

(Address given by the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President, University of Notre Dame, at the 66th Annual Convention of the National Catholic Educational Association, Detroit, Michigan, April 8, 1969)

THE CHANGING FACE OF CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Change has often been described as a condition of life -- what does not change, dies. If this is so, then Catholic higher education is very much alive today, in fact, for us change has not in recent years been just a condition, but rather a way of life. If many of our institutions' Founding Fathers were to return for a visit today, they would not recognize their creations. Some would be pleasantly surprised, some shocked, some probably horrified.

If it is any consolation, they would react much in the same way to our country and our Church, unless they belonged to that company of rare souls who never really age, who see institutional change not only as inevitable, but desirable, who always take the long view of the future rather than embalming the past as the best of all possible worlds.

I believe that our particular problem is that we were strongly conditioned too long to the relatively changeless, particularly in philosophy, theology, and in our institutional life style and customs. When Pope John opened the windows, it wasn't just fresh air that blew in -- it was a major hurricane. Maybe we should have nicknamed it Alma.

We had missed many of the normal changes that took place in other societies, at a slower pace, over decades and centuries. Whether you like the term of Fortress Church or ghetto, the fact is that we had been insulated from many of the on-going changes that most societies assimilated

gradually, from as far back as the Reformation and the French and American Revolutions. Our changing came all at once, with Vatican II. In the course of a very few years, during the Council and since, change has so modified the Church and all of the institutions within it that many who converted to the Church because of its seemingly changeless style of life, down to the use of a dead language, are now having second thoughts about their decision. It may well have been for them the right decision made for the wrong reasons.

Many criticize the present Holy Father for his "Yes, but" style of declaration; yes, but I suspect that to a future historian he might more accurately be seen as trying to keep the wildly rocking Bark of Peter from tipping over, and still moving forward as well as from side to side. Certainly, no one envies him his task, nor us ours either. I heard a joke the other day about a university president who died and went to Hell and was there four days before he noticed the difference.

It was ever thus for the leadership of institutions in times of great change. Good management used to be enough. Today, what is needed as well is vision and this is a reasonably rare human quality. Without vision, the good leadership of normal times becomes hesitant and worried. Change is seen as totally destructive of all that is secure and good and given, rather than an opportunity to update, to develop, or to reassess. It is not that the new is always right or even better, especially in its first manifestations which are often over-reactions. To those long accustomed to the old however, the new is often threatening as well as frightening, and to those wedded to security, the new can appear to be the essence of insecurity.

It is perhaps a matter of where one stands or has stood to view the central danger in the onrush of change today, either as a crisis of authority or as a crisis of leadership. What I am suggesting is that it may more importantly be a crisis of vision which alone can inspire the exercise of both leadership and authority in our times. This is no time for a lack of nerve or verve. When one views the breadth of change in the narrowness of the time pattern and the unanticipated suddenness of it all, one cannot be too surprised that this is so. What is really needed at this point of time is to try to understand the lines of force underlying the changes, the basic thrusts of the changes, and to assess, if possible, where we are at the moment, where we are likely going, and to judge whether we ought to get on with it, in this or that form of change, or simply cry out in frustration, "Stop the world, Lord, I'm getting off".

It would probably be easier at the outset of this exercise to look not at ourselves, our Church, or our institutions, but at the world in which we live and breathe and have our being. One very important dimension to the change we experience is the fact that it really began in the world about us, and grew to such an extent that we could no longer disassociate ourselves or our institutions from this world without becoming totally irrelevant to the new challenges and opportunities now presented to our mission.

The worriers oversimplify this as dangerous by saying that we, our Church, and our institutions are becoming largely secularized, whereas, in fact, we may for the first time in ages be beginning to understand the full implications of the Incarnation, the values and autonomy of the secular

order, and the necessity of relating ourselves, our Church, and our institutions to what is good in the world, to listen more attentively to the signs of the times through which God, the Holy Spirit, may well be speaking to us.

