to do so in the University’s history. He also served as chair of the Program of Liberal Studies, editor of The Review of Politics, and founding director of Notre Dame’s Center for Philosophy of Religion. Outside the University, he served terms as president of the American Catholic Philosophical Association and of the Yves R. Simon Institute. He worked tirelessly over many years for the ideals of liberal education on Phi Beta Kappa’s Committee on Qualifications and with the North Central Association in the accrediting process.

After his initial studies in philosophy through a master’s degree at the Catholic University of America, Fred went to the University of Paris to study the phenomenological and existential strains in continental philosophy, a journey that he completed in the Ph.D. under A. Robert Caponigri at Notre Dame. In France, Fred became especially interested in the then recent and continuing Catholic renaissance in French intellectual life. Through that interest he became linked in another way to Notre Dame where Yves Simon’s presence and Jacques Maritain’s active influence were in place at mid-century.

Fred revealed himself, as a teacher of political philosophy, in what he once said about Simon. He wrote of Simon’s “genius at bringing into view the critical theoretical questions which lay behind the controversies of our public life.” He noted that Simon showed Catholics “that liberal democracy and its emphasis on freedom was in no way
opposed to the Catholic tradition,” and he showed liberals “not only that that tradition could provide a foundation for democracy” but that it also “provided a sounder foundation than did the possessive individualism of some of the classical theories of liberal democracy.” Writing on another occasion as editor of *The Review of Politics*, Fred affirmed the journal’s tradition of looking at political problems “under historical, philosophical and theological perspectives.” He added that “those perspectives require the objectivity of scholarship, but we have never understood objectivity to entail indifference or scholarship to demand neutrality. We continue to work in the traditions of political democracy and of Catholic Christianity.”

I knew of Fred through his teaching before I met him at Notre Dame in the 1960s. Graduate student associates at the University of Chicago who had done their undergraduate work at Notre Dame spoke of the great impact of his teaching, especially his guided explorations of Aristotle’s *Politics*. In the same 60s and before I joined the Program of Liberal Studies and came to know him as a colleague, I saw firsthand his analytical power and skill at directing a seminar in a faculty seminar (Collegiate Seminar faculty of the time) on John Stuart Mill’s *On Liberty*; he drew remarkable perceptions of that text out of all of us, and I know that in his customary fashion he kept thinking about the argument of that text over the years. More than twenty years later, he published a very important article on Mill’s *On Liberty*. His much remembered teaching of Aristotle took place in what has been most often known as the “Politics” tutorial of the Program of Liberal Studies; that course was a quite constant part of Fred’s teaching station in his first fifteen years on the faculty. Later when he returned to the Program in the 1980s, he frequently took up this station again, and I had precious and regular opportunities to discuss with him illuminating and vexing aspects of the *Politics*. Fred was, in all his reading and notably with respect to this text, a most perceptive and probing reader from whom one always learned much. I came some time ago to believe that this text, along with his decidedly Christian sense of the common good and personal humility, accounted for his style of citizenship and leadership which I had seen over many years informing his life. He always had a sense that one had to work hard and tirelessly for the “possible” improvement in a given context and that what one sought had to be critically derived from an understanding of what was truly good. He also took very seriously Aristotle’s teaching that a good person would know how to rule and be ruled in turn. He was an exemplary citizen in his various communities from department, University, to the wider republic: he assumed responsibilities at the asking, prepared well for meetings, and contributed in a civil way that elevated discourse and understanding of the common good.

One of the great themes of Fred’s inquiry and thought was the relationship between faith and reason. This was, of course, bound up with his study of Augustine but seemed to take on new life for him with the appearance in the late 1990s of John Paul II’s *Fides et Ratio* which Fred studied carefully (he had made his own index of it) and about which he lectured. He had formulations, no doubt Augustine-inspired, of faith’s assistance to reason that I found notably striking and helpful. While emphasizing that faith seeks understanding, in fact suggesting that faith seeks and understanding finds, that faith is thinking while assenting, he drew attention to how faith extends the horizon for reason and can lead us to look at evidence in a different way. The depth of Fred’s Christianity and its sacramental nature came out in a conversation that has ever remained with me. Over coffee after attending a lecture together, a lecture that had somehow raised for consideration whether all human
relationships were some form, however attenuated, of a contractual utilitarian calculus, we came to ask about the unrequited love manifest in Christ. Was such love simply and entirely beyond the reach of humanity? Where might it be found? where is it at least approximated? After some groping about and a realization that the problem we had come on could clearly put not only politics but also all human relationships deeply at odds with Christianity, Fred drew attention to marital love and the having and nurturing of children as where such love might and sometimes did exist. Here a relationship could be a good in itself. Here too, Fred lived as he thought. Fred was married to Dr. Patricia Crosson and has five children.

In the five to six years before his death, Fred was especially interested in clarifying Leo Strauss’s teaching on esoteric writing and asking whether and how the esoteric dimension appeared in Christian classical writers like Augustine and Aquinas. This inquiry brought him to distinguish a Christian notion of “latent” meaning over against the esoteric that he saw Strauss opening in our understanding of the great tradition of political philosophy. Such work of Fred’s last stage of life as well as a number of his prize essays over the years, including one previously unpublished, are found in a collection of his essays which he began to prepare for publication in the months before his fall. Professor Michael Crowe and Father Nicholas Ayo have edited the collection following Fred’s leads, and Professor Katherine Tillman has provided a significant interpretive introduction to the collection. The book is titled *Ten Philosophical Essays in the Christian Tradition*, and readers interested in purchasing the book are asked to get on a list for further notification by dropping a line to the office of the Program of Liberal Studies at 215 O’Shaughnessy Hall.

Fred’s specific love, as a teacher, or better, as a facilitator of liberal education, was for the role of being leading questioner in a Great Books seminar. For him the key to deft guidance of discussion was greater and greater understanding of the text while maintaining a sense for what were real questions on the ordinary horizon of the human being and citizen. He emphasized the simple human good and happiness that came from greater understanding of who we are and where we are in time and in the universe. I found especially meaningful an observation in his address upon winning the annual Sheedy Teaching Award in the College; the address was picked up by the *Chicago Tribune* and published on its editorial pages as well as in campus publications. Fred said, “To be better informed, but also to reflect on and to understand that information, is to expand not only our memory banks, but the scope, the articulation, of the everyday world we live in, to enrich the meaningfulness of our daily experience. Learning can help us to see more, to see otherwise, to discern what we never noticed. *The more you know the more you can actually see and hear and feel.*” At another time Fred spoke of wanting his students to attain “the skills of discerning and relating, of finding the order and meaning in nature and in culture. To begin to do that, to begin to be able to make for ourselves informed judgments about life and about works of literature, about politics and sociological theories, about what is worth reading and loving and doing, is to begin to free ourselves from being the prisoners of the mass media and the conventional wisdom of our time.” The good of the education Fred encouraged was personal, yet in speaking on behalf of liberal education in various national and campus contexts, he was ever attentive to the bearing of such expanded and truly understanding minds on good citizenship in all our communities. He welcomed and nourished the outstanding student, but Fred never understood his teaching vocation to be centered on further
propagating the professorial ranks or professional philosophy.

In another notable reflection on education, Fred expressed his debt to his students and spoke of his role in a vertical, continuing community. He observed that “I learn along with the students. Sometimes I learn from things that a student remarks on, that I had never thought about before; sometimes the discussion presses me to articulate an issue in a way I had never thought about before. And so in a way, I am the carrier of insights from generation to generation of students, the carrier of gifts, so to speak, to the students who come after this generation.”

For years now, his students of earlier years have especially looked forward to his appearance as seminar leader on a reunion weekend or in a summer “Return to the Classics” program. Upon returning to one of these seminars in recent years, a student of his from the 70s noting Fred’s “marvelous insights,” wondered “how much of the riches of his intellect had I missed during my student years because of my own limitations.” William John, one of his students from the 60s, specifically remarked on his reaching out to struggling students and being at that time nearly alone among the faculty in socializing with students. Other undergraduate students who became successful professors in political theory and philosophy noted that Fred taught one “how to teach political philosophy” and that “his combination of personal integrity, intellectual depth and spiritual acuteness was unique,” inspiring me “to become a teacher and to require consistent excellence from myself as well as my students.” Katherine Kersten, among the very first women to take a Notre Dame bachelor’s degree, herself a mother of four, business woman, lawyer, educator and noted columnist, showed in her comments upon Fred’s death that his students could perceive the full significance of the gift of this man. She observed that “there are few minds like his in the university world today – few with such a broad grasp of the Western tradition and the best that has been thought and said. There are certainly few who can lead students with such love and skill to ponder the good, the true and the beautiful.”

Susan O’Shaughnessy, one of the nine graduate students whom he supervised through the Ph.D., noted that “Fred led with kindness and intellectual appeal. He believed that every human being loved to learn. He believed that academic work was necessarily collaborative.” Such testimony to his work makes it unsurprising that Father Hesburgh, Fred's “special president” from his first years through his Deanship and much of his time active at Notre Dame, speaks of him as “a dream of what one looks for in a Notre Dame faculty member, wise as befits a philosopher and a great teacher, one of the very best.”

Students and colleagues will especially remember Professor Crosson’s pensive manner, pacing around the room, eyes closing as he was thinking at times to himself and at times aloud as a true philosopher should. He laughed often, not the laughter rupturing an Aristotelian gravitas, but a laughter of joy in the shared understanding he had with many and in his participation in the work of the education. Fulton Sheen perhaps had a grasp of this when he is reputed to have observed that “one weeps most profoundly for others, and one laughs most salvifically to express thanks.”

During the last two years as we were losing him, Fred did not upon visits feel confident to say much, but his warm smile and handshake upon arriving and departing and occasionally even his words of thanks were a reminder of how generously and lovingly he yet stood among us. It is our turn for a simple thanks to God and his family for sharing him and through him his learning, wisdom and example with so many students and colleagues in the Notre Dame community.
Father Nicholas Ayo celebrated a fiftieth anniversary of ordination on Nov 29th (an early ordination for the class of 1960). There will be a family celebration in New Jersey in early May and something of a Holy Cross celebration in late May. On May 28th in the late afternoon there will be a mass for the entire Holy Cross ordination class of 1960 (50th) and the class of 1985 (25th). Fr. Jeff Schneibel, C.S.C., an alum of PLS, is a member of that ordination class.

