



PROGRAMMA

A Newsletter for Graduates of the Program of Liberal Studies
The University of Notre Dame
Volume XIII, No. 2 July, 1989

A Final View from 318

This is the final issue from the 318 office, but no, it does not mean our demise. This month we move to new office quarters on the second floor of O'Shaughnessy Hall in room 215. We have been contemplating this move for some time. It is finally to be a reality for the Program. The new quarters will include an office for an undergraduate advisor, a nice Agora, improved window space, and a fresh look to the department. The expansion of office space on the third floor of O'Shaughnessy has meant the disappearance of all classroom space. Our new quarters relocate us where we most wish to be—in the midst of student life and the undergraduate teaching dimension of the College. We will have as neighbors the Arts and Science College Honors Program office as well. This will give us the opportunity to develop deeper associations with members of that program. Changes continue to take place at Notre Dame on many levels, and we are seeking to grow creatively with the University while still keeping a clear focus on our unique contribution to its general educational endeavor.

Professor Michael Crowe has, as always, prepared another interesting edition for our readers. Our two feature pieces include an important document by our founder, Otto Bird, and the annual Edward J. Cronin prizewinning essay, awarded this year to senior Heather Anne Ingraham.

In our last issue, I reported on the visit of Mortimer Adler to the Program, and the stimulation he provided the ongoing conversation within the Program. In January, this was followed by an address by Otto Bird, who spoke to the Program about his original vision of its aim and purpose. This is summarized in a shortened version of a report he submitted to the University in 1953, which is presented below. Professor Bird's essay provides us with a view of the Great Books tradition as it originally came to Notre Dame, and to these foundations we must continually refer while we continue to grow with the challenges of the 1990s. Notre Dame's development as a strong research and teaching institution has brought with it inevitable changes in the context in which the Program exists. There is a more pronounced disciplinary atmosphere surrounding us. The faculty necessarily move less freely through the many seminars and tutorials because of other demands on their time; faculty are more frequently gone from the program on funded leaves for research purposes. Nonetheless, our goal remains that of achieving a balance of research and teaching emphases such that we will carry on the great books tradition in education with fidelity and growing excellence and continue to offer the finest undergraduate education of which we are capable.

There are many challenges to the notion of a 'great book' and 'great books education' heard frequently in academia and the public media today. News of the dismantling of the Stanford

Western Civilization program is but one sign of this. Questions are raised about the notion of a “canon” of reading. Public intellectuals—Allan Bloom, Jacques Barzun, Mortimer Adler—are heard sounding alarms with respect to these trends. We must address these issues with care and insight, developing on our common commitment to a great books program in a Catholic university.

The reworking of our new chronological seminar list, ordering the readings generally in terms of their dates of publication, is a process which inevitably raises for us the issue of the definition of ‘excellence’ in works of diverse genre and of varying degrees of accessibility. This is particularly an issue as we deal with works from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Our seminar committee made some useful remarks on the issue of ‘excellence’ in a report issued to the department at the beginning of our seminar revision. A quotation from their conclusions is in order:

With respect to differences in perspective, the choice of the seminar readings is intended to focus on axial works, which like foundational works are not only generally the more powerful and coherent, but which remain in dialogue with their alternatives. It has often been remarked that the conclusions of one generation are the premises of the next, which correctly implies that the defeated alternatives tend to become occluded, forgotten, with a consequent shift in the self-understanding of the successful view, i.e., the view that becomes dominant.

Hence the selection of works should be alert to the shifts which have taken place in the very conception of the arts, of politics, of science and philosophy. One of the ways of following this principle is to listen to the participants in the “great conversation” and to note which predecessors and contemporaries they take most seriously, feel most obliged to refute or agree with, are aware of opposing. It is obvious that this sequential character of the historical conversation cannot be grasped without a clear sense of the order of the contributors and of the logic of the conversation’s development.

The concept of a “conversation” figures broadly in the principles of selection. With this understood, it is perhaps not as impossible as some claim to decide on which books ought to be on our reading lists. I was struck by this issue recently in attending a lecture attacking the notion of ‘canonicity’ by a visiting lecturer from Stanford University. Although the aim of the talk was to discount the idea of a privileged set of ‘great books,’ the lecture would have been inaccessible to those who had not already read the main works of Plato, Aristotle, St. Thomas, Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Marx, Faulkner, and Nietzsche at issue. Critique of a canon seems inescapably to imply familiarity with the same canon if it is even to be intelligible.

As our seminar revision draws to a close, we will all have the experience of teaching new seminars next year (the new lists will be published in the next issue). A patient review of other aspects of our curriculum in light of this new list will begin this year as we continue to strive for excellence in liberal education.

Faculty of the Program have also been active in extending our special insights to the wider university community. Three important conferences were organized by Program faculty members this spring. Professor Clark Power was co-organizer of the conference “Moral Education in a Pluralist Society”. Professors Kent Emery and Mark Jordan conducted an international conference on medieval learning and philosophy, *Ad Litteram*, in conjunction with the Medieval Institute, and hosted noted medievalists from several countries. Professor David Schindler was the main organizer of the conference “Nature, Grace and Culture” sponsored in conjunction with his editorship of the journal *Communio*. Rev. Walter Kasper’s keynote address, “Nature, Grace and Secularization” was an important analysis of secularization in all its complexities by one of the leading theologians of Germany. This text was subsequently used for an alumnae/i reunion seminar in June conducted by Professor Schindler and it will be reprinted in a forthcoming issue of

Communio.

This should indicate some of the interplay taking place between teaching, learning, reason, faith, inquiry, and discussion within the Program and within the University as a result of the Program's presence.

A special thanks is due to all those who have contributed to the Program either directly or indirectly over the past year. Our Cronin, Bird, and Nutting awards remain self-supporting through your help. I would also make mention of the importance of our Stephen Rogers fund. With some generous contributions, the Rogers Scholarship Fund is now approaching a size that its award will make it possible for at least one student to remain at Notre Dame and in the Program who otherwise might be forced to drop out for financial reasons. The rising tuition rates at Notre Dame continue to require the increase in the principal of endowed scholarship funds if they are to be effective in meeting these needs.

This summer, through your help, we are conducting a series of three faculty seminars, reading together works proposed for consideration on our new senior seminar list. Time during the academic year is often limited for such common work together, and only in summer workshops do we seem to have the time needed for a more leisurely examination of important topics.

We are also pleased to welcome as newest member of the tenured faculty Professor Kent Emery, Jr. who was promoted to Associate Professor with tenure this spring. Professor Emery has taught previously at The Citadel and the University of Dallas and is trained in late medieval English literature and theology. He is also this year's winner of a triple-crown award of a fellowship from the National Endowment for the Humanities, one from the American Academy of Learned Societies, and a third from the Guggenheim Foundation. This will support his research for a two-year period on Denis the Carthusian. We also welcome back to full-time service Professor Stephen Fallon and Fr. Nicholas Ayo after a year of research leave.

Some personnel changes are also to be noted. Professor Susan Youens, who has conducted the Fine Arts tutorials for us since 1984 is moving to the Notre Dame Music department, and will be replaced by Dr. Linda Austern, a musicologist spending the past year on a post-doctoral fellowship at Radcliffe. We wish her all good wishes in this change, and we hope to keep in close contact with her. Professor Jordan continues in an associate status, dividing his time between us, the Medieval Institute and the Philosophy department. Finally, I wish to offer the best from all the Program faculty, and I am sure best wishes from all her former students, to Professor Janet Smith, who has been with us since 1979 and is leaving us for a position in the Philosophy department at the University of Dallas. We have all learned much from her presence and dedication to the Program, to teaching, and to the cause of truth. I am sure she would be pleased to hear from you at her new address. Good luck Janet!

—Phillip Sloan

Programma (the Greek word means "public notice") is published toward the end of each semester by the Program of Liberal Studies for its graduates.

Faculty Editor

Michael J. Crowe

Copyright 1989

University of Notre Dame

From the Editor's Desk

News of the PLS faculty is the chief subject of this issue's letter from the editor.

Fr. Nicholas Ayo will have a new paperback version of his *Sermon-Conferences of St. Thomas Aquinas on the Apostles' Creed* appearing this Fall from Univ. of Notre Dame Press. *The Creed as Symbol* was the March feature selection of the Clergy Book Services, which bought the entire first printing. The book has gone into a second printing. He was busy giving retreats in the Springtime at Ancilla Domini in Donaldson, Indiana, Holy Cross House on the campus, Casa Santa Cruz in Phoenix, and the University of Portland in Oregon. He stayed at Portland for two weeks in order to visit former students and friends he knew during 1965-74, when he was teaching American literature there. His summer plans include completing a book on the basic Christian prayers, the Paternoster and the Ave Maria. He is looking forward very much to returning to the classroom in the autumn. Writing is a lonely business.

Frederick Crosson spent two weeks in London and Paris this summer, seeing the sights with his youngest daughter, who will enter Notre Dame in the Fall. In the Spring, he led a seminar on Allan Bloom's book for an adult great books group in Chicago.

Michael Crowe recently sent off the final camera-ready version of his *Theories of the World from Antiquity to the Copernican Revolution*, which Dover plans to have in print by the end of the year. The preliminary version of it was used in a summer course at the University of Florida. In March, he presented a paper, "Duhem and the History and Philosophy of Mathematics," at a conference on "Pierre Duhem: Historian and Philosopher of Science." He continues to be interested in finding references to ideas of extraterrestrial life in classic sources and appreciates the leads he has received from alums. He is looking forward to leading a seminar in July for some Chicago-area PLS graduates on Dostoevsky's "Dream of a Ridiculous Man."

Kent Emery—see Professor Sloan's early report.

Steve Fallon, who has mailed his manuscript on Milton and seventeenth-century philosophy to a publisher, suggests that Thomas Merton's remark on "the incomparable agony of a new author waiting to hear the fate of his first book." may be an exaggeration, but unfortunately not by much. Steve has appreciated his leave for the time made available for his research and growing family, and thanks all taxpayers for their involuntary support of the NEH.

André Goddu presented a paper entitled "The Realism That Duhem Rejected in Copernicus" at a conference on "Pierre Duhem: Historian and Philosopher of Science," which was held in March at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. He also organized and chaired the session "The Logic of Walter Burley" at the 24th international congress of Medieval Studies at Western Michigan University in May. During part of June, he and his family vacationed in Florida.

Walter Nicgorski reports that one of the highlights of recent months was this year's consideration in the Politics tutorial of the *Roe versus Wade* case; the discussion of the Supreme Court's major opinion on abortion took place in the same week during April that the current *Webster* case was being argued before the Court. Visiting the Program to join Professor Nicgorski and lead the discussions of *Roe* was John Breen ('85), who completed Harvard Law last spring and wrote there a thesis on *Roe*. More on John's current activities elsewhere in this issue. Professor Nicgorski's other activities of late included the presentation of a paper on "American Pluralism: A Condition or a Goal?" at Notre Dame's Conference on Moral Education in a Pluralist Society, the publication of an earlier essay "The Morality of the Liberal Arts: An Aristotelian Perspective" in the volume entitled *The Good Man In Society*, and participation in the 50th anniversary celebration for *The Review of Politics*, the Midwest Political Science Association Meeting, and the recent *Communio* conference.