How could we possibly disassociate ourselves from such secular realities as the current emphasis on the dignity, freedom, and rights of every human person, whatever the nature or place of his human origin in time and space; the possibilities of nuclear energy for good or for evil; the democratization of authority, especially in the area of outmoded monarchism or modern totalitarianism; the quest for world peace through world law; the conquest of hunger and the control of population where it negates human development; efforts for greater understanding and collaboration between peoples, cultures, religions, and races; and the extermination of illiteracy.

We did not invent, inaugurate, or, in many cases, inspire these worldly and secular movements. We may still, however, collaborate with them, understand their spiritual implications, and add to their successes. But we cannot even begin if we are seized by the ridiculous idea that we have created this world and everything good in it. Nor can we begin to change if the world to us is bad, and collaboration with the world somehow wicked. Here we should begin with humility and a new broader perspective and vision which we have too long lacked.

Take one simple illustration of what we might learn in the process and apply to some of our own internal institutional problems. For years, the Christian concept of charity was to feed the hungry. No one will argue with that, so we spent hundreds of millions of dollars over centuries of time doling out food to hungry people. The rich did not get poor in

the process, and the poor were often enough further humiliated or debased. In the missions, we had the phenomenon of "rice Christians" and, at home, economic dependency often meant loss of personal dignity or erosion of human initiative.

No one will say that there was not enormous good will and generosity expended in this obviously charitable operation, and all will admit that food relief will always be necessary in times of physical disaster, famine, and war, but no one among us was listening when Ghandi said: "Give me a fish and I will eat today; teach me how to fish and I will eat every day". It took some very secular scientists and two very secular institutions, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, to find a new way of exercising charity, quite different from our old traditional way of just giving away food. The new way was superlatively effective in feeding hungry people, cost a small fraction of what we were spending annually on charity, and had the result of enhancing rather than depreciating human dignity, while solving their problem of hunger structurally and permanently and at its roots.

What was the secret of this new initiative? Asking new questions, finding new answers. More than a billion of the world's population has for many thousands of years subsisted on rice. But there was never really enough to feed everyone adequately -- even though the folklore said that the best was being done. The worst of the folklore said there would be a better crop next year, "Si Dios lo quiere" -- "If God wills it".

That wasn't good enough for those with a vision of the total reality of the situation. They founded the International Rice Research Institute

at Los Banos in the Philippines, studied rice and its culture thoroughly for the first time. The result, in four years time, with an annual budget of slightly over a million dollars, was a completely new species of rice, IRRI-8, a new systemic insecticide, a new fertilizer. The first year that these new seeds and techniques were widely used the surplus rice grown throughout the Orient, on the same land with the same human effort, was valued at \$1,300,000,000. Next year's surplus, with another new rice seed, IRRI-5, will be valued at \$3,200,000,000.

If this says anything, it shouts that good will, generosity, and spiritual motivation cannot substitute for technique. If this involves change, so be it. My real fear is that we will go on distributing tons of food, because that is the way it has always been done, instead of distributing only pounds of new seed, insecticides, and fertilizers that would enable the same people to grow many more tons of food than we could ever supply them as a pitiful dole.

I mention this one example because it is central to a core Christian activity, charity, as we have conceived and practiced it. This is only one area, and there are many more, where we have much to learn, in ways just as basic. Fundamentally, of course, it still adds up to vision, looking ahead rather than only looking backward. It means more than a change in vocabulary, although God knows we have much excess baggage to dispose of there, too, so many of our outmoded dichotomies: the sacred and the profane, for example.

No wonder classical theologians were shocked when Teilhard de Chardin spoke of "blessed matter", in an attempt to reverse their

insulting terminology. What in God's creation could have been profane since God became man, and the Word, flesh. Ideas and institutions, even language and people -- how stuffy they become when normal evolutionary change is not allowed to do its work. To save the form, the nay-sayers are willing to sacrifice the reality; to save face, one would see them at times willing to sacrifice souls, although one should say in charity that they know not what they do. Nonetheless, the deed is done and millions suffer.

