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NO REGISTRATION FEE
PLS Conference Sponsored by Henkels Lecture Series
with assistance from the University of Notre Dame, the Program of Liberal Studies, the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President Emeritus, the Cavanaugh Chair in the Humanities, and the Department of Medical Education of St. Joseph's Regional Medical Center.

PLS CONFERENCE IN CONJUNCTION WITH
ASSOCIATION FOR CORE TEXTS AND COURSES
SEVENTH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONFERENCE

The Wider World of Core Texts and Courses

CAMPUS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
APRIL 5-8, 2001

ACTC Conference hosted by the University of Notre Dame.

Information about Association for Core Texts and Courses Conference

Scott Lee (215) 204 – 3176
Email: sleet@blue.temple.edu
ACTC Website: http://nimbus.temple.edu/~zelnick/actc

REGISTRATION AND CONFERENCE PAYMENT SHOULD BE MADE THROUGH
THE ASSOCIATION FOR CORE TEXTS AND COURSES.
Registration: c/o Linda Tribune (215) 204 – 1770. Or write to ACTC, 1114 West Berks Street, Intellectual Heritage Program, 214 Anderson Hall, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122
Biographical Information on the Three Keynote Speakers for the PLS Fiftieth Anniversary Conference on “Liberal Learning and the Great Books”

Eva Brann, who has her doctorate from Yale University in archaeology, holds the Addison E. Mullikin Tutorialship at St. John’s College of Annapolis and Santa Fe, the most prestigious college devoted to Great Books education. Having joined the St. John’s faculty in 1957, she served as Dean from 1990 to 1997. She has taught at Stanford, has been a member of Princeton’s Institute for Advanced Studies, and is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Among her five books, the most recent is The Study of Time: Philosophical Truth and Human Consequences.

Frederick J. Crosson, who holds his doctorate from Notre Dame in philosophy, is the Rev. John J. Cavanaugh Emeritus Professor in the Humanities in the Program of Liberal Studies at the University of Notre Dame. He joined the PLS faculty in 1952 and has served as Dean of Notre Dame’s College of Arts and Letters. In 1998, he was chosen for that college’s most distinguished teaching award and is currently national president of Phi Beta Kappa.

Jean Bethke Elshtain, who holds her doctorate from Brandeis University, teaches at the University of Chicago as the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Professor of Social and Political Ethics in the Divinity School, the Department of Political Science, and the Committee on International Relations. With nearly two dozen books to her credit, she also serves as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, of the National Humanities Center, and of Notre Dame’s Erasmus Institute.

Biographical Information on the Nine Distinguished PLS Graduates Who Will Present Reflections at the PLS Fiftieth Anniversary Conference “Liberal Learning and the Great Books”

John M. Breen graduated with highest honors from the Program of Liberal Studies in 1985, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. He then attended Harvard Law School, where he served as a member of the Board of Student Advisors, teaching research and writing to first year law students. After receiving his J. D., he clerked for Judge Boyce F. Martin, Jr., of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. He then practiced law at Sidley & Austin in Chicago, specializing in commercial litigation. He now teaches at Loyola University (Chicago) School of Law, where his courses include commercial law, legal ethics, and jurisprudence. His scholarly works include lengthy studies of the Uniform Commercial Code and its primary draftsman, Karl Llewellyn. He has also written on legal ethics and on the relationship between religious faith and the practice of law. He currently serves as Reporter to the Illinois Supreme Court Committee on Professional Responsibility and on the Board of Directors of the Arab-American Bar Association of Illinois. John lives with his wife, Susan Nelligan Breen, in Naperville, Illinois.
Robert Bowman graduated magna cum laude from the Program of Liberal Studies in 1958, winning a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship to study philosophy at Yale University. After a year at Yale, he decided to pursue a career in medicine. After pre-med studies and medical school at Boston University, he received his M.D. in 1964. Upon completing his internship at Genesee Hospital, he spent three years in the military. He then returned to a residency in psychiatry and a fellowship in law and psychiatry at the University of Pittsburgh, completing these by 1972. He then pursued psychoanalytical training. Beginning in 1972, he began part-time teaching at University of Pittsburgh’s Medical School Department of Psychiatry. His time over the last twenty years has been divided between private practice and running a forensic psychiatry unit for the state of Pennsylvania. In recent years, he has concentrated on private practice in an Appalachian community in Pennsylvania. His spare time is spent with the piano, reading, and learning Italian, German, Russian, and Greek. He and his wife have four children, one of whom graduated from the Program of Liberal Studies.

Martha Jiménez graduated from the Program of Liberal Studies in 1983. She then attended the University of California’s Boalt School of Law, where she served as co-editor of La Raza Law Journal. After a period as a law fellow at the Center for Law in the Public Interest in Los Angeles, she in 1987 joined the Washington, DC office of MALDEF (Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund) as a legislative attorney. In 1990, she began a three-year period of working as a policy analyst for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, becoming in 1993 a staff attorney in the San Francisco office of MALDEF. She is now Assistant Director of the Working Communities Division of The Rockefeller Foundation. She has appeared on numerous television and radio broadcasts, is the recipient of many awards, including the San Francisco Bar Association’s Award of Merit, and has served on an array of commissions and boards, including the Board of Directors of the Bar Association of San Francisco and the Advisory Council for Notre Dame’s College of Arts and Letters.

Katherine Kersten graduated summa cum laude from the Program of Liberal Studies in 1973 and was selected for Phi Beta Kappa. She received a master’s degree from Yale University’s School of Organization and Management, and then worked for several years in banking and university administration. In 1982, she graduated from the University of Minnesota Law School, where she was selected for the Law Review, and subsequently practiced law for three years. After her second child was born, she decided to become a full-time mother. Kersten then began a “second career” as a writer and public policy analyst, working from her home. She became a columnist for the Minneapolis Star Tribune, and also worked as a commentator for National Public Radio’s “All Things Considered.” She has also written for a variety of publications, including the Wall Street Journal, Policy Review, First Things, Christianity Today, and the Weekly Standard, and is co-author of Close to Home. Currently, she is a senior fellow for cultural studies at Center of the American Experiment, a public policy institution in Minneapolis, which she helped to found in 1990.
James McDonald, C.S.C., graduated from Notre Dame in 1979 majoring in both the Program of Liberal Studies and in Modern Languages. He had already by that time begun studies that culminated in 1984 with his ordination as a Holy Cross priest. In the same year, he received his Master of Divinity degree from Notre Dame with High Honors, with a year of his training having been taken at the Institut Catholique in Paris. After a year of teaching and rectoring at Notre Dame, Fr. McDonald began advanced studies in modern languages (Spanish and French) at Cambridge University, where he received a Master of Arts degree with Honors in 1987. After serving as Vice-Principal of St. George’s College in Santiago, Chile, he began legal studies at Catholic University of America, and received his J.D. degree in 1994, specializing in international law. From 1994 to 1997, he served as Provincial Steward of the Indiana Province of the Holy Cross order. In 1997, he was named Assistant Dean of the Notre Dame Law School, becoming in 1999 Associate Dean. In January, 2001, he returned to Santiago, Chile to assume the position of Rector of St. George’s College.

In 1963 Robert McNeill graduated summa cum laude from the Program of Liberal Studies, was the Valedictorian and was awarded a Rhodes Scholarship. He received an advanced degree in Economics (With Distinction) from the University of Oxford, England. From 1967 to date, he has been with Stein Roe & Farnham, one of the world’s leading investment counseling firms, where he currently serves as Executive Vice President. At Stein Roe, his responsibilities have included: Senior Partner, Executive Committee; Chairman Emeritus, Investment Policy Committee; and Founder, Stein Roe International. He has been active in the Rhodes Scholarship selection process for the past 25 years, chairing the Illinois State and Great Lakes Regional Selection Committees. His civic affiliations include Board Membership with: Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Adler Planetarium and Astronomy Museum, Hadley School for the Blind, Institute for the International Education of Students, Big Shoulders Fund, and Catholic Charities of Chicago. He served as “Principal For A Day” in four Chicago Inner City Schools. He is currently a member of the University of Notre Dame International Council. Bob lives in Winnetka, Illinois with his wife Martha, has five children (two Notre Dame Graduates) and six grandchildren.

Janice Louise Mary Peterson is a Hoosier native. The fourth child of Virginia and Ronald Peterson of Plymouth, Indiana, Janice studied in Notre Dame’s Program of Liberal Studies, graduating in 1981 with high honors and with election to Phi Beta Kappa. She served as a volunteer with the Holy Cross Sisters in Brazil from 1982 to 1983. She attended Indiana University Medical School, graduating in 1989. In January of 1989 she served with the Greencastle Winter Term in Mission in Iquitos, Peru. She was a founding member of the International Health Tract, a program to promote missionary work during Residency Training at St. Joseph’s Medical Center in South Bend, Indiana. Doctor Peterson served at the Mercy Sisters Hospital in Georgetown, Guyana in November of 1990. She completed her Family Practice residency in 1992. She is currently a diplomate member of the American Board of Family Practice as well as a member of the American Academy of Family Practice. Doctor Peterson has served as a volunteer physician and missionary for the Catholic church in Ethiopia from 1994 to the present.
Michael Schierl graduated summa cum laude from the Program of Liberal Studies in 1984, and became a member of Phi Beta Kappa. He received his J. D. from Harvard University in 1988. In 1987, he took a year off from his studies at Harvard to serve as the Assistant to the President for Fort Howard Paper Company, where he negotiated joint venture relationships and the potential sale of Fort Howard's Far East subsidiary located in Hong Kong. From 1988 until 1992, Michael was a corporate attorney in New York with the law firm Dewey Ballantine, where he specialized in merger and acquisitions and public market transactions. From 1993 until 1998, Michael served as the President of Julius Capital Partners, a Chicago-based private equity firm he founded. In 1999, Michael and his wife, Valerie, founded Who2Trust, Inc., a new type of business directory that helps Consumers find businesses recommended by people they know. Based in Oak Brook, Illinois, Who2Trust currently has over 50 employees and is targeting a future IPO. Michael lives in La Grange Park, Illinois with his wife, Valerie, and daughter, Madeline. They are currently expecting a second child.

Kenneth Taylor graduated cum laude from the Program of Liberal Studies in 1977, having been selected for the Program's Willis Nutting Award. In 1984, he received his Ph. D. in philosophy from the University of Chicago. He is currently Associate Professor of Philosophy and Symbolic Systems at Stanford University and is the incoming chair of his department at Stanford. He has also taught philosophy at Middlebury College, Wesleyan University, University of Maryland (College Park), and Rutgers University. He is the author of a book titled Truth and Meaning: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Language (Blackwell, 1998) and of Referring to the World: An Introduction to the Theory of Reference (Oxford University Press, forthcoming). He has also published numerous articles on the philosophy of mind and the philosophy of language. Professor Taylor has held fellowships from the Lilly Foundation and the Ford Foundation.
A VIEW FROM 215

F. Clark Power

Room 215 looks out on the nearly completed building that will house Philosophy and Theology faculty next year. I will miss bumping into my colleagues from these departments in the corridors of Decio, just as I miss seeing my colleagues from Sociology, who are now located in Flanner. The price of growth is differentiation. The Arts, the Social Sciences, and now Philosophy and Theology are housed in different buildings. We will have to find new ways of fostering dialogue and collaboration among the departments in the College of Arts and Letters. I am confident that the Program of Liberal Studies, which embodies the ideal of the university as an integrated whole, will play a special role in this effort. My colleagues and I have been enriched beyond our expectations by the conversations across and beyond the disciplines that are part of our daily life in the Program.

The Year 2000 was a special one for us. We began the celebration of our fiftieth anniversary last Spring, and we will conclude our celebration this April with a special symposium and conference. We provide detailed information about these events in this issue and hope that you will join us in participating in them. This year we are also celebrating Professor Michael Crowe’s installation to the Cavanaugh Chair in the Humanities. As most of you know, Professor Crowe is a graduate of the Program of Liberal Studies. He joined our faculty in 1961 and became department chair in 1967 as an untenured professor. Professor Crowe established the Graduate Program in History and Philosophy of Science in conjunction with the (General) Program of Liberal Studies while he was department chair. Notre Dame’s graduate program in the History and Philosophy of Science was one of the first of its kind and blossomed more recently into the Reilly Center for Science, Technology and Values. Whenever I introduce Professor Crowe, I jokingly refer to the fact that he is the only faculty member in our Great Books Program to have written a “great book,” A History of Vector Analysis: The Evolution of the Idea of a Vectorial System. The first large-scale study of the history of vector analysis, it won La Maison des Sciences de l’Homme’s Jean Scot award as a classic in the history of mathematics in 1992, twenty-five years after it was first published. Professor Crowe’s teaching in the Program led him to develop an interest in the history of astronomy, which resulted in the 1986 publication of Extraterrestrial Life Debate 1750-1900: The Idea of a Plurality of Worlds from Kant to Lowell. This monumental 700-page volume is the definitive work on the subject and is recognized as one of the most important volumes to be published in the history of science in the last two decades. I am only sampling from Professor Crowe’s many achievements. He has distinguished himself as an administrator, a scholar and a teacher. I know of no other faculty member whose undergraduate teaching has born such fruit in his research and vice versa. He is, indeed, an example for us all at Notre Dame; and as he concludes his illustrious career, he is richly deserving of this endowed chair, an honor long overdue.

