



Science/Technology Education in Church-Related Colleges and Universities

Publication Year: 1989

ID: BK022

*Note: This book is out of print.
This is one article from the book. All the articles are available for
download as pdf's from the ITEST web site. A complete listing of the
articles available from this book is shown at the end of this document.*

The Role and Importance of Research and Publication in Church-Related Schools

ID: BK022-012

Fr. James Skehan, SJ



Institute for Theological Encounter with Science and Technology

Cardinal Rigali Center • 20 Archbishop May Drive • Suite 3400-A • St. Louis, Missouri 63119 • USA

314.792.7220 • www.faithscience.org • E-mail: mariannepost@archstl.org

The Role and Importance of Research and Publication in Church-Related Schools

Fr. James Skehan, SJ is the Director of the Weston Observatory at Boston College. Fr. Skehan received his PhD in geology and geophysics at Harvard University. He is deeply involved in faith/science work, being a member of Creation and Cosmos in Baltimore and the Task Force for Cultural Exchange between Faith and Science of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts as well as a member of ITEST.

Introduction

A quick glance at the question implied by the title of this paper may prompt the response, “what difference can there be between research and publication at a church-related and any other school?” My position is that there should not be any difference in the quality of research and there is not necessarily any difference in the motivating force that prompts an individual faculty member at either type school to engage in research and to communicate its results in published form. However, I believe that there is a bonus that may be reaped by the scholar for whom religious values provide an additional reward or motivation. Further, my experience leads me to think that not all such scholars are members of faculty of church-related schools by any means. However, the presumption is that a large number of those at church-related schools are there not only because of the quality of the institution but because they regard as important the value-laden religious atmosphere of the institution and the freedom to worship according to their religion within the academic oasis. Thus, in addition to considerations of research and publication as generally understood, I will address those additionally enriching aspects of the topic that are related to human nature (“natural religions” if you wish) and to the overtly religious dimensions as well.

What is and is Not Research and Publication?

Research and publication may mean diverse things in different contexts. In the context of our present discussion of church-related schools and education, I wish to use the terms in two different senses but will try to clearly differentiate them. Research, in terms of scholarly investigation, I take to mean original studies by which the scholar carries out a project or program of research in such a way as to contribute new data, interpretations, models or theories in the particular field. Scholarly publication, in that context, is generally taken to refer to those writings that have been submitted by the author to the editor of a recognized journal or book publishing house, who then enlists peer review to establish that such manuscripts meet at least minimum standards of quality, before being accepted for publication. Review papers, that summarize the state of knowledge in a given field, may be regarded as scholarly if they demonstrate that the author has a breadth of expertise and knowledge sufficient to provide a balanced and insightful review of research developments in the field. In my own field of the geosciences there are a large number of prestigious journals and publishing houses, of which *Tectonophysics* and the Geological Society of America are respectively but two.

A second usage of the term research and publication may refer to studies that are published with little or no peer review. The research so published may range from excellent to poor, but the element of quality control is either lightly exercised or is more or less absent. Such a publication in my field is the annual volume of *Field Trip Guides* to various parts of New England published by the New England Intercollegiate Geological Conference (NEIGC) for use by professional geologists and students in field trips held on a particular weekend each fall. These papers have proved to be some of the most useful published materials on the geology of the region available, although not subject to rigorous peer review. Peer review is most useful in general, but is commonly a time-consuming process. The lack of peer review process allows the annual guidebook of “telephone-book” size to appear in a timely fashion.

In addition to research and publication that involve original contributions to knowledge, there is another spectrum of contributions that are the product of study, expertise and diligence whose main function and value is other than the development of new contributions to knowledge. Such contributions as textbooks, laboratory manuals,

teaching aids, book reviews, public education materials, writings for newsletters, collaboration with the media in presenting educational materials and the like, all have an important role to play in the total educational enterprise. However, it is important for our discussion that a clear distinction be made between original research and resulting publication and other important educational activities in church-related schools.

Scholarship in Non-Church-Related Schools

Scholarship in church-related schools in North America has improved notably over the past 30 to 40 years. Nevertheless, in the recent Carnegie Foundation survey of research universities in the United States, only one church-related school, Yeshiva University, appears among the ranking institutions. I believe that the Carnegie criteria to judge which are the leading universities are misleading because the requirements for inclusion are that the institution receive at least \$33.5 million in federal support and award at least 50 Ph.D degrees. Those criteria strongly favor institutions having medical schools, engineering schools and/or those having science departments having a substantial commitment to defense-related research. Nevertheless a large number of the institutions of Table 1 would be included on a list based on academic quality irrespective of the level of funding and the numbers of Ph.D degrees.