Retreat work in Phoenix in February of this year and at Holy Cross House in March and in LaPorte in June have kept Fr. Ayo busy this spring. Fr. Herb Yost's fine book, “Waiting in Joyful Hope,” -- a book of spiritual meditations -- was published with editorial collaboration from Fr. Ayo, who recommends the book highly.

On 4 January 2010, the American Astronomical Society at its annual meeting in Washington, DC awarded Professor Michael J. Crowe, (PLS 1958) its LeRoy Doggett Prize for Historical Astronomy, a biennial international prize for lifetime contributions to the history of astronomy. The prize included a handsome plaque, check, and expenses. As part of the ceremony Crowe presented a talk at a plenary session of the ASS attended by 1500 members as well as five other PLS grads: Rich Allega, Bert Brenner, John Burkley, Thomas Long, and Rob Premo. For details, see [http://www.aas.org/had/doggett/2010doggett2crowe.html](http://www.aas.org/had/doggett/2010doggett2crowe.html)

Steve Fallon is finishing up his final year as department chair and looking forward to teaching more and having more time to read and write. This summer he will write essays on Milton and Isaac Newton, on Milton’s anti-monarchic writings, and on Milton and the virtues.

Steve and Joan are in the midst of a nearly decade long stretch with a high school or college graduation every year. This year Claire graduates from Princeton and Argentinian AFS exchange student Fede Milutinovic graduates from John Adams High School.

In April of 2009 Bernd Goehring travelled to beautiful Canterbury in England to participate in the international conference *Saint Anselm of Canterbury and His Legacy*, which was held on the occasion of the 900th anniversary of Saint Anselm’s death. Bernd gave a talk on “Truth as Rightness in Anselm of Canterbury and Henry of Ghent,” a topic inspired by the engaging seminar discussions with PLS students about Anselm’s thought. In the summer of 2009 Bernd was invited to present a paper at the international conference *Later Medieval Perspectives on Intentionality* at the University of Parma in Italy. During the academic year 2009-2010 Bernd is on leave, thanks to a major research fellowship from Georgetown University for work on his book manuscript on Henry of Ghent’s theory of cognition; he is currently a Visiting Assistant Professor in Georgetown’s Philosophy Department. Selected resources for research in medieval philosophy can be found on Bernd’s new website: [http://sites.google.com/site/medievalphilosophyonline/](http://sites.google.com/site/medievalphilosophyonline/). Bernd is grateful for the opportunity to meet recent PLS graduates in Washington, D.C., and to learn that they are thriving in various places and positions – at the White House, Department of Justice, Georgetown University and elsewhere in the greater D.C. area.
With this coming fall totaling 14 semesters of dedicated service to the PLS community as the Associate Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies, Felicitas Munzel will return to her Decio office next spring both with gratitude for having had the opportunity to be a part of the lives of our wonderful students in this capacity and with the twinges of regret, therefore, that such necessary transitions bring with them. The joy of working with the PLS students, especially in regard to working with you to keep the flame of the *artes liberales* glowing in a concrete realization of the idea of that education as she has come to know it also in her research, has by far outweighed the frustrations with which bureaucratic mentalities try to burden us (how often she heard, "yes, but the system . . . " but, as we also know, we got you registered into those courses anyway!). The cultivation of the philosophical habit of mind (once at the core of the stated mission of the Program) is a core that, for me, will always abide. It's been a great ride; it's been fun and now it is time to move on. As a colleague in the Kant scholarship observed recently, her work is becoming an interpretative series on Kant, the "Kant's Conception of" series: first of practical wisdom (at the dissertation level and without that precise title), then of *Kant's Conception of Moral Character*, then of *Kant's Conception of Pedagogy*, and next of *Kant's Conception of Practical Reason* (with an interlude between Character and Pedagogy consisting in a translation of and introduction to Kant's 1775/76 Friedländer lectures from Vol. 25 of the Academy Edition on *Kant's Lectures on Anthropology*). It is to the practical reason project that she now turns, served well also by the education one receives in the Program. Cicero (as an inspirational source for Kant) and Bacon (as an author to whom he replies) are expected to figure prominently in the discussion. So teaching and research and, yes, service can and do mutually complement one another - in a proper Kantian striving for unity and coherence. It is not a Kantian world in which we live, but we are the makers of our own worlds.

Clark Power’s daughter, Kara, was married on January 2, 2010 in St. Andrew’s Church in Drexel Hill, PA, where Clark and Ann were married. From June 25 to June 27, Clark will be hosting the fifth annual, Play Like A Champion Today™ Leadership Conference for youth and high school sports coaches and athletic administrators. If you are interested in attending, go to the website, Playlikeachampiontoday.org or contact Clark directly. PLC has trained over 10,000 coaches and 2,000 parents is translated into Spanish and is currently being translated in Lugandan. PLC is currently launching a new initiative, Champions for Children, aimed at reaching out to children in under-resourced urban neighborhoods and schools. Clark will be presenting several papers on Moral Education in early May at the American Education Association in Denver, Colorado.

Professor Phillip Sloan is concluding his last year of (of 36) teaching as a regular faculty member and will retire at the end of Spring 2010. He hopes to continue part-time teaching in the Program after this. During the past year he was one of the main organizers of the international conference “Darwin in the 21st Century: Nature, Humanity, and God,” held on November 1-3 of 2009 as Notre Dame’s contribution to the international conferences organized around the 150th anniversary of the publication of Darwin’s *Origin of Species*. The proceedings of this conference will be published by the University of Notre Dame Press. He has continued work during this year on his book on the conception of life in early molecular biology, and a component of this will be published in 2010 by the University of Chicago Press. With Carter Snead of the Notre Dame Law school, he received an
award to conduct a faculty workshop on the ethical, philosophical, and legal dimensions of stem cell research as part of Notre Dame’s intercollege initiative to develop a Center for Adult Stem Cell research. He has also continued as faculty advisor of the student club, Forum for Bioethics. In December he was a participant in a conference organized by former PLS professor David Schindler on the nature of experience at Catholic University.

**Tom Stapleford** and his family and spent 2008-2009 in the Boston area while he was a Visiting Scholar at the American Academy of Arts & Sciences. Although they enjoyed our time in Massachusetts, everyone was glad to come back to South Bend. (That’s testimony either to the peculiarity of the Stapleford family or to the pull of good friends and the joy of being part of PLS!)

In the fall, Cambridge University Press published his first book, *The Cost of Living in America: A Political History of Economic Statistics, 1880-2000*. The book examines the history of efforts to measure the “cost of living” (especially inflation) in order to reflect on the place of economic statistics in twentieth century politics. Demonstrating that statistical calculation requires political judgments, he explains what choices were made in constructing and using American cost-of-living statistics and why those choices matter, both for our understanding of U.S. history and for contemporary political and economic life.

Having returned to Notre Dame, he has been excited to work closely with PLS students once again as they wrestle with great books in both seminar and in the science tutorials. In the fall, he also had the opportunity to co-lead an exciting, university-wide, faculty seminar dedicated to reflections on how Notre Dame can improve the integration of the humanities, social sciences, engineering, and natural sciences in undergraduate education.

Tired of earning a salary, **Professor Emerita Katherine Tillman** has volunteered to teach a course entitled “The Sermons of Cardinal John Henry Newman” at South Bend’s Forever Learning Institute, which serves about a thousand regional elderberries a year. She notes the upcoming beatification of Newman by the Holy Father when he visits England in September.

**Henry Weinfield**’s study, *The Music of Thought in the Poetry of George Oppen and William Bronk*, was published by the University of Iowa Press in 2009. His collection, *Without Mythologies: New and Selected Poems and Translations*, came out in 2008 from Dos Madres Press. He is currently working on new poems and trying to finish a book on English poetry from Milton to Stevens. Henry says that he is looking forward with great anticipation to this summer’s PLS Alumni Symposium.
GOLDEN JUBILEE OF REV. NICHOLAS AYO, C.S.C.

Father Nicholas Ayo, C.S.C. will celebrate the 50th anniversary of his ordination as a Holy Cross priest in May of 2010. A number of his colleagues who have benefited from his priestly ministries have prepared the following expressions of congratulations and thanks. For two recent examples of his pastoral presence and priestly eloquence, see elsewhere in Programma: the homilies he presented at the funerals of Otto Bird and Fred Crosson.

Prof. Michael Crowe: Warmest congratulations on this happy event! Please accept my gratitude for all that you have done for my family and for me over so many years. You have been there for us when we needed to grieve or to celebrate. You cared for us, prayed with or for us, and if needed presided at our funerals. A fine colleague, a gifted scholar, a dedicated teacher, and always priestly. You have been a blessing in so many ways.

Steve Fallon: Warm congratulations, from a fellow Jerseyite, on a lifetime of serving the Church and the University as a priest of the Holy Cross order. I'm grateful that for some years we had the benefit of your wisdom in the Program of Liberal Studies, where I counted myself fortunate to be your colleague.

Julie Marvin: In our few years together on the faculty, you set an example of charity, candor, and respectful, open-minded, full attention to others that has been a touchstone for me a member of the PLS community. My every encounter with you, then and since, has enriched me. I know I’m not alone in this. Thank you, and thank God, for your service among us.

Thanks!

Prof. Walter Nicgorski: Can one be truly priestly and genuinely pastoral even in the course of professional life? You, Father Nicholas, have shown me how it might be done, and in that respect and others, you have taught me compassion and patience and thus a generous understanding. How happy it is to recall how your vocation has worked out here at Notre Dame over these many years since you wrote me from the Novitiate. May your priestly witness continue ad multos annos.