At this point, I have the strong impression that I have said enough, if not too much, on the subject of change, or the lack of change, as generally characterizing our world, our Church, and, to some extent, ourselves and our institutions. I should now return to the specifics of this talk on the changing face of Catholic education. Against the background of the above discussion, I will not have to take as much for granted as would have been necessary without this general consideration of change.

I

There are three main foci for the basic changes in Catholic higher education today: Trustees, faculty, and students. There are, of course, many subsidiary wheels within wheels, but I shall attempt to mention them in passing. However, I am convinced that the really significant changes are structural, with the understanding that the basic ideas behind the structural changes will be operative in the new structures. I am not assuming that this is necessarily so, but I do assume that new ideas are generally more operative within new structures than without them. In a very real sense, new structures institutionalize new ideas. Here is the very core of change and a new life style.

For all its revolutionary implications, the change from clerical to lay trustees was effected in a few institutions with a minimum of fuss and all too little publicity. It is a move that still lies ahead for most Catholic institutions of higher learning and other Catholic institutions, such as hospitals, although I cannot overemphasize its basic importance to any significant change.

I believe, immodestly, that Saint Louis and Notre Dame established the basic pattern at about the same time. We are two of the largest institutions in the whole Catholic Church. We were completely under clerical control for all our history, and then in May and June of 1967, we passed into lay control. This was not a legal fiction or a trick with mirrors. If anyone owns these multi-million dollar institutions, the largest of their kind, it is now laymen, not priests or religious orders. The laymen make the basic policy decisions under new statutes, which clearly and for the first time declare our Catholicity under a state charter; they appoint the president and principal officers; they approve and publish the budget; they answer to any and all public and Church authority, although they are largely independent of both.

All of this was not accomplished without protest or large cries of anguish on the part of a few who profess poverty, but cling to possessions; who profess the Christian education of the whole man, but would deny to their own graduates the responsibility for a Catholic institution; who profess service, but want to govern; who profess humility, but want power. Perhaps I am too blunt, but just attempt to do what we did, and you will find the same reaction from those to whom any basic change is anathema.

All that Father Paul Reinert and I can tell you is that our lay Trustees have given great strength and dedication to our institutions. They are no less Catholic than we; sometimes possibly more so. We have more freedom for good and honest intellectual endeavor than ever before. We have more moral and financial support. Our special juridical and institutional status is much more visible and clean-cut vis-a-vis the Church and the state. We have more freedom for untrammelled priestly and religious service, less ambiguity about the good of the institution and the good of the Order. There is more visibility to the considerable services that we, as religious, are contributing and more dignity to those who serve because their competency is recognized. Professionalism is the new emphasis, not blind and often uncomprehending or mechanical or unmotivated obedience. In a word, we are vastly better off in every way.

I can honestly think of nothing bad and everything good to say about this new arrangement for the highest governance of the Catholic college or university. Perhaps a little less than two years is too short a time in which to pass judgment, but, thus far, all systems are go and the total effect has been very good indeed. I am personally grateful to the vision of our highest religious authorities and our religious confreres for making all of this possible, and to our lay Trustees for accepting this serious responsibility at great personal cost to themselves, their time, and talents. What I find slightly incredulous is that so many institutions with even greater problems have been so slow to do likewise. This is, of course, their business, not mine, but I must say in frankness that the time to act is not now, but long past.

There are some structural changes that are difficult to judge. This one, I think, speaks for itself. This new form of governance has solved, once and for all time, the problem of academic freedom within the Catholic university. And it has removed from the Bishops and the Magisterium of the Church all the possible embarrassments that can come from an institution that is totally in the service of the Church without being the Church or the Magisterium. The Catholic university, thus conceived, operates as a civil corporation, under a state charter and lay control, thus becoming an extraordinarily effective bridge between the Church and the world. It truly answers to both and is organizationally directly responsible to neither. If it does its task properly, it should be a blessing to both.