Table 1 Leading Research Universities

Boston University	U of California, San Diego
Calif. Inst. of Technology	U of California, San Francisco
Carnegie Mellon University	University of Chicago
Case Western Reserve University	University of Cincinnati
Colorado State University	U of Colorado, Boulder
Columbia University	University of Connecticut
Cornell University	University of Florida
Duke University	University of Georgia
Georgia Inst of Technology	University of Hawaii, Manoa
Harvard University	U of Illinois, Chicago
Howard University	U of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Indiana U at Bloomington	University of Iowa
Johns Hopkins University	University of Kentucky
Louisiana State University	U of Maryland, College Park
Mass Inst of Technology	University of Miami
Michigan State University	U of Michigan, Ann Arbor
New Mexico State University	U of Minnesota-Twin Cities
New York University	U of Missouri, Columbia
North Carolina State University	University of New Mexico
Northwestern University	U of N Carolina, Chapel Hill
Ohio State University	University of Pennsylvania
Oregon State University	University of Pittsburgh
Pennsylvania State University	University of Rochester
Princeton University	U of Southern California
Purdue University	U of Tennessee, Knoxville
Rockefeller University	U of Texas, Austin
Rutgers University	University of Utah
Stanford University	University of Virginia
State University of New York Stony Brook	University of Washington
Texas A&M University	U of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Arizona	Virginia Polytechnic Inst and State University

U of California, Berkeley
U of California, Davis
U of California, Irvine
U of California, Los Angeles

Vanderbilt University
Washington University
Yale University
Yeshiva University

Note: These institutions are classified as Research Universities I by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Most offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctoral degree, and give a high priority to research . Each receives at least \$33.5-million in federal support and awards at least 50 Ph.D degrees annually.

Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Source: Chronicle of Higher Education, Sept. 6, 1989

Moreover, to achieve the distinction of a Stanford or a Cal Tech is not an undertaking lightly entered into or a goal that is achieved by chance. It requires that the leadership of the institution over a prolonged period of time establish academic excellence as a priority of the highest magnitude, and that the institution be prepared to recruit faculty members, graduate students and post-doctoral fellows of such caliber and motivation as to distinguish themselves in research and publication. Granted all of these factors, a serious question remains as to why it is that those communities of scholars who populate the “best” schools are some of the brightest, most articulate, most productive, and most highly motivated academicians? I believe that each of these scholars have several notable features in common: they are preeminent in their mastery of their field and are dedicated, enthused, and perhaps consumed by their search for answers and their desire to communicate their results to their peers. Additionally they are blessed if during most of their career they serve under enlightened academic leadership that supports their research to anywhere near the highest possible extent.

Recently, I attended a symposium at Harvard University honoring my thesis advisor on the occasion of his retirement. One of his former students prefaced his Symposium paper with a tribute to this well-known and much honored faculty member in a statement that was right to the point and one that characterized that life of scholarship. The speaker, a former student and a distinguished researcher in his own right, while acknowledging that other speakers had correctly identified many endearing and important facets, felt that the most important characteristic of our professor’s career was his integrity! Everyone in the audience, recognizing the great depth of perception and the accuracy of this appraisal, gave him a standing ovation! I maintain that in addition to great native intelligence and special educational opportunities, the factor common to all the truly great scholars is integrity or authenticity.

Scholars in a World of Scholars

A fundamental way in which to view the scholarship of faculty in church-related schools is to recognize basically that the academic reputation of the individual and of the department rests chiefly on the quality and quantity of research and publication, on the achievement of graduate and undergraduate alumni/ae of the department and on the quality of the post-doctoral fellows who are attracted. In this respect, the scholar in the church-related school has the same opportunities and the same responsibilities as regards the academic discipline as any other scholar from any other college and university.

Obstacles to Research and Publication

Reflection on the related questions of why there is only one church-related institution among the Leading Research Universities (Table 1), and why there is such a relatively small, although growing, number of truly distinguished scholars in church-related schools suggests that the issue is not only complex but that the situation is improving. From the time of the founding of the Academy that became Georgetown University in 1789 and the restoration