Clark Power reports that last February 24 and 25, he and Dan Lapsley co-chaired a conference "Moral Education in a Pluralist Society," as part of the AT&T Visiting Scholar Series.

Notre Dame Press has agreed to publish the conference papers and several additional chapters. This summer Clark is teaching Great Books Seminar I and he, his wife, Ann, and Dan Lapsley are planning an international conference on moral education, which will be held at Notre Dame in 1990. He is analyzing data from a three year study of the moral cultures of secondary schools.

Teresa Reed-Downing, who has been teaching in PLS over the last few years as an adjunct, has taken a full time position in the Department of Philosophy at Rockhurst College in Kansas City, Missouri. All best wishes to Teresa.

David Schindler reports above all that he is enjoying his new little home on the St. Joseph River, with its quiet view of the water and trees and accompanying sounds of Spring. He hosted recently, at Notre Dame, the first international meeting of *Communio* to be held in the United States, and gave a paper entitled "Faith and the Logic of Intelligence: Secularization and the Academy" at the conference which followed the meeting. Articles of his on Catholicism and American culture appear in the May and June issues of *30 Days*.

Phillip Sloan, in addition to his duties as Chair, is completing his book on the early context of Darwin's thought, *On the Edge of Evolution: Richard Owen's Hunterian Lectures, May-June 1837*. He will finish this during a research leave in the spring of 1990 in London, where he will also teach the Program seminar to the London PLS students. He delivered the inaugural address to the Notre Dame-St. Mary's new Eighteenth Century Seminar in the spring with a discussion of the changes in French science at the French Revolution. He is new president of the Midwest History of Science Society. He is also doing preliminary work this summer on aspects of his projected book on a Christian response to the Darwinian revolution with a paper on the naturalization of the human species in the eighteenth century.

Janet Smith will be taking a tenure track position at the University of Dallas in September. She will be leaving South Bend during the first week in August. After that time, she can be contacted at the Philosophy Department, University of Dallas, Irving, Texas 75062. Phone: 214-721-5000. Speaking on *Humanae Vitae*, she has travelled to Rome; Philadelphia (where she was delighted to meet Pat Farris and John Haley); Manchester, New Hampshire; Santa Paula, California; Cleveland, Ohio; Rockford, Illinois, and elsewhere. Talks on other subjects were also given in Dallas and Corpus Christi, Texas, and New Orleans.

Katherine Tillman will be on research leave during the next academic year writing on—you-guessed-it—Cardinal-Newman, happily burrowing into her "new" home after major water destruction forced her into a nearby inn for the four months of spring semester. She will be giving the dinner address (entitled: "The Darkness before Kindly Light: Newman's Classic Descent into Hades") at the 1989 Newman Conference at the University of St. Mary of the Lake, Mundelein, Illinois, Aug. 11-13. Regarding the new definitive biography of Newman just out from Oxford University Press by the Rev. Ian T. Ker, she comments: "I bet the volume is excellent, but in *normal* PLS fashion, I shall let you know what I think of it *after* I have read the text."

Michael Waldstein, who has been a visiting assistant professor this year and will return for the coming year, has taken his family to his native Austria for the summer. While there, he will be writing the final section of his doctoral thesis for Harvard Divinity School. He already has a doctorate in philosophy.

Michael J. Crowe
Editor

THE AIMS OF THE GENERAL PROGRAM

by Otto A. Bird

[Editor's Note: Professor Otto Bird, the founder of the Program of Liberal Studies or the General Program of Liberal Studies, as our program was called for the first three decades of its history, delivered the "Opening Charge" for the second semester of this academic year. Professor Bird's address consisted of a somewhat revised version of a report that he prepared for the University in 1953 after the third year of the program's existence.]

The Need for General Education

The General Program of Liberal Education is a "general" program. That is to say, it is an effort in "general education." As all of us know, this has been a popular name in American education during recent years. It has come to mean almost any thing to any one. Here I am using it in the simple sense of an education that is common to all. An undifferentiated program would be a more accurate name. In this sense it is opposed to a program consisting of 'elective' courses of the student's own choosing. All the students in the General Program follow the same course of studies. On entering Notre Dame, the Freshman can choose to follow the General Program rather than one of the other programs of study. But after this initial choice, the program is determined. It is a 'required' program of study. We take between 45-60 entering Freshmen a year, and as long as they choose to remain within the program there is no question of what subjects they are going to follow. This coming year, when for the first time we shall have all four years of the program in operation, we shall have about 170 students following our courses of study.

On what principle, by what right, it may be asked, can we demand that all our students should pursue the same course of study, especially in this industrial and technological society of the 20th century.

To that question it seems to me that the best answer, within the compass of fewest words, is that contained within the statement of the question. We demand a general education of our college students just because they live in an industrial and technological society. The need for a general or common education is greater than ever before precisely because our society is more industrialized than ever before.

This sounds like a paradox. But it quickly reduces to the literal as soon as we gain a little perspective upon what happens to the citizens in an industrial society. Adam Smith, I suggest, affords us an exceptional vantage-point for gaining perspective upon our society. He lived at the beginning of our era of industrialization, and it was possible for him to know at first hand, as it no longer is for us in the West, the difference between an industrialized society and one that has not yet felt such effects.

We do not need to accept all of Adam Smith to admit the truth of his claim that progressive division of labor is one of the main marks of the industrial society. What happens to the citizen under the division of labor? Let us listen to Adam Smith:

In the progress of the division of labor, the employment of the far greater part of those who live by labor, that is, of the great body of the people, comes to be confined to a few very simple operations; frequently to one or two. But the understandings of the greater part of men are necessarily formed by their ordinary employments. The man whose life is spent in performing a few simple operations, of which the effects, too, are perhaps always the same, or very nearly the

same, has no occasion to exert his understanding, or to exercise his invention, in finding out expedients for removing difficulties which never occur. He naturally loses, therefore, the habit of such exertion, and generally becomes as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human creature to become. The torpor of his mind renders him not only incapable of relishing or bearing a part in any rational conversation, but of conceiving any generous, noble, or tender sentiment, and consequently of forming any just judgment concerning many even of the ordinary duties of private life. Of the great and extensive interests of his country he is altogether incapable of judging; and unless very particular pains have been taken to render him otherwise, he is equally incapable of defending his country in war.... His dexterity at his own particular trade seems, in this manner, to be acquired at the expense of his intellectual, social and martial virtues. (*Wealth of Nations*, bk V, chp. 1, pt. iii, art ii-iii)

All of us can recognize the person that Adam Smith presents. A few years ago, Charlie Chaplin in his movie *Modern Times* satirized the crippling effect of our industrialized specialization. He showed us the factory worker who could no longer prevent his hands and arms from going through the motions of tightening nuts and bolts on which he was engaged on the assembly line. We recognize this industrial worker in the factory. But there is no reason for supposing that his brother, the white-collar worker in business or government is really any better off. His task may be of a different kind, but for the most part it consists in a routine that calls on only a small part of his total intellectual and human capabilities.

The member of the non-industrial society is in a different position from almost any one of us today, no matter what our job. "In such societies," as Smith goes on to point out, "the varied occupations of every man oblige every man to exert his capacity, and to invent expedients for removing difficulties which are continually occurring. Invention is kept alive, and the mind is not suffered to fall into that drowsy stupidity, which, in a civilized society, seems to benumb the understanding of almost all the inferior ranks of people." Today, Adam Smith would find it difficult to find anyone who is not a member of what he calls the "inferior ranks," i.e., the working as opposed to the leisure class.

With the help of Adam Smith I think we can discern a principle of immense import for the problem of education in an industrial society. We can sum it up as follows: in an industrial society, which is marked by an extensive division of labor, a person's job cannot develop his capabilities to the full. The industrial society must therefore devote its attention and energies to the education of the man 'off the job' and apart from it. This is necessary not only out of justice to the individual person, but also for the common good of the society.

This principle enables us to understand, I believe, why the public devotes so much more attention today to education than it did in Adam Smith's time. It is not primarily because an industrial society demands trained technicians. If that were the only reason we certainly could do it in much less time than we now devote to education. There is a deeper reason obscurely motivating our thinking and acting on educational problems. It is the realization, however obscure and confused, that the work and play of an industrial society cannot by themselves educate intelligent men and women. Other institutions, our schools and colleges, are needed for that purpose.

We often hear the complaint that we are demanding too much of our schools and loading upon them functions that are more properly exercised by other institutions. Certainly, formal schooling is not the only educational means in society. But under advancing division of labor formal education becomes increasingly more important as the dominant educational force. We must demand more of our schools now than formerly because the other institutions of industrial society are less capable of fulfilling the great and primary educational task.

Our greatest confusion comes, however, when we think that the main task is preparing our students 'for a job.' What truth there is in the statement is almost the opposite of what is usually understood by it. We have to 'educate for a job' primarily in the sense that our specialized jobs today are incapable of eliciting the capabilities that lie in the human person. If our graduate does not enter upon his job today with an intelligence trained to find intelligibility wherever it exists, he will never find it at all, for the job he enters upon will seldom force him to rise to the heights of his intelligence.

Put in still another way, this is to say that man should continue to learn all his life if he is to develop as a human person. But our jobs by themselves provide no such motivation. The motivation has to be brought to them. That is the task of education, and it is a full-time task. Without persons prepared to bring intelligence to bear upon their tasks, whatever they are, and to continue learning all their life long, we have persons of narrow routine, described by Smith as sunk in the torpor of stupidity and ignorance. Or to use another description of the stunted men incapable of learning, we have what C. S. Lewis calls "men without chests."

Liberal Education Alone Satisfies the Need for General Education

We have been considering how an industrial society demands a general education for its members. Since the division of labor makes specialists of men on the job, a general education is needed to tend to their common humanity. This need exists for all men in all societies. It is only rendered more acute by the industrial society and not created by it.

Granted that there should be an education common for all, what constitutes it? What is its content? This question is not yet one of the means to be used, but rather of the objectives at which it should aim. If the problem were only that of providing something that all our students should share in, a 'common core,' as it is sometimes called, there would be many ways of solving it. In fact, there always has been some such common subject in our schools, if it has been only some such thing as physical education.