Clark Power: Nicholas, all of us, faculty and students, have been blessed in a special way by your friendship and pastoral ministry. Your pastoral service has been extraordinary. You were there in a personal way for me and for so many of us when we grieved the loss of parents, close friends, and colleagues. You pointed the way to discipleship in your eloquent sermons. You wrote books that have enriched lay as well as scholarly audiences, books that will be treasured for generations to come. You courageously challenged us a Church to welcome the contributions of women, homosexuals, married people, and all those marginalized by poverty and prejudice. I cannot begin to thank you.
Prof. Phillip R. Sloan: We began our association back in the 1980s learning the Eastern Classics together for Seminar, and have been a friend and colleague ever since. Your fine and deep writings have inspired me and many others, and your special priestly presence at many times of need in my life and that of my family, including the moving homily at my wife Sharon’s funeral, will always be appreciated. We have indeed been blessed by your presence among us. Congratulations on this anniversary.

Prof. Katherine Tillman: To a truly inspiring pastor of souls, through your teaching, your writing, your sharing, your counseling, your preaching and your praying:
BEST THANKS AND HEARFELT CONGRATULATIONS!

Henry Weinfield: Dear Nicholas, Nineteen years ago, when I interviewed for the position in PLS, having never previously been on campus, you welcomed me, took me to lunch, and then suggested that we go for a walk. During that walk, you showed me the sights that would eventually be featured in your lovely book, Signs of Grace: Meditations on the Notre Dame Campus. Your generosity, warmth, and kindness to me were extraordinary, and I have never forgotten that afternoon. I found a friend in you, as well as someone in possession of real wisdom. In the years that followed, I came more and more to cherish your presence. For example, I have always felt that yours are the most beautiful sermons I have ever heard. I can’t say that I remember the content of all of them, but they had (and have) a quality of simplicity and even radiance—a musical quality—that has stayed with me. Three of your books in particular—Signs of Grace, Times of Grace: Spiritual Rhythms of the Year at the University of Notre Dame, and Sacred Marriage: The Wisdom of the Song of Songs (your translation of and commentary on the most beautiful of love poems)—will always be important to me. When I leaf through them, as from time to time I do, pausing here and there to revisit a favorite passage, I hear your voice and think with gratitude of how much you have meant to me personally, as well as to all of your colleagues in PLS and so many generations of students.
STUDENT AWARDS

2009 Willis Nutting Award-Michael Clemente
The graduating student who contributed most to the education of classmates and teachers.

Mike also won the Disability Studies Forum’s senior thesis prize for his essay “The Impairments of the Social Model of Disability.” Before turning to graduate studies, he will continue his passion for service by living for a year in a L’Arche community for adults with intellectual disabilities, followed by a two year commitment to Teach for America.

2009 Otto Bird Award-William Thanhouse
The best senior essay judged to best exemplify the ideals of liberal learning

“The Spiritual Development of Pierre Bezukhov as a Mirror of Tolstoy’s Philosophy of History in War and Peace.”

His first trip to Nepal as a volunteer under the auspices of the Kellogg Institute inspired Bill to return after graduation as a teacher in a Fulbright program. Thereafter Bill will bring his love of liberal learning to planned service for Teach for America.

2009 Susan M. Clements Award-Emily McKeown
A female senior who exemplifies outstanding qualities of scholarly achievement, industry, compassion and service

Before continuing with graduate studies, Emily will be gainfully employed (no small feat today) with Schurz Communications doing research and analysis in the communications industry.

2009 Edward Cronin Award-Michael Benz
(for the second time; he also won the award in 2007)
For the best paper submitted in a PLS course

“Ismael’s Soul as Water,” This paper appears in this issue.

Mike’s post graduation plans are to work in environmental policy for a few years before pursuing graduate studies in the humanities. Meanwhile he will continue working on a novel which he started over a year ago.
2009 Stephen Rogers Endowment for Graduate Studies:

Patrick Corrigan
While still an undergraduate, Patrick Corrigan translated his concern for the plight of people, first in Darfur and then in Uganda, into substantial initiatives that included bringing prominent speakers to Notre Dame and serving with the Holy Cross in Uganda (where he returned for another year and a half after graduation). In his senior thesis he analyzed the disjunction between the concept of justice as it was conceived and applied by the International Criminal Court in Uganda and as it was conceived by the victims themselves. During his post-graduation service, Patrick completed an internship in the Ugandan Parliament as a member of the Peacebuilding and Conflict Resolution Committee and he published his first article in the *East African Journal of Social Justice*. In the fall of 2009, Patrick began a two year program leading to a Master in Public Policy degree from Harvard's Kennedy School of Government.

Margaret Culhane
Maggie is graduating with a dual degree in Biology and the Program of Liberal Studies. As an undergraduate, her research work related to HIV testing and education initiatives has taken her to Africa (Lesotho and Gambia); she has presented her work at several conferences here at ND and last spring chaired a group of undergraduates who organized a conference in celebration of the anniversaries of Charles Darwin’s birth and the publication of the Origin of Species. Inspired by our Program to go beyond straight biology, Maggie will go on to graduate studies in the History and Philosophy of Science, but first she too will serve with Teach for America for the next two years, teaching High School Biology in Chicago’s inner city.

Donald Zimmer
Don is in his first year as a resident at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota. He and his wife Crystal are expecting their first child as I write, in April. Don continues to contribute his time as a medical volunteer in Haiti. This past year Don and Crystal brought a Kenyan child to live with them while she had heart and cleft palate surgery. They were heartbroken when young Joyce had to leave this spring to return to Kenya.
When Ishmael tells us, in *Loomings*, that “meditation and water are wedded for ever,” we have a hint of the disastrous divorce to be charted in the rest of *Moby-Dick*. In Ahab, Ishmael chronicles the insanity resulting from the persistence of human meditation without the most essential traits of water: its fluidity, transparency, and the serenity of its blueness. These are the very aspects of the harmony of Ishmael’s mind, that allow him to confront life’s horrors without despairing, with a transparency of sight, fluidity of insight, and focal serenity that preserves the marriage of joy and sorrow, love and fright, in the world.

Perceiving the origin and deviance of Ahab’s monomania, Ishmael discovers that his own center is a watery soul that can blend to a harmonious union with the world, and that Ahab’s tragedy is the freezing of his soul into an outraged individuality that cannot retrieve the natural fluidity of its spirit, which might have preserved the fluidity of joy and sorrow in confronting life’s inscrutability. In the subtlest way, Ishmael, not Ahab, reveals the true possibility for human greatness in meeting the ineffable phantom of life.

Ishmael’s mind from the outset reveals its fluid spirit. Every experience engenders a corresponding thought in Ishmael which can flow into greater and greater circles of meditation, until reaching dark centers of incomprehensibility. These various crystallizations of ineffable mysteries appear as boulders or icebergs in the stream of meditation, and it is by virtue of his mind’s fluidity that Ishmael can encounter these impenetrable ideas and, instead of crashing into them, continue to flow around them, with inner harmony. This inner principle, however, begins as a mystery to Ishmael; it is only in the course of telling his story that he comes to an understanding of the metaphysical realities that water hints, both of the world and of his own soul.

In *Loomings*, for example, Ishmael begins with a description of water’s “magic” as a pacifying agent to morbid thoughts, without a deeper sense of what this signifies. At first the sea, that great expanse of water seems merely an escape:

> “Whenever I find myself growing grim about the mouth; whenever it is a damp, drizzly November in my soul; whenever I find myself involuntarily pausing before coffin warehouses, and bring up the rear of every funeral I meet; and especially whenever my hypos [neuroses] get such an upper hand of me, that it requires a strong moral principle to prevent me from deliberately stepping into the street, and methodically knocking people’s hats off – then, I account it high time to get to sea as soon as I can. This is my substitute for pistol and ball. With a philosophical flourish Cato throws himself upon his sword; I quietly take to the ship,” (18).

By this description, Ishmael seems the paradigm of morose meditation, so much that his apprehension makes him want to knock people’s hats off, as if to ruffle their shallow tranquility and open their minds to the reality he sees in death. But instead of succumbing to this despair and annihilating
himself, Ishmael “quietly takes to the ship,” not a pistol and ball so much as a delay, a chance to dispel the darkness. There is something in water that is instinctively felt by everyone. This is the intuition that brings Ishmael to the sea, and at which he marvels: “Take almost any path you please, and ten to one it carries you down in a dale, and leaves you there by a pool in the stream. There is magic in it. Let the most absent-minded of men be plunged in his deepest reveries – stand that man on his legs, set his feet a-going, and he will infallibly lead you to water, if water there be in all that region,” (19). Ishmael’s awe stems from the magic of this connection, that the “absent-mindedness” of the reveries is the impulse towards the water. It seems that water becomes the embodiment of the depth of these reveries. And though Ishmael feels this intuition is universal – “As every one knows, meditation and water are wedded for ever,” (19) – he cannot yet say precisely what it means. He feels this wedding gives glimpses of a deeper insight, that its magic has a metaphysical sense to it, underlaying human intuitions, as shown by its common deification: “Surely all this is not without meaning,” (20). Yet the meaning, for now, is not a positive, graspable idea, but a “phantom,” presenting a vague image of the ineffable, to awe humans, with equal wonder and consternation: “And still deeper the meaning of that story of Narcissus, who because he could not grasp the tormenting, mild image he saw in the fountain, plunged into it and was drowned. But that same image, we ourselves see in all rivers and oceans. It is the image of the ungraspable phantom of life; and this is the key to it all,” (20). Yet here, covertly, Ishmael has transformed the lack of meaning into meaning. If water is the image of an ungraspable phantom, it is folly to grasp for it. The deeper meaning of Narcissus, in this light, seems to be the folly of regarding the water’s reflection of himself, and finding the reflection’s lack of substance a torment. To see the water’s transparency, as well as its reflections, to see the ungraspable in the image, is “the key to it all.” Ishmael recognizes this key from the outset, but also knows that to recognize and to be content with this recognition are two different things. While one may understand that the phantom of life is ungraspable, how can one be at peace with this reality?