I am assuming here the kind of vision described above, but I can attest that this kind of vision is available to those who will match it to the structural changes I have been describing. There is a curious kind of clericalism that assumes that only clerics have vision. If this were true, then our whole higher educational effort has failed -- but, fortunately, it is not true. In fact, I believe we need a double vision today, that of clerics and laymen working together, and I know of no place where this can be better done than in the field of Catholic higher education.

II

This is as good a spot as any to pass on to the second focus for change, the faculty of Catholic higher education. There was, in the recent past, no organization in the world where the president had more

power and more control than in the Catholic college or university. He moderated all worlds there: the material, the intellectual, the spiritual. This situation is long gone in the better Catholic institutions of higher learning and, in large measure, explains why they are now better. One-man rule in the Church and its organizations had its last gasp theoretically when collegiality was proclaimed, in Vatican Council II. One might hope that earlier developments in Catholic higher education both promoted and were confirmed by this proclamation of collegiality.

For too long a time, lay professors and even lay administrators in Catholic colleges and universities felt themselves to be second-class citizens, the hired hands who did the work, but made none of the decisions. The first official decision of our new lay Board of Trustees was to confirm the year-long study of our faculty -- like most, more than 90% lay -- and to approve the provisions of a new Faculty Manual which clearly places all academic decisions in the hands of all the faculty and their elected representatives on the various Councils and Senate.

For once and for all, all the i's were dotted and all the t's crossed. Nothing is left to chance or to the beneficence of a philosopher-king-president. Appointments, promotion, tenure, curriculum, academic freedom and autonomy, due process, professional standards, and all the rest -- these, the Trustees decided were the realm of the faculty and to be determined on the terms and according to the procedures that the faculty specified in its year-long study.

Professionalism and competence are the coin of this realm. Again, there is no first-class institution of higher learning where this is not

the order of the day. Moreover, in Catholic institutions, there was an interesting twist of reverse English -- when all of these rights and duties and responsibilities were legislated for the faculty -- it was clearly stated that all clerical faculty should enjoy them to the same extent as lay faculty, that as professional men, all should be accorded equal dignity and freedom.

All this will sound strange to other institutions who so legislated their affairs several decades ago, but again, this must be seen against the background of change in the Church and its institutions already discussed above. The important point now is not that these changes were a long time in coming, but that they are here, completely and wholeheartedly here, and that our institutions are immeasurably better and stronger because of this basic structural change. Coming of age is a happy event, whenever and however and wherever it happens.

There are two other matters I should mention in regard to faculty. First, I think Catholic institutions of higher learning have always had, long before Faculty Manuals, a very special kind of faculty. Maybe it was a case of self-selection, maybe we fared better than we deserved, but the lay faculty I have known in Catholic colleges and universities over the years always seemed to have a special kind of dedication, a zest for teaching all too uncommon today, and a loyalty to the institution. They were most often the kind of persons we felt happy at seeing as the preceptors of the next generation, because they were unselfish, dedicated, and good, as well as wise people.

The day of Mr. Chips is probably long gone, a casualty to publish or perish, but may I say that in the change-over to greater professionalism,

I hope that we still will have the good sense to cherish this vanishing type of professor who enjoys professing, in his teaching and in his life, every good thing that we would like to think characterizes the life of the mind that is not divorced from the life of the heart, the good person who teaches more by what he is than by what he says.

I do not think that change towards professionalism need involve a disregard for what a person is, as well as what he knows, what degrees he holds. There are still great and intelligent and well-educated persons who are attracted to institutions that stand for something, as we should. Only they can make our institutions what they profess to be. May we continue to seek them out, cherish them, and listen to them for they are the unsung heroes of days gone by. They may still be heroes today, perhaps less unsung, but we need them. May I also say in honest tribute that many of them were and are not Catholic, even though they have cherished everything that the word Catholic, at its best, stands for. They are at home with us and we have had a better home of the intellect because of their presence. They made ecumenism a reality in Catholic institutions of higher learning long before most people knew what the word meant.