There is, of course, great advantage in all the students studying the same things. As Santayana once remarked, "It doesn't matter what so long as they all read the same things." This is one way of meeting the demand for 'integration.' If students are all taking the same studies, the possibility of 'atomic' division between courses is more or less overcome. What happens in one class is then always available for reference and use in another one. 'Cross fertilization' may then become a reality. This is all but impossible in a college constructed completely for specialization. When students from differing specialties do happen to meet in a common class, their backgrounds are so diverse that there is no common meeting-ground but what is offered in that course. In such a situation courses almost inevitably become so many 'atomic' units.

The real problem, however, is not getting just any common 'core' of education, but of getting the right and best one for the purpose. It is here, of course, that differences arise. There is more or less widespread agreement in American colleges on the need for a 'core education' common to all. But this is about the only agreement there is on the meaning of general education. In content and general objectives there are almost as many meanings for 'general education' as there are programs.

Yet it should not be impossible or even difficult to discover our general objective. Indeed, except for our own century, there has been all but unanimous agreement, from the time of the ancient Greeks, on what an educated person should be, and an educated person is certainly the aim of education as we are here concerned with it. Our look at Adam Smith contains all the elements

for an answer, even though Smith in the chapter on education at which we have been looking, is strongly critical of the university education of his time. The point is, however, that he differed not about the ideal of an educated man, but about the means used to achieve that ideal. We could, in fact, take almost any of the great exemplars of education from Plato down to Newman, and we would find substantial agreement on the ideal of education.

Because, however, we started with him, let us stay with Adam Smith. In some ways he can serve our purpose even better than more exacting and greater thinkers. He cannot be accused of wanting to educate only scholars or gentlemen. His aim is confessedly lower and more general, since he is concerned with the education of what he calls the "inferior ranks" of society.

With even so lowly an aim, what does he demand? A man able, he tells us, "to exert his understanding, or to exercise his invention, in finding out expedients for removing difficulties,...[capable] of relishing or bearing a part in any rational conversations,....of conceiving [a] generous, noble, or tender sentiment, and consequently of forming [a] just judgment concerning...the ordinary duties of private life, [and] of the great and extensive interests of his country." Such are Smith's own words. But he becomes even more explicit than this. He demands the "intellectual, social, and martial virtues," and he demands them for the sake of the happiness of the person and of society. For, as he says, "happiness and misery, which reside altogether in the mind, must necessarily depend more upon the healthful or unhealthful, the mutilated or entire state of the mind, than upon that of the body."

Let me remark again on the weight of Adam Smith's authority. He is no Aristotelian or Thomist; he is bitter and unjust about the Church; he condemns the classical liberal education of the Oxford of his time; indeed, the *Edinburgh Review* with which Newman will contend about liberal education 50 years later is in some sense a follower of Smith; he is the exponent of the industrial and capitalist society. Yet for all this, when it comes to what education is and what makes an educated man, he calls for the intellectual virtues and the health of the whole mind. He wants a liberal education.

The substantial agreement of the Western Tradition, down to the 20th century, on the aim of education is more than a matter of authority. It rests on principle and the nature of man. Unlike other animals, man cannot develop and reach his specific perfection without the help of art. Art in all its many varieties is a work of reason, and reason also has its proper arts. They are the liberal arts, which have given their name to liberal education. With them man is able to "exercise his understanding" and achieve all the aims that we have just seen Adam Smith demanding. They are the essential means by which the mind develops the intellectual virtues.

This is not the place to develop a theory of the liberal arts. Nor is it really necessary so long as we understand that they are the means by which the mind is able to reach its full scope and attain that health of mind which has the name of intellectual virtue. Besides, we shall see something of their essential nature when we come to consider the means for achieving a liberal education. Here it is sufficient perhaps to call them the arts of knowing, learning and teaching. Their end is knowledge of the true. Yet they are also needed for any practical work. They are, in fact, the most essential of all man's means, since it is with and through them that man's rationality operates. We might compare them in the intellectual order to what prudence is in the moral life. Just as no moral virtue is possible without prudence which chooses the right means in accord with right appetite for the right end, so no intellectual virtue, whether art, science, understanding, or wisdom can express itself except through the liberal arts.

Such is the main objective our education should aim at on the general level. The development of the mind through the acquisition of the liberal arts, or, to put it another way, the development of

intellectual maturity and intellectual health. Of course, many sciences and arts, many different kinds of knowledge are needed for this purpose, as we shall consider in turning now to the means. But the emphasis is not upon art and science as subject-matter apart from the mind. The development of the student is the aim of education at the general level, and not the perfecting of a science or art as subject matter.

The development of the mind is an objective sufficient and good in itself. But that is not to say that many other goods do not also flow from it. Even if no other good except that of intellectual health came from it, that would be eminently worth having, since on it our misery or happiness finally depend. But it is also true that in developing the mind in the arts and virtues proper to it, a man is also preparing himself to act with intelligence in whatever field he applies himself.

So much then for the objectives of the General Program of Liberal Education. It is a *general* program because it is one program common to all entering upon it, with a prescribed series of courses. It is a program of *liberal* education since it is designed to promote the intellectual maturity and health of its students through the acquisition of the liberal arts.

***The Essential Means of a Liberal Education:
Communication or Tradition? Training or Initiation?***

There is wide-spread and fundamental disagreement today about the end of education. Among Catholics, however, there should be no such disagreement, since we do share a common idea about man. But when we come to the question of the means to achieve the end, the disagreement is still more wide-spread. Yet disagreement cannot obscure the fact that there are two basic and essential means for any educational venture: teaching and materials. The question is whether any one kind of teaching and materials is best for achieving our purpose of exercising, training, and forming the mind.

To answer that question, and I am bold enough to attempt an answer, we need first to consider the relation between teaching and materials in the light of our objective. Teaching obviously involves communication, and communication involves something to be communicated. The relation of teaching and materials is thus the problem of the relation between communication and tradition, where 'tradition' is used in its basic sense of something communicated or handed down.

Perhaps it will be best to start with an example that will show us concretely the relation between communication and tradition in training the mind. Suppose we take learning to talk, or learning a language. Here at the very minimum there are at least three elements to distinguish: 1) the one learning to talk, or the student; 2) the language that is being learned, which, as something handed down, is tradition; 3) the one using the language as something the person already has, or the teacher.

In any learning situation these three elements are present and are inseparable. It might seem at first as though the teacher were not necessary. It is true that a *living* teacher is not always needed. Yet in the sense of some one using the language who knows it, even though he may be long since dead, and his speech is present only in writing, then it is obvious that a teacher is there. The Rosetta Stone, for example, or its inscriber, was the teacher for Champollion, when he succeeded in learning the language of Egyptian hieroglyphics.

Tradition is likewise always present, although the teacher and, consequently, the learner may be more or less conscious of it. Tradition cannot be denied, it can only be neglected. Language, and the same holds true for all our arts and sciences, is a common work and a common inheritance. Cut the student off from that inheritance, and his own power and art of language will suffer. Cut

him off from it completely, and he will never be able to acquire the art of language.

Finally the third and most important element in the learning process is the student himself. He is the most important because his development, the acquirement by him of the art, is the aim and reason of the learning and teaching process. Without him no learning takes place. No one can learn to talk for him, and no matter what the teacher does, if the student never exerts himself, no learning will take place. In this sense the learner is the primary agent in learning and the teacher only an auxiliary and cooperative agent. That is why teaching, from the time of the ancients, is compared to such arts as medicine and agriculture, where it is nature, not the doctor or farmer, that is the principle of cure and growth.

This example of learning a language is true for all the liberal arts. I think it is also true for the manual, mechanical, and practical arts, i.e., for all learning. But here we are concerned only with liberal education. Immediate consequences flow from it, or can be seen in it, with regard to our problem of finding the best teaching and materials for our purpose. We can also reformulate our problem. What we want are the best means for training the student in the arts of the mind and initiating him into his tradition. Because of the inseparability of communication between student and teacher and the tradition that is being communicated, these are but two aspects of the one educational problem.

First, with regard to the problem of teaching. Since the student is the primary agent in learning, and learning is the end of teaching, that teaching will be best which most effectively actuates the learning power of the student. Here the main aim is not the selection, organization, and development of subject matter. Of course, that is involved, and we will have to return to it. But if our aim is to develop the learning powers of the student, and that must be first or no learning will take place at all, then the demands of subject-matter will not by themselves meet our need. The teaching need is first to dispose, encourage, provoke, irritate the student to learn for himself.

What this means in practice is, I am convinced, that the lecture must be abandoned as the major, if not the only, method of teaching at the college level. The lecture as a method is almost entirely dictated by the needs of subject-matter. It is proper to the university, where mastery of subject-matter, and not acquirement of the liberal arts is the main task. We Catholics need to recover our own teaching tradition in which the *disputatio* figures so largely, as we see from the works and method of St. Thomas. Behind the *disputatio* lies the whole tradition of dialectic with Socrates as its great image. It is no paradox to claim that our teaching and education would be more Thomistic if it became more Socratic. But whether Thomistic or Socratic it would be better teaching and better education.

Acting on this principle the General Program here at Notre Dame has abandoned the lecture as the primary method of teaching. In its place we have substituted what is now called the discussion-method. We limit our classes to at most twenty students. Then on the basis of the reading they have done before the meeting, the teacher and the students, and the students with one another, attack the problem raised by the text. The aim is always to make the student an active participant. To question, even to cross-examine him, to draw him out and lead him on, to test his understanding of the problem that has been proposed and the answer given to it. Our aim is to compel the student to take part—to find and see a problem, to take it apart and find the ways of tackling it, to reach a solution and then explore and defend it so as to make sure in every possible way that he has an understanding of it.

I do not mean to imply that discussion is the only method we use. It would be foolish not to use every teaching means available. But discussion is the main one, because by it there is greater chance that the student will be brought actively into the work of the classroom. The temptation of the lecture is for the student to remain a passive recorder, occasionally exercising his memory. There it is the lecturer, not the student, who is the agent and primary learner.

Emphasis upon the activity and participation of the student in learning is a real virtue of the so-

called 'progressive education.' We should give credit where credit is due, though I do not believe there is anything particularly modern or 'progressive' about it. Socrates is after all the great exemplar of the principle behind that method. Their defect, however, is in thinking that one thing is as good as another so long as activity occurs. This just is not true with regard to training the mind. Here one thing is better than another, and the problem about the 'transfer of training' should not be allowed to blind us to this fact.

Let us revert for a moment to our example of learning a language. It is perfectly possible to learn a language by studying nothing but the daily newspaper. Yet it is no less obvious that if we confine ourselves to that source, we will experience very little of the power of language, of the heights and depths of which it is capable. What is worse we will have no standard by which to judge whether the language we encounter in the prose is poor or excellent. To experience language at the height of its powers, to see how excellent it can be, to possess models that will incite us to emulation, to enable us to care and tend our language so as to preserve and foster it, we need to study the masters of the language—the great poets and prose-writers.