of the Jesuit Order in North America in 1810, much of the academic effort of Church-related institutions went into undergraduate programs that rightly were given a high priority. To keep this topic in perspective one must remember that it was only in the 1870's that East Coast universities began to introduce graduate lecture courses. And in the Midwest graduate programs were introduced after the turn of the century as follows: U. of Indiana, 1904; U. of Illinois, 1905; Washington U., 1922; St. Louis U., 1925; U. of Missouri, 1928; and Louisiana State U., 1931. Boston College initiated its Graduate school in 1924 (Fitzgerald, 1986). In the 1930's the Jesuit General, writing to superiors urged them to develop graduate schools in their institutions comparable to the best in the United States. In 1932, for example, a total of 131 doctorates were given by Catholic Institutions of which 66 were conferred by Jesuit Schools. By 1933 33 Catholic universities were offering graduate degrees. Serious attention to graduate programs and to the academic preparation of faculty to staff these programs came slowly and took place sporadically before 1930. It is safe to say generally that teaching schedules were unusually heavy and not uncommonly remain so, at least as compared to those of faculty in institutions listed in Table 1. Financial resources were also a limiting factor then as now.

Scholarship, A Special Vocation for the Christian

Howard Gray, S.J., in his keynote address to the Jesuit Honor Society, Alpha Sigma Nu, convention at Georgetown last October, described scholarship as "a privileged pilgrimage toward truth for those who are called to use their gifts in the world of ideas." On the occasion of the bicentennial of Jesuit education in the United States, he said additionally, "The world is formed, interpreted and led by ideas. The talented Christian, who can bring his or her competence into the secular world of ideas has a special vocation today." He went on to say that no greater duty falls on Jesuits today than promotion of scholarship, but he was at pains to suggest that something more could be done on a university level "as an integral part of Christian formation "to create a climate beyond academic competence for professional success that will help both Jesuits and lay colleagues who hunger and thirst "to serve not just one another but others."

Scholarship and the Authentic Scholar - A Link to Mysticism?

I suggest that one of the most important aspects of scholarship, whether in a church-related or non-church-related school is intimately linked not only to native intelligence but especially to personal integrity and authenticity, a complex quality that Bernard Lonergan, S.J. has suggested is the characteristic shared in common by the scientist, by other scholars and the mystic. Egan (1982, p.109) in writing about *A Future Mystical Theology* points out that Lonergan, by correlating the basic insights of St. Thomas Aquinas with contemporary physics and mathematics, has "disclosed what theology and the secular sciences have in common, namely fidelity to the basic dynamism of the mind to be attentive, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible. Both theology and science, therefore, have a mystical basis." For Lonergan, their very dynamics "raise the question of ultimate truth, value, and authenticity." Egan (p.110) further points out that mystical theology "can find in Lonergan's theological method, based on the inherently mystical dynamism of the mind, one of the best ways to correlated critically and comprehensively religion, science and culture."

Thus, it appears that pursued to its logical conclusion, Lonergan's statement would hold that the authentic scholar, whether or not professing a religious motivation for carrying out his/her studies, operates in an atmosphere of integrity and love, "flowing from a self grasped by God's unconditional love, and a self structured by judgment and decision. Through surrender to the transcendental precepts, the basic dynamism of the human spirit to be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable, be responsible, and be in love, human authenticity arises (Egan, 1982, p.114)." Thus, one may conclude, on the basis of Lonergan's insights in this matter, that the true scholar is a person of integrity and authenticity, and for that reason the scholarly activity has much in common with mysticism since it is responsive to the transcendental precepts.

Lonergan approaches the topic from a somewhat different perspective from that of Teilhard de Chardin, S.J. An important byproduct of all research and publication carried out with integrity, a feature that Lonergan (1958, p.349) explicitly attends to is that there is a personal transformation that takes place in the researcher over and above the

discovery of new information. In the process of attaining truth, the scholar achieves personal self-transcendence in truthfulness. Even though one truthful statement does not make one trustworthy, nevertheless, habitual scholarly pursuit of truth deepens and confirms one in truthfulness he contends.

“Pure desire to know. . . is the absorption of investigation, the joy of discovery, the assurance of judgment, the modesty of limited knowledge. It is the relentless serenity, the unhurried determination, the imperturbable drive to question following appositely on question in the genesis of truth” (Lonergan, 1958, 349).

Thus the process of research and publication has the capacity on a continuing basis to deepen the scholar’s personal integrity or truthfulness.

But beyond the transcendental notion of truth, Lonergan (1972, p.34-35) introduces the transcendental notion of value which he defines as “what is intended in questions for deliberation, just as the intelligible is what is intended in questions for intelligence, and just as truth and being are what are intended in questions for reflection.” Lonergan further notes that “the transcendental notions are the dynamism which promotes the subject to full consciousness” beyond cognitional to the existential. Consequently Lonergan concludes that in any activity, that involves self-transcendence, such as research and publication, the scholar can become a principle “of benevolence and beneficence, capable of genuine collaboration and of true love. . . by reaching the sustained self-transcendence of the virtuous man that one becomes a good judge not on this or that human act, but on the whole range of human goodness.”