Peace, as Ishmael discovers, flows from the meaning one finds in the ineffable’s presence in the image of water – that water, literally ungraspable, nevertheless is undeniably real, and in blending with our beings, reveals the nature of our beings. Mounting the mast-head at the beginning of the Pequod’s journey, Ishmael again experiences the characteristic absent-mindedness of reverie, this time brought on by water and leading back to water, and discovers a deeper relationship:

…but lulled into such an opium-like listlessness of vacant unconscious reverie is this absent-minded youth by the blending cadence of waves with thoughts, that at last he loses his identity; takes the mystic ocean at his feet for the visible image of that deep, blue, bottomless soul, pervading mankind and nature; and every strange, half-seen, gliding, beautiful thing that eludes him; every dimly-discovered, uprising fin of some undiscernible form, seems to him the embodiment of those elusive thoughts that only people the soul by continually flitting through it. In this enchanted mood, thy spirit ebbs away to whence it came; becomes diffused through time and space; like Wickliff’s sprinkled Pantheistic ashes, forming at last a part of every shore the round globe over. (136)
Ishmael has felt this connection before but never stated it precisely: in the “blending cadence of waves with thoughts,” a fluid harmony emerges which is truly “absent-minded,” an unconsciousness whereby the self, as the thinking mind, disperses into the water. In losing an identity, in shedding the confines of the mind, Ishmael’s soul realizes its true fluidity, and becomes intermingled with the “deep, blue, bottomless soul, pervading mankind and nature.” There is a beauty to this water, this soul, that is undiscernible, embodied but not defined, elusive because the forms it takes are “continually flitting through” the soul. Hence the soul’s form is the form of water itself, which is formlessness, “deep, blue, bottomless,” and ever-fluid, ever-changing. If the soul had assumed an individuality of its own, some sort of solid form as a personal mind, this form diffuses into the sea, and every ashy particle of that soul blends with the sea itself. With this fluid soul at his center, Ishmael says, “There is no life in thee, now, except that rocking life imparted by a gently rolling ship; by her, borrowed from the sea; by the sea, from the inscrutable tides of God,” (136). Without knowing the source of the inscrutable tides of God, Ishmael feels his life to abide in them. To lose oneself, then, is truly to find oneself, because one’s soul is of the same ineffable nature as water, whose life is imparted by God. It is a potent image, revealing the soul’s nature both passively and actively.

But even sunk in this meditation, Ishmael perceives the other side to this transformation. The spiritual blending seems to want the material transformation for its completion, and the self, taking its thinking to be bound in its solid, fleshy form, balks at the death of its individuality, at the prospect of becoming “dividual”: “But while this sleep, this dream is on ye, move your foot or hand an inch, slip your hold at all; and your identity comes back in horror. Over Descartesian vortices you hover. And perhaps, at midday, in the fairest weather, with one half-throttled shriek you drop through that transparent air into the summer sea, no more to rise for ever. Heed it well, ye Pantheists!” (136). This slipping, ever so slight, is the flip side of the soul’s enchantment. The vortex of the self, the Cartesian cogito equating life with self-awareness, cries with horror at its fragmentation, sustained by a material form that keeps a “hold” on life by holding the soul, usually, to conscious individuality. Here, Ishmael recognizes again the duality inherent in life, that strives towards universality even in particularity, yet cringes at the death that universality entails to the form of one’s soul. This horror might seem an illusion to the vacant mast-stander, lost to himself, but Ishmael knows that it has an integrity of its own – “Heed it well, ye Pantheists!” – because it cannot be avoided. The slip brings about instinctive horror, and if Ishmael is to reconcile its reality with the beauty and the truth of the watery soul, he must confront it.

In this way, Ishmael’s confrontation with horror mirrors Ahab’s, and in describing Ahab’s evolving monomania, Ishmael brings himself face to face with the torment that the “ungraspable phantom of life” can inspire. For both of them, Moby Dick becomes an inscrutable symbol of the inscrutable force shaping the world. Ahab’s confrontation, however, has a different origin and aim than Ishmael’s; hence he says, “What the white whale was to Ahab, has been hinted; what, at times, he was to me, as yet remains unsaid,” (159). This is a crucial turn of thought for Ishmael. Having encountered the thought of Moby Dick for the first time through Ahab’s mania, he could have absorbed that spiteful meaning
into his consciousness, but by his native sensibility, his meditative spirit described above, he takes Moby Dick into his imagination and finds in him the counterpoint to his mast-head experience, the horrific crystallization of all his despairing reflections, and the challenge to the viability of his fluid spirit. The gnawing question is whether his spirit is fluid enough to create a harmony with this horror presented by Moby Dick. To know, Ishmael must express this horror in all its aspects, and finds it to radiate from a single aspect of the whale:

...there was another thought, or rather vague, nameless horror concerning him, which at times by its intensity completely overpowered all the rest; and yet so mystical and well nigh ineffable was it, that I almost despair of putting it in a comprehensible form. It was the whiteness of the whale that above all things appalled me. But how can I hope to explain myself here; and yet, in some dim, random way, explain myself I must, else all these chapters might be naught. (159)

Explaining this “nameless horror” to himself is the key to Ishmael’s understanding. But he has already perceived that its ineffability defies explanation. What he seeks to explain, then, is not the metaphysical reality itself, not its cause or necessity, but rather why its visible aspect, its whiteness, terrifies him, so that he may understand himself. Given his intuition on the mast-head, this sought understanding amounts to a desire to know of how the horror of death persists in the soul, when the soul feels itself, in deepest meditation, to be one with water, with the soul of the world, whose fluid life is imparted by God. So far, Ishmael has only acknowledged that a horror remains despite this serene meditation, and now he confronts Moby Dick’s imperious whiteness as this horror’s essence.

Ishmael begins, however, by cataloguing the many benign associations of white, its recurring cultural symbolism of purity, holiness, innocence, gladness, and majesty. And yet “…with whatever is sweet, and honorable, and sublime, there yet lurks an elusive something in the innermost idea of this hue, which strikes more of panic to the soul than that redness which affrights in blood,” (160). How can a single quality produce these diametrically opposed perceptions? Ishmael suggests that it is precisely the perception that determines the nature, and that the more insightful consideration reveals that the benignity of white is a misperception, or rather an incomplete perception of its import. The “innermost idea” is terrible in its elusiveness, and this “quality it is, which causes the thought of whiteness, when divorced from more kindly associations, and coupled with any object terrible in itself, to heighten that terror to the furthest bounds,” (160). So while Ishmael believes the innermost idea to be a terrible elusiveness, it need not manifest itself that way. Coupled with the “sweet” and “sublime,” it maintains a dynamic meaning, where both benign and malign ideas may be felt. But when divorced of those benign associations, and given to something terrifying in other aspects, so that terror piles on terror with no hint of goodness, whiteness realizes the greatest possible terror.

Ishmael proceeds to contemplate this “furthest bound” of whiteness: “It cannot well be doubted, that the one visible quality in the aspect of the dead which most appalls the gazer, is the marble pallor lingering there; as if indeed that pallor were as much the badge of consternation in the other world, as of mortal trepidation here,” (162).
To appall is to horrify, and “appall” has the same sense as “pallor” – a whiteness infused by death. The horror of whiteness is the horror of death. Here Ishmael has traced the subtlety of the metaphysical horror at what is inscrutable. It is not simply a “mortal trepidation,” not simply fear at uncertainty. Whiteness, in its blanching of the dead corpse, seems to signify that our uncertainty, our inability to know beyond death, remains in death; indeed, becomes a “consternation in the other world,” unresolved as it was in this world. Ishmael sees that it lends an indefinite aspect to the soul, a formlessness sapped on substance, unlike the formlessness of water, whose substance can be felt and seen. He hints at this contrast with a mountain analogy: “…the White Mountains of New Hampshire, whence, in peculiar moods, comes that gigantic ghostliness over the soul at the bare mention of that name, while the thought of Virginia’s Blue Ridge is full of a soft, dewy, distant dreaminess,” (163). The “blueness” calls forth all the serene intuitions of the masthead reverie, while whiteness only calls forth fright, just by its own nature. And mountains, by their nature, give another aspect of fear not readily apparent in oceans: “…in the mere fancying of the eternal frosted desolateness reigning at such vast altitudes [of the Andes], and the natural conceit of what a fearfulness it would be to lose oneself in such inhuman solitudes,” (164). The ocean’s blueness, a reflection of the sky, an effect of its transparent watery substance, obscures this thought of “inhuman solitudes;” the mountains cannot hide the solitary meaning of their whiteness, and when the sea assumes this white aspect at the poles, it “seems a boundless churchyard grinning upon him with its lean ice monuments and splintered crosses,” (164). And so by this dire meditation, Ishmael has bound the horror of whiteness with an unresolved death, an insubstantial soul, and inhuman solitude, a complex of concepts undoubtedly speaking dread. This correlation seems to be that “furthest bound” of terror, borne by a divorce of whiteness from its kinder incarnations.

But what credence can be given to these conceptions? On what basis does one believe this ghastly conception of whiteness to “shadow forth” the truth of the world? Ishmael gives voice to such doubt: “But thou sayest, methinks this white-lead chapter about whiteness is but a white flag hung out from a craven soul; thou surrenderest to a hypo, Ishmael,” (164). Could it not be that, in abstracting the horror of whiteness from its other attributes, he has given us an unreal monster, a hypo, without any basis in metaphysical truth? Though our imagination is powerfully moved by this white fear, could it be that Ishmael has merely white-washed, in “white-lead” paint, the benign beauty of the world? If so, the imagination has obscured the truth, not discovered it. But Ishmael does not lightly discard this “instinct of the knowledge of the demonism in the world,” seen in the foal frightened by instinctive fear of buffaloes’ “savage musk” (164). The intensity of this instinctive feeling brings forth a kind of faith in Ishmael: “Though neither knows where lie the nameless things of which the mystic sign gives forth such hints; yet with me, as with the colt, somewhere those things must exist. Though in many of its aspects this visible world seems formed in love, the invisible spheres were formed in fright,” (164). The force of the feeling is what gives it reality, and as the force of beauty in the visible world seems to inhere in brilliant color, the force of terror in the invisible shines forth precisely in that visible invisibility, in whiteness.