The Year 2000 was also a special one for the students in the Program, particularly
our graduating class. Tom Kilroy was chosen by the seniors and faculty for the Willis Nutting Award, which is given to the student who has contributed the most to the education of his or her peers and professors in the program. Patrick Jehle received the Bird award for his Senior Essay, written under the direction of Professor Weinfeld. Last Year’s Cronin Award for writing in the Program was won by Stacey Fuller.

The students in the Program have continued to support the World Masterpieces Seminar, as drivers, childcare workers, and writing tutors. This Fall, about a dozen of them became teachers, as we launched a series of new “Great Books” community service projects in the South Bend Schools. Our students conduct seminars at two sites: Hamilton Alternative School and St. Joseph’s Elementary School. We have many more volunteers than we can place right now, but we hope to expand our outreach as our resources permit.

As usual, we had a strong turnout for the Alumni reunion this past summer. In our reunion seminar, we had a spirited discussion of a chapter from Earl Shorris’s New American Blues, which inspired the World Masterpieces Seminar for residents of the Center for the Homeless. The reunion seminar has become one of my favorite events of the year. Our selection of texts has varied widely over the years, from selections from our seminar readings to the American Bishops’ Letter on Women. We invite you to make suggestions for future readings. We have found that texts between ten and twenty pages work the best.

I hope that all of you will think about attending our Continuing Education Symposium, a Sunday (evening) through Friday (morning) event held annually around July 4. Last year we held our second such symposium and had a wonderful turnout of alumnae/i and their parents. About half of our participants had returned from the previous year. You will find registration information in this issue. This is an inexpensive way of recharging your intellectual and spiritual batteries and the faculty’s too. Why not get in touch with some of your classmates and plan a reunion week? Feel free to include your non-GP/PLS friends and family members; it is never too late to enjoy reading and discussing the Great Books.

Best wishes to all of you in the coming year. Thank you for your generous support over the past year. We are deeply grateful to you for sustaining our extended PLS community. I ask that all of you continue to keep Professor Fallon and his family in your prayers. As many of you know, his wife, Nancy, died suddenly last February 23 at the age of 44. The editor of The Courier, St. Mary’s alumnae magazine, Nancy represented the highest ideals of higher education in the context of faith. Among her many service activities, she championed a Junior Great Books Program at a local parochial school; and she played a key role in establishing our Seminar for the Center for the Homeless. Nancy’s life was a blessing to us all.
FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

Henry Weinfield

This issue of Programma coincides with the fiftieth anniversary of the Program, which we will celebrate in a conference on "Liberal Learning and the Great Books" this coming April (see the announcement on page). As part of the celebration, the Opening Charge that began the academic year was given not by one faculty member, as is our usual custom, but by the four current faculty members who have served as chair of the Program: Professors Walt Nicgorski, Phil Sloan, Steve Fallon, and Clark Power. Their remarks on the history of the Program (see pp. 18-29) make it clear that there were giants in the earth in those days. In addition, this issue contains Father Nicholas Ayo's All Soul's Day homily, his beautiful address on the Jubilee year in the Church; the Cronin Award essay for the past year, Stacey Fuller's fine discussion of American exceptionalism, an essay originally written for Professor Nicgorski's class in Political and Constitutional Theory; and a section of my own very slowly developing translation of Hesiod's Works and Days. We hope you enjoy the issue, and we look forward to seeing as many of you as possible in April at the PLS Conference and in the summer at the second annual PLS Summer Symposium (also announced in this issue).

Julie Marvin, who did such a wonderful job as the editor of the last few issues of Programma, is on leave this year, and the task of filling her shoes as editor has fallen to me. (The last we heard, she was sojourning in such out-of-the-way spots as Stockholm, Paris, and London—but we expect her back in South Bend next year, and the stewardship of Programma will then fall back upon her very capable hands.) As always, we are tremendously grateful to Debbie Kabzinski, our department secretary, without whose patient efforts Programma would never see the light of day.
HOMILY
The Closing of the Jubilee Year Address

November 6th, 2000
Nicholas Ayo, c.s.c.

A recent circular letter of the superior general of the Congregation of Holy Cross begins with a description of the opening of the Jubilee year in Rome. “This past Christmas eve, at Saint Peter’s Basilica in Rome, an African horn sounded the joy of a new Christian millennium. Pope John Paul II, in an exuberant, solemn ceremony, knelt in prayer before the Holy Door adorned with flowers and perfumes from Asia, Oceania, and the Far East. After a solemn silence, the Pope stood and crossed the threshold. He led a resplendent procession of people representing all the earth’s continents. Together they symbolized the daring human pilgrimage we all make through time and history toward the heavenly realm of the New Jerusalem. We long to dwell with each other in God’s presence where life is lived peacefully, lovingly, abundantly. Our Christian faith holds us to the hope of this promise revealed in God’s gracious word” (The Consecrated Life: A Sign of Eschatological Hope: Letter of the Superior General, p.1).

God’s people and God’s creation are inclusive. God shines with love on the just and the unjust. God excludes nobody and loves everything God has made. In ancient Israel the jubilee year, every fifty years, was an act of piety toward God in the recognition that our human society and its cultural arrangements tend all too often to exclude people, to marginalize the weak, the poor, the old, the indebted (in our day, let me add the gay, the lesbian), the other, the stranger, and the enemy. Such division among a people united under God and who hoped to survive in a world of competition and violence all around them begged for a remarkable solidarity. Everyone would be given another beginning. Privilege and wealth would be redistributed. We would forbear. Prisoners would be set free; slaves would be emancipated; debts would be forgiven. We would begin again, because to continue with the exclusion of some for the benefit of others would destroy peace and justice in the family of humanity.

Most all of us have played the game of Monopoly in our childhood. It is a telling strategy, where people around the table are lost and forgotten. By driving out one’s fellow players the game of Monopoly is won at the end when one person owns all the property and accumulates all the money and everyone else has been driven from the game. But then, if a happy community is our desire, we must begin again, redistribute equally the money, and seat everyone again at the table. In effect, one must declare a jubilee year so that we can go on with the banquet of life where none sit it out while others pile it up.

It has been two thousand years since the birth of Jesus Christ our Lord. We are grateful for a thousand graces and sorrowful for a thousand failures to live the gospel. We are mindful that now at the end of this jubilee year and the end of this our second Christian millennium we await that final jubilee. What is this new heaven and new earth, this eighth day of creation, this day the Lord made, this jubilee of jubilees, song of songs to be accomplished by the Lord of Lords? That coming again of the Lord Jesus was not a time of fear for the early Christians. They eagerly anticipated the last judgment, the second coming,
the parousia, the endtimes. "Come, Lord Jesus" was a jubilant plea.

We await the resurrection of our body at the last times. Why is this fullness of our body and our soul united delayed until everyone is present? Heaven is not heaven until all the saints are gathered. Only people live forever. No one is ever gone away. If anyone is not yet seated at the table the rest of us cannot fully celebrate and feast. Only when we are all gathered, all the people whose lives have built up our lives and to whom our lives have extended life and welfare, do we have all of our body. The communion of saints is the mystical body of Christ, and our resurrected body is only fully risen when we are united with everyone from the past to the eternal now of God's presence. Our lives are so inter-linked through the history of creation that not only will there be a new heaven, a new saintly community without exclusion, but there will be a new earth, a fulfillment of all the billions of years of matter itself striving to become closer to spirit. The earth itself as the stuff of our body in this world is striving to be taken up with us in the resurrection of the body, into a world where there is no pretended away to throw things into, but only transformation of matter into something yet more wonderful. Nothing of the unlikely and rare collisions of the very cosmic standust of which our bodies are made will have been in vain, for God will lose nothing of the yearning of this earth in a renewed heaven and a new earth, "because the world itself will be freed from its slavery to corruption and share in the glorious freedom of the children of God. Yes, we know that all creation groans and is in agony even until now" (Rom 8: 21-22).

In the creed we cry our belief. The "communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting" emerge from the gift of the Holy Spirit in the catholicity of the Church. We are a universal church, a church of everything God created and everyone for whom God provides. "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him may not die but may have eternal life" (Jn 3: 16). It is a world without exclusion, a world of inclusion, a world that we yearn for in our own conscious efforts to achieve one world for one human race with peace and with justice. "This is God's dwelling among men. He shall dwell with them and they shall be his people and he shall be their God who is always with them. He shall wipe every tear from their eyes, and there shall be no more death or mourning, crying out or pain, for the former world has passed away" (Rev 21: 3-4).

We seek that jubilee awareness that all nations belong to one mother earth and one Holy Spirit. We try as a Holy Cross community to be international in our missions and outreach whatever our apostolate. We try at the University of Notre Dame to expose our students to the wider world of planet earth, our global village. Our intellectual endeavor should sensitize minds and hearts to this larger picture of one world, one community, one God. Most of all, the Church belongs to every culture, every place, every time, every people.

Along the lake shore by Holy Cross hill there still stands a small and vulnerable statue of Saint Thérèse of Lisieux. It was the devotion of the high school seminarians of Holy Cross Seminary, which once stood on that hill, who arranged for the statute and set it on a stone base near the path around the lake. Saint Thérèse was confined to a Carmelite monastery and her life shortened by tuberculosis. And yet her heart was with the global evangelization of the whole world for Christ. The Church canonized her a saint and made her patron of the international missions, for by her prayers and her desire for God in her everyday life in a restricted cloister she was missionary to the whole world every moment of her life. To this day one finds flowers around the statue.

Time will have an ending as time had a beginning. The glory of God will be in the ending as it was in the beginning. "Let there
be light.” Creation does not fall back into nothing but comes forward into everything. “Then I saw new heavens and a new earth. The former heavens and the former earth had passed away, and the sea was no longer. I also saw a new Jerusalem, the holy city, coming down out of heaven from God, beautiful as a bride” (Rev 21: 1-2). As the psalmist writes: “Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, from everlasting to everlasting thou art God” (Ps 90: 1-2).

In the letter to the Hebrews the focus is on Jesus Christ as the creative Word of God in the beginning and the fulfilling Word of God in the ending. “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever” (13: 8). Or as the eucharistic liturgy joyfully responds after the transformation of the bread and wine–we and this our world–into the body of Christ: “Christ has died. Christ is risen. Christ will come again.” Past, present, future all one, glory being to God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as it was in the beginning, is now, and will be forever, world without end–Jubilee everlasting, Amen.
THE CRONIN HIGH-TABLE POEM FOR 2000

Henry Weinfield

A Translation of Lines 109-196 of Hesiod's
Works and Days

[Note: In this section of the poem, Hesiod tells us of the five ages of man:
the Golden, Silver, Bronze, Heroic, and Iron Ages.]

The deathless ones, who dwell upon Olympos, as of old,
In the beginning made a race of mortals that was gold.
These people lived in Kronos' time, when he was heaven's king;
Like gods they lived, with carefree heart, remote from suffering.
No toil or misery was theirs; to them there never came
Wretched old age—in feet and hands they always were the same,
Rejoicing in the feast the while, apart from every woe;
And when they died it was as if mild sleep had laid them low.
They were endowed with all things good; spontaneously then
The earth bore rich, abundant fruit; and these contented men,
Living in peace, enjoyed its works and all its many goods,
Abundantly supplied with sheep, beloved of the blessed gods.

Now, since the time this happy race was covered up by earth,
As tutelary deities Zeus bids them still go forth
To serve as guardians of men, and at his high behest
Watch over suits and wicked deeds, clothed in a shrud of mist.
Givers of wealth, they roam the world, beneficent and kind—
This is the kingly privilege that they have been assigned.

They who upon Olympos have their dwellings fashioned then
A second, much inferior race, a silver race of men,
Neither in understanding nor in stature like the other:
A hundred years the child remained, coddled by its mother,
A baby in the house, but big! frolicking all that time;
And when at last they were full grown and come into their prime,
They only lived a few short years—in suffering and pain:
Fools, from reckless violence they never could refrain,
And would not serve the deathless ones—it went against their pride—
Nor at the holy altars of the blessed would they preside
As custom has decreed to men; so Zeus the Kronion
Hid them away in rage at what these men had left undone,
The honors that they did not give the Olympian deities.
The earth has covered them as well, this second race, but these
Beneath its confines now are called the mortal-blessed-below;
For honor still accompanies these second ones, them too.