What is true of language is, I would claim again, true of all the arts and all the different kinds of knowledge. For training the mind, for setting a standard for all the works of the mind, nothing can take the place of the greatest works. They record the discoveries and achievements of the human spirit. They exhibit the liberal arts at the height of their power, and, in struggling to understand them, we need to employ the same arts that were used in their composition.

In brief, since learning necessarily involves tradition, the makers and recorders of that tradition should provide the materials of learning, and these are the great books. They should be used as the basic texts for the special subject matters. But before going into that question I would like to consider first the need and value of a course that cuts across and includes all the basic subject matters—a multi-discipline or non-subject matter course.

The Unity of the Mind: the Seminar

The mind has different ways of knowing. It can likewise turn its attention to different kinds of things or subject matters. Corresponding to these different ways and objects, our colleges and universities have divided into departments and organized their studies in different courses. It often seems that the division has become so hardened that communication between the various departments and courses stops. The university then ceases to be an intellectual community. In an effort to overcome the resulting 'atomization,' at least as regards the students, we then introduce new courses in 'integration.'

I think we can sympathize with the desire for integration, even if there is something comical in thinking that it can be accomplished by another 'atomic' course. 'Departmentalization' is in a real sense false to the fundamental unity of the human mind. No man in thinking and knowing acts only as a specialist. Aristotle, who is perhaps the father of our academic divisions, does not hesitate in one and the same work to speak as natural philosopher and metaphysician, as dialectician and logician, as critic of literature and historian, as moralist and even as theologian. The same is true of all of us, both teachers and students, except sometimes in our specialized courses.

Now I am not arguing that there are no distinctions between disciplines and subject-matters. But I think there should be some place in the academic curriculum where the unity of the mind may be respected and where all the basic subject matters may be looked at and considered for their own sake, rather than from the view-point of some special discipline. We would then see in a concrete fashion how one problem can be approached in many different ways and how poet and philosopher and theologian operate under different lights for various ends. Furthermore, if we read works in these different subject matters in the chronological order of their appearance, we

shall be able at the same time to gain valuable historical perspective.

This, in broad lines, sketches what the General Program is attempting in what it calls the Seminar. This is a very extensive reading course in the great books in all basic subject-matters, beginning with Homer and the ancient Greeks and coming down to Tawney and Toynbee in the present. Twice a week the students meet, usually with two of their teachers, to discuss the work they have read for that meeting. We quite frankly approach the book as Catholics of the 20th century. We want to see what it has to say to us now, whether it was written 20 years or 20 centuries ago. But for that purpose we have first to find out what it is saying, and frequently how it is saying it, i.e., by what method. Thus we are led to compare the methods of the different disciplines and of the different schools or philosophies representing the discipline.

Here, again it should be emphasized, that our main aim is developing the arts of the mind in the student: his ability to speak and think, to narrow-down a problem and explore ways of finding a solution, to understand and test the solution that is found. The aim is not primarily to 'master' the context of the book. That is the specialist's task, and already presupposes the arts of knowing and learning. Yet we are being initiated into the tradition of the Western World through reading and discussing the books of the Western Tradition. We meet the problems that have confronted men in the past and still confront them, the solutions that have been given and are still being given. Our aim is thus in one sense to understand ourselves and our society better. We are learning something of what has been called the "received idea of the good." Since we read as Catholics and Americans we constantly find that our own 'presuppositions' are being challenged. In meeting that challenge and in studying as a leading part of our reading the classics of our Catholic tradition, we are deepening our understanding of Christian democracy.

One of the greatest services performed by the Seminar is the opening and enlarging of the student's intellectual world. It is one of the most effective means of arousing and exciting the student to learn, and, with that, all the rest of the educational task is greatly simplified. No less important is the opportunity that the Seminar offers the faculty. All college teachers now have been trained as specialists. The Seminar, in cutting across all subject-matters, takes the teacher outside his 'field'. It enables him to read and contemplate many of the great works he had always meant to read but for one reason or another 'had never got around to.' In this way the Seminar provides a unique way for the college teacher to continue learning in liberal education and not just in the field of his specialty. At the very least it assures a minimum of common acquaintance with certain books in all subject-matters for the faculty. Such common acquaintance should not be minimized as affording a basis for the intellectual community which the college stands for.

The Basic Disciplines and Subject-Matters

Let us turn now to the basic subject-matters and disciplines by which the mind is trained in the liberal arts. The liberal arts like any art need a material or context in which to exist. As I have already claimed, certain disciplines are better than others for acquiring the arts. This is to say, that although the human mind is a fundamental unity, there are certain basic ways by which it operates. These ways provide a 'natural' division for 'courses' by which the arts may be acquired: what in the General Program we call the Tutorials.

This is not the occasion for attempting to argue and prove the existence of basic kinds of knowing. I shall have to limit myself almost entirely to exposition. Yet I believe that we will admit that there are differences between such things as a theological exposition and a metaphysical argument, the determination of a moral good, a political appeal, and an historical narrative, a mathematical demonstration, a scientific analysis, and a poem. The simplest test of their difference is that we cannot read them in the same way without badly misunderstanding them. A poem, for example, demands a different kind of reading from a metaphysical argument, and a mathematical

demonstration is something else again.

The fact that we can talk about all of them as involving reading means, of course, that there is something common to them. All involve symbols and structures. The symbols, whether verbal or formal, present ideas, conjunctions of ideas in judgments, and structures of judgments in arguments or rational wholes. These symbols and structures function upon a certain subject-matter or for the sake of knowing and dealing with certain great objects, viz. man, the world, and God. Yet these symbols can and need to be studied in themselves. This need provides us with our first basic discipline or subject matter.

I should say rather, *two* basic disciplines or subject-matters. For among these symbols we can distinguish two different kinds: what I referred to above as verbal or formal symbols. They might also be called linguistic and mathematical. At any rate, this difference in the kind of symbols involved gives rise to two different kinds of arts: the linguistic and the mathematical arts, corresponding to the Trivium and Quadrivium of Mediaeval fame.

Both these arts provide knowledge of symbols and structures as well as facility and power in their use. This is the reason, I suppose, why some colleges allow their students to elect either language or mathematics for concentrated work. Frankly, I think this is a mistake. Both arts are necessary. Although in some sense, mathematics, as Willard Gibbs declared, is also a language, the two kinds of arts finally move in different directions, while remaining mutually attractive and beneficial. That difference appears in the distinction between the language of the book of men and that of the book of nature. Our verbal language, insofar as it tends towards the production of a structure that can exist for its own sake without any reference to anything beyond itself, approaches the poem as its limit. That is why T.S. Eliot can claim that the poets are always the particular custodians of language. Mathematics, on the other hand, insofar as it tends to build all its structures and symbols on the whole numbers, tends toward the apprehension of the metaphysical one, and for this reason approaches science, and beyond that metaphysical as its term.

Language

Two of the four Tutorials that run through the four years of the General Program are devoted to the linguistic and the mathematical arts. The Language Tutorial during the first two years is primarily concerned in gaining understanding and facility in what are now called the 'Communications' arts, and formally, Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic. For this purpose we utilize Latin and French along with English on the ground that more effective understanding of language can be gained from the comparison and contrasts that a classical and a modern foreign tongue can provide with our own. Although we concentrate on Latin the first and French the second year, the study of the foreign language is not divorced from that of English. Thus in effect we have combined the usual Freshman composition with the foreign language course.

The entire aim of the first two years is to gain facility and power in the use of language. We do not aim at any more than a reading knowledge of French or of liturgical Latin and depend to some extent on the use of these languages later on in Philosophy and Theology. With a minimum of grammatical drill in the narrow sense, our students read, analyze, and imitate selections in Latin and French of works that they have read in the Seminar in translation. Special care is taken to select texts that will illustrate the different uses of language as it is ordered to different purposes: the difference, for example, between a poetic and a scientific use of language.

With two years apprenticeship in the linguistic arts, the last two years are devoted to a consideration of language as an instrument for production and knowledge: in the third year to poetry and the problem of poetic knowledge, and in the fourth to logic and linguistic.

Mathematics and Science

The second of the symbolic disciplines—mathematics—deserves a place in the liberal college for the same reason that language does. Being concerned with the symbols and structures that the mind uses in knowing, its first purpose is to provide the mind with power and facility over its own operations. That is why mathematics is a liberal art. It frees the mind from subjection to its own tools.

But, in addition to this, mathematics enjoys a particular advantage of great importance. Of all the ways of knowing, it provides the clearest and simplest example of science. In mathematics, if no where else, it should be possible to show what a science is. Here by *science* I mean no more than a rigorous demonstration of conclusions from principles. It is no accident that men of all philosophies, from the ancient Greeks down to the present, have always appealed to mathematics as the type of what the human mind can do in demonstration. Mathematics thus enjoys a unique advantage for showing the power of the human mind.

I am aware that it is frequently claimed that there is such a thing as a mathematical mind and that it is a matter of birth whether you happen to have one or not. I would not deny that some have more mathematical talent than others. But it is absurd to claim that any student capable of college study is unable to do mathematics. Mathematics is the clearest example of science because it is the simplest expression of the work of reason. To claim that a student is incapable of mathematics is to say that he is incapable of reasoning. If that is so, then he certainly does not belong in college.

Yet it is true that students coming to college are perhaps more poorly prepared in mathematics than in anything else. Often poor teaching has persuaded them that they do not possess 'mathematical minds.' This makes the college problem harder. It does not make it impossible. It only means that we cannot take anything for granted. But in one sense that is even an advantage. College, as distinct from preparatory, mathematics properly should be more concerned with understanding the foundations of mathematics. It is what Felix Kline called "Elementary Mathematics from an Advanced Standpoint" in the title of one of his books. In one sense this means seeing the presuppositions and all that is involved in geometry and arithmetic as science. It means starting from the beginning, and this makes it possible for even students with poor preparation to embark upon college mathematics.

To achieve these purposes the General Program begins mathematics with geometry as presented in the unexpurgated and unabridged Euclid. Geometry offers the advantage over arithmetic as a beginning since it has the intuitive appeal of imaginative illustrations. The student can picture the magnitudes studied. Euclid possesses the additional advantage of being the first to present geometry as a deductive axiomatic science. Taught with the modern developments in mind, Euclid is not archaic or antiquarian, and it is possible for anyone to read and understand him. After the study of Euclid, with particular emphasis upon the structure of his work and facility in following and reproducing his various kinds of proof, we go on to the study of number systems upon an axiomatic basis. Here we see how it is possible to do for the various kinds of numbers what Euclid did with magnitudes. At the same time, through experience with real numbers and the limit concept we are laying the foundation for the calculus, which is studied in the second year. The students then have the essential tool for advancing, in the third year to the study of physical science. The fourth year of the mathematics-science tutorial is devoted to biological science.