For Ishmael, this is the subjective grounding of his horror, which he has found to be
universal present in the world and perceived by many more than he himself. Yet he says, “...not yet have we solved the incantation of this whiteness,” for he has not found that essential thought, the invisibly existing thing, that brings forth this subjective dread, inherently evoking this horror underneath “the very veil of the Christian’s Deity,” (165). Wishing to understand himself by explaining his subjective horror, Ishmael feels compelled to nonetheless seek the objective reality of these feelings, to establish a terrible principle outside of himself that gives birth to these terrors. It is the same vexation of Narcissus and Ahab, and Ishmael follows their path, hazarding the metaphysical possibilities of the horror of whiteness:

Is it that by its indefiniteness it shadows forth the heartless voids and immensities of the universe, and thus stabs us from behind with the thought of annihilation, when beholding the white depths of the milky way? Or is it, that as in essence whiteness is not so much a color as the visible absence of color, and at the same time the concrete of all colors; is it for these reasons that there is such a dumb blankness, full of meaning, in a wide landscape of snows, a colorless, all-color of atheism from which we shrink? (165).

The consternation of death’s pallor, the vague fog of ghosts, the inhuman solitude of mountains, all point toward a Godless universe, a “heartless void” whose immensity swallows up the human heart and annihilates the human mind by its very nullity, its absolute nothingness. All distinction, of form or matter, drains into whiteness. To be both the absence of color in itself, but the base in which colors inheres and by which it is judged, seems to show a fundamentality to whiteness that presents a “dumb blankness, full of meaning.” To Ishmael, in its “innermost idea,” whiteness can just as easily bespeak atheism as God.

What, then, can decide? How could we possibly know what is the true perception? Ishmael’s question of self-knowledge, first an intuitive unease, transformed to a metaphysical question, now becomes a question of epistemology. Here he refers to the “natural philosophers” – the modern empiricists – whose scientific view of the nature of light might be seen to support this metaphysical understanding:

And when we consider that other theory of the natural philosophers, that all other earthly hues – every stately or lovely emblazoning...all these are but subtle deceits, not actually inherent in substances, but only laid on from without; so that all deified Nature absolutely paints like the harlot, whose allurements cover nothing but the charnel-house within; and when we...consider that the mystical cosmetic which produces every one of her hues, the great principle of light, for ever remains white or colorless in itself...pondering all this, the palsied universe lies before us a leper... (165).

The nature of light itself, in this epistemology, seems to confirm the metaphysical fear. Rather than human imagination whitewashing a joyous world in fear, it seems that our senses detect only the deceitful coloring of Nature itself, cloaking its abhorrent meaninglessness in bright “allurements.” Light itself becomes the “mystical cosmetic,” whose effect on the diverse objects of the world is color, but whose proper essence is whiteness, undifferentiated, pure and without meaning. Do we take its effects for benevolence or
deceit? And if truly deceit, is it the benign deceit, inherent to a created world, or malicious deceit of a cruel creator? In its very meaninglessness, whiteness now appears malicious to human beings. Pondering these thoughts, Ishmael remarks on how the whole universe now looks “palsied,” become a “leper,” implying that the sick pallor it wears to human eyes can not elicit sympathy, but only turn man away in horror. “And of all these things the Albino whale was the symbol. Wonder ye then at the fiery hunt?” (165). With this final question, Ishmael evinces a real empathy with Ahab’s madness, and the whole suffering of the human race, when brought into relief by these dire meditations. Given this inscrutability whose nature, when questioned, begins to bear an aspect of malice, to infuse horror with its blankness, Ishmael believes it no wonder at all that some are driven to the “fiery hunt.” It seems that the only cure to despair would be to embrace its opposite – fierce defiance.

And yet Ishmael is not a hunter of the white whale, but allows himself to be an instrument of the hunter, if only for the chance to witness the outcome of the struggle, more curious than vindictive. In observing Ahab, and chronicling the course of his madness, Ishmael realizes more and more that his own mind is formed to neither despair nor defy, though it be equally capable of contemplating, and feeling, the dire sentiments that lead to both in others. Or rather, his mind has taken on a formal fluidity by recognizing the nature of his soul, which flows throughout his being and unites him to the watery soul of the world. The self, that returns horror-struck from sea-swept reveries, has not so much given way in Ishmael as it has taken on the principle of the soul, and become like water: fluid, transparent, serene. The mind, the seat of the thinking self, which tends to form a solid personality around this soul, in Ishmael has become a fluid agent itself, capable of contemplating the world in its many aspects and finding their inner harmony, or, if there be no harmony, of ebbing and flowing between opposites, recognizing both to be true of the world.

In The Grand Armada, enchanted by the vision of nursing whales, serene amid the maelstrom of their circling comrades, Ishmael expresses his own inner tranquility as if realizing it for the first time. Peering into the depths of the water, he reflects that this transparency is precisely what reveals such a mystically beautiful sight to him – the very opposite of white, in its transparency reflecting the joyous blue of the sky, and harboring the calm beatitude of life newly borne. Discovering in this vision “that enchanted calm which they say lurks at the heart of every commotion,” Ishmael understands that his mast-head experience, and all his other reveries, are not merely lulls in his identity, not mere glimpses of his inner being, but greater revelations of his entire being:

And thus, though surrounded by circle upon circle of consternations and affrights, did these inscrutable creatures at the centre freely and fearlessly indulge in all peaceful concerns; yea, serenely reveled in dalliance and delight. But even so, amid the tornadoed Atlantic of my being, do I myself still for ever centrally disport in mute calm; and while ponderous planets of unwaning woe revolve round me, deep down and deep inland there I still bathe me in eternal mildness of joy. (303)

Ishmael’s being comprises all the tornadoes of his despair and horror at the prospect of whiteness, comprises every doubt and
sorrow. And yet, like the inscrutable creatures who “serenely reveled in dalliance and delight,” Ishmael finds that his central soul preserves a “mute calm.” How this inner harmony occurs seems “inscrutable” and yet it abides in him; even in “unwaning woe,” constantly revolving in his thoughts, in his mind, in a far deeper region, Ishmael’s soul bathes in “eternal mildness of joy,” drawn from the nature of his soul itself, drawn from the nature of water, from the nature of God. All that is “me,” all that is the self that suffers from “unwaning woe” in the “tornadoed Atlantic” of his individual being, is finally bathed in the water of the soul, so that the mind itself becomes a fluid being, capable of both joy and sorrow, as water is capable both of serenity and turbulence. To say that the mind becomes “formal fluidity” is to say that it integrates the soul’s joyful freedom of formlessness into its individualizing principle. Ishmael feels all horrors and joys in his being, and while expressing these as emotions of an individual, he nonetheless harmonizes them into an inner peacefulness.

Ishmael has realized in this vision that his mast-head intuition is not merely a secret truth, soon abandoned by his panicked self, but a truth by which he manifestly lives, by which his self and his soul achieve a dynamic harmony, rather than a frozen unity, in the apprehension of the soulfulness of water. This is the harmony that distinguishes Ishmael from Ahab, who feels all the same horrors as Ishmael, but who, by the intensity of his physical pain fusing with his metaphysical anguish, loses all fluidity of spirit. He binds himself willfully to an insane defiance of the unknowable, exalting himself as the god of his own existence, negligent of all joys and serenities that the unknowable presents side by side with its horrors. By his final day, his soul has literally frozen to his outraged mind, frozen into the icy personality of cold calculation, even as his feelings rage in boiling anger. His frozen spirit has resulted in a complete divorce of meditation from its watery, harmonizing nature, so that feeling enrages thought, and thought enrages feeling, but they do not reconcile each other: “Ahab never thinks; he only feels, feels feels; that’s tingling enough for mortal man! to think’s audacity. God only has that right and privilege. Thinking is, or ought to be, a coolness and a calmness; and our poor hearts throb, and our poor brains beat too much for that. And yet, I’ve sometimes thought my brain was very calm – frozen calm, this old skull cracks so, like a glass in which the contents turn to ice, and shiver it,” (419). No reconciliation can come for Ahab, and his thoughts delete in capricious conclusions, though his intellect had mapped the whole range of the conundrum he was circling.

Ishmael perceives the final overthrow of Ahab’s soul in The Symphony, where the mild joy of sea and sky make one last plea for Ahab’s embrace. He feels the gentleness of the air, and keenly feels the foolishness of his “desolation of solitude” that has admitted “but small entrance to any sympathy,” (405). And yet while he grieves the loss of his native sympathy, of his human loves, of the enjoyment of a bright day’s mildness, he cannot reconcile himself to this other side of his monomania. “He seems to hear in his own true heart the measureless sobbing that stole out of the centre of the serenity around,” but he cannot conceive that an oceanic serenity may steal from the heart of sorrow (405). The thought of life’s inscrutability returns to him and overthrows all benign meaning, looming large as the white whale, with only malicious intent. He imputes all his mental machinations and bodily actions to the omnipotent God whose creation shows such malice, but he has
already elevated himself to God by styling his defiance as his supreme potency. And when he gazes into the water, raging to “pierce its profundity,” he never looks through its transparency but sees only the reflection of Fedallah, his sinister shadow (406-407).

Only Ishmael, with his far-ranging, ever-fluid soul, can both contemplate the old man’s outrage in all its intensity, and discern the harmony that equally lay before his eyes. Ahab asks, “Is Ahab, Ahab?” as if he weren’t the creation of his own insane personality. Ahab is only Ahab and nothing else. The more interesting question is rather, “Is Ishmael, Ishmael?” for his soul has the capacity for seemingly everything that the life of the universe chooses to reveal to him. He can see the sexual harmony of the air and sea, whose wedding is presided over by the sun, whose natures seem simultaneously one and two, the only distinction being the sex (404). He sees into the essence of every crewmember on the Pequod, and becomes bosom friends with the strangest crewmember of all, Queequeg. He perceives, as Ahab never could, the sublime beauty and “gentle joyousness” of Moby Dick, resplendent even in his most horrible aspect. And as this passive, peaceful observer, Ishmael seems to have lost the fire of personality that would make him an active agent, that would make him the focal point of a human story. But on closer inspection, we see that Ishmael’s energy has only been transferred to another task. If he is not, like Ahab, an artist of his own life, that is because he has left the notion of “own life” in the foaming waves of the sea. He has become a storyteller, an artist of all life, making meaning out of life’s great materials – its marvelous palette of colors, and its blank white canvas.
Dear All,

It was a long time ago when I first wrote an email to the program updating people on my status in the midst of Katrina and its unpredictable aftermath in my life: I was a sudden flood victim and a disaster recovery center manager for the FEMA branch of Homeland Security. In that email I spoke of all the books lost in the flood, and shortly afterward I was opening up box after box of books purchased from Amazon for the student of New Orleans. The Program of Liberal Studies had delivered. The only problem was that I had no classroom and no students to give the books to. The city was still too overwhelmed to educate and in all the chaos, getting a new teaching job wasn’t in the cards for me.