Then Zeus the father made another race of mortal ones,
In nothing similar to the silver—this third race he made bronze
And of the ash tree: mighty, dire, and in their arrogance
Given to Ares' groaning deeds and acts of violence.
They ate no bread—so dauntless and so adamant their spirit,
So huge, resistless was their strength, that nothing could come near it;
And irresistible the arms that from their shoulders grew
Upon their brawny bodies; bronze their arms and houses too
And implements: they worked in bronze—dark iron there was none.
By one another's arms they were subdued and overthrown,
And nameless to chill Hades' mouldy dwelling they went down;
For howsoever terrible and mighty they were grown,
Black death took them—they resigned the bright light of the sun.

When they were covered in their turn, when this race too was gone,
Zeus on the ever-nourishing earth made yet another one;
And these the son of Kronos made more righteous, better far,
A race of heroes, god-like men—men of this fourth race are
Called demigods; they came before us on the unbounded earth,
And were destroyed by dreadful war: some who had ventured forth
To fight in battle for the flocks of Oedipus were slain
Beneath the seven gates of Thebes, in the Kadmean domain;
And some whom ships conveyed across the great gulf of the sea
To Troy, were swallowed up by death in its finality,
All for the sake of Helen, for her of the lovely hair;
To others, life and livelihood and homes where no men are
Were given by Zeus the father in the earth's remotest part:
Here were these heroes settled: they dwell with carefree heart
Beside deep-eddying Ocean, in the Islands of the Blessed.
Three times a year the fertile earth grows ripe and is increased,
And happy are the heroes whom it bears delightful grain.

I wish that I were not among this last, fifth race of men,
But either dead already or had afterwards been born;
For this race now is iron indeed, and never, night or morn,
Will leave off from their suffering, worn down by toil and woe.
The gods will give them harsh and grievous cares, but even so,
They too shall have a share of good, mixed though it be with pain—
Also, Zeus will eradicate this race of mortal men:
In such a time when at their birth babies turn out to be
Gray at the temples; when fathers and sons have lost all harmony;
When the relation of comrade to comrade fails, and of host to guest;
When brother no longer is friend to brother, as formerly in the past.
They'll treat their parents with disdain as soon as they are old,
Heartlessly finding fault with them in accents harsh and cold;
And ignorant of the punishment the gods mete, as they are,
They'll not be likely to repay their parents for their care.
Taking the law into their hands, they'll pillage and destroy
Each other's cities; gratitude shall no man then enjoy
Who righteously serves justice and who keeps his oath, but him
Who's wicked and does violence—that man they will esteem.
Might shall make right: the evil man his better will subdue
By speaking crooked words and swearing oaths upon them too;
And shrieking Envy that delights in harming wretched men,
With foul-mouthed, hate-filled face shall be each man's companion then.
OPENING CHARGE: SEPTEMBER 6, 2000

REMARKS HIGHLIGHTING THE HISTORY OF
THE PROGRAM OF LIBERAL STUDIES

The Program from 1979-1985

by

Walter Nicgorski

Twenty-one years ago on an early autumn evening, I stood in this very place and addressed the students and faculty of PLS. It was the opening charge for that year, and it was titled "Building A Cathedral." It was the beginning of six years during which I was charged with a special stewardship for the Program as its chair. Then, a generation ago, the physical setting was the same as it is this evening. We seem, as a Program, to have met in this lounge of the Library with great regularity since its opening in 1963. Often we have overflowed the limited space of the room. In a context of quite overwhelming and constant change, specifically with respect to the physical dimensions of this university (indeed, without much exaggeration we can say that roads are moved and tunnels dug, and buildings come and go all about us, nearly as the seasons change), it is remarkable that we are here again in this place, with essentially our same seminar lists and much the same curriculum as a generation ago and even longer. Yet, with the exception of a few of the faculty, the faces before me are new ones, many of which I must come to know better as we begin this new academic year. A reminder of the change all around us came to me as I pulled from the file the typed text of my address from 1979 [Professor Nicgorski held up the manuscript text of his charge-address]. You may note from all the cross outs and the messy form of the revisions that here was a text prepared on an old typewriter; word-processors were yet on the horizon, at least for me and my faculty colleagues. And you will see the text typed on the back of paper already used – a reminder that I and this university were once, relatively speaking, much poorer, and that was not so very long ago.

We are in the course of a year of celebration of the golden anniversary of the Program’s founding, a celebration of the taking root at Notre Dame of what is often regarded as the most notable reform movement of undergraduate education in the history of American higher education, the Great Books movement. I have been asked this evening to highlight the more extensive written history of the Program’s life during my chairmanship. That history, prepared with the editorial assistance of Professors Ayo, Crowe, and Marvin, is found in the special edition of Programma titled “Notre Dame’s Program of Liberal Studies: The First Fifty Years.” So the details of what follows are available to all in that written form.

There were four significant developments in the Program from 1979 to 1985. First, there was a dramatic increase in enrollment, an increase we initially actively sought in various efforts to check a then slipping enrollment. By the end of the six year period, we had more than doubled the size of the entering classes of the late 70s...
and created a potential problem of being a larger community than was consistent with our pedagogical convictions. At the end, we were working on efforts to curtail enrollment.

A second notable development was the name-change of the Program. For some time, I and the faculty went back and forth on whether it was prudent to break with a name (General Program of Liberal Studies, known as the GP) that was held in such affection by graduates from the first thirty years of the Program’s history. Whatever good reasons there were for changing the name, the critical votes for the necessary faculty majority seemed to appear after a certain football game here against Georgia Tech. This was not, I should note, the game in which the legendary Rudy made his appearance, but it was a game in which the program sold at the stadium listed most of the Georgia Tech players as majoring in the General Program. So what happened on that football weekend played a role in getting the “General” out of our title. Much followed from the adoption of the new name, including a contest among students to design an appropriate seal for the Program, and the seal selected appears today on most publications of the Program, including the flyer announcing this evening’s gathering.

A third development related to our curriculum. This entailed dropping required tutorials, one each from the Philosophy, Theology, Natural Science, and Literature components of the Program. This was not easily done, and within a few years it would be partially undone and revised. The intent at the time was in part to increase student electives and thus make it easier for students to participate in foreign study programs and to do concentrations in specific disciplines along with the Program; very important too was the need to find a ready way to control the amount of teaching that faculty were called upon to do in the Program. The teaching load in the Program had not been reduced, as it had throughout the University, despite increasing expectations for research and publication. And then the increasing enrollment added to the pressures on the faculty.

Finally, the Program’s manifest successes in drawing new students and its long-established fine record in educating Notre Dame students seemed to play an important role in the University establishing in the Program an endowed Chair in the Humanities named after Father John J. Cavanaugh, the President of the University under whose tenure and with whose enthusiastic support the Program had been founded in 1950. In the course of an international search for a suitable first occupant of this Chair, the Program turned to Professor Frederick Crosson who had taught in the Program in earlier years and was then occupying the O’Hara Chair in the Department of Philosophy. Professor Crosson responded favorably to the invitation to return to the faculty of the Program.

Those major events of the six-year period are markers and, to a degree, the fruit of efforts throughout the period to raise the Program’s own awareness of the significance and nature of its distinctive educational endeavor and its role in the larger Great Books reform movement. My “Building A Cathedral” theme in that 1979 address was the way I found to announce and characterize those efforts. The theme was embedded in a story G.K.Chesterton told; perhaps it was during his lectures at Notre Dame in the 1930s. In any case, I told his story in that address, and it went as follows. Chesterton reported once coming upon a construction site (always likely at Notre Dame), and there he approached individually several workmen (mason’s apprentices, I suppose). These men were moving bricks from a drop-off point to the place where they were readily within reach of the working masons. Chesterton asked a first brick-
carrier what he was doing, and he re-
sponded that he was passing time and
earning a living. Approaching a second
brick-carrier, Chesterton asked the same
question, and this carrier responded demon-
stratively that he was moving bricks from
here to there. Approaching a third work-
man and asking the same question, “What
are you doing?” Chesterton received the
answer, “I am building a cathedral.”

Then, as on that evening a generation
ago, I want to urge that we take our com-
mon endeavors very seriously. We must
regard our being and development as con-
cerns of high and, yes, sacred importance.
We must, above all, let visions grow within
us, visions of what we can be and do, vi-
sions that relate our potential being and
doing to the great tasks before the commu-
nity of humankind. Those are the tasks of
human development and human renewal
through education and conversion, the tasks
of new and renewed understanding and
insight into all important things and the
tasks of new levels of community in justice
and love.
The Program from 1985–1992

by

Phillip R. Sloan

I was Chair of the Program of Liberal Studies for seven years, with a one-semester leave in the spring of 1990. I also am the last Chair to have had some direct contact with the “founder” generation of the Program—Otto Bird, Willis Nutting, Edward Cronin—who were all to some extent still active when I first joined the Program in 1974.

I have also been able to see many changes, from minor ones like the change of name from the General Program of Liberal Studies, known then to everyone as “GP,” to the Program of Liberal Studies, which gave us the acronym of PLS, a change perhaps in part brought about by such facts as that the Georgia Tech football team also had a high proportion of majors in “General Program,” as some of us noted about the time of our name-change debate!

I had also grown up in an era when Mortimer Adler and Robert Maynard Hutchins were names in the public intellectual sphere and the “Great Books” movement was something every reader of the local newspaper in my home town was to some degree aware of. One could win a free set of the “Great Books” by having one’s question appear in Mortimer Adler’s weekly newspaper column. Many of these roots of our own Program have now faded into memory for much of university and popular culture.

When I became Chair in 1985, much of my time and effort was devoted to substantial curricular matters that changed the Program in some important ways. For example, when I joined the Program, all students were taking a 4/4 Program course load every year, and all of us were teaching 3/3 loads. This meant a broad and continual interaction between students and faculty, and we easily as faculty might have had students three or four times in our Program classes by graduation time.

This situation was to change when in 1984/85 the faculty approved a discontinuation of four of our required tutorials. This reduction of the curriculum was the largest change in the Program requirements since its loss of the first year in 1956. It had the positive effect of permitting the PLS faculty to achieve a teaching load somewhat equivalent to that of surrounding departments, a pressing need in light of the higher research expectations on the faculty being imposed by the University. But a curricular reduction of this magnitude also had many negative consequences, and I felt as new Chair that it demanded further reflection on the character and goals of our new “streamlined” curriculum if we were not to let the Program lose all coherence, or reduce it effectively to the status of a “second major.”

In view of these changes, it seemed essential to me that it was time to begin a major review of the curriculum and the fundamental educational purposes that lay behind the founding of the Program. It was also necessary to articulate future goals for the Program that could direct it in the changing Notre Dame environment that increasingly was emphasizing research productivity and graduate education.

It has long been my conclusion that the primary organizational concept that has enabled the Program to survive amidst the many changes that have taken place in the external University since 1950 was Otto
Bird’s decision to structure the Program around recognized disciplines—Literature, Theology, Mathematics, Foreign Language, Natural Science, Philosophy—rather than following the “trivium-quadrivium” model that underlay the Great Books programs at most of the other “great books’ colleges.

This disciplinary organization has meant in practice that new faculty could be hired from leading graduate schools with well-developed research specializations in standard disciplines, increasingly necessary if we were to meet the growing research expectations of the University. On the negative side, it also carried the potential to “compartmentalize” the Program into disciplinary areas, particularly as we dropped the original ideal of having faculty teach regularly in tutorial areas outside their disciplinary specializations. The danger in this was that of a conception of the Program as a “multi-disciplinary” major, rather than the integrated liberal arts curriculum that I considered to be its founding mission. Through summer workshops and several faculty discussions in the 1986-88 period, we completely re-examined the Program, looking first at the seminars and then at the individual tutorials and sequences.

The first decision of the faculty resulting from this self-study was to reorganize the Great Books Seminar reading lists chronologically over the three years of the major, rather than continue the policy of three different “ancients to moderns” Seminar sequences that had been a novel characteristic of the Notre Dame Program from its beginning. This chronological revision also gave us the opportunity to review the entire Seminar list and make needed revisions in the list.

Revision of the tutorial sequence was a more complicated process. This required the review by faculty subcommittees of the larger pedagogical goals of each surviving tutorial. We also made an effort in our discussions to obtain a greater degree of consensus (and in our discussions, consensus is not an easy thing to come by!) on a list of common texts that would predictably be treated in parallel sections of given tutorials, so as to increase the sense of cohesion in the Program.