The Sciences

In discussing mathematics as science and, especially in widening the notion of science to include the empirical in physics and biology, it is obvious that we have passed beyond concern with symbols and structures as such. We are also dealing with subject-matter and the basic ways

of knowing. This is only to note again that the works of the mind cannot be 'departmentalized' in exclusive divisions. Even in discussing the fundamental arts of dealing with symbols and structures we are bound to deal with subject-matters and the ways of knowing. Let us turn then to consider the basic kinds of knowing and their meaning for the liberal college curriculum.

The first and most general distinction among the ways of knowing is determined by which of two questions we are asking: 'Do we want to know what is the case?' or is our concern rather 'what should be?' The questions are different, and answers to them involve different kinds of knowing. In one the nature of the thing is the principle; in the other the end or good is the principle of knowledge. The distinction of these two kinds of knowledge is frequently made today in terms of 'descriptive' and 'normative' science. The ancient distinction between theoretical and practical knowledge, however, is more accurate, according as our knowledge is ordered in the one case to knowing and the other case to doing, or making.

The posing of the two questions indicates at once the order of any systematic study of them. The answer to the question of 'what should be' already presupposes an answer to the question of 'what is.' In other words, practical knowledge derives, or presupposes, principles from theoretic knowledge. In terms of the curriculum this means that practical science, which includes what are now called the social sciences, should come at the latter half of the period of study.

The human mind, however, possesses two different sources for the principles of its knowledge. One is the unaided light of human reason, the other the gift of God through faith and Revelation. Neither must be neglected, and it is the great advantage of the Catholic college that the religious source is sure of its place. Nor should the two be confused. This is particularly true in our time when we can no longer count on a common acceptance of our religious heritage.

Our preliminary distinction thus provides a two-fold division, each part of which is double. On one side is the need for developing the mind in the disciplines proper to theoretic knowledge according as its principles are derived from reason or from faith. On the other side is the need for the disciplines proper to practical knowledge as its principles derive from reason for faith.

Practical Science

Each of these major divisions needs further sub-divisions before we reach the level of the curriculum. Let us start with practical knowledge, as the simplest to explain even though it comes later as derivative. The two great concerns of our practical knowledge, the two great objects about which man possesses some hope of working improved, are self and society. Accordingly there is a 'natural' division of practical knowledge into what may be called Ethics, or the study of the perfection of the human person, and Politics, or the study of the perfection of society, each divided according to the source of its principles in reason or faith. Thus in the General Program the systematic study of Ethics is taken up in the third year in what we call the Philosophy and Theology tutorials, the one being primarily concerned with the nature and development of the natural human good through moral virtue and the other with the supernatural good of the human person through the theological virtues. In the fourth year politics is studied in the Philosophy Tutorial primarily as the nature and structure of the democratic state and in the Theology Tutorial in the Church as a society and its social teaching. I should note that though the name Philosophy Tutorial is used, the General Program does not hesitate to employ in these practical studies much of what now goes by the name of social science.

Theoretical Science

As we turn now to theoretical knowledge, we face a more complex task. Not only because theoretical knowledge is more complex than practical science, but also because its study is not so

readily adapted to separate courses. It tends of its nature to penetrate through many different approaches. Yet the major distinctions are clear enough. The mind, in seeking to know 'what is the case,' has three alternatives: 1) It can seek to know things as they are involved in matter and in which some knowledge of sensible matter is necessarily involved. Let us call this the realm of Natural Science, using the term in this broadest sense. 2) The mind can seek to know things as involved in order and relation, or under the aspect of quantity, as the scholastics say. This is the realm of Mathematical Science. 3) Finally, the mind can seek to know things, abstracted from both sensible matter and quantity, as enjoying being and existence. This is the realm of Metaphysical Science.

If we take these three in their full comprehension and extension, we have all the basic ways of knowing as science—the ways by which the reason perfects itself in rational knowledge. There is still another kind of knowledge, but it is intuitive rather than scientific. We meet it in metaphysics, in poetry, and in the spiritual life.

With these major principles, it is comparatively simple to indicate the rest of the disposition of the General Program. The way of knowing in Natural Science is begun the first year in the Philosophy Tutorial with the study of the principles common to all the natural world: nature, change and motion, time and place, etc. It is continued the second year in the study of the mathematics necessary for the scientific analysis of motion, i.e., the calculus. The third year considers natural science in the inorganic world through the study modern physics, and in the organic world in the fourth year in the tutorial in biology, including psychology.

Mathematical science has already been described in connection with our consideration of mathematics as a liberal art. However, it should be noted that the General Program returns to the logical side of mathematics again in the fourth-year Language Tutorial, which is concerned with logic as a science.

Metaphysical science is begun in the second year in the Philosophy Tutorial and in the Theology Tutorial, where God and Creation are the principal problems of study. The third and fourth year Seminar is devoted extensively to philosophy, so that Metaphysical science is again of major concern.

Summary View of Curriculum

In summary, the curriculum of the General Program has been presented here as consisting of three distinct elements:

- 1) The Seminar, consisting of reading and discussion of great books in all basic subject matters: theology, philosophy, science, and imaginative literature.
- 2) The Liberal Arts of symbolic and structural analysis in language and mathematics: the Language and Mathematics Tutorials.
- 3) Basic ways of knowing and subject-matters:
 - a) Theoretical knowledge, consisting of Natural Science, Mathematical Science, and Metaphysical Science, from both the principles of reason and of faith.
 - b) Practical knowledge, consisting of Ethics and Politics, again from the principles of both reason and faith.

Several cases of over-lapping have occurred in following this division. There are actually many more than have been particularly noted. It must be remembered that the subject-matters that have particular Tutorials for their systematic study are also constantly coming up for discussion in the Seminar, and also in the Language Tutorial, at least during the first two years. Over-lapping is perhaps the wrong word; inter-penetration or cross-fertilization are better. The General Program consciously endeavors to provide the students with an experience as broad and as high as humanity's intellectual endeavors and achievements. Its aim is to help students to carry on what

Mr. Hutchins has called, "clear and intrepid thinking about fundamental issues."

Although I am aware that I have greatly stretched your patience, there is much I have left out. I only hope that I have not omitted what is essential to give you some acquaintance with the General Program. If I have succeeded in communicating its ideal, our fundamental objective and the basic means for achieving it, then you know what the General Program is. The rest, the details, can be left for discussion another time.

Edward Hopper: Reflections and Rewards

by Heather Ingraham

[Editor's Note: For this essay, Heather Ingraham was awarded the 1989 "Cronin Award," given each year to the student whose essay is judged to be best among all those nominated by the faculty. Heather will pursue an M.A.T. degree next year at the University of Chicago in preparation for teaching literature at the secondary level.]

Edward Hopper is often credited with being one of America's greatest realist painters. From his early career as a graphic illustrator, to his etchings and prints, and finally to his career as an oil painter, Hopper exhibits a careful eye for detail and a keen precision that hones those details down to their essential elements. This is one reason for the immediate impact of his work; Hopper's simple geometry and bold use of color are others. His close attention to the commonplace details of life in America, right down to the cornices and windowframes of turn-of-the-century buildings, has gained him the reputation of a precursor to the photorealists.

Yet Hopper is as much a master of psychological manipulation as of realistic detail. His works reveal a repressed emotion totally unexpected in compositions of such light and order. Partly due to the subject matter, partly due to the technique, and largely due to his habit of painting "with the intellect as master" so as to challenge the viewer," Hopper creates works that inspire a peculiar—and maddening—tension in the viewer.¹ He achieves this tension by deliberately evoking a set of standard expectations and then thwarting them—not by crushing them, but by introducing so many nagging doubts that any certainty of interpretation is hopelessly undermined. This careful emotional manipulation is significant enough to and make one feel uncomfortable in calling Hopper "merely an objective realist:" he makes the ordinary too extraordinary to be given such a careless and limiting label.²

The initial analysis of any work, of course, begins with the artist's use of color, line, form, light, and subject matter. With Hopper, as with most notable artists, entire volumes could be filled on any one of these topics, but as this is not the aim of this paper, it may be helpful to call attention to "the often noted intensity of his works, achieved by sharp color contrasts, vivid light or absolute darkness, surprising angles of vision, abrupt croppings, and obtrusive geometry."³ Even a brief overview of Hopper's works, in a variety of media including watercolors, etchings, drypoint, and oils, reveals a remarkable (sometimes annoying) uniformity of approach and clarity of vision. In terms of color, Hopper is unafraid to employ a dark palette, despite the emphasis on light of the Impressionist movement—still a strong influence in Hopper's time. Hopper's colors do have their emotional effects: their primary value seems to be in the psychological tension they create between sinister darkness and innocent light. The bright, clear red of the dresses of many of Hopper's women is not so much a testimony to their innocence as to their pluck in attempting to stave off the darkness.

Hopper uses bright red in the face of approaching (or omnipresent) darkness in such paintings as *Gas* and *Nighthawks*. But it is not unusual to see the inverse, wherein a predominantly light painting is punctuated with patches of sinister blackness, as in *House by the Railroad*, with its peculiar triangle, or *Hotel Room*. These black shapes are emphasized "through the absoluteness of their blackness, their severe geometry, and their two-dimensionality that makes them appear first

1 J.A. Ward, *American Silences*, p. 173.

2 Lloyd Goodrich, *Edward Hopper*, p. 15.

3 Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

as geometrical figures.”⁴ In these cases the mysterious patches seem to bring the depths of a black void directly into the otherwise innocuous life of the building. The play of bright against dull allows him to incorporate contrasting colors and corresponding tensions: a spell-binding and carefully crafted phenomenon. Overall, Hopper’s use of color is “arresting—a spectrum-like range that could be gaudy, but is both vital and balanced.”⁵

Related to the psychological effects of color and darkness is Hopper’s use of light. Unlike the light of the Impressionists, Hopper’s light is rarely soft or diffuse, tending instead to a harshness that leaves no room for blurred distinctions. Oftentimes, it acts on the paintings’ inhabitants like the lighting of a stage. The broad, spotlight-like wash of *Sunlight in a Cafeteria*, or the concentrated light of *Night Windows* makes this readily apparent through the attention it calls to normally insignificant daily actions. At other times the light takes on almost human characteristics: the shafts of sunlight on the floor of *Sun in an Empty Room* recall the sound of someone padding across the room in stocking feet, even as they throw the angular corners of the room into preternaturally sharp focus.