To make a long story short, I took a one year leave of absence from TFA, shipped all the books to my sister’s place in North Carolina, worked some odd jobs around the states for a while, and then disappeared to South America for a year, where I spent a lot of time writing, thinking, re-reading Don Quixote among other things, hitchhiking, and mountaineering to the Northern Chilean Ice field deep in the Patagonian Andes. All in all it was a full-bodied prayer and the years to come would prove to be the full-bodied answer.

I wish I would have made the time during the last two years to send photos and messages from my students showing how the books sent from PLS changed their life, but I was busy and forgetful and I didn’t. But that’s what this letter is about. I want people to know it when they put some good into the world and you did.

I returned to New Orleans and taught for a year, but the daily education going on just wasn’t enough. The kids deserved better, so last year I joined a team with a vision and we started a new school in New Orleans, and our school was focused, goal oriented, hardworking, and demanding. Finally, we had created an environment where the books would be used, talked about, read out loud, read silently, dog-eared, sat on, stuffed in book-sacks, and ruffled beyond all belief. I never would have thought I’d derive such joy from seeing books get worn, but never before had I realized that the most abused books I’ll ever seen were the ones in mint condition, sitting untouched on a shelf due to the squawking, fly-swatter protection of a wild-eyed and misguided librarian. That image is almost enough to understand the difference between a real high school and a defunct one.

At my new school, my classroom didn’t have a number, but was known as “Notre Dame.” The name became synonymous with questions like “What is a chair?” and “Why would Holden Caulfield do that? Is he really as sadistic as Essence says he is?” and commands like “Explain
how your thinking went from there to here... no we will wait. That is the point.” Finally the books had found their purpose, and I assure you I proudly let the kids know where they came from.

I’ll be honest though, not all of the curriculum was a great books seminar. I did my duty and taught lessons on research and using information sources so my 9th graders would be prepared for the all-important standardized tests, but I never stopped with those obnoxious Socratic questions that made the students roll their eyes in frustration with philosophy, and then respond intelligently and respect me for expecting them to handle it. In the end, on their humanities standardized tests our 9th graders were the #1 performing class in all the city’s open-enrollment classrooms and 3rd including the selective schools. This meant many things, but above all it meant a lot to our kids. To them it meant school is an open path and they really are on a college track. It is a beautiful thing and I did a lot of it with your books.

This group of boys were my ‘advisees’ which means they were my responsibility across the board. They were also known as “Notre Dame” at Sci Academy. At least one of them is adamant about going to ND for college.

Today I am still focused on human rights and activism, but I’m hoping to work more globally through a career in medicine-infectious disease specifically. To make this happen, I’m doing a post-baccalaureate pre-medical program at the University of Virginia and volunteering at the HIV clinic at the university hospital. To me it all goes together. It fits like the miraculous accidents of travel, or like the way each concept and sentence in Paradise Lost seems intelligently aligned to cosmological themes (at least to me). You would be surprised at the all the symbolism, metaphors and allegories I notice between all the books, teaching, and now science. But then again, you’re PLS people-you probably won’t be surprised at all.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Alfano</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility: A Good Business Decision</td>
<td>Bernd Goehring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Ambrose</td>
<td>How to Live the Examined Life: Literature as the Fulfillment of Action and Contemplation</td>
<td>Felicitas Munzel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Benz</td>
<td>“Because of my love for Dulcinea of Toboso, she is worth as much as the highest princess on earth”: Don Quixote’s Heroism as Artistry of Belief</td>
<td>Stephen Fallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Borrego</td>
<td>Faust and the Supernatural: Human Striving and the Influences of Good and Evil</td>
<td>Bernd Goehring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Bulso</td>
<td>Free Will and Love in <em>The Divine Comedy</em></td>
<td>Stephen Fallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Calcutt</td>
<td>“The Church in Her House”: Women’s Significance in the Jesus Movement According to Paul</td>
<td>Candida Moss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Carothers</td>
<td><em>An Ghadai Dubh</em>: Fiend or Feline? Translation and its Challenges</td>
<td>Bernd Goehring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Clemente</td>
<td>The Impairments of the Social Model of Disability</td>
<td>Candida Moss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Conway</td>
<td>For the Love of the Game: Youth Sport and Stage-Environment Fit</td>
<td>F. Clark Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Crosby</td>
<td>Transformative Suffering and the Critical Role of Love in <em>The Brothers Karamazov</em></td>
<td>Krista Duttenhaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Culhane</td>
<td>Structures of HIV/AIDS Disability: Sex, God, and the State</td>
<td>Candida Moss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Curtis</td>
<td>From the Outside Looking In: External Perspectives on American Exceptionalism</td>
<td>Walter Niegorski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian DeSplinter</td>
<td>The Ethics of Richard Dawkins’ <em>The Selfish Gene</em></td>
<td>Robert Goulding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William DiPiero, II</td>
<td>“He Was Asking for It”: A Discussion of How Moral Education Counteracts the Bullying Problem</td>
<td>F. Clark Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kate Fahrenbach</td>
<td>Looking at Famous Men: On the Absence of Visual Literacy in The Program of Liberal Studies</td>
<td>Steven Affeldt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lisa Floran  Searching for a Language That Cannot Be Rejected: Words, Advocacy, and the Case of Female Genital Mutilation  Gretchen Reydams-Schils

Mike Folger  Private Property: Classical Perspectives and a Contemporary Challenge  Walter Nicgorski

Rebecca Gannon  “Visionary Power Attends the Motions of the Viewless Winds”: Wordsworth’s Two-Fold Development in The Prelude  Henry Weinfield

Kevin Garcia  Theoretical Exploration of Leadership: Practical Application in Sports  F. Clark Power

Christina Golubski  “With Kisses Pure”: An Analysis of the Passions in Paradise Lost  Stephen Fallon

David Greene  Characteristics of a Written Constitution: English Influence on the United States Constitution and Bunreacht na hÉireann  Walter Nicgorski

Elisia Guerena  Across the Footbridge: A Journey Through Nietzsche’s Conception of Laughter  Steven Affeldt

Santiago Gurulé  Ralph Ellison and the Art of Transcending Solitude: Elliot Bartky

Patrick Kibbe  Which Theory of Justice Should Guide Development?  Walter Nicgorski

Emily McKeown  The Metaphorical Ascent: Reading Plotinus and St. Teresa of Avila as a Spiritual Exercise  Robert Goulding

Stacy Mick  “Unless a Grain of Wheat”: The Mysticism of Work, Egolessness, and Social Justice in the Writings of Simone Weil  Krista Duttenhaver

Kimberlee Montoya  Inquiry of the Tensions Between Fortune, Freedom, and Providence in The Knight’s Tale  Julia Marvin

Patrick Moore  From Contradiction to Coexistence: Authenticity and Ethics in a Modern Age  Steven Affeldt

Kenneth Sawyer Negro  Reality as Understood by Plotinus and Advaita Vedanta  Robert Goulding

Connor Nowalk  A Political Message: Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony  Julia Marvin

Ryan Oakley  Shelley’s Tragic Vision of Love  Henry Weinfield
David Partida  
A Critique of Alasdair MacIntyre’s Presentation of Stoicism in *After Virtue*  
Gretchen Reydams-Schils

Matthew Pentz  
Exemplar: The Character of Diomedes in the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*  
Julia Marvin

Catherine Peters  
The Language of Injustice  
Gretchen Reydams-Schils

Stephanie Peters  
Ethical Practices of a Physician: Internalized Way of Living or Externalized Code of Conduct? A Critical Examination of the Ancient and Modern Forms of the Hippocratic Oath  
Felicitas Munzel

Justin Queen  
Science, Evolution, and Church Teaching  
Kevin Mongrain

Mary Katherine Schweihs  
“Thus, I Give Up the Spear!”: Herman Melville’s Exploration of the Human Condition through Captain Ahab’s Victorious Death  
Steven Affeldt

James Spitalere  
Something from Nothing: Video Games, Theology, and Making it Up as You Go Along  
Julia Marvin

Kathryn Swiss  
The Essential Unessential: Milton's Ambiguous Chaos in *Paradise Lost*  
Henry Weinfield

Bill Thanhouser  
The Spiritual Development of Pierre Bezukhov as a Mirror of Tolstoy’s Philosophy of History in *War and Peace*  
Krista Duttenhaver

Frances Thunder  
“Shaping Fantasies” and Crafting the Self: An Exploration of Consciousness in Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*  
Julia Marvin

Joe Venturini  
Redefining Death: An Argument for Person-Based Criteria  
Bernd Goehring

Sarah Walter  
Argumentation as Persuasion: How Reasoning Influences Moral Decision-Making  
F. Clark Power

Mark Weber  
Education as the Lifeblood of Sustainable Development: Analyzing the External and Internal Returns on the Education Investment  
Felicitas Munzel

Ashlee Wright  
Complementary Contradictions: An Examination of Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*  
Henry Weinfield

Ann Yackshaw  
Fever Dreams and Ecstatic Truth: a Nietzschean Analysis of the Cinema of Werner Herzog  
Gretchen Reydams-Schils
ALUMNAE/I NEWS

The editorial staff of Programma welcomes contributions and reserves the right to edit them for publication. For information about becoming a class correspondent, please contact the Program of Liberal Studies Office.