These reforms were also accompanied by a more general commitment of the faculty to a streamlined, but pedagogically-focused, emphasis on a genuine “liberal arts” curriculum conceptually distinguished from an “interdisciplinary humanities” program.

Why is this difference important? A distinction between these two models has not been always easy to articulate, but it has two significant consequences.

First, the “liberal arts” tradition considerably predates historically the notion of “humanities” in the sense these came to be defined in the German universities in the 19th century. The “Humanities” meant in this German tradition the sciences of the spirit—Geisteswissenschaften—designating those subjects bearing on human self-reflection, such as history, literature, theology, art. These were sharply distinguished from the “sciences of nature”—the Naturwissenschaften—that dealt with topics like physics. But the classic artes liberales had divided the intellectual terrain very differently. It included in the arts of the quadrivium such topics as music, mathematics, astronomy. It included grammar and logic.

Hence, although it has been crucial to our practical survival over the years that we have followed a more traditional division into the “humanities” with some additions of the sciences as if these were separate disciplines, the Program has been conceptually different than this structure might suggest. In modern terms the Program has strongly resisted the division into the “two cultures,” or even “four cultures,” such as we see in our College structure at Notre Dame, that canonizes distinct ways of
knowing and divides them into sometimes warring cultures.

Second, a “liberal arts” focus maintained the ideal of a common dialogue that did not fall along traditional disciplinary lines. Both students and faculty in the Program must participate in this conversation that cuts across areas of specialization and academic turf lines.

In my tenure as Chair I took it as a sense of the faculty that we generally saw our contribution to higher education to lie in our commitment to integrated liberal arts education, and that it was important to maintain this theoretical focus. As such, the Program remains the only example of the original University of Chicago ideal of the Great Books curriculum of studies that now exists in the context of a multi-disciplinary, research University.

We have also been able to tried in spite of all the changes in the University to maintain a recognition of our position as a program within a Catholic university, with a special focus and emphasis on the important authors and reflections within this tradition, distinguishing the Program from its secular affiliates. In this respect, Otto Bird’s Neo-Thomistic view of the organization of learning remains still of interest to many of us.

It seems unnecessary here to go further into the details of my years that you can also read in my discussion in the Programma special issue. In closing I would like to offer a few reflections on the importance of all our work in this unique—and I do mean unique—educational endeavor. We are living in a very complex world. I feel myself at times overwhelmed by computerization, by the explosion of information, by stunning developments in biotechnology such as the Human Genome Project, by the moral issues that face us with the growing environmental crisis and the likely advent of human cloning for certain purposes in the next decade. And if I feel overwhelmed at times, I am sure you, as young students, must find it very daunting to confront this world and think about some way in which you can achieve an active and meaningful role in it. What prepares us for this world? what gives us some sense of balance amid this complexity?

In answer I recall often Otto Bird’s remark made in an opening charge many years ago. It was his answer to the question: “What is the good of such a liberal arts education in the context of an advanced technological society?” To which he simply replied (as I recall it), “it is exactly because we live in that society that we need a liberal arts education.” By this it does not mean “nostalgia” for the past, a refusal to face the present, but the ability to deal with these challenges and not be defeated by them. I hope that this education can do the same for you. I wish you all best wishes for this new year of work together.
The Program in the Mid-Nineties

by

Stephen Fallon

We Program faculty have at times felt embattled as American universities moved toward increasing specialization and as attacks on canons were the order of the day, particularly in some of the most influential departments of literature. As the century drew to a close, however, the Program's tenacious adherence to its vision of education made it a model educational enterprise. Decades of erosion of core requirements at many or most universities led to public consternation: why were universities graduating arts and science students without even a nodding acquaintance with Homer and Plato, with Vergil and St. Augustine, with Shakespeare and Newton, with Kant and Darwin? There were and are calls for a return to core curricula. At the same time, universities themselves began to recognize that tendencies toward larger classes and increased use of teaching assistants, while making short-term economic sense, made little sense pedagogically.

The Program in this climate was and is uniquely situated to address these growing concerns, because it has remained both conservative and progressive. The conservative side of the Program is more visible to casual observers. The Program is not apologetic about maintaining its Great Books list and insisting that, given the limitations of time, some works are more worth reading than others, that excellence of thought and expression is intrinsically worthwhile, and that the ability to stand the test of time is one criterion of that worth. (Of course, as faculty discussions on the seminar list make vividly clear, the Program is keenly aware that there are many, many more works worthy of placement on a Great Books list than we have time to read with you in three years.)

The progressive nature of the Program can be traced to its origins in the Great Books movement itself, which was conceived as a way to open the walls of the university to working people, and to illustrate that the great texts have something to say to everyone, including the non-expert and the non-scholar. In reducing, and in the seminars eliminating, the reliance on lecture and the authority of the podium, the movement and the Program seeks to realize a more democratic vision of education. This does not mean that receiving the most votes in a classroom makes an interpretation "right." It means that we are all partners in the enterprise of construing texts, and that my authority as a teacher extends only so far as the aptness of the questions I pose and, when they are appropriate, the arguments I make.

Despite the skepticism of some of our professional colleagues, a skepticism you may yourselves have faced from friends and roommates, we were confident that we were on the right track. An integrated curriculum, with Great Books seminars serving as the hub for a series of courses exploring the various disciplines, would prepare our students not only to work in the world but also to be thinking men and women. We were encouraged by student enthusiasm and by our graduates' fierce loyalty to the Program. We have not been impervious to the ferment outside, and we have added works by women to the seminar list, and we have added as the last book in the chrono-
logical sequence Ralph Ellison's great novel, *The Invisible Man*. While some assume that Great Books lists are in themselves inimical to diversity, I doubt that there is a major in the university that requires its students to read such a diverse array of works. I'm thinking not only of, for example, the works by women and the African-American Ellison, but also the Eastern texts and even the Greek texts; while European intellectual culture may spring from Greece, time spent with the texts shows us how distant that culture is from ours.

Increasingly, our vision has been acknowledged and endorsed by those outside the Program. This struck me forcibly one day when I had as chair occasion to speak about the Program with the eminent Yale literary critic John Hollander. Yale's English department led the way in the postmodern and poststructuralist literary critical movement in the 1970s and '80s. Hollander applauded PL's commitment to classic texts, to examining central works of literature, philosophy, theology, science, social science, and music. He added that graduate schools would be looking for our graduates not only *despite* but *because* of their bypassing of narrowly specialized undergraduate curricula. When I asked which English departments might be most open to our graduates, he replied, to my surprise, that he was thinking of Yale itself. If he is right, and I think that he is, then the vanguard of American education is after half a century beginning to catch up with us.

As chair I was struck again and again by the convergence with Program practice of blueprints for educational improvements issuing from the Dean's office or university committees. We were told to consider requiring of our honors students a senior project or essay, but we had long been requiring this of *all* our students. We were told to encourage students to visit our offices, but PLS students have always visited their professors, and not only when papers are due (we are hoping that our new students will continue that tradition). The university strove to find ways to offer small seminars featuring discussion of important texts, again something that we do as a matter of course.

We did face challenges in the mid-1990s, and we do so today. I'll mention one tonight. Already by the mid-nineties the move toward double-majors had significant and, frankly, unwelcome implications for us. Opinions differ as to the source of this movement. Some trace it to the inaccessibility of some upper-class courses in some departments to non-majors. Others, citing a difficult job market for graduates, believe that students wish to make themselves more marketable with each major or concentration that they can add to their diploma. The latter reason is, I think, understandable but misguided, as employers will not be counting certificates but looking for signs of ability to think, read, write, and speak, skills that are at a premium in our Program. In any event, the move toward double majors has made it difficult for many students who want a Program education to finish the sequence of twenty courses that we require. We continue to wrestle with the question of how far to accommodate requests for exemptions, or whether to accommodate them at all. Reluctance on the part of the faculty to exempt students from courses derives from our commitment to an integrated course of study; each course is an essential part of a whole, and requiring the whole sequence allows us to build in one course upon what was learned in another.

Despite challenges and changes, the Program in most essential respects remains the same as it was when I arrived, when many of you were in pre-school or Kindergarten. While it is perhaps inevitable in a history to focus on changes, more has remained the same. During my term we continued to be blessed with eager and intelligent students. If some observers say
that Notre Dame students, while intelligent, lack the intellectual passion of, say, Chicago undergraduates, we have never had that problem in the Program. Like their predecessors, the students of the early and mid-nineties loved to read, to discuss in seminar, and to carry those discussions back to the dining hall, quad, dorm, and even nightclubs, much to the amusement of campus watchers from *The Observer* and *Scholastic* (an amusement tinged with respect and envy). The students continued to surprise and instruct us with their insights and to humble us with their commitment to service. A remarkably high number are involved in service while here and in yearlong or multi-year service commitments after graduation; in 1993, for example, 39% of our graduating seniors embarked on service stints in the U.S. and abroad of a year or more. (On a personal note, I can say that when my children and I suffered a grievous loss, the Program responded with characteristic generosity, and students converged on my house, cooking, gardening, spending time with the children.

If skeptics look suspiciously at our curriculum as basic training in the univocal and oppressive views of dead white males, those who know us and the books better understand the great conversation as a living record of inquiry and intellectual openness. The Program values the Catholic intellectual tradition and shares that tradition with its students, but it does so by academic inquiry and not by catechesis. There is sufficient confidence in that tradition that it can survive and flourish in an atmosphere of open inquiry.

I remember vividly a night exactly fifteen years ago, in which Professor Sloan offered a characteristically learned and humane Opening Charge to the assembled Program. He showed us our enterprise foreshadowed in the letter of Machiavelli, a writer often misunderstood, to his friend Vettori, in which he speaks reverently of the privilege of conversing over his books with the ancient masters, a privilege we share today in our classrooms. Professor Sloan closed his inspiring charge, as I will, with Socrates' prayer at the moving conclusion of Plato's *Phaedrus*: "Give me beauty in the inward soul; and may the outward and inward man be one. May I reckon the wise to be the wealthy, and may I have such a quantity of gold as a temperate man and he only can bear and carry."
The Program Now

by

Clark Power

Throughout my years as Chair, I have focused on the Program's relationship to the college, university, and local community. When I first came to Notre Dame in 1982, I felt that the Program was somewhat isolated from and misunderstood by other departments. To many of our colleagues, the Program was out of step with the rest of the university and with prospering major research universities. While research and graduate teaching were becoming the focus of attention, the Program maintained its commitment to undergraduate education. While elective courses were proliferating, we held fast to our required core of seminars and tutorials. While less writing was being assigned, we increased our requirements and maintained our mandatory senior essay. While grades were inflating, we tightened our standards. While context seemed to make texts inaccessible to all but the experts, we persisted with our Great Books Seminars. While the canon was being called into question, we revised but never abandoned our collective Great Books curriculum. While specialization was isolating scholarship among and even within departments, we fostered discussions across the disciplines.

In recent years, the pendulum has begun to swing the other way, and much of what we have been doing is now at the forefront of higher education reform. While many still see us as traditionalists, we are increasingly regarded as visionaries. I am fortunate to be chair at such a time and to have an opportunity to communicate the achievements of the Program.

Just before Nathan Hatch took office as Provost, the Program underwent an external review. The assessment was glowing. Louis Dupre of Yale noted that PLS was "the best Great Books program" in the nation; and Thomas Roche of Princeton said that PLS was "one of the most interesting educational programs in America." During my second year as chair, the Templeton Foundation recognized the Program as an "outstanding example of the Best in American Higher Education." After almost fifty years, the Program had begun to win the national recognition that it so richly deserved. The Program had also earned great respect throughout the university. Although we were the last of the departments to move to a 2-2 teaching load, our record of scholarly publications, grants, and fellowships was one of the best in the College.

Feeling both proud of our students and challenged to make service a more visible part of the Program's identity, Steve Fallon and I began to explore how the Program might be able to make a corporate contribution to the community. We had no concrete ideas about how to do this until Fred Crosson brought to my attention an article in Harper's by Earl Shorris describing a class in the humanities that he initiated for adults below the poverty line in New York City. Shorris's article was based on a chapter of his 1997 book, New American Blues: A Journey through Poverty to Democracy. Shorris was a graduate of the University of Chicago during the Hutchins era, when students in the College followed a rigorous Great Books curriculum. In his book, Shorris makes a strong case for a Great Books education as "an answer to the problem of poverty in the
United States." He argues very simply that a Great Books education in the humanities fosters human development and political participation. Shorris's *New American Blues* offers both an intellectual and practical response to the elitist view of university education put forth by his classmate Allan Bloom in *The Closing of the American Mind*, a book that Bloom discussed with our faculty prior to its publication in 1987. While I agreed with much of Bloom's criticism of American culture and with Bloom's celebration of the great works of the Western tradition, I was dismayed by his view that liberal arts education should be preserved for the few. While the term "liberal arts" originated as a reference to the arts of free or privileged men who had leisure to explore them, the term has come in a democratic age to refer to the liberating effect of the arts, which can prepare any man or woman for full participation in the community's cultural and political life (in the widest sense).