Nor is Hopper’s light necessarily focused on people: sometimes it seems to pour quite innocently over studies of architecture. Hopper, in fact, is almost obsessed with the play of light over architecture: he once built a cardboard model of a house in order to see exactly how the light and shadow looked. Yet Hopper is remarkably restrained in his use of light, in that he does not use it to pass judgment on the subject matter—which is not to say that he remains purely objective. Instead, the preternatural brightness of his light (he seldom mixed it with yellow, which is a common practice designed to “soften” light), together with the apparent straightforwardness of the architecture, evokes a kind of odd suspicion. Everything seems a little *too* pristine, a little *too* harmless. For such natural, “unaltered” light, it is almost disturbingly expressive. What does Hopper say about the matter? “What I wanted to do was paint sunlight on the side of a house.”⁶

As far as subject matter, much attention has been given to Hopper’s concentration on the city, particularly the American city. Like certain authors of the period, Hopper calls attention to precisely those elements of daily life most likely to be ignored: the sidewalks, the roofs of factories, the ornament on the tenement building windows. “By sympathy with the particular [and enlarging the scale] he has made it epic and universal.”⁷ (Take for instance his paintings of skylights and factory roofs.) This at least is the “objective” subject matter—what the viewer sees in the painting. But Hopper, like most artists, often has a second subject matter, located beneath or beyond the surface, extending directly into the mind of the viewer.

The subject matter is brought directly into the viewer’s mind through careful compositions. It has often been remarked that Hopper’s canvases are remarkably still: silence is almost a tangible element of the works. Yet Hopper’s paintings “suggest little of the calmness, tranquility, [and] placidity commonly associated with” stillness.⁸ Instead, the stillness creates an overwhelming impression that something is about to happen—or else that it has just happened, in which case we want to find out what it was. In either case, the viewer cannot tear himself away from the half-withheld promise of action.

Hopper’s masterful control of psychological elements—and therefore of the viewer—should make one hesitant to call Hopper a realist, even though (art-) historically, the label is appropriate. Hopper does too much in his paintings to manipulate the way we perceive them to be simply a recorder of reality. The artist states this explicitly when he says many of his images are “a

4 *Ibid.*, p. 181.

5 Goodrich, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 31.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 101.

8 Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

synthesis of many impressions;" further, when asked where the subject of a particular painting was, Hopper answered (pointing to his forehead), "In here."⁹ This forthright statement seems to make ridiculous the project of one of the books I encountered in writing this paper, the author of which (G. Levin) had gone about identifying and photographing several of the places and houses Hopper had painted, as if to prove somehow that he was a literal observer.

I strongly disagree. There are too many ways in which Hopper plays with details, overemphasizes light and shadow, manipulates scale and stature, for him to be a literal painter. One of the most vividly effective arguments against Hopper's supposed realism is the blatantly unrealistic placement of the observer in so many of his works. "Viewers are located uncomfortably in space," and put in positions that "could not be occupied by actual human beings."¹⁰ Again and again the viewer is located in the upper corner of a ceiling (*Office At Night*), floating in space above a street (*Night Shadows*), hanging precariously from a fire escape, or at best leaning dangerously far out of a window. The effect of this is to make the viewer dreadfully uncomfortable, crammed into corners or dangling unnoticed—always with the fear that he will soon be noticed—as he witnesses the actions in the rooms. This, combined with other factors like the indisputably subjective response engendered by the characteristics of the "objective" architecture, should be ample proof that Hopper is no literal realist. "For all his realism, Hopper was essentially a poet," states one author; and his close attention to detail, "rather than conceal[ing] the falsifications in time and space. . . exaggerates them."¹¹

The previous paragraph mentions the viewer's fear of being noticed: there is a strong and repeated element of voyeurism in Hopper's work. To some extent this effect is heightened by the frequent inclusion of unclothed women, but there are other influences as well. One of these is the manner in which the people go about their activities completely unaware that they are being observed. Such is the case with *Office At Night* and *Apartment Houses*. Sometimes the people in the painting seem genuinely unconscious of anything being wrong: these are the easiest works to view. At other times, however, the characters look anxious, as if they suspect something might be amiss, but cannot quite identify it. The peculiar effect of this is to make the viewer start looking over his own shoulder to see who might be watching *him*.

Indeed, the peculiar thing about Hopper's voyeurism is the discomfort it arouses in the viewer. The erotic thrill is kept to a minimum, for many times the women seem lumpish or stiff rather than exceptionally attractive. The strange vantage points granted to the viewer (cramped in the corner of a room, attached somehow to the ceiling, peering out one window into another at such an angle as to be in danger of falling) put him at immediate risk of discovery—or even physical injury. And yet the hope of seeing something forbidden, something illicit, prevents the viewer from simply looking away. It is one of several ways Hopper builds tension into a canvas. (The discomfort of the viewer may also have something to do with Hopper's own experience; hating to be observed when drawing, he sketched some of the apartments he used for *Night Windows* from inside his car, to the consternation of the apartment-dwellers, who several times called the police to investigate the man who sat for hours at a time looking up at them from his car.)

Strangely, the voyeurism never discloses anything sordid. The only actions our closet vigilance ever uncovers are ones almost outstanding in their sheer normality: a woman's backside presented almost comically to the window as she bends to undress, a maid making a bed, and similarly banal situations. The most we can hope for is that something will happen. Yet there is an undeniable excitement that accompanies our viewing. This seems to result from the ambiguity of the motions we see. This is most vividly depicted in the etching *Evening Wind*, where we are unsure whether

⁹ Goodrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 130, 132.

¹⁰ Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

¹¹ Goodrich, *op. cit.*, p. 108; Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

the woman is just crawling into bed when the curtains flutter, or if she's been in bed for a while and is now getting up to close the window.¹² The viewer watches with anticipation to find out whatever he can.

The discussion has covered some of the ways Hopper makes the viewer unwilling to tear himself away from the painting, and the strongest pull seems to be created through enticing the viewer to stay and see what happens next. How is it that so many of Hopper's paintings create this sense of anticipation so vividly? One of the ways, according to Hopper himself, is through the composition. In several of his works there is a strong horizontal thrust—the railing of a bridge, a sidewalk, a windowsill. “They are like the edge of a stage beyond which drama unfolds.”¹³ This effect is most deliberate in works like *Manhattan Bridge and Lilly Apartments* and *From Williamsburg Bridge*.

Anticipation is also subtly suggested through Hopper's fascination with early morning scenes. The paintings of deserted morning streets illustrate this especially well: although there is literally *nothing* happening on the canvas, the inevitable association with the stillness of early morning is of promise at the beginning of a new day. In some respects this is almost ironic, given the rather stolid looking buildings, none of which seems a likely source of hope. Further, the looking-forward of dawn is balanced by a looking-back, to the night before, in such works as *Sunday* and *Early Sunday Morning*. These paintings also raise significant questions: Was the night before in wild contrast to the stillness of the morning? Or was it equally still and unpopulated? Again, Hopper anticipates the viewer's hopeful associations, then sows such persistent doubts that any certainty for either a positive or negative reading is rendered impossible. The viewer cannot know for certain, and once again is left shifting impatiently in forced indecision.

This applies equally well to his paintings of women in apartments. Hopper has created several paintings where a woman, almost always unclothed, stands or sits before a window and looks outward. Oddly, the voyeuristic effect is gone in these morning paintings—perhaps because we tend to associate daylight with a sort of honesty and safety. At any rate, these paintings more than any others develop a sense of anticipation and hope—but also of guardedness, resignation, and the inability or unwillingness to change. The tendencies toward hope and resignation exist side-by-side in many of Hopper's paintings, creating a deliberate tension.

The hopeful anticipations of morning are perhaps best expressed in a painting like *Morning in the City*. Here a woman stands facing the window, holding up a towel as if folding it after her bath. Her face seems relatively unconcerned and relaxed, and her towel evokes the symbolic absolution of bathing. Portrayed in a moment of unconscious reflection, the woman pauses momentarily and looks out the window before continuing her morning activities. Her nakedness implies a vulnerability and innocence that impart a hopeful reading of the work: she seems free of any bitterness or resignation, and her life looks forward even as she faces forward into the light, completely open to the possibilities of the day.

One receives a different impression from *Eleven A.M.* As the title indicates, this hour is hardly the break of dawn, and yet the woman is still undressed and her room disordered. She appears to have begun dressing—her shoes are on—but that is as far as she has gotten. She seems lost in a reverie of looking out the window, perhaps watching the progress of other peoples' activities even as she takes no action within her own life. The promise of a new day seems lost on her due to her unwillingness or inability to make good on it.

Two other paintings that command our attention are *A Woman in the Sun* and *High Noon*. The first of these, with the sunlight slanting in and the self-assured, uncompromising stance of the

¹² Admittedly this is not a voyeuristic work, despite the presence of a nude; we are (probably) somewhere in the room with her.

¹³ Museum of Modern Art exhibition catalogue, *Edward Hopper*, p. 14.

woman, seems the portrait of a savvy individual taking a moment before embarking on her plans for the day. And yet the expression on her face looks a bit jaded; she seems almost rueful as she stands next to her rumpled bed, naked in a patch of sunlight, smoking her cigarette. One wonders what happened the night before. Perhaps the two hills reclining together outside her window offer a clue; perhaps they possess a permanence in their relationship which she does not in her own—but again we are only guessing. And the strength of her posture and her pride in her physical appearance tend to undermine any attempts to view her as a broken-down woman who has seen too many one-night stands.

High Noon is another fascinating work offering little clue for a single correct interpretation. Here is a woman dressed only in a blue robe and shoes, standing in the doorway of a house in the full light of day. Her position between light and shadow is an ambiguous one: her bared right breast, coolly inviting stance, and state of semi-undress make us wonder what she has been doing. And yet the colors of the painting are among the brightest and most innocuous that Hopper has ever employed. Further, her face is inclined slightly upward, so that she is looking at the source of light. And yet she (or the house at least) seems totally alone on a vast prairie. What is she doing there? Perhaps she is a farm wife, enjoying the delights of connubial bliss with her husband, and is now taking in the view of their land with the assurance of rightful ownership. But shouldn't her husband (and she herself) be working? Perhaps she is a siren of sorts, luring the unwary traveler out of the light and into the darkness of the house's interior. Plainly, and to his infinite frustration, the viewer does not and cannot know.

This tension of not knowing is a crucial one in Hopper; it is also an unexpected one given the emphasis on light, order, and composition. All of these elements lead the viewer to expect that he can be sure of the meaning of what he sees. Yet this is obviously not the case in Hopper's art. The certainty of seeing—which we have come to regard as the most reliable and objective of our senses, and which is consciously evoked by Hopper—is constantly undermined. The viewer is *not* certain how to interpret what he sees: there are too many conflicting clues. This strange upheaval of the conventional associations of vision extends also to the symbolic value of windows in art. Of Hopper's windows it has been said that they "are most often bolder than the houses that contain them."¹⁴ For this reason it is worth concentrating on the use and symbolic value of windows in Hopper's art.

Windows are commonly associated with eyes, and nowhere is this more apparent than in *House by the Railroad*. This strange apparition of a house, with its grandiose Victorian-influenced architecture, is all the stranger for its location in the middle of nowhere. To some extent the house seems innocuous, with its whiteness and position in the sunlight. And yet, in another way, it seems almost like a frog: large and lumpy, with big eyes, only in this case all of the lumps have become eyes as well. The house is a study in eyes. In some respects this doubtless pertains to Hopper himself: it is obvious that he is a master of observation. In another respect, however, the superabundance of eyes is ridiculous: what is there, in that vast prairie, for the house to look out over?