Certainly, overt fostering of these fundamental human values is germane to the goals of church-related colleges and universities. The opportunity for the scholar and student in an environment that is calculated not only to foster such values but to stimulate a reflection on them should be a strong feature of church-related schools.

Teilhard De Chardin’s Mystical Dimension of Scholarship

It must be admitted that the mystical dimension of scholarship up to the present has hardly been an overarching preoccupation of the faculty of church-related institutions. However, that is not to say that it should not be an increasingly strong motivating factor, if one takes seriously the thought and spirituality of Teilhard de Chardin, S.J. Teilhard developed a mysticism of knowing, quite different from the mysticism of unknowing of many before him, particularly as knowing relates to scientific discovery. His view may be summarized in his statement from *The Phenomenon of Man*, “Religion and science are the two conjugated faces or phases of one and the same complete act of knowledge.” King (1981, p. vii) says he believes the real significance of Teilhard is in his “exuberant claim that in the very act of scientifically achieving, he knew God. Teilhard began writing a theology of process and many of his readers came to see as he had seen; for when human knowledge is in process, God is found in the act of knowing.”

Teilhard gained many of his insights from the letters of St. Paul. In particular Teilhard linked the role of co-redeeming or co-creation of the universe to the work of the sons (and daughters) of God. Paul speaks of all creation groaning. . . . To explain this passage C. H. Dodd (1957 p. 33-34), in his study *The Meaning of Paul for Today* cites the poem *Everyman*, by Edith Anne Stewart claiming that it presents beautifully a thought akin to that of St. Paul, and certainly closely related to Teilhard’s view of the matter (King, 1981, p. vii-viii).

*All things search until they find
God through the gateway of thy mind*

*Highest star and humblest clod
Turn home through thee to God.*

*When thou rejoicest in the rose
Blissful from earth to heaven she goes;*

*Upon thy blossom summer seas
Escape from their captivities;*

*Within thy sleep the sightless eyes
Of night revisage Paradise:*

*In thy soft awe yon mountain high
To his creator draweth nigh;*

*This lonely tarn reflecting thee,
Returneth to eternity;*

*And thus in thee the circuit vast
Is rounded and complete at last,*

*And at last, through thee revealed
To God, what time and space concealed.*

Teilhard De Chardin's Synthesis

For Teilhard de Chardin, research plays a most important role in building up the Kingdom of Christ. He approaches the subject from the general point of view of geology, since that was his field of expertise. His line of thought goes much as follows. The outer crust of the Earth is made up of the layer called the lithosphere and is composed of rock. The hydrosphere is intimately associated with and is superimposed on the lithosphere, consisting as it does of water within the outer part of the Earth and on its surface. The biosphere has developed on the lithosphere and hydrosphere and is made up of the great variety of life forms that have evolved therefrom. An additional Earth-encircling layer, the atmosphere, is the gaseous sphere of air and clouds that provides our weather and interacts with the other spheres in many ways.

Teilhard has pointed out that with the advent of mankind on the Earth, an entirely new phenomenon has taken place. Unlike the other animals which know, mankind knows that he knows -- there is reflection. Teilhard recognizes that there has been produced and continues apace the development of products of the mind and heart that are forming a world-encircling, organic-psychic sphere that he refers to as "the thinking Earth" and he calls it the Noosphere." He says "we must enlarge our approach to encompass the formation, taking place before our eyes and arising out of this factor of hominisation, of a particular biological entity such as has never before existed on earth--the growth, outside and above the biosphere, of an added planetary layer, an envelope of thinking substance, to which, for the sake of convenience and symmetry, I have given the name of the Noosphere." (de Chardin, 1964, p.157). The term, noosphere, is from the Greek word, mind, and refers to the terrestrial sphere of thinking substance.

In this connection Teilhard draws our attention to the phenomenon of research that he regards as characteristic of the present age, an urge, a need to seek understanding, discovery and invention. He points out with great delight and awe that in past generations there were only a handful of researchers, but toward the end of his life in 1955 "In fields embracing every aspect of physical matter, life, and thought, the research-workers are to be numbered in hundreds of thousands, and they no longer work in isolation but in teams endowed with penetrative powers that it seems nothing can withstand." (de Chardin, 1964, p.173).