Unfortunately, Great Books programs including our own have tended to serve the privileged in our society. We have focused our energy on carrying forward the Great Conversation without paying sufficient attention to those excluded by race and class. Shorris's course in New York City, taught by a cadre of volunteer professors, convinced Steve Fallon and me not that the Great Books were for everyone (that we already believed) but that the Program of Liberal Studies could reach out to the most marginalized in our society if we were determined to make this happen.

Steve Fallon and I turned for help to the Director of the Center for the Homeless, former PLS graduate Lou Nanni. With Lou's leadership, the Center had become nationally recognized for providing not merely a shelter for the homeless but a way out of poverty. Lou suggested that we recruit our students from those who had finished the initial treatment phase offered by the Center. By the beginning of the 1998-1999 academic year, we received approval for a course bearing credit from the Program of Liberal Studies, and we launched our course that year.

As we were navigating the Notre Dame bureaucracy, we worked out the logistics of the class with Lou Nanni and Debbie Lane, who directs the Adult Education Program at the Center for the Homeless. Because the life circumstances of guests of the Center often change quickly and unpredictably, we decided to offer a sequence of three eight-week units. Students earn a credit at the completion of each unit. We organized the units thematically, beginning with the theme of *Justice and Tyranny*, moving to *Self-Discovery*, and concluding with *God and Nature*. We took most of our texts from the seminar lists and added a few contemporary selections, such as Martin Luther King's "Letter from a Birmingham Jail" and Doris Lessing's "The Old Chief Mshlanga." PLS faculty have volunteered to help us as "guest seminar leaders," and over twenty PLS students have been involved as childcare workers, van drivers, tutors, and ethnographers.

The World Masterpieces Seminar has received national and international media coverage, which has led to over thirty-five different universities seeking our assistance in setting up similar programs. Overwhelmed by these requests and seeking to expand our outreach, at the beginning of the 1999-2000 academic year we hired Mary Hendriksen to serve as a part-time coordinator. Mary established a World Masterpieces Seminar, led by Gretchen Reydams-Schils, for women living at the YWCA in South Bend.

As I look back over the past fifty years and ahead to the new century, I fully expect that the Program, blessed as it is with strong faculty, students, and alumnae/i, will continue to flourish. We are in many ways stronger than ever before, yet we are also more vulnerable than ever before. Most of
our students are double majors, most study abroad, and increasing numbers are being drawn into an ever-expanding number of interdisciplinary minors. Students' lives outside the Program are busier and we can no longer mount the extensive extracurricular program of lectures and social events that we had when I joined the Program. Our faculty are busier as well—the reduced teaching load means that we teach fewer courses to fewer students; and our commitments outside the Program mean that we have less time for faculty seminars and social events. Over the years the trend is clear—both faculty and students have been devoting less and less time to the Program. Some see this as a loss and fear for our survival. I am more positive. I think that the Program has been enriched by the contacts that our students and faculty have had outside the Program. We have become less insular but no less of a community dedicated to ideals that gave birth to our Program. I am confident that we can and will move ahead, preserving what has made us great but also willing to meet the challenges of the future.
FOCUS ON NEW FACULTY

Henry Weinfield

We are very happy to welcome Steven Affeldt to the Program faculty. Steven is a philosopher with many interests in the humanities, and he will be teaching the philosophy tutorials as well as the seminars. He comes to us from Harvard, where he worked primarily with Stanley Cavell and where he wrote a dissertation entitled “Constituting Mutuality: Essays on Expression in the Basis of Intelligibility in Rousseau, Wittgenstein, and Freud.” The dissertation involves an attempt to articulate areas of intersection among political philosophy, moral philosophy, and aesthetics.

Steven is that rare bird in contemporary philosophy who has leanings to both Analytical and Continental philosophy and who is interested in the relations between them. His undergraduate work at Berkeley was mainly on Wittgenstein, Heidegger, and skepticism. He then went to Harvard, planning to work on Wittgenstein and early twentieth-century analytical philosophy, but through a class with Stanley Cavell on Emerson, he realized that he needed to return to an aspiration of philosophy that keeps in touch with literature and the humanities broadly. For his dissertation, he originally planned to focus on Wittgenstein and the issue of mutual intelligibility, but the short, prefatory chapter he intended to write on Rousseau and the problem of the legislator’s intelligibility ended up being a 300-page study of the Social Contract! And this, in turn, occasioned a serious interest in and study of political philosophy.

He has published several articles on Rousseau and Wittgenstein individually, and has a new article forthcoming in The Monist entitled “Society as a Way of Life.” In addition, his essay on Wittgenstein’s moral philosophy will appear in the next issue of Philosophical Topics. Steven’s current project is a book on Rousseau, Hegel, Nietzsche, and Heidegger on aesthetic problems in the constitution of community.

This year, Steven is teaching Ethics, Political and Constitutional Philosophy, and Seminars V and VI in the Program—so he has his hands full! He previously taught in the Johns Hopkins Philosophy Department, and, before that, for three years as a Harper-Schmidt post-doctoral fellow in the Humanities Core Program at the University of Chicago. Steven reports that he is delighted to be at Notre Dame and in PLS, and, for our part, we are thrilled to have him with us.
Nicholas Ayo along with Michael Crowe and many others in the PLS department has been active in promoting the 50th anniversary of Great Books at Notre Dame. A history of the Program of Liberal Studies (a special issue of Programma in May) was followed by an Alumni/ae celebration in June. A banquet evening was preceded by an anniversary mass and concluded by seminars on the following day. A window display of the accomplishments of Great Books at Notre Dame can be viewed in the Hesburgh library concourse through mid-November. In early April, under the leadership of Father Nicholas and Mike Crowe, the PLS department is sponsoring a conference on “Liberal Learning and the Great Books,” to be followed immediately at Notre Dame by the seventh annual conference of the Association for Core Texts and Courses.

Francesca Bordogna is on leave this year, having received a Whiting Fellowship to work on her book on William James. The book will locate James at the boundaries that were then increasingly separating philosophy from psychology and from the other emerging sciences of the human subject.

Michael Crowe has been named the Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, C. S. C., Professor in the Humanities in the Program of Liberal Studies. Among his forthcoming publications in early 2001 are a revised edition of his Theories of the World from Antiquity to the Copernican Revolution and a Japanese translation of his The Extraterrestrial Life Debate 1750-1900. Presently, much of his time has been spent working with Fr. Ayo; they are co-chairing the various PLS Fiftieth Anniversary functions. In Spring, 2001, he is teaching the PLS seminar in Notre Dame’s London Program, but will return for PLS’s fiftieth anniversary conference on “Liberal Learning and the Great Books.” He can be reached at Flat B, Notre Dame London Centre, 1 Suffolk St, London SW1Y 4HG, England or at Crowe.1@nd.edu.

Steve Fallon writes: “I am grateful for the thoughts, prayers, and help of so many alumni/ae of the Program. The response to Nancy’s death has been humbling. I’ve always enjoyed hearing from students, and this year they have been particularly welcome. The children and teaching keep me going now.” Steve hopes to see many of you at the 2001 Summer Symposium (July 2-6).

Julia Marvin is on research leave this year. She spent the fall working with manuscripts in London, Oxford, and Paris, and is now in Stockholm, where she is finishing up her edition and translation of the Anglo-Norman prose Brut chronicle and enjoying the relatively balmy temperatures and modest snowfalls of Sweden.

Felicitas Munzel writes: “The highlight of spring 2000 was the 6th International Kant Congress, which met in Berlin the last week of March. With over 900 Kant scholars from around the world in attendance, together with the historic setting of the Humboldt University, it was truly memorable. Currently I’m on sabbatical leave, supported by a grant from the Earhart Foundation, to write my next book on Kant as the philosopher-educator; i.e. interpreting Kant’s critical philosophy as engaged with the pedagogical reform debates of the 18th century and entailing the project of recovering a classical notion of paideia. A paper on this theme which I delivered in Washington this
past Labor Day weekend at the American Political Science Association meeting was well received. Smaller projects feeding into this larger one include the translation of Kant’s lectures on anthropology (which is very near completion and will be published by Cambridge) and a contribution to a Blackwell Companion to the Philosophy of Education for which I am writing the chapter on Kant and Hegel and their contributions to the “science of pedagogy,” which becomes a pervasive motif in 19th century thought. The German Kant scholar Otfrid Hoeffe has invited me to come to Tuebingen and I will hopefully be spending next summer at the university there to work on my book project with the benefit of the interaction of its faculty and graduate students.”

**Clark Power** serves as the Associate Director of Notre Dame’s Mendelson Center for Sports, Character, and Culture, which he helped to establish. This Center focuses on how participation in youth sport can build character. His wife, Ann, recently finished her Ph.D. in Sociology and is currently the Undergraduate Advisor in Notre Dame’s Sociology Department.

During this last year **Phillip Sloan** has been Director of the Reilly Center for Science, Technology and Values, and the undergraduate Program in Science, Technology and Values. This has been a challenging new assignment, and yet it has enabled him to integrate his teaching and learning in the Program with the development of courses and curricula at Notre Dame for students interested in the connections between the liberal arts and new developments in technology and science. He has been assisting the DeNobili College in Pune, India in its development of science and religion studies that will link the western and eastern traditions. He also continues to serve as one of the University representatives to the Lilly Fellows Program that is seeking to coordinate the development of faith and learning in a broad network of church-related colleges. He also serves on the board of the Association for Core Texts and Curricula (ACTC), which will hold its national meeting at Notre Dame, April 1-4 in conjunction with the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the Program. Prof. Sloan was also able to take a long-overdue leave last spring semester. This allowed him to develop several written articles, including one on “Mach’s Phenomenalism and the British Reception of Mendelism,” which was delivered at the International Conference in Paris commemorating the 100th anniversary of the development of the science of genetics. Related to this topic, last February was published his collection of edited papers and commentary, Controlling Our Destinies: Historical, Philosophical, Ethical, and Theological Perspectives on the Human Genome Project (Notre Dame, 2000). This was the result of the conference on the human genome project organized by Prof. Sloan held at Notre Dame in October 1995. He is continuing to explore some of this more recent work in his research along with his research on earlier issues in the history and philosophy of the life sciences. Most of all, he still enjoys teaching in the Program.

**Katherine Tillman** writes that she is busy preparing for the onslaught of invited lectures and publications this year, in celebration of the 200th anniversary of Cardinal Newman’s birth. These will take her to South Carolina, Chicago, Dublin, Oxford, and Honolulu. Not bad, eh? She also awaits the appearance, this spring, of Newman’s little known but important works, “Rise and Progress of Universities” and “Benedictine Essays”-to be published together by Gracewing House in London and by UND Press, with her seventy page introduction and notes on Newman’s philosophy of Catholic education. Other than that, it is “Metaphysics and Epistemology” with all of the seniors this semester.
THE 2000 EDWARD J. CRONIN AWARD WINNER

American Exceptionalism: Constant Theme, Changing Meaning

Stacey Fuller
Class of 2000

The belief that America is somehow different, special, and unique has been an idea that has lasted throughout American history. From the earliest settlers in the New World until today, this idea of American exceptionalism has been a continuous theme, winding itself through the most notable rhetoric this country has produced. Although it is arguable as to whether this idea has any basis in reality or is simply a myth or tradition, it is certain that this idea has made an impact on the beliefs and actions of American people, influencing them in their most trying times. American exceptionalism has spanned all of American history and has been used by many authors of varying beliefs. All of which affirms the strong presence of this idea in Americans’ conception of themselves and their place both in history and in the world today. Although exceptionalism has been a major idea in the political and social life of America, the actual substance and meaning behind the idea has evolved over time in the discourse of American politics so that it no longer means exactly what it once did.

Beginning with John Winthrop’s “City upon a Hill,” continuing through other notable documents like the Declaration of Independence, and into Abraham Lincoln’s inspiring speeches, the American people have been grounded in this idea of exceptionalism, but the idea itself has come to mean something different to each ensuing generation though it has remained honored by all.