This last element calls to mind another commonly held notion: that the windows of a building are the windows to the world. In this respect a great deal of Hopper's art may be read optimistically: look at all the examples of people looking out their windows at the world! But the viewer must ask what it is that the people are seeing. In several instances, the windows look out onto the city: buildings, railroad tracks, other city dwellers hurrying about their business, more buildings. Oftentimes, the windows look out upon other windows, which in their socket-like stare seem to say, "Nothing more interesting here than what you've got there; keep your eyes to yourself."

¹⁴ Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

Even the woman in *Morning in the City* seems to be subconsciously aware of this: many people see her holding up the towel as a way of protecting herself from the prying "eyes" of the building across the street. At other times, as in *Hotel Room*, the window discloses only infinite blackness: hardly an encouraging prospect. The emphasis on hotels should suggest rest, travel, recreation, new places worth seeing. Instead, the general lack of scenery (consider *Hotel By A Railroad*) seems to suggest that location does not really matter: if the view is dissatisfactory (and most would agree that it is), then the fault lies with the viewer. All that anyone will ever see through a window is "quiet, lonely, and obscure defeats, those which have happened, are happening, or are about to happen."¹⁵ This is a most discouraging reading.

Regardless of the view afforded by them, however, there seems to be some worth in at least being responsive to windows. One of the bleakest and most claustrophobic of all Hopper's works is the deathly closed-in *Chair Car*: the windows themselves are an opaque pasty mud color, and no one even attempts to look out. And yet the light patterns on the floor indicate that this is not a subway train, and that therefore something should be visible through the windows. Even more so than a hotel room, a train suggests unusual and picturesque scenery: why then is no one looking out? In *Sunlight in a Cafeteria* and *Morning Sun*, Hopper demonstrates that even when the view is not particularly appealing, there is still something life-giving about the sunlight pouring in through them; it can add an element of brightness and purity to an otherwise routine and unadorned existence.

It is the potential, always the potential, that strikes such a sympathetic—and yet frustrating—chord for the viewer of Hopper's works. *Room in Brooklyn* demonstrates perhaps more than any other the simultaneous promise and futility of looking out a window. The woman sitting in the chair commands a view over the rooftops of the other buildings of the city; she has a vase full of flowers and a tidy apartment. She is probably well off. The sky outside is a beautiful blue, and the sun comes in warmly through the side window.

One can read this painting positively, and say that she must be a lucky woman to have such a beautiful and commanding view of the city, and that the world is (symbolically) at her feet. Such a reading is supported by a look at the Christmas card Hopper designed for his wife-to-be: the two are depicted reclining in a window looking out at the moonlit skyline of Paris. But one can also, and with some justification in light of the pollution and shabbiness of many older cities, grumble about having only row after endless row of identical buildings and smokestacks to look out upon. Nor do we receive any clue from the woman as to what she sees: we cannot be sure whether she is looking out the window at all—she may be knitting or reading.

And so it is that Hopper leaves us hanging in the balance: he offers clues, but never a resolution, as to the proper interpretation of his works. Many people find them bleak and discouraging, and with good reason. In more recent times, people have been attracted to the nostalgic depictions of the people and architecture of the early part of the century; but this is to overlook the carefully constructed psychological tensions in Hopper's work. I myself am fascinated by these tensions even though I often find the paintings themselves rather repetitious. "It is true that his design has definite limitations: it is based largely on straight lines and seldom uses curvilinear elements; it is predominantly horizontal, though with strong vertical forms; it is relatively static, lacking fluidity, and restricted in movement; and it employs certain devices again and again."¹⁶ In spite of these faults, Hopper's paintings are exceptionally powerful, almost physically so, and his art holds forth both a challenge and a wistfulness that I find very appealing.

The potential for hope is there, even if it is never actualized; and the subject matter has, for me at least, always held a certain promise of growth and discovery. For this reason I do not find the

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

¹⁶ Goodrich, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

concentration on old trains, rusted tracks, and steel towns depressing: these are remnants of an age when the country was growing rapidly, and if we have not lived up to all the promises that were made then, we are perhaps a little wiser for it. Similarly, the people in the Depression-era diners and drugstores are a testimony to the hardiness and spirit of the American people; if this is a romanticized view, then consider that even if they do not notice the details of their surroundings, Edward Hopper certainly does. This in itself is encouraging, and reminds us to look among the commonplace details of our own lives for the surprises they may afford.

Hopper's work is evocative of these and other feelings, and the tensions in his work serve mainly to hold and extend my interest. Those who find his work depressing are unfortunate, in that they miss out on its austere beauty; those who view it nostalgically miss the deeper associations. Hopper's much-vaunted "realism" serves largely to add concreteness to the precision of his psychological view: Hopper himself wrote that his efforts had been attempts "to force this unwilling medium of paint and canvas into a record of [his] emotions."¹⁷ His work challenges the viewer, and what Hopper says of art might also apply as an approach to life: "the province of art is to react to [life] and not to shun it."¹⁸ Ultimately, his work provokes "an attempt to grasp again the surprise and accidents of nature, and a more intimate and sympathetic study of its moods, together with a renewed wonder and humility on the part of such as are still capable of these basic reactions."¹⁹ And in this statement we may find a clue to the people looking out the windows: Hopper is no depicter of static "reality"—he is urging us, through the power of his images, to live actively.

Bibliography

- Goodrich, Lloyd. *Edward Hopper*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc. (not dated).
- Levin, Gail. *Edward Hopper: The Complete Prints*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company and Whitney Museum of Art, 1979.
- Levin, Gail. *Hopper's Places*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985.
- Museum of Modern Art. *Edward Hopper* (Exhibition catalogue.) New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1933.
- Ward, J.A. *American Silences: The Realism of James Agee, Walker Evans, and Edward Hopper*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985.

¹⁷ MOMA, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

¹⁸ Goodrich, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

¹⁹ MOMA, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

Alumnae/i News

Editor's note: Please write your class correspondent. We continue to need class correspondents for some years.

Class of 1955

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

Class of 1957

Tom O'Bryan is currently a lawyer, living at 5320 No. Sheridan Road, Chicago 60640. He would like a paper in *Programma* on the Bahia Faith.

Class of 1958

(Class Correspondent: Michael J. Crowe, PLS, U. of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556)
Robert Bowman continues to run an in-patient psychiatric clinic in Fayette County, Penn. as well as having a private practice. He and Clare are the parents of a lawyer, Mary Alice (PLS '85) and have a second offspring, Patrick, currently enrolled in Law School.

Class of 1960

(Class Correspondent: Anthony Intinoli, Jr. 555 Santa Clara Street,
P. O. Box 3068, Vallejo, CA 94590)

Class of 1963

Bill Moran is the Regional Inspector General for the Department of Health & Human Services, U.S. Government. He plays soccer, participates in men's discussion group, and pays bills for children's college education. His addresses are (H) 221 Lawndale, Wilmette, IL 60091, (W) 105 W. Adams, 23 Floor, Chicago, IL 60603.

Class of 1966

Jack Pigman is a lawyer for Porter Wright, Morris & Arthur in Columbus, OH. His address is 6251 Deeside Dr., Dubun, OH 43017.

Class of 1967

(Class Correspondent: Robert W. McClelland, P. O. Box 1407, Muncie, IN 47307-0407)

Class of 1968

James Ewing is the Principal for Spring Avenue School in LaGrange, IL. His address is 6715 Breckenridge Rd., Lisle, IL 60532.

Class of 1970

William Maloney is an Ophthalmologist (cataract and refractive surgeon). He enjoys teaching, the arts, and skiing. His address is 2023 W. Vista Way, Suite A, Vista, CA 92083.

Class of 1971

(Class Correspondent: Raymond J. Condon, 2700 Addison Ave., Austin, TX 78757)

Added by PLS Office:

Robert Baxter is an attorney with Partner in Capehart & Scatchurd, Mt. Laurel, NJ, and he enjoys offshore sailing. His address is 410 Strawbridge Ave., Westmont, NJ 08108.

Class of 1972

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

Added by PLS Office:

Michael Ward is an attorney. His address is 1012 Mulford St., Evanston, IL 60202.

Class of 1973

(Class Correspondents: John Astuno, 1775 Sherman St. #1325, Denver, CO 80203-4316
and John Burkley, 1643 Barrington Road, Columbus, OH 43221)

Added by PLS Office:

Dave Carlyle is a Family Physician. His address is RR 1, Woodlyn Hills, Algona, IA 50511.

Class of 1974

Joseph Griffin is the Campus Minister at Central Michigan University. His address is 1405 S. Washington, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48858.

Class of 1976

Rev. James Gray, S.J. completed his long novitiate with the Jesuits, and was ordained in December of 1988. He serves in the inner city parishes of Detroit.

Congratulations to Andrew Panelli on his promotion to Direction of Planning at South Bend's Mastic Corporation.

Class of 1978

Carl Muñana is the general manager for J.P. Morgan's Mexico Office. He is sitting on the edge of promise or pestilence in the world's largest city. His address is c/o J.P. Morgan, 23 Wall Street, New York, NY 10015

Class of 1979

(Class Correspondent: Thomas J. Livingston, 517 Fordham Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15226)

I would wait until after our reunion in June to write this, but my deadline is May 15th . . . so here goes . . . In New York City, Bob Massa is more accustomed to deadlines than most of us; he writes for the *Village Voice*—mostly about the theatre, but lately he's turned his professional attention to "medical issues". Forgive these cryptic designations. I'd say more if I knew more—where are those cards and letters?

Have we all not wondered—were we all not trained to wonder—just what makes a book great? I don't know the answer, but may I suggest a book to add to the List? *The Time-Life Complete Book of Home Repair*. Here's why: in the Adams-Morgan section of Our Nation's Capital, Bill Baker, who is an attorney with the Enforcement Division of the SEC, owns a home—a cooperative, and around that home, his copy of *The Book* serves him well. Anyway, one day last summer, when Bill was in Newport, RI, who should he chance to meet? Ed and Susan Mello who, along with their three children, share a home in Marlboro, MA¹. And what book did Bill find Ed carrying? You guessed it. Is this convergence not itself a convincing sign of greatness? If that weren't enough, does the fact that a recent, but limited survey reveals that two others among us have copies clinch it? They are Bill Brittan² and Jim McLean.

Bill is a partner in the Chicago law firm of O'Connor, Schiff & Meyers. A few months ago he abandoned his rented apartment just up the alley from where John Dillinger breathed his last, and

¹ It's been blessed by Fr. Caspersen.

² The Class of '74 came lately to opt for experience over exuberance, so they placed Bill on waivers, and all we had to pay to get him back is a dollar.

bought a condominium further north and east—still in Lincoln Park.