The second matter that needs inclusion in the record is something that, no matter what we say, is always a matter of open suspicion to all who really do not know what Catholic higher education is and can be. This is the matter of freedom and autonomy. No matter ^{WHAT} ~~how~~ many professors, Catholic and non-Catholic, who have taught with us and in other types of universities, say regarding the complete freedom and autonomy they find in our institutions, there is always the lurking suspicion that somehow a Catholic college or university cannot really be free and autonomous. We seem to be tagged with thought control no matter what we say or do. Our Faculty Manuals may assure as much and more than others, our faculty

may testify to the fact, but always there is the assumption that being Catholic means being unfree.

It matters not that one may feel uneasy in mentioning spiritual matters in other secular institutions. Commitment to the importance of the spiritual and moral implications of all human questions, to make the discussion truly complete and adequate, is seen as a fault, whereas commitment to anything else -- atheism, agnosticism, secular humanism, materialism, or whatever -- is seen as a virtue of sorts. I suppose all we can really do is to keep on saying that no subject, or no intellectual approach to a question, no book or no speaker, is out of bounds on our campuses, whenever it is a question of honest and intelligent discussion. We can still insist on the fundamental importance of philosophical and theological dimensions, for as Riesman and Jencks say, this may be our special contribution to the American intellectual scene: to insist on the consideration and discussion of ultimate questions and ultimate values.

The real crux of this question of academic freedom and autonomy in Catholic institutions of higher learning is not ultimately in political science, or literature or in chemistry, but in theology. Here our past record, especially in America, is not too spectacular, not because of overt oppression, but because our institutions have not distinguished themselves in theology. But this, too, is changing, and a crisis of credibility may be in the offing.

Here is the real testing ground, the real confrontation between the Church teaching -- the Magisterium -- which we are not, and the

Pilgrim Church seeking a deeper understanding and expression of revealed truth, which we very much are. I have written at some length on this subject in a Presidential Address given to the International Federation of Catholic Universities at Kinshasa, Congo, last September.

The gist of my thesis is this: Theology in the Catholic university must enjoy the same freedom and autonomy as any other university subject because, otherwise, it will not be accepted as a university discipline and, without its vital presence, in free dialogue with all other university disciplines, the university will never really be Catholic.

I grant the difference between teaching Catholic Doctrine to undergraduates -- which should not be unlike teaching classical physics or mathematics or history -- and doing graduate research. In the latter endeavor, there may at times be a real or apparent conflict between the Magisterium of the Bishops and the hypotheses of the pioneer university theologian working at the frontiers of theological inquiry. I see no problem in Bishops saying on occasion that, in their judgment, the theologian is not being faithful to the accepted teaching or expression of revealed truth, but they can do this without seeming to jeopardize his honest efforts within the authentic realm of university research, which is something different from teaching revealed truths.

In every university science, hypotheses have always been open to denial and repudiation -- sometimes with reason and sometimes without. The academy can and does live with this. So can theology, as long as there is a clear distinction between the teaching of the official

Magisterium and the legitimate research hypotheses of graduate university theologians. I see no conflict here, only complementarity that is fruitful for both sides.

As Father Ladislav Orsy, S.J. says so well, the charism of the Bishops is stability of doctrine, fidelity to revelation, and the charism of the university research theologian is the development of doctrine, the articulation of revealed truth in ever more relevant terms, in keeping with the development of all knowledge and the growing expression of cultural progress. The key to this complementarity is best seen in the operation of Vatican Council II, where the inspiration of the periti, mostly university theologians, assured the most advanced theological statements of the Council Fathers, the Bishops, of the most relevant expression of ancient truth adapted to the minds of modern men. Without the fruitful assistance of these periti, Vatican Council II would have been much less effective in speaking to the modern world. Perhaps we best justify the efforts of university theologians today by seeing them as the vanguard of Vatican Council III.

III

Now to students, always the most exciting and the most difficult part of any educational discussion today. Here, change is not only rampant, but galloping. First let us say, God bless them, these difficult, demanding, revolutionary students who are the reason and often the despair of our educational existence. We find it difficult to live with them, but, without them, there would be little reason for our institutions.