American exceptionalism is specifically the idea that America is a special country with a special mission and place in this world. It is the belief that the American people are distinct and unique in their calling to be a model nation for the whole world. Because of the strong belief in this notion, the American people have always seen themselves as occupying a unique position. They truly do see themselves as having a model government that has succeeded and, in doing so, has become a model nation, which others should study and then imitate. The prominence of this view in American culture has potentially both negative and positive consequences. It has probably led the American people to look down upon other nations and often has led them to interfere in other nations’ politics when perhaps they should have left those nations alone. On the other hand, this idea has prompted the American people to strive towards an ideal, truly to be a model for the rest of the world. It has offered an incentive for the American people to work harder and faster, to find new ways to improve this country and most importantly to promote the ideals of freedom and equality throughout the world. Although the idea of American exceptionalism might not have an actual grounding in reality, the idea has become real through the influence it has had on the actions and behavior of the American people.

American exceptionalism had its origins long before the United States of America was ever even created. John Winthrop is the originator of this idea in his work “A Modell of Christian Charity.” John Winthrop was born in England in 1588 to a family of moderate landed wealth. Winthrop was a Puritan, and as the conditions in England grew worse for the Puri-
ians during the 1620's, he made the decision to leave for New England. Arminianism was on the rise in London, a belief that was in direct conflict with the Calvinistic teachings of Puritanism. The Puritans saw this movement as turning the Church of England back towards Roman Catholicism, which troubled Winthrop. In addition to this, Winthrop had to provide for his many sons, who were approaching maturity around this same time. He became worried about providing for his sons as well as for himself and the other members of his family and thought that leaving England would be better for him. The Massachusetts Bay Company was formed around the same time as Winthrop began to debate what to do about his situation. He eventually decided on setting out for New England, mainly for the above reasons. Later, around October of 1629 as plans were being made for the voyage and the new colony before the company had even left England, Winthrop was elected governor of the group. From this moment on Winthrop became the leader, both spiritual and political, of the group that was leaving everything it knew and starting out for a distant and savage land with a specific purpose and mission in mind.

Winthrop especially felt called upon by God to lead this group of Puritans to the New World. Upon being elected governor, he expressed his feelings in a letter to his wife: "So it is that [it] hath pleased the Lorde to call me to a further trust in the businesse of the plantation, then either I expected or finde my selfe fitt for (beinge chosen by the Company to be their Governor) the onely thinge that I have comforte of in it is, that heerby I have assurance that my charge is of the Lorde and that he hath called me to this worke." Winthrop took this duty to care for the Puritans very seriously. He knew that this was the chance to begin again, free from all the history and past mistakes of Europe and especially the mistakes of England. This move to New England was a fresh start for them all and the chance to form a new government and way of life in accordance with the Puritan beliefs—something that was not possible in England. Although this meant giving up his land, home, and comfortable life in England, the call from God was too strong for Winthrop to resist.

Winthrop began almost immediately on his task of setting up a new government and direction for the Puritans. On board the Arbella as they sailed towards the New World, he set down his ideas for the new community that was to be formed upon arrival in New England in his work "A Modell of Christian Charity." This work was also delivered as a sermon to those on board as a means of describing what he hoped to build on land. This work of Winthrop’s has become his most famous and is indicative not only of how Winthrop viewed and planned his community but also of how Americans later came to feel about their community and place in the world. This document outlines both Winthrop’s political and religious views, and in it one can see how these views are not separate but are instead entwined with one another. "A Modell of Christian Charity" is Winthrop’s vision for the ideal community he hoped to form and he sets a high goal for the Puritans of his community to achieve in it. In Winthrop’s eyes, though, this community has the ability and the calling to do something greater than that which it left.

Even from the title of Winthrop’s sermon, one can begin to grasp the significance and purpose of this work. The word "model" in the title seems to suggest two different meanings of the word and perhaps two different purposes behind this work. The first definition of “model” would be “structural design” or a “pattern of something to be made.” This meaning of the word would indicate that Winthrop wanted this work to lay out his plans for the community. “A Modell of Christian Charity” would then be a type of blueprint for the
community when they arrived in New England. From this work, the Puritans would attempt to construct Winthrop’s proposed idea in reality. The community would use the guidelines set out in Winthrop’s work as the foundation of their new life together. The word “model,” however, also suggests a second meaning, that of “an example for imitation or emulation.” Perhaps Winthrop also meant for this new community to be a model, an ideal, and an exemplar for the rest of the world. Winthrop might have imagined his work to be a picture of the ideal holy community. Thus, even from the title “A Modell of Christian Charity,” a sense of Winthrop’s purpose for this work in laying the foundation of his new community and the influence he hoped that it would have on the rest of the world can easily be seen. Winthrop hoped not only to relate to his people the work ahead of them but also to reveal to his people how important their task was to be in building this unique community as an example for all others to follow.⁸

That Winthrop probably meant to suggest the double meaning of the word “model” in his title is further proven by his religious feelings. Winthrop strongly believed that God had called forth this group of Puritans to perform a special mission. There was a special covenant between God and the Puritans, he believed, and under that covenant the Puritans had been called upon to perform this special task. Winthrop believed that a nation only existed through a covenant with God, and without such a covenant or upon the breaking of this covenant, the nation would fall: “Every nation, they all knew, existed by virtue of a covenant with God in which it promised to obey His commands. They had left England because England was failing in its promise.”⁹ Winthrop further felt that God had agreed to a covenant with his group of Puritans because He had allowed them a safe voyage and arrival in New England: “Now if the Lord shall please to heare us, and bring us in peace to the place wee desire, then hath hee ratified this Covenant and sealed our Commission, [and] will expect a strickt performance of the Articles contained in it, but if wee shall neglect the observation of these Articles . . . the Lord will surely breake out in wrath against us. . . .”¹⁰ With the sealing of this special covenant with God, the new community Winthrop and the Puritans were forming became a special one. In allowing for a safe voyage and blessing the Puritans with the opportunity to establish a new community, God now expected great things of the Puritans and Winthrop. In Winthrop’s eyes, God had called them to a higher level of community, one that incorporated both the political and the religious. With the giving of the special covenant and mission, Winthrop and his Puritans believed that they had to follow God’s commandments as closely as possible: “When God gives a speciall Commission he lookes o have it strickly observed in every Article.”¹¹ The covenant was then sealed, and it was now Winthrop’s mission to order a new community according to the covenant with God.

Due to this special covenant with God, Winthrop felt that the whole world would be watching as this new community came into being. To Winthrop, this new society was not to be a continuation of their old way of life but was to be a trial. The Puritans were beginning a completely different type of society unlike anything they had left behind. Their new way of life was not to be fashioned after the government and society they had known in England, but instead was to be an experiment in both politics and Christianity. In effect, Winthrop felt that he was called forth to answer the question, “Can Christianity and politics be joined?” It was their calling to attempt this joining: “They [the Puritans] were involved in a test case which would determine whether men could live on earth according to the will of the Lord. . . . Winthrop believed that it had been given to
these immigrants to find out whether they were of sufficient faith to carry that work on, to bring the Reformation to full fruition.” All eyes would be watching them to see if this new type of government would work. This put even more pressure on Winthrop to succeed in the formation of his community. Winthrop not only had to construct this community in a way that would fulfill his covenant with God, he was also called upon to show the rest of the world what an ideal community would be.

It was along these lines that Winthrop came to see the “Citty upon a Hill” he was forming. Along with the special covenant with God came certain responsibilities—that of building a model community and in doing that to follow the commandments of God. Winthrop laid down two main principles on which the new Puritan community was to be based in “A Modell of Christian Charity.” These principles, relating to the inequality of all people and the bond of Christian love, were in accordance with God’s decrees and would serve as the foundation of the community. With these principles as the basis of the government, the community would not only hold their covenant with God, but would also serve as an exemplar to the other nations of the world. Under Winthrop’s two doctrines, the Puritan community would truly come to be a “Citty upon a Hill” for the world to see.

The opening sentence of “A Modell of Christian Charity” lays down the first principle of Winthrop’s proposed society: “God Almightye in his most holy and wise providence hath soe disposed of the Condition of mankinde, as in all times some must be rich some poore, some highe and eminent in power and dignitie; others meane and in subieccion.” Winthrop justifies this immediately, however. There are three justifications for the inequality of people, according to Winthrop. The first is that God shows man His glory and power when He creates such diversity and variety within mankind. God’s creation in general is one of variety and difference, and man is part of the whole of God’s creation. The second justification is that God through His Spirit exercises more grace in instilling virtues throughout a diverse population. The variety in human beings allows God to work in many different ways to help His people. The third and final justification that Winthrop offers in defense of the inequality among men is that this inequality then requires that all people need each other. If human beings were all the same, then what could one provide for another? There would be no need for interaction among people and therefore no sense of community. When each person has his or her own particular and distinctive gift or talent, then each person becomes dependent on all the others. This dependence on one another to fulfill physical and spiritual needs builds a stronger community that relies on each other and interacts with each other. The principle of inequality, which may first be seen by many as a terrible injustice on the part of God, was viewed by Winthrop instead as a benefit and blessing from God.

This blessing of inequality in the creation of all humanity produces brotherly or Christian love within the community. Inequality and difference create a bond of love between members of the community because each depends on the others for support and fulfillment of needs. Christianity is concerned primarily with love, the love that God had for humanity to send His Son to die in man’s place, and Winthrop’s community, serving as the model one, should also be concerned primarily with love. This love between the community’s members transforms it into an earthly paradise: “nothing yeildes more pleasure and content to the soule then when it findes that which it may love fervently, for to love and live beloved is the soules paradise, both heare and in heaven.” By loving each other, the community members are sharing Christ’s love and living out God’s commandments. This love, derived from the
interdependence of the community, is central to Winthrop’s vision: “This love, is as absolutely necessary to the being of the body of Christ, as the sinews and other ligaments of a natural body are to the being of that body. This love is a divine spiritual nature free . . . and of all graces this makes us nearer to resemble the virtues of our heavenly father.”\(^{15}\) From inequality, a presumable justice, comes instead a tight bond of love, and this is the foundation of Winthrop’s community as laid out in “A Modell of Christian Charity.”

From this foundation of love and reliance on one another, Winthrop believed his ideal community had been formed. The “Citty upon the Hill” now had a foundation and a blueprint that was to be built in reality. The special mission given to the Puritans through a covenant with God was outlined by Winthrop:

The end is to improve our lives to doe more service to the Lord the comforte and encrease of the body of christe whereof wee are members that our selves and our posterity may be better preserved from the Common corrupcions of this evil world to serve the Lord and worke out our Salvacion under the power and purity of his holy Ordinances.\(^{16}\)

Through this community, the Puritans would not only live in an ideal way, but they would also convince others to follow in the same path, to form similar communities formed in Christian love: “...soe the way to drawe men to the workes of mercy is not by force of Argument [but] from the goodnes or necessity of the worke.”\(^{17}\) In this way, the Puritans would persuade others to join them, further fulfilling God’s mission for them. By forming a community grounded in the belief that God had made a special covenant with them and in creating this covenant set the community apart from others as a model for all, Winthrop hoped to build “a Citty upon a Hill, [with] the eies of all people upon [them],” and the foundation for American exceptionalism was laid.\(^{18}\)

American exceptionalism may have begun with Winthrop’s “Citty upon a Hill,” but it certainly did not end there. It continued through such documents as “The Declaration of Independence” and The Federalist Papers, and other influential papers in the early years of America’s union. John Winthrop’s idea that he was forming a special community under a covenant with God and that this community was to serve as a model for the world became the fore-runner of a long tradition:

In this lay-sermon that stands near the head of American literature, Winthrop anticipates many of the themes of American literature and the concept of the American dream. America is the place sanctioned by God for a chosen people. By working together, this chosen people will achieve God’s will. Here, then, is the manifesto of an early dreamer of the golden dream.\(^{19}\)

One of the most famous authors and speakers that Winthrop was to anticipate in “A Modell of Christian Charity” is Abraham Lincoln. Throughout his many momentous speeches, such as the Address to the Lyceum, his Second Inaugural Address, and the Gettysburg Address, Lincoln uses American exceptionalism as a motivation and inspiration for the country especially during the painful Civil War. His speeches carry on the ideas first conceived in Winthrop’s vision of an ideal holy community. For Lincoln, the “Citty upon a Hill” was no longer a tiny Puritan community—it had become America as a whole. A new enterprise began with the Declaration of Independence, in Lincoln’s view, and the eyes of the world watched the formation of this new and daring community. America was to be a country espousing the ideas of
liberty and equality, and the Civil War was fought to restore these ideas in America and pronounce them throughout the world.