On the outskirts of Pittsburgh, Jim and Gina McLean and their sons Jayson and Connor moved—in April of '89—into their new home in Bethel Park. Jim is an attorney with the firm of Manion, McDonough & Lucas.

By the way, this past January, Bill Baker and I flew down to Santiago, Chile where we visited Fr. Jim McDonald. A few months before us, Lise Strickler and her husband Mark Gallogly did the same. We all agree—Baker with some reservations—that Mac was a perfect host. Aside from ministering to and teaching the students at St. George's College, he has lately supervised the design and construction of a new school building on St. George's campus.³ Lise and Mark live in Manhattan's Upper West Side, and Mark is a Vice-President in the "leveraged acquisitions" division of Manufactures Hanover Trust.

I expect that, after attending the reunion and after receiving those cards and letters, I'll have plenty of information to work into the next *Programma*, but if not, I shall not hesitate to devote this entire space to a fictional account of "The Life and Times of Russell Reed King".

Added by PLS Office:

Steven Gray is an attorney. His address is 2440 Overlook Rd. #18, Cleveland Heights, OH 44106.

Edward J. Mello has a new address: 699 Hemenway Street, Marlboro, MA 01752.

Class of 1980

(Class Correspondent: Mary Schmidlein, 9077 Swan Circle, St. Louis, MO 63144)

Added by PLS Office:

Lynn Joyce Hunter is a communications coordinator, Catholic Charities, Archdiocese St. Paul-Minneapolis. She has resigned the position as manager, Program for Disabled Persons, to work 1/2 time since the birth of Gregory John, on 2/10/87. Her address is 1750 Dayton Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55104. She asks if anyone in PLS has reactions to Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind*. Yes Lynn. See *Programma* Winter 1988 for a faculty forum. It was also used in the summer alumnae/i seminar in 1988.

William Rooney is a lawyer for Willkie Farr & Gallagher in New York City. He is on the Board of Directors, New York Catholic Forum Lecturer, and Theology for the Laity ("Human Dignity and the Workplace" Spring 1989). His address: 400 East 71st St. Apt. 5P, New York, NY 10021.

Class of 1981

Janice Peterson is a Family Practice resident at St. Joseph Medical Center. She graduated from Indiana University Medical School this May, and spent January of '89 working with a mission team in northern Peru. Her address is 739 Allen St., South Bend, IN 46616.

Class of 1982

Steven A. Hilbert is a Vice President for Telluride Real Estate. He lives in a ski resort, married Kim and have 2 children (Samantha 4 and Steven 1). He also says that Barry Tharp '87 and Tim Cannon '80 live and work there. His address is Box 1805, Telluride, CO 81435.

Joe Shaffer is in marketing at SC Johnson. He will be moving to Milwaukee this summer.

Class of 1983

(Class Correspondent: Patty Fox, 103 Knickerbocker Rd., Pittsford, NY 14535)

³ The latest rumor in Holy Cross is that Mac will be back soon at Notre Dame, this time seeking a bachelor's degree in Civil Engineering. As Doctor Sloan once said in another context, "It's not too late." One last question: without a context is a text a pretext?

Added by PLS Office:

Maria Miceli Dotterweich is in the Division of Development, Jackson Community College Foundation. She is the V.P. for Notre Dame class of '83, Catholic Social Services Board member, United Way volunteer, teacher of 11 & 12 grades religious education, Michigan Right to Life, V.P. of parish council, and secretary of ND Alumni Club of Jackson. Her address is 2010 Dale Rd., Jackson, MI 49203.

Karen Prena is graduating this May from NYU School of Law and will become an associate at McDermott, Will & Emery in Chicago, Illinois. After the Bar Exam, she will travel to South America to hike in the Andes. Her address is: 208 East Hillside Road, Barrington, IL 60010.

Friedrich J. von Rueden is an attorney in Milwaukee, WI (Associate at Cook G. Franke, S.C.). His address is 4030 Fountain Plaza Drive, Brookfield, WI 53005.

Class of 1984

(Class Correspondent: Margaret Smith, 2440 E. Tudor Rd. #941, Anchorage, AK 99507)

Added by PLS Office:

Lynn Malooly is the community relations coordinator for the Greece (NY!) School District. Her address is 65 Nottingham Road, Rochester, NY 14610.

Class of 1985

(Class Correspondent: Laurie Denn Spurgin, 4920 204th St. W., Farmington, MN 55024)

Added by PLS Office:

Br. Kevin Baldwin, L.C. is a seminarian studying for the priesthood. His address is Legionaries of Christ, 475 Oak Avenue, Cheshire, CT 06410.

Jim King is a seminarian. He is studying for the Diocese of Peoria, at Mount St. Mary's Seminary in Maryland. He will be starting the second year of theology in the Fall. His address is Mount St. Mary's Seminary, Emmitsburgh, Maryland 21727-7797.

Michael Witous is an insurance broker with C.M. Financial. His wife is Sheila S. Ward-Witous ('84). Their address is 401 E. Colfax, Suite 402, South Bend, IN 46617.

Paul Caruso worked for the year in biomedical research at the Université de Claude Bernard in Lyon, France. He hopes to enter medical school on his return.

Michael Richerson completed a Master's program in Western European Politics and Economics as a Rotary Scholar at the University of Durham in England. He hopes to continue advanced studies in the fields of international relations and government.

Tom Wood received his Master's Degree in Social Work from the Univ. of Wisconsin-Milwaukee this spring and has begun work at the Milwaukee Psychiatric Hospital. His new address: 3032 N. Pierce St., Milwaukee, WI 53212.

Class of 1986

(Class Correspondent: Margaret Neis, 936 Pleasant, Apt. P2, Oak Park, IL 60302)

Jan (Buchanan) Becher: Jan and her husband Steve have a baby boy (I believe his name is Jeremy). He's probably close to a year old now.

Dierdre Erbacher: I heard rumors that Dierdre was engaged. (I believe the wedding is in the fall).

Beth Fenner: The trusty east-coast connection. Beth is working as a consultant in Boston. She's hoping to make the move to NY to try to work in publishing (editing).

Anne-Marie Finch: Now that Anne-Marie is a 3rd year (actually) graduate of law school (ND) she no longer answers her phone "Peace and Love". She will be working with a judge (on the federal level—I think?) and will be traveling from coast to coast next year.

Marie Frank: Marie has returned from Scotland and is studying Architectural and Art History at Univ. of Virginia. She seems worked to death but happy. New address: Box 20-625, 388-

327 E. Stadium Rd., Station 2, Charlottesville, VA 22904.

Kate Hebert: Kate now lives in Indy. She works for Tau Kappa Epsilon fraternity at last check (*not* as a house-mother, but in development) I believe she's starting grad. school at I.U. in the fall. She's also engaged to be married in about a year.

Liz Kenney: Liz is a student at the Univ. of Chicago. She's in an education program.

Charles Kromkowski: Charles transferred from U of Chicago to Univ. of Virginia. He is currently caught up in the grad. school rat race—publish, publish!

Joe Kulis & Margaret Neis Kulis: Joe and Margaret were married at Sacred Heart Church at ND on April 22nd. Joe is still working in sales and Margaret will be starting her 2nd year of grad. school at Loyola Univ of Chicago in philosophy.

Felicia Leon: Felicia at last note was in the Peace Studies program at ND.

Added by PLS Office:

Michael Leary is an executive officer of a weapons company. He is happy to be back in the infantry after a stint as aide de camp. He is preparing for a West Pacific deployment in June, and still living in San Clemente and hoping for a fellow PLS'er to visit. His address is Lt. M. P. Leary, WPNS Co 1/9, Camp Pendleton, CA 92055, and phone# (714) 361-1156.

Colleen McCloskey was a 3rd year law student at Loyola of Chicago. She will start in the Fall as an Associate at the Chicago law firm of Adler, Kaplan & Begy; the firm specializes in aviation, space, and environmental law (so I guess those Nat. Sci. classes might come in handy!). Loyola Law School has just started a great books seminar, she plans to join. Her address is: One East Scott #612, Chicago, IL 60610.

Sean Reardon is a high school teacher in physics/photography, and is a volunteer on Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. His address is c/o Red Cloud Indian School, Pine Ridge, SD 57770.

Class of 1987

(Class Correspondent: Terese Heidenwolf, 843 Mandy Lane, Camp Hill, PA 17011)

Added by PLS Office:

K. Scott Connolly is the coordinator of Youth Ministry. He will be traveling to Tijuana, Mexico this July to work in a workcamp for children. They are taking 20 people from the youth group to the sight called Los Niños (the children). He attended the Fiesta Bowl in January and had a *great* time in Phoenix. His address is 10508 112th St. S. W., Tacoma, WA 98498.

Class of 1988

Lisa Abbott is a student in Munich. She likes being a student ("I always did want to be just like Mike Sharkey"). And she suggests that we *continue* to print the class of '88 announcements regarding *only* Mike Sharkey, his present occupation and of course all of his most special activities. That should suffice.

Gilberto J. Marxuach is a law student at Yale Law School. He will be working in Puerto Rico this summer. His address is P.O. Box 8A Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520.

Class of 1989

(Class Correspondent: Coni Rich, 2680 Trader Court, South Bend, IN 46628)

Dan Barrett would wish to give to his fellow PLSers some advice "Don't Find Sanity!" His address will be The Triangle Suite 501, 11477 Mayfield Rd., Cleveland, OH 44106.

Coni Rich found a job in the South Bend area after discovering she wasn't qualified to ride a lawn mower around the south quad. Although disappointed that she won't be able to contemplate the ontological mystery while communing with nature, she is happy to be working for PJ Marketing Services, Inc. as a sales assistant. She is anxious to hear from members of the classes of '88 and '89, and can be reached at the above address, day or night (219) 277-1764.

Many Thanks to Contributors

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

Contributions to the University Designated for PLS since the Last Issue

John Astuno, Jr.
Robert Donnellan
Rev. James Gray
Steven J. Gray
Steven A. Hilbert
Gilberto Marxuach
Colleen McCloskey
Maria Miceli Dotterweich
Carl Muñana
Karen Prena
William Rooney
A.J. Schwartz
Christopher Stent

Contributions to the Otto A. Bird Award Fund

O. Barry Bird
Robert Donnellan
William Moran

Contributions to the Edward J. Cronin Fund

Rev. David Barry
Robert Baxter
David and Cathy Carlyle
Robert Donnellan
James King
Charles Muckenhirn
Dennis O'Connor
Joseph Shaffer
Michael Witous

Contributions to the Willis D. Nutting Fund

Robert Donnellan

Contributions to the Stephen Rogers Memorial Fund

Peter Bowen
David Carlyle
Gary Raisl
Joseph Griffin
Dr. John Lyon
Carl Muñana
Claire Perona Murphy
Gregory St. Ville
Friedrich J. von Rueden
James Wyrsh