Please help us update our alumni database!
Send us your current email address, mailing address, and phone number.
If you would like to let your classmates know what you are doing these days, please include an update as well.
You can forward your information to pls@nd.edu or call the office at 574-631-7172.

The Program is saddened by the unexpected loss of long-time friend and supporter Francis D’Eramo (*82), who passed away on April 27, 2009. We were able to reconnect with Francis at several Summer Symposiums. We will miss him.

Class of 1954
Added by the PLS Office:
Tom Field, a member of the first PLS graduating class, recently returned to Notre Dame to speak at a forum on “Homosexuality Under the Dome: Past Struggles and Present Solutions.” Field, who was student body president at Notre Dame, earned advanced degrees in economics and law from Oxford, Harvard Law School, and Georgetown, and worked as an attorney in both government and non-profit settings. He retired as a colonel in the U.S. Army Reserves after 32 years of service, and is a member of the Advisory Council for the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network.

Class of 1955
(Class Correspondent: George Vosmik, 21151 Lake Rd., Rocky River, OH 44116-1217, flyty@apk.net)

Class of 1956

Class of 1957

Class of 1958
(Class Correspondent: Michael Crowe, PLS, 215 O’Shaughnessy Hall, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, 574-631-6212, crowe.1@nd.edu)

Class of 1959

Class of 1960
(Class Correspondent: Anthony Intintoli, Jr., 912 Georgia St., Vallejo, CA 94590-6239 aintintoli@yahoo.com)

Class of 1961

Class of 1962
(Class Correspondent: John Hutton, Box 1307, Tybee Island, GA 31328)
Class of 1963

Class of 1964
(Class Correspondent: Joseph J. Sperber, 42 Ridge Road, East Williston, NY 11596, Tel: 516-747-1764, Fax: 516-747-1731, Email: joe42ew@gmail.com)

Joe Sperber wrote: “My wife Valerie and I retired last July. I after a career as a lawyer, including the last 27 years as Counsel at Davis Polk & Wardwell in New York City. Valerie after 27 years as a nursery teacher in our parish school. We have three boys, married to three lovely daughters-in-law, and now have six wonderful grandchildren, two boys and four girls. Joseph IV, our oldest, is a graduate of Georgetown University and Georgetown Law Center and is a lawyer with the Justice Department in Washington, DC. Paul, our second, also graduated from Georgetown and is trader with Morgan Stanley in New York City. Andrew, our youngest, graduated from Mt. St. Mary’s and is a New York City police officer.”

Class of 1965
(Class Correspondent: Lee Foster, P.O. Box 5715, Berkeley, CA 94705)

Class of 1966
(Class Correspondent: Paul Ahr, 8020 East Drive #318, Miami Beach, FL 33141, 305-965-9303, paulahr@cpcontext.com)

Class of 1967
(Class Correspondent: Robert McClelland, 584 Flying Jib Ct., Lafayette, CO 80026-1291)

Class of 1968

Class of 1969

Class of 1970
(Class Correspondent: William Maloney, M.D., 2023 West Vista Way #A, Vista, CA 92083, 760-941-1400, MaloneyEye@yahoo.com)

Class of 1971
(Class Correspondent: Raymond Condon, 4508 Hyridge Dr., Austin, TX 78759-8054)

Class of 1972
(Class Correspondent: Otto Barry Bird, 15013 Bauer Drive, Rockville, MD 20853, BarryBird@hotmail.com)

Class of 1973
(Class Correspondents: John Astuno, 16 Meadowview Lane, Greenwood, CO 80121, johnastuno@earthlink.net and John Burkley, 200 Law Road, Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510, burkley@optonline.net)

Class of 1974
(Class Correspondent: Jan Waltman Hessling, 5613 Frenchman’s Creek, Durham, NC 27713-2647, 919-544-4914, hessling@mindspring.com)

Added by the PLS Office:
Mark Maurer, already the recipient of the Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, C.S.C., Award from Notre Dame’s Alumni Association, will be awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree at Notre Dame’s commencement ceremony in May, 2010. Maurer, president of the National Federation of the Blind (NFB) since 1986, earned a law degree from Indiana University in 1977 and is a member of the bar in Ohio, Indiana, and Maryland and the Bar of the Supreme Court. He has worked tirelessly in fighting discrimination against the blind and in securing civil rights for persons with disabilities. During his tenure as president of the NFB, Maurer has focused energy and attention on the development of new technologies for the blind.

Class of 1975
(Class Correspondent: David Miller, 4605 Aberdeen Avenue, Dublin, OH 43016)
Class of 1976
(Class Correspondent: Pat Murphy, 2554 Rainbow Drive, Casper, WY 82601, 307-265-0070 W, 307-265-8616 H 307-262-2872 C pmurphy@wpdn.net)

Class of 1977
(Class Correspondent: Richard Magjuka, Department of Management, Room 630C, School of Business, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47501).

Added by the PLS Office:
Anne Dilenschneider has been selected from an international pool of alumni/ae as Ashland Theological Seminary’s 2009 Distinguished Alumna for Pastoral Leadership. She received the award at the seminary in Ashland, Ohio on October 27th.

She is also presenting a paper “Refusing to be put aside: Women and the meaning of betrayal” at the 3rd Global Conference - Forgiveness: Probing the Boundaries to be held in Oxford, England from Thursday 15th July to Saturday 17th July 2010.

Class of 1978

Class of 1979
(Class Correspondent: Thomas Livingston, 517 Fordham Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15226-2021)

Class of 1980
(Class Correspondent: Mary Schmidtlein Rhodes, #9 Southcote Road, St. Louis, MO 63144 mvsr3144@sbcglobal.net)

Class of 1981
(Class Correspondent: Tom Gotuaco, World Marketing Alliance, 2234 A Westborough Blvd., S. San Francisco, CA 94080-5405)

Class of 1982

Class of 1983
(Class Correspondent: Patty Fox, 902 Giles St., Ithaca, NY 14850-6128)

Class of 1984
(Class Correspondent: Margaret Smith, P.O. Box 81606, Fairbanks, AK 99708-1606)

Added by the PLS Office:
John Kromkowski shared a lovely creative meditation with PLS on St. Martin. We’d be delighted to print it, but with the two memorials in this edition of Programma, we lack the space.

Class of 1985
(Class Correspondent: Laurie Denn, 5816 Lyle Circle, Edina, MN 55436-2228)

Class of 1986
(Class Correspondent: Margaret (Neis) Kulis, 1350 Coneflower, Gray’s Lake, IL 60030, kulis.hom@sbcglobal.net)

Class of 1987
(Class Correspondent: Terese Heidenwolf, 49 W. Church St., Bethlehem, PA 18018-5821 heidenwt@lafayette.edu)

Class of 1988
(Class Correspondent: Michele Martin, 3106 Voltaire Blvd., McKinney, TX 75070-4248, mmmartin99@hotmail.com)

Added by the PLS Office:
Jim Carroll now owns and operates an online journal called Converge! New Digest http://www.convergedigest.com/ in Silicon Valley that reports on the latest IT issues.

Pat Stanton writes: “After working a few years after graduation, (and thanks to the half-truths told in recommendation letters authored by Profs. Crowe and Power), I attended Loyola Law School in Chicago. After short stints at a mega law firm and as a clerk to a federal judge, I have practiced as a business litigator at what was once considered a mid-size (60 lawyers) business law firm. Last summer my firm joined a larger firm (450 lawyers), Dykema Gossett. My wife, Karen (U. Va. grad), and I have five kids-Tommy (7),
Burke (5), John (2), and Peter and Ellie (seven month old twins). We live on the block where I grew up in Beverly, a neighborhood on the Southside of Chicago, where my sons and I (and soon my daughter) waste countless hours watching, listening to and reading about our beloved (and often hapless) White Sox and Fighting Irish.”

Class of 1989
(Class Correspondent: Coni Rich, 1529 South Lake George Drive, Mishawaka, IN 46545, 574-271-0462, conijorich@aol.com)

Class of 1990
(Class Correspondent: Barbara Martin, 45 Westmoreland Lane, Naperville, IL 60540-55817, jbryan45@att.net)

Class of 1991
(Class correspondent: Ann Mariani Morris, 101 Raymond Rd., Sudbury, MA 01776-3454 annie@rickmorris.com)

Class of 1992
(Class correspondent: Jennifer Adams Roe, 7226 Concordridge Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45244 Jenroe@cinci.rr.com)

Class of 1993
(Class correspondent: Anthony Valle, 147-55 6 Ave., Whitestone, NY 11357-1656)

Class of 1994
Added by the PLS Office:
Rebecca Lubas wrote: “I am now an Assistant Professor of Librarianship at the University of New Mexico, and Director, Cataloging & Discovery Services. In August I presented a paper at the International Library Federation conference in Milan, Italy. This year Joe McCarty and I celebrated our 15th wedding anniversary.

Class of 1995
(Class Correspondent: Andrew Saldino, 125 Manor Rdg., Boone, NC 28607-9875 saldino@excite.com)
Added by the PLS Office:
Amy Siddons Karr is Senior Director of Development and Health Foundation Affairs at the University of Virginia’s Health System Development Office, a role that combines executive staffing for the Associate Vice President for Development, oversight of the Health System’s foundation and corporate relations program, chief of staff duties, and volunteer board administration. She has worked in development at UVa for twelve years at the Health System and the Engineering School. Amy received a Ph.D. in English at the University of Virginia, specializing in Victorian literature, in 2004. Amy was married in 2007 and has a ten-year old step-daughter.

Added by the PLS Office:
Danielle Bird Voeller wrote: “I’m married to Phil Voeller, a Boeing engineer and retired Navy captain, and we have two daughters, Naomi and Leah (age 5 and 3 ½). After Naomi was born, I decided to take a break from my career. I most recently worked for Microsoft Press where I managed the list of books we published for programmers. We haven’t read any Great Books to the girls yet although we’ve read the Chronicles of Narnia to Naomi twice (she’s a huge Aslan fan). One of the many valuable lessons I learned at PLS was from Edward Cronin and that is ‘Less IS More.’”

