What is needed is less emotionalism and more careful thought on the many problems facing us. All sectors of the nation need badly to start thinking with their heads instead of their hearts. Understanding, acceptance, and a willingness to compromise for the greater good is a primary requirement.

E. Hayes
Holy Cross ended a decade of change under Father Swords in a most appropriate fashion last fall. What had originally been little more than a formal dream to improve the College was at last beginning to be realized in terms of new attitudes, values, and interests. What had been at first little more than an awareness that we had to change quantitatively — build more buildings, attract more students, and hire more teachers — was starting to assume qualitative proportions. What had originally been conceived more out of fear was beginning to find a basis of hope. What had been undertaken by an inward looking community in a smug society was being carried on by a more professional association in a deeply-troubled country. In short, we are on our way, and are beginning to learn that the course is more treacherous than we had anticipated, our destination further away than ever. We all have regrets, but we know that we can do nothing but push on.

The evidences of our condition are manifold. Structurally, the College is vastly changed from what it was ten years ago. Its Jesuit community, administration, faculty, and student body are becoming identified as functionally separate estates. Each is seen as having its own realm of authority, and its own special competence. The Jesuits are concerned with the community’s spiritual needs, a task of considerable frustration when confronted by a highly secularized environment. The faculty is increasingly expected to provide direction for the students not only in the achievement of a career but also in realizing the good life by both instruction and example, objectives particularly difficult at this time because of the agonized state of our society. The students are the concern of the other three estates, and they can best function by knowing as many of the students’ needs as possible. The College, in short, cannot be a matter of science, but of art. The administration, to the anger of many of its alumni, and to the chagrin of many of its friends, has increasingly recognized this role. Rule and objective administration are giving way to consultation and need. We have recognized that we can neither be a despotism nor a democracy.

The College’s achievement of this condition was graphically illustrated during the December disturbance. In the months leading up to the confrontation, there was a considerable effort, mainly by Jesuits, to judge the dissident elements of the increasingly structured student body — i.e., the kids on “pot,” the opponents of America’s oligarchic, imperial system of government, and the students who are hostile to the Church — as having no place here because “they are not Holy Cross men.” There was hardly any greater recognition of the fragmented character of the student body by the faculty. By both estates, the “open” campus issue in general, and the General Electric recruiting in particular, provided a matter of sufficient principle for a showdown, especially since the “troublemakers” seemed to be one and the same.

In preparing for the confrontation over General Electric recruiting, the administration went to great pains to meet the challenge. Its strategy and tactics were only adopted after consultation with a wide range of campus interests. At the actual confrontation, the only surprise element was the confusion caused by the presence of unexpected students, both pro and con. An improvised identification process had to be adopted, one which resulted in a disproportionate number of Blacks being selected from the crowd. While the culprits were waiting to go before the Judicial Board, administration assurances were made that they would be allowed to make the widest pleas to try to justify their behavior. When this proved unfounded, and the students involved were, in effect, expelled, the Blacks walked off, and the majority of white students went on strike.

In this situation, the administration decided to intervene. In a most courageous manner, it set aside the decisions, and called upon the community to consider its own state. In doing these things, the administration rested its case upon the strongest legitimizing considerations — i.e., conscience and objective opinion — in order to pacify the Jesuits and the faculty. While their immediate reaction was hostile — e.g., some Jesuits acted as if Father Swords had just assassinated the Pope from ambush, and would have shut down the school to avoid such a travesty; and some faculty members thought that the school should stand up for principle, and that their classes were the most important events that could happen to their students — calm ultimately prevailed. Rather than behaving like Harvard, MIT, and Columbia, with their lists of proscribed students, court injunctions, and police department numbers, we had emerged from our most severe crisis as a renewed community. For most, there seemed to be an increased respect for the character and needs of others.

The future will not be easy; it never is. Quite probably, it will have crisis and problems even more confounding. Nevertheless, if we survive as a college, and survive we must, I think that we can say, as few American communities can, that 1969 was one of our finest hours.

T. Ford
Science seems now to be riding on the crest of the economic wave. People in other areas are chagrined, and rightfully so, that they are not getting more financial support. On the face of it the sciences have to spend more on laboratories and equipment. Even though you may have twice as many English majors as science directed-people, the latter still cost more. Now either you face this expense or you drop science completely, and I don’t think you can afford to do that.

J. Martus
To think all of society is determined by economics is a simplistic view. As fond as I am of Marxian theory and as much as I’m a student of Marx, I can not accept his theory of history. I really believe in a complex world, a general equilibrium world, where all variables — economic, political, and social — are interrelated. It is a very difficult world to deal with because there are no easy solutions. F. Petrella