The idea of American exceptionalism runs throughout Abraham Lincoln’s speeches, beginning with his earliest recorded ones. In 1836, when he was just twenty-seven years old, he, along with a few other men, formed a young men’s Lyceum in Springfield, Illinois to which he gave a powerful speech in 1837. This speech is one of the earliest of Lincoln’s speeches that have been preserved, and already present in it is the idea of American exceptionalism. Throughout this speech, many of the same ideas that Winthrop presented in “A Modell of Christian Charity” appear. Lincoln’s speech begins with a list of the many blessings that the American people have received. For Lincoln, these many blessings include everything from the land and climate Americans enjoy to their political institutions, which provide them with a government based on freedom and equality. Lincoln then reminds the Lyceum that these blessings came to them as a legacy from their ancestors. They inherited this land and these institutions that their ancestors had won and fought hard to build:

We, when mounting that stage of existence, found ourselves the legal inheritors of these fundamental blessings. We toiled not in the acquisition or establishment of them; they are a legacy bequeathed us by a once hardy, brave, and patriotic...race of ancestors. Theirs was the task (and nobly they performed it) to possess themselves, and through themselves, of this goodly land, and to uprear upon its hills and its valleys a political edifice of liberty and equal rights.

Lincoln wants these young men to remember the sacrifices that their ancestors gave in order to establish and build this country. It is easy to forget these ancestors and what they did not only to win this country but also to constitute it in the manner they did because we live today in these peaceful times, Lincoln says. This is all the more reason to remember those who gave their lives and energy to build this government, which has simply become a gift handed down from one generation to the next. Just as they were blessed by being given the opportunity to establish this nation, so each ensuing generation is continually blessed by being able to enjoy the products of those previous labors. Americans have been specially blessed, and Lincoln wishes to remind the young men in his audience of their blessings, lest those blessings go unappreciated.

In his Address to the Lyceum, Lincoln also points out how hard their ancestors fought for this country. All of their energy and dreams were wrapped up in this country and in making it succeed. They had to prove to the world that the people could not only choose a form of government, but that this chosen constitution could be constructed in reality and succeed. According to Lincoln, the early Americans recognized that the world’s eyes were on them, and that the world was waiting to laugh at their failure or praise their achievements. They, too, were a “City upon a Hill,” testing new methods of constitution and running a noble experiment:

Through that period [the founding] it was felt by all to be an undecided experiment...Their all was staked upon it; their destiny was inseparably linked with it. Their ambition aspired to display before an admiring world a practical demonstration of the truth...—namely, the capability of a people to govern themselves. If they succeeded they were to be immortalized...If they failed, they were to be called knaves, and fools, and fanatics for a fleeting hour;
then to sink and be forgotten. Lincoln argues that for the people of each following generation, the experiment appeared to be already over—the Constitution had been long established and proven a success. But this country’s citizens must remember that they are still called to be a model for the rest of the world. The country was still a very young one during Lincoln’s time, and the world was still watching closely to see if it would succeed. By remembering this country’s founders and their many sacrifices, today’s citizens should also feel the call to this mission to form a great country based on the idea of liberty and equality. These ancestors are no longer here, and their memory is slowly fading as time passes so the citizens of today must step up and take on the responsibility of continuing to create and improve this nation. This nation will fail unless its citizens can both remember their history and take up the task left by their ancestors and carry on with it. Throughout this early speech of Lincoln, the ideas of American exceptionalism are present—that America has been especially blessed, that America proved herself to the world by showing that a government of the people could be constituted, and that her citizens have the responsibility to carry on the mission to make America the model of a free and equal government.

These exceptionalistic ideas presented by Lincoln in the Address to the Lyceum persist throughout later and more prominent speeches, including the Gettysburg Address. Lincoln gave an address at a ceremony in which the cemetery at Gettysburg was being dedicated in November of 1863, just a few months after the battle had been fought there. His speech was not intended to be the principal speech of dedication to be given at the ceremony, but its simple and yet powerful message has long outlasted the other events and speeches of that day. Although the speech was thought a failure by many of those present on the day of its delivery and by critics across the country, they perhaps failed to understand Lincoln’s message and his vision of the country. In this remarkably short address, Lincoln’s every word is fully of meaning. Lincoln begins his speech by first emphasizing the principles upon which this country is based—liberty and equality. For Lincoln, these principles are the foundation of this country going back to the Declaration of Independence in which they were first proclaimed: “Lincoln drew on the language of the fathers for the power of persuasion with which he made it absolutely plain to his fellow citizens that ‘nationalism of slavery’ meant the recantation of the Declaration of Independence...” He wants to remind the audience that these are the principles for which they are now fighting in the Civil War. They are fighting to prove to the world that a country based on those principles and with a popular government can endure: “Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.” For Lincoln, the eyes of the world are once again on America as she fights this Civil War. During the founding period, the world watched to see if the people could decide on a form of government and then construct it in reality. Now they watched to see if this special country could survive.

The men who fought in the Civil War should provide inspiration to continue fighting for the principles of liberty and equality, Lincoln argues in this address. They fought for their country to defend it and its principles. According to Lincoln, the world saw what they did here and cannot ever forget the sacrifices they gave to carry on the battle. Now everyone else should pick up the fight where those brave soldiers left off. The call to continue the fight must be answered or else the country risks a defeat. For Lincoln, it was the duty of every
citizen to fight in order to preserve the union for which their ancestors had fought and labored. Too much had already been given in the fight for this country by the founding fathers and also by those fighting in the Civil War to let the fight end now. It would be devastating to those who fought for this country both in the distant and recent past and also to the ideals of liberty, equality, and popular government for the country to suffer defeat and end. Although it is mainly for the love of America that they fought in the Civil War, it is much greater than that—they were also fighting to prove to the world that a government such as the one in America can endure. For Lincoln, what should be taken from the Battle of Gettysburg is greater inspiration to fight for the preservation of this country:

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth. 28

These are the same principles that Lincoln spoke of in his Address to the Lyceum. He wanted the young men to remember their ancestors and the dedication they had to this enormous experiment in government and use that as inspiration to carry on the mission of continuing to build and improve America. At Gettysburg, Lincoln is doing the same thing: only he is making it more personal and real to his audience. He wants the audience to look at the cemetery where the bodies of thousands lay who fought only a few months before to preserve this country and its government, and he wants people to remember them and their cause. Lincoln, in his Gettysburg Address, uses the ideas of American exceptionalism to inspire his audience to persevere in the fight to defend their country and the principles to which it is dedicated.

American exceptionalism abounds in Lincoln’s later speeches as well, such as his Second Inaugural Address. This address, delivered on March 4, 1865, is different from Lincoln’s other speeches that employ American exceptionalism. In this one, he adds a spiritual aspect to his speech, not unlike that of John Winthrop, who was concerned specifically about fulfilling his special covenant with God through a Puritan community. Lincoln in this address speaks of God’s direction and will for the American community. Although still using the sacrifices those in battle have made in giving their lives to preserve their country as a source of inspiration, Lincoln focuses his speech on God and His plan for America. In his other speeches, Lincoln had briefly referred to the Bible, Christianity, or God, but never before had he focused on God’s design for America or on God’s selection of America for the special mission of being a model community based on liberty and equality. Although in his previous speeches, America does have a special heritage for Lincoln, this idea did not necessarily seem to include God’s direct involvement in America’s destiny. In Lincoln’s Second Inaugural speech, however, after four years of bloody and difficult war, the need for justification of the war affects Lincoln, and he introduces the idea of God’s special commitment to America’s destiny as a way of finding meaning in the long and painful war:

If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having
continued through His appointed
time, He now wills to remove, and
that He gives to both North and
South this terrible war as the woe
due to those by whom the offense
came, shall we discern therein any
departure from those divine at-
tributes which the believers in a
living God always ascribe to him?²⁹

Lincoln believes that the history of this
country has been under God’s control since
its inception and that even this terrible war
serves God’s purpose for this country.
Although no one desires war and all wish it
to end, it is serving God’s purpose and so
will continue until that point when God’s
plan has been carried out.

At the end of his Second Inaugural
Address, Lincoln returns to some of the
ideas he expressed in his earlier speeches.
He asks for continued support to see the
war to its end so that the nation may heal
and return to peace. He calls on the
strength of the citizens to finish the war and
begin again with a fresh start for the country
through a healing process. In his address,
Lincoln summons the people of America to
a higher mission, one which he knows they
are able to perform:

With malice toward none, with char-
ity for all, with firmness in the right
as God gives us to see the right, let us
strive on to finish the work we are in,
to bind up the nation’s wounds, to
care for him who shall have borne the
battle and for his widow and his
orphan, to do all which may achieve
and cherish a just and lasting peace
among ourselves and with all na-
tions.³⁰

With these words, Lincoln began his second
presidency, which was cut short by his
assassination that same year. The speech is

a powerful statement of Lincoln’s belief in
the strength and character of the American
people. Lincoln’s Second Inaugural Ad-
dress shows clearly that Lincoln felt that
both he and his fellow citizens had a special
calling to fight for liberty and equality, and,
therefore, to fight to preserve their country.
American exceptionalism has wound
its way through all of American history,
becoming a source of pride and inspiration
for the American people. It has taken on
different forms throughout history, though
meaning one thing to one generation and
another to the next generation. John
Winthrop, the governor of the Massachu-
setts Puritans, first brought the idea to
America. For him, the idea was based in
religion. Without this religious aspect, he
would have considered his community no
more special than any other one. But be-
cause of the covenant they had sealed with
God and the special mission He had given
them, Winthrop came to view his commu-
nity as a “Citty upon a Hill.” This model
community, based on the principles of
inequality and the love resulting from that
inequality, is vastly different from Abraham
Lincoln’s idea of community. For Lincoln,
American exceptionalism is founded more
in political institutions than in religion.
Americans should be proud of their country
because it has political institutions, which
protect and provide for liberty and equality
for all citizens. Lincoln does not completely
ignore the religious aspects of America’s
calling to be a model nation for the world,
but he tends to emphasize the political
institutions instead. Both Winthrop and
Lincoln do use the idea that their commu-
nities are special and unique to inspire and
call their people to live better and more
virtuous lives. Although the core of their
American exceptionalism is different,
Winthrop and Lincoln were able to use the
idea effectively and bring out the best in
their people during difficult times.
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ANNOUNCING THE SECOND ANNUAL PLS/GP SUMMER SYMPOSIUM
JULY 2-6, 2001

Last July alumni/ae, family, and friends of the Program returned once again for a weeklong Summer Symposium. The participants gathered for Fred Crosson’s week-long seminar on Herman Melville’s Moby-Dick and Virginia Woolf’s To the Lighthouse, as well as one session mini-seminars led by other members of the Program faculty. We are now planning our third annual Summer Symposium and faculty interest is high. We are still fine-tuning the structure of the Symposium with the help of the enthusiastic and thoughtful responses from students from the first two years, who have asked for more classes and more opportunities for conversation with faculty members.

We will be adding classes this year. We’ve always had one five-day seminar and five one-day sessions. In 2001, there will be two five-day seminars, if interest warrants. We will have one of the single-session classes and one of the week-long seminars in the morning, and a second week-long seminar in the evenings. Projected courses, all with PLS faculty, include

**Week-long seminars**

- Plato’s Republic with Walt Nicgorski
- Shakespeare’s Hamlet with Steve Fallon

**One or two session classes on**

- Beethoven or Mozart—Ed Goehring
- The Controversy over the Canals of Mars (1877-1915)—Mike Crowe
- The Lord’s Prayer—Nicholas Ayo, C. S. C.
- Genetics and Molecular Biology—Phil Sloan
- Lincoln—Elliot Bartky
- Moral Development—Clark Power
- Newman—Katherine Tillman
- Wordsworth or Shelley—Henry Weinfield

There have also been several promising suggestions from veterans of the Symposium; these are being circulated among the faculty (send more if you have them).

Housing will again be available on-campus and at a hotel near the campus.

If you think that you might be interested in the 2001 Symposium, please mail the form to Summer Symposium 2001, 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 friends of the Program as well as to graduates, so if you have a friend who would jump at the chance to be involved, feel free to share this information. We look forward to seeing you in July.

Steve Fallon
Summer Symposium Coordinator
WHO: PROGRAM FACULTY, ALUMNI/AE, FRIENDS, AND FAMILY

WHAT: PLS/GP SUMMER SYMPOSIUM

WHEN: JULY 2-6, 2001

WHERE: NOTRE DAME CAMPUS

WHY: TO SHARE BOOKS, REFLECTIONS, FRIENDSHIP

We need to collect a registration fee to cover costs for the week. As was the case last year, the cost will be $350 for the week, or $450 for two. We will try to make arrangements for those eager to attend but for whom the registration fee would be an obstacle.

September 8, 1999

Dear Steve,

I know that Nina has conveyed to you how much we both enjoyed the program this summer. I have been telling many of my friends that initially I felt that no one wanted NOT to be there more than I. However after experiencing the program and all of its benefits, I can honestly say that I doubt if anyone enjoyed it more than I.