Susan Dogneaux wrote: “I am married to Derrick Beasley, have two girls Lola (4) and Tess (new!), am a children’s librarian at the Louisville Free Public Library, went to library school at the University of Texas at Austin, graduated from there back in ‘98.”
Class of 1996
(Class Correspondent: Stacy Mosesso McConnell, 351 Ayr Hill Ave. NE, Vienna, VA 22180-4726)
Added by the PLS Office:
Jamey Wetmore just completed his third year as Assistant Professor at the Consortium for Science, Policy & Outcomes and the School of Human Evolution & Social Change at Arizona State University. In fall 2008 his second edited volume was published: Technology & Society: Building our Sociotechnical Future (with Deborah G. Johnson). When he was taking history and philosophy of science classes in PLS he was thrilled to find that one could use the tools of the humanities and the social sciences to study science. He vowed he would do the same with technology. This book is an introduction to accessible articles that do just that. One of the articles included – “Amish Technology: Reinforcing Values and Building Community” – was originally written as his senior paper under the direction of Michael Crowe.”

Class of 1997
(Class Correspondent: Brien Flanagan, 1211 SW Fifth Ave., Suite 1600-1900, Portland, OR 97204, bflanagan@schwabe.com)

Class of 1998
(Class Correspondents: Katie Bagley, 1601 18th Stret NW, Apt. 318, Washington, DC 20009-2500, ksbagley@hotmail.com, and Clare Murphy, 848 El Quanito Drive, Danville, CA 94526-1829 cmshalom@hotmail.com)

Class of 1999
(Class Correspondent: Kate Hibey Fritz, 11424 Rokeby Avenue, Kingston, MD 20895, kefritz@gmail.com)

Class of 2000

Class of 2001

Class of 2002
(Class Correspondent: Ricky Klee, 625 Orange St., Apt. 55, New Haven, CT 06511 rklee3@gmail.com)

Class of 2003

Class of 2004

Class of 2005
Added by the PLS Office:
Carl Bindenagel has written to tell us about his recent travels in France, where he was able to meet his new niece, Marjam, and visit with his sister and brother-in-law. He “couldn’t be happier” to be a doting uncle, and claims that he is completely smitten with baby Marjam’s smile. Carl particularly enjoyed Lyon, where his brother-in-law treated the whole family to a guided tour, and describes in lively fashion a visit to the Basilique de Fourvière, where he was delighted to hear the church bells playing jazz.

Linda Skalski spent part of 2009 working as a summer intern for Commonweal Magazine, where she read manuscripts, worked on updating the magazine’s website, and did some reporting in the field. After her summer internship, she returned to Duke University, where she is working on a masters degree in religion.

Class of 2006

Class of 2007
Added by the PLS Office:
Matt Timmel wrote: “I’ve been working in Madison for two years now in the Health IT industry, a fairly shocking development considering my PLS background. I’m traveling across the US to glamorous places like Iowa and Kentucky helping hospitals slowly move from paper to electronic medical records. In all seriousness though, it has been a very challenging, but rewarding experience so far, however mundane it may sound!”
Class of 2008

Class of 2009

Added by the PLS Office:
Martha Calcutt writes from the small town of Wexford, Ireland, to tell us about her year serving as a lay parish music minister. In between choir rehearsals, planning liturgies, and practicing for Christmas services, she has been traveling around Ireland (including several visits to Dublin), savoring Rissoles (the Wexford delicacy), joking with the locals about her Fighting Irish sweatpants, and preparing a Thanksgiving dinner, American-style, for 30 Irish friends. macalcutt@gmail.com”

Mary Katherine Schweihis, is the creator and manager of a blog that is currently being written by eight PLS students of the class of 2009. The eight PLS students writing the blog are: Mary Katherine Schweihis, Michael Benz, Katie Swiss, Elisia Guerena, Ryan Oakley (from China), Anna Curtis, Mike Folger, and Maggie Culhane. The blog is called Pensees Now. Here is the link: http://penseesnow.com
MANY THANKS TO ALL CONTRIBUTORS

Contributions Received at the PLS Office for Support of Programma and the Program of Liberal Studies since the Last Issue

The Program of Liberal Studies is home to a distinguished group of scholar-teachers committed to a vision of the power of a liberal arts education centered on the Great Books. Program faculty members strive to establish an intellectual, social, and spiritual community for students. These efforts often rely on the generosity of the University's alumni/ae to meet with success.

We are fortunate to be at Notre Dame, a university that receives enthusiastic support from its alumni and alumnae. Many of our graduates, however, may not know that it is possible to earmark a gift by specifying the unit to receive it in a letter accompanying the donation.

As I have written to some who have contributed to the Program in recent years, I am deeply grateful not only for the financial support but for the continuing vote of confidence in the department, its faculty, and its students. I have been asked to tell potential contributors that, if you wish to have your gift recorded in the current tax year, you should time the contributions to arrive before December 10. After that point, Debbie is likely to be on vacation, and checks might not be processed until the new year.

When responding to the Notre Dame Annual Fund, please consider donating to the Program of Liberal Studies.

If you would like to make a gift of any kind, contact:

Gretchen Reydams-Schils
Chair, Program of Liberal Studies
215 O'Shaughnessy Hall
Notre Dame, IN 46556
prlibst@nd.edu

We heartily thank you for your support of our programs.

Contributions to the
Rev. Nicholas Ayo, C.S.C. Award

A new award established to honor Nicholas Ayo after his retirement from teaching in the Program.

Beth Zangmeister McCormick
Contributions to the
Otto A. Bird Fund

This is a tribute to the faculty member who worked with Mortimer Adler in founding the General Program. Otto A. Bird started the department in 1950. This award recognizes the graduating senior who wrote the year’s outstanding senior essay. The announcement of this award is keenly anticipated each year at the Senior Dinner, when students and faculty gather to celebrate the completion of the final requirement for graduation.

Annemarie Sullivan Hitchcock
Mark Kromkowski
Dr. Gary Raisl
Wise Women (book club that Otto’s daughter Kate Bird is a member)
James R. Wyrsch

Contributions to the
Susan Clements Fund

Susan was an extraordinary student and a remarkable young woman who graduated in 1990 and met an early and tragic death in 1992. This award is presented each year at the Senior Dinner, to the Program of Liberal Studies female student who exemplifies outstanding qualities of scholarly achievement, industry, compassion, and service.

Wendy Chambers Beuter
Mr. & Mrs. Paul Browning
Mr. & Mrs. Robert Clements
Thomas Kwiecien
Dana Rogers

Contributions to the
Edward J. Cronin Fund

The Cronin Fund both honors a legendary teacher and helps to reward (and thus to encourage) undergraduate efforts to write lucidly and gracefully. The Award is for the finest piece of writing each year by a student in the Program of Liberal Studies. This is a distinct honor; it constitutes the Program’s highest prize for writing in the course of ordinary course work. Your gift will help us to recognize Program students who meet the high standards for writing set by our invaluable senior colleague.

Charles Boudreaux
David Carlyle
Annemarie Sullivan Hitchcock
Douglas Siddoway
Contributions to the
Program of Liberal Studies
Center for the Homeless Project

In 1998 the Program of Liberal Studies began a community outreach seminar with students from the South Bend Center for the Homeless. The World Masterpieces Seminar runs for the entire academic year. Contributions help defray the cost of the books and outings to plays, concerts, and operas.

Lynn Malooly

Contributions to the
Jay Kelly Memorial Scholarship

The Jay Kelly Memorial Scholarship was established in memory of a PLS student who came to Notre Dame in the fall of 1988. He battled cancer for two years and passed away after his junior year of college. This award, commemorating Jay’s spirit, is awarded annually to a junior in the Program who is in financial need.

Mr. Andrew and Prof. Larisa Cavallari

Contributions to the
Willis D. Nutting Fund

The Willis Nutting award was established to memorialize one of the great teachers in the Program. Those who taught with or studied under Willis remember his gentle style, his clever wit, and his deep faith. The Willis Nutting tree outside the Art Department bears this motto from Chaucer: “And gladly wolde he lerne, and gladly teche.” This was his style, and we hope that it will always be yours as well. The Award is for “that senior who has contributed most to the education of his or her fellow students and teachers.”

Robert Dini

Contributions to the
Stephen Rogers Memorial Fund

Stephen Rogers graduated from our department in 1956. He later became a remarkable asset to our department faculty. Steve was physically challenged; he was blind. In 1985, Steve died during the final portion of senior essay time. We can’t think of a better way to keep Steve’s ideals alive than to fund a scholarship in his name. The Stephen Rogers Fund helps us to assist worthy students facing unexpected financial difficulties. The fund is given to the PLS student with the most financial need. On more than one occasion, the Fund has allowed students to remain in school when otherwise they would have had to withdraw.

William Brittan
Thomas Fleming
Patrick Mannion
Daniel Smith
Gregory St. Ville
Mary Elizabeth Wackowski Wittenauer
Contributions to the
Stephen Rogers Endowment
for Graduate School Studies

The endowment will be used to support Graduate School Studies for students of the Program of Liberal Studies.

Contributions to the University
Designated for PLS since the Last Issue

These contributions provide the department funds for the many faculty and student functions (Opening Charge, Christmas Party, Senior Dinner, Senior Brunch), office equipment, and much more. They also provide us the means to send Programma to over 1,900 alumni/ae all over the world.

Richard Allega
Gregory Beatty
Theodore Becchetti
Gene Brion
Kathleen Collins
Robert Donnellan
Thomas Durkin
Katie Ellgass
Peter Frank
Adam Frisch
Daniel Hartnett
Terese Heidenwolf
William John
John Kromkowski
Rev. Michael Kwiecien, O.CARM.
Anne Marie Janairo Lewis
Rebecca Nanovic Lin
Joseph Lindsley

Thomas Long
Robert McClelland
Courtney L. Miller O’Mara
Michael Miller
Ann Mariani Morris
Claire Perona Murphy
Thomas Neuburger
Joseph Pietrangelo
Margaret Wood Powers
Susan Prahinski
Lawlor Quinlan, III
Dr. Gary Raisl
Jackson Sigler
Daniel Stewart
Erich Straub
Mary Skae Sturges
Eugene Tuite
Jameson Wetmore