They are the wave of the future that threatens to engulf the present, namely us. But we have to understand them, even more, to love them -- else we should abandon the whole endeavor. So let us try.

If the name of the game is change, today, for students of this generation, the name is changissimus. Whatever is must go, and whatever is not must come to be. I am less than convinced by this general persuasion, but in view of what I have already said, I can understand it. A few examples may illucidate the problem.

First, there is the drive for relevancy in all that is taught in our institutions today. Here, I smell an easy error, and a deep and abiding truth. If relevancy means that education must prepare one to live and operate in a real world, as opposed to an imaginary world, who can oppose it? But if relevancy is confused with contemporaneity, then we are being hoaxed, and so are the students. What is relevant today -- such as today's newspaper -- is completely irrelevant next week, next month, and, especially, next year. Relevancy certainly has to have reference to the present, anchors in the past, and meaning for the future. To this extent, it is geared to that which is unchanging, truth and falsehood, good and evil, life and death, beauty and ugliness, justice and injustice, time and eternity, love and hate, war and peace -- to mention a few of the really relevant issues that have faced mankind yesterday, today, and certainly will face him tomorrow. All of these issues will be relevant if we have a colony of human beings on Mars by the year 2000.

If the university is not to amuse or distract, rather than to educate its students, it must resist a superficial nowness of concern,

a relevancy of today that passes all too quickly with tomorrow, a relevancy that will all too soon be a monumental irrelevancy. Certainly, man can learn something from the human victories and failures of the past, can measure against them the problems of the present, and can rationally and hopefully face the future armed with this knowledge. I spare you Santayana's dictum about those who ignore history. Even in such a pragmatic and relevant a subject as civil engineering, the half life of all that can be learned today, with the most up-to-date knowledge and techniques, is ten years. In other words, the best and most relevant of civil engineering science today is 50% irrelevant ten years from now. This is inevitable with all of human knowledge doubling every fifteen years.

Here again, the Catholic college and university can lead the way amid shifting sands, if we have the courage to insist that there are philosophical and theological realities, bearing on the nature and destiny of man, that have a much longer half life, in fact a life stretching into eternity. What is more relevant than man himself, with his visions and his failures, with his grace and his ugliness, with his promise and his disappointments. History and literature, philosophy and theology, poetry, art, and drama, language, law, and culture -- these are the subjects that retain across all the years their relevancy to the human situation -- here our human strengths and our human weaknesses are manifested, here are the ultimate relevancies of every age revealed, and here, in the midst of great change, we must count on our few reliable anchors, our few tried and true directions, our few bright stars in the blackness

of night, whatever the winds of change. This is in the best Catholic tradition and present reality -- the ancient wisdom, ever old and ever new. But it must be made to come to life and to shine today for our students. Let us admit that we have not done too well in this department.

Perhaps relevancy is really a state of mind that can be insinuated and inspired by great teachers as one views the Grecian Wars, the Roman or Holy Roman Empire, the Renaissance and the Reformation, the Industrial Revolution or the Space Age. All of these human events have something to say about the challenge and response of man to man and to his total global environment, the moral issues, the stretching of man's spirit. All are highly relevant if seen in the total human context. We might add that even the most relevant issues may be taught irrelevantly unless one is sensitive to man, his promise and his fears, his vision and his blindness, his aspirations and his failures.

There is a second issue which today seizes our students -- involvement. Again, all is not simple or uncomplicated. All of us who lived through the apathetic generation of the fifties should welcome the desire of this generation to be involved. Let us admit that here too we in Catholic higher education have a strong tradition of paternalism, of deciding everything for our students whatever their own minds in the matter.

This will no longer wash. Not only are we no longer in loco parentis, but neither are their parents. In the present juvenocracy, all wisdom is conferred on youth by age eighteen, with or without the vote. They know what is best for themselves, and the present tendency

is to defer to their judgment: on discipline, on regulations in the dormitories, on who shall speak at the college or university, on who shall be punished and how, and, in addition, they often demand a voice in Faculty Senates and on Boards of Trustees.