I had initially agreed to attend the program as part of an anniversary gift to Nina. In the back of my mind was the fact that Joey would be there at the same time, the fact that there is a golf course on campus, and the fact that the Cubs were playing in Chicago.

I never left South Bend and managed to play only 9 holes with Joey the entire week I was there. The program really was a rewarding experience for those of us who were not fortunate enough to attend Notre Dame as undergraduates. It provided a brief glimpse into all of the wonderful things that happen day in and day out at the University.

Both Nina and I hope to be able to return to the program next summer. Warmest regards.

Sincerely,

Mike Pietrangelo
2001 Summer Symposium Questionnaire

Name __________________________

Address __________________________

Phone __________________________

E-mail __________________________

_____ I am interested in hearing more about the July 2-6 2001 Summer Symposium.

_____ I already know that I want to attend.

I am more interested in

_____ Inexpensive but spartan housing at Alumni Family Hall

_____ More comfortable but more expensive housing at local hotel

I have the following suggestion for text or topic. (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 with a copy to Debbie at kabzinski.1@nd.edu
ALUMNI 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 see this issue's editor's column.

Class of 1954

Class of 1955
(Class Correspondent: George L. Vosmik, P. O. Box 5000, Cleveland, OH 44104)

Class of 1956
Added by PLS Office:
Jack Sigler-Activities since graduation:
#US Army - 1956-58
#Private foundation (Iran, Egypt) - 1959 - 1967
#Student - 1967 -68 (American Univ. - MA, political science)
#Energy Consulting - 1968 -1978
#Foreign Service Officer - 1978 -1991 (Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Abu Dhabi, USCENTCOM)
#Student - Jan 2000 - present (Florida State Univ. - Institute for the Study of Napoleon and the French Revolution - MA candidate)
wife: Ruth (Foreign Service Officer on detail to State of Florida)
children: Mike (ND-PLS, 1981), Thomas, Steven, Therese, Claire
Other study: Univ. of Tehran - Persian Literature & Language; American University of Cairo - Business Administration, Arabic; Northern Virginia Community College - Outdoor Recreation.

Class of 1957

Class of 1958
(Class Correspondent: Michael J. Crowe, PLS, U. of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556)

Class of 1959

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

Class of 1961

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

Class of 1963

Class of 1964

Class of 1965
(Class Correspondent: Lee Foster, P.O. Box 5715, Berkeley, CA 94705)
Added by PLS Office:
Bill John writes: "I have recently read two good books on the topic: "The Disappearance of God" by Richard Elliott Friedman, Professor of Hebrew and Comparative Literature at UC San Diego. He talks about three related mysteries: the progressive hiddenness of God as the Hebrew Scripture develops, the circumstances surrounding an incident in the life of Nietzsche at Turin in January 1889, the connection between Nietzsche and Dostoyevsky, and, finally, the striking parallels between modern cosmology and the Kabbalah. The second book is "What is God?" by John F. Haught, an Assistant Professor of Theology at Georgetown. Rather than asking "who" God is, he asks "what" is God. His short answer is taken from Rudolf Otto: (I AM Who Am) is Mysterium Tremendum et Fascinans. Haught develops his thinking by suggesting five related ideas that point to God: Depth, Future, Freedom, Beauty, and Truth. Haught draws on the thinking of Paul Tillich, Friedrich
Nietzsche, Michael Polanyi, Karl Rahner, Jurgen Moltmann, Jean Paul-Sartre, Soren Kierkegaard, Alfred North Whitehead, Gabriel Marcel, David Tracy, and more. Reading the book was rather like sitting in on a PLS seminar.

Class of 1966
(Class Correspondent: Paul R. Ahr, 225 S. Meramec, Suite 1032, St. Louis, MO 63105)

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

Class of 1968

Class of 1969

Class of 1970
(Class Correspondent: William F. Maloney, M.D., P.O. Box 8835, Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067-8835/2023 West Vista Way, Suite A Vista, CA 92083  619/941-1400 ph 74044.2361 @compuserve.com)

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

Don Feldmann writes, "As a 1971 graduate of the program, I consider myself a continuing student of the great books. As time goes on, I find myself appreciating my undergraduate education more and more. Recently at a professional seminar, I was dismayed to listen to another (about 60 years old and not from either PLS or ND) complain about his liberal arts education. What a shame that after a lifetime of perspective, he could not appreciate his education as much as I do. Of course the program is special, but I was still dismayed. Keep up the good work!"

Class of 1972
(Class Correspondent: Otto Barry Bird, 15013 Bauer Drive, Rockville, MD 20853)

Class of 1973
(Class Correspondents: John Astuno, 1775 Sherman St. #1875, Denver, CO 80203-4316, and John Burkley, 10 Cuscaden Walk, Apt. 08-03, Singapore 249693 burkley@pacific.net.sg)

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

Class of 1975

Class of 1976

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

Class of 1978

The Corby Award is presented annually to someone who has distinguished himself or herself in the military. This award was presented to John Lancaster the weekend of the Notre Dame/U.S. Air Force Academy game, 28 October 2000.

John was badly wounded in action and partially paralyzed as a Marine officer in Vietnam. But rather than let that defeat him, he returned to "The World," earned an ND Law degree, and has spent the past 30 years working on behalf of disabled veterans and disabled Americans. John is currently Executive Director of the President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities.
Class of 1979
(Class Correspondent: Thomas A.
Livingston, 300 Colonial Drive, Pittsburgh,
PA 15216)

Class of 1980
(Class Correspondent: Mary Schmidtlein
Rhodes, #9 Southcote Road, St. Louis, MO
63144)
Added by PLS Office:
William Rooney and his wife Mary
have three boys. Their address is One
Harbor Road, Darien, CT 06820.

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

Class of 1982
(Class Correspondent: Francis D’Eramo,
1131 King St., Suite 204, Christiansted, USVI
00820, ithaca@viaccess.net)

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)

Class of 1985
(Class Correspondent: Laurie Denn, 5725
Hansen Road, Edina, MN 55436-2404)
Added by PLS Office:
Becky Miklos wants to share her good
news. She adopted a baby girl! Sarah
Catherine Yang Yuan Miklos was born June 3,
1999. She was adopted in China on March 28,
2000 and arrived home on April 6, 2000.
(Please see note at the end of class news.)

Class of 1986
(Class Correspondent: Margaret (Neis)
Kulis, 1203 Harvard Terrace, Evanston, IL
60202-3213)

Class of 1987
(Class Correspondent: Terese Heidenwolf,
41 Valley Park South, Bethlehem, PA 18018
heidenwt@lafayette.edu)

Class of 1988
(Class Correspondent: Michele Martin, 6402
Oakbrook Dr., Corpus Christi, TX 78413)

Class of 1989
(Class Correspondent: Coni Rich, 238
Ashbury Court, South Bend, IN 46615 (219)
288-0753 conijorich@aol.com)

Class of 1990
(Class Correspondent: Barbara Martin, 45
Westmoreland Lane, Naperville, IL 60540-
55817, barbaranjohn@msn.com)

Class of 1991
(Class correspondent: Ann Mariani, 36 East
Hill Road, Brimfield, MA 01010)
Added by PLS Office:
Susan Shull Murphy is an elementary
Reading Specialist and kindergarten teacher.
She enjoys taking art classes at the Maryland
Inst. of Art and gardening, and hiking with
Mac (her dog). If anyone is in the Gettysburg
area, Susan would be happy to provide food
and lodging. Her address is 212 Gladhill
Road, Fairfield, PA 17320.

Class of 1992

Class of 1993
(Class correspondent: Anthony Valle, 147-
55 6 Ave., Whitestone, NY 11357-1656)
Added by PLS Office:
Jenn Stone is living in St. Louis. She spent
a year in Papua New Guinea and then a couple
of years in Russia right after graduation, teaching
with ministries of the Salesians. She’s en-
gaged to be married, but I don’t know if she’d
want that part printed.

Catherine Hechmer is still in Saranac
Lake, New York, working as an Alcoholism
and Substance Abuse Counselor (she passed
the credential exam last year); and just received a promotion to Senior Counselor after having worked the last two years as a family counselor. Catherine also sings and plays bass guitar and saxophone in a folk/rock/blues trio and they've released four albums. Anyone interested could check it out at the website at HiveMusic.com/akageorge.

Class of 1994

Class of 1995

Class of 1996
(Class Correspondent: Stacy Mosesso, c/o Notre Dame Law School, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, e-mail: Mosesso.1@nd.edu)

Sharon Keane ('84), who now is associate director of marketing in the Education Department of Notre Dame's Mendoza Business School, recently had some very sad news to impart. She informed us that Jerry Mulligan (also '84) passed away on January 31st after complications from surgery to remove a brain tumor. Jerry is survived by his wife, Caroline Masciale Mulligan (also a 1984 PLS grad) and daughter, Clare Mulligan. Jerry worked for Catholic Charities on social justice issues. Since 1991 he worked for the National Wildlife Federation and held the position of Grassroots Communications Manager at the time of his passing. He was involved in lobbying activities. In 2000, he earned the Federation's Charlie Shaw Partnership Award for exemplary service. Jerry's interests included Notre Dame football, Irish music, mentoring interns, gardening, pick-up softball games, and the Sunday Washington Post crossword puzzles.

Class of 1997
(Class Correspondent: Brien Flanagan, 929 Eastwood Road, Gencoe, IL 60022-1122 bflan@globaIcommunicators.com)

Class of 1998
(Class Correspondents: Katie Bagley, 520 Valley Road, Charlottesville, VA 22903-3217 (804) 295-3349, ksb5j@virginia.edu, and Bryce Seki, 28 Fischer Graduate Residence Apt.2C, Notre Dame, IN 46556, Seki.1@nd.edu (219) 634-4486)

Class of 1999
(Class Correspondent: Kate Hibey at khibey@hotmail.com)

Class of 2000
MANY THANKS TO CONTRIBUTORS

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

Contributions to the University Designated for PLS

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 1,600 alumni/ae all over the world.

Richard D. Allega     Anne Lewis     Teresa M. Russell
Theodore M. Becchetti Thomas Livingston Mary V. Schmidtlein
Dr. Michael E. Bozik Ann M. Mariani Albert J. Schwartz, Jr.
John Bransfield       Robert W. McClelland Robert P. Sieland
Patricia A. Fox       Karen McCloskey     Jackson L. Sigler
Joseph S. Giglia      Patrick E. Medland Thomas W. Stach
Daniel T. Hartnett    Thomas W. Pace    Joseph E. Tiritter
M. Elizabeth Kenney    Gary F. Raisl      Wendy E. Verkler
Michael E. Kwiecien    William Rooney    Pamela Fox Weber
David A. Lawlor

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.

Peter Frank
Donald G. Yeckel

Contributions to the William Burke Memorial Book Fund

William Burke was in our first graduating class. He loved Notre Dame and treasured the Program. His family and friends have set up the William Burke Memorial Fund, which has so far provided a new bookcase and many books for the use of our students.
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. Her classmates hope to memorialize her with a named scholarship to be awarded annually to a Program student. We have many worthy students in financial need. At the moment, the Development Office is monitoring contributions to see if the fund will be viable, so your gift will be especially welcome.

Margaret Clements
Robert & Nancy Clements
Walter Clements
Dan Jukic
Katherine Kennelly
Barb (Martin) & John Ryan

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.

David and Cathy Carlyle
Peter R. Frank
Karen O’Brien
Michael C. Richerson
Donald G. Yeckel

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 U. Dini
Donald G. Yeckel
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.

John R. Fitzpatrick

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.

John C. Coleman
Eric L. Fredrickson
Maureen Loiello McElroy
Carl F. Munana
Caroline Palmer
Michael C. Richerson
Daniel W. Smith
Mary E. Wittenauer
I would like my old friends and teachers to know where I am and what I am doing these days.

Name_________________________________________ Class_________________________

Current Address

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Present Occupation

__________________________________________________________

Special Activities

__________________________________________________________

I would like to contribute the enclosed amount to (specify) special award fund of the Program*

__________________________________________________________

Comments: (Including any suggestions on what you would like to see considered in Programma)

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

*Make checks payable to the Program of Liberal Studies and designated to the appropriate fund. Those for Rogers Scholarship should go directly to the Development Office. All contributions are tax deductible and are credited at the University and on Alumni/ae records as a contribution to the University.

Send contributions, information or inquiries to:

Program of Liberal Studies
215 O’Shaughnessy Hall
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
(219) 631-7172
Fax (219) 631-4268
e-mail AL.pls.1@nd.edu
Join the celebration of fifty years of Great Books education at Notre Dame!

See page 3 for details.