Obviously, all of these issues are not of equal merit or importance. I would say, as a general principle, that their desire for involvement is good, as it affects their education, their student government, their extra-curricular life, their concern that the university be a community in which they have a real and not a fictitious part. I believe that we can establish structures that give them both involvement and voice in all of these matters without ^{instantly} conferring upon them the ^{learned} ~~instant~~ competence that should characterize faculty or the ultimate responsibility that is the prerogative of Trustees.

We should involve students in every legitimate way to the extent that they are willing to assume responsibility, as well as to assert their rights. The results should ultimately be measured by their growth in maturity, insight, and creativity, and the basic standard should be educational development, the vitality of our institutions, and the greater realization of community on all the layers that characterize the educational enterprise. Also, we must take some chances and have more faith in this younger generation and have more understanding of their concerns.

Student involvement may be a blessing or a curse in our institutions. All our efforts should be bent to making it a blessing, a step forward, a new look that integrates rather than compromises. There is no easy path or instant wisdom in this matter, but I am still in favor of the open mind and the adventurous spirit -- provided that we preserve

for competence that which demands competence. We can do this and still open up our structures, as never before, for student participation that will be educative for them and for us.

I have a third and last consideration regarding students. If we read the signs of the times, young people today have a very special approach to the ultimate religious reality which is union with God. We, in our day, realized this by the sacramental approach. They have discovered a new sacrament -- service to the poor and the disadvantaged. Why disparage their desires to find in service to others a new form of prayer?

If they find and serve Christ in the hungry, the thirsty, the naked, the imprisoned, the essential has been realized. They find Christ and they serve Him, as He Himself indicated He might be found and served. This is a more difficult way than that to which we are accustomed, and I suspect that they will soon find that to persevere in this difficult quest they will need new sources of grace and power that are available to them in the Mass, the sacraments and prayer. They may, if they walk this path, find a deeper and a more realistic spirituality than we found. Perhaps they will avoid the dichotomy of the pious person who was totally lacking in a hunger for justice, a compassion for the poor of the world.

Educationally, I believe this means that we must find new and creative outlets for the idealism, generosity, and the dedication of this generation of students. If we found no educational problem for giving credit to students who mixed chemicals or measured elements in the laboratory, why find it difficult to give credit to those students

who seek a practical outlet for sociological, psychological, economic, or educational theory in their service to those who are the living laboratory, the people who live deprived lives in the cities surrounding our institutions? While I personally have been greatly concerned in turning out graduates who are intellectually competent, I am even more concerned in turning out students who are deeply compassionate. Failing this latter, Catholic institutions of higher learning would with great difficulty justify their special existence, whatever else we do.

Having come this far, I fear I have missed even mentioning much that should characterize the changing face of Catholic higher education. There is the whole perplexing field of what we are or should be doing for the disadvantaged minorities of America, the special advantages of our own Catholic heritage as a minority that should give us special insights in dealing with other minorities, Catholic or not; the inspiring call to ecumenical endeavor today; the great opportunity for liturgical experimentation, liturgical music and art; the worldwide concern that the word Catholic signifies as opposed to Chauvanistic, the isolationist, the single culture, namely Western, that engages so much of educational effort today; the use of the freedom that is ours as private institutions for a wide variety of experimentation, especially in philosophical and theological education, that is widely neglected elsewhere in the educational domain and generally done badly by us, too; the establishment of a style of life in our institutions that really reflects the quintessence of a Christian community, united in ideal, study, action, and prayer; the personalism that is our heritage

despite its neglect and desiccation on so many of our campuses.

All of these good movements of the spirit are stirring today, and if they are allowed to bloom as they should, I should think that our future survival would not be endangered, but assured, because the world of education needs all of these realities and needs them desperately. Maybe instead of worrying about the changes ahead of us, we should rather decide which changes are needed and overdue, and effect them with vision, vitality, enthusiasm, and verve. This would make my remarks of today quickly obsolete and, personally, I shall welcome the day when that is so.