He provides a further insight into research as he continues, "Research, which until yesterday was a luxury pursuit, is in process of becoming a major, indeed the principal function of humanity. . . . As in the case of all the organisms preceding it, but on an immense scale, humanity is in process of 'cerebralisin'g' itself. And our proper biological course, in making use of what we call our leisure, is to devote it to a new kind of work on a higher plane: that is to say, to a general and concerted effort of vision. The Noosphere, in short, is a stupendous thinking machine." (de Chardin, 1964, p.173). Thus it is by our participation in research and in various activities that foster research that each one of us participates in building up the Noosphere. Teilhard continues his vision of humanity's role:

“Humanity . . . is building its composite brain beneath our eyes.” (de Chardin 1964, p. 178). Thus, in Teilhard’s view, by participating in the work of research and publication we participate in the mystical work of “re-creation” of the Earth and universe. It is this view, that Teilhard derives from the writings of St. Paul, that convinces him that until the masterplan by which the Earth and the universe were created is rediscovered, Christ can not assume His full role as King of the Universe. Thus, in his view, mankind’s role of rediscovery by means of scholarship is one of the important keys to insure and hasten the coming of the Kingdom!

Scholarship in Theology, Philosophy and the Natural Sciences

In a lengthy message to Rev. George V. Coyne, S.J., Director of the Vatican Observatory, His Holiness, Pope John Paul II refers to the publication of the volume, *Physics, Philosophy and Theology: A Common Quest for Understanding*, as affording the Pontiff the opportunity to thank the astronomer for efforts devoted to “a subject of such paramount importance.” The Pope goes on to say that the theme of the conference is a crucial one for the contemporary world and because of its importance he wishes “to address some issues which the interactions among natural science, philosophy, and theology present to the Church and to human society in general.”

The entire fourteen pages of the papal message is a welcome treatment of several aspects of my topic, and deserves careful reading and reflection by anyone concerned with scholarly activities in church-related schools. Among other statements, His Holiness goes on to speak about these relationships and interactions as follows:

“By encouraging openness between the Church and the scientific communities, we are not envisioning a disciplinary unity between theology and science like that which exists within a given scientific field or within theology proper. As dialogue and common searching continue, there will be growth towards mutual understanding and a gradual uncovering of common concerns which will provide the basis for further research and discussion. . . .

“We might ask whether or not we are ready for this crucial endeavor. Is the community of world religions, including the Church, ready to enter into a more thorough-going dialogue with the scientific community, a dialogue in which the integrity of both religion and science is supported and the advance of each is fostered? Is the scientific community now prepared to open itself to Christianity, and indeed to all the great world religions, working with us all to build a culture that is more humane and in that way more divine? Do we dare to risk the honesty and the courage that this task demands? We must ask ourselves whether both science and religion will contribute to the integration of human culture or to its fragmentation. It is a single choice and it confronts us all.

“Now this is a point of delicate importance, and it has to be carefully qualified. Theology is not to incorporate indifferently each new philosophical or scientific theory. As these findings become part of the intellectual culture of the time, however, theologians must understand them and test their value in bringing out from Christian belief some of the possibilities which have not yet been realized. The hylomorphism of Aristotelian natural philosophy, for example, was adopted by the medieval theologians to help them explore the nature of the sacraments and the hypostatic union. This did not mean that the Church adjudicated the truth or falsity of the Aristotelian insight, since that is not her concern. It did mean that this was one of the rich insights offered by Greek culture, that it needed to be understood and taken seriously and tested for its value in illuminating various areas of theology. Theologians might well ask, with respect to contemporary science, philosophy and the other ares of human knowing, if they have accomplished this extraordinarily difficult process as well as did these medieval masters.

“The matter is urgent. Contemporary developments in science challenge theology far more deeply than did the introduction of Aristotle into Western Europe in the thirteenth century. Yet these developments also offer to theology a potentially important resource. Just as Aristotelian philosophy, through the ministry of such great scholars as St. Thomas Aquinas, ultimately came to shape some of the most profound expressions of theological doctrine, so can we not hope that the sciences of today, along with all forms

of human knowing, may invigorate and inform those parts of the theological enterprise that bear on the relation of nature, humanity and God? . . . (John Paul II, 1988, in Coyne, p. M1-M14.)

“Science can purify religion from error and superstition; religion can purify science from idolatry and false absolutes. Each can draw the other into a wider world, a world in which both can flourish. . . .

“Both the church and the scientific community are faced with such inescapable alternatives. We shall make our choices much better if we live in a collaborative interaction in which we are called continually to be more. Only a dynamic relationship between theology and science can reveal those limits which support the integrity of either discipline, so that theology does not profess a pseudo-science and science does not become an unconscious theology. Our knowledge of each other can lead us to be more authentically ourselves. No one can read the history of the past century and not realize that crisis is upon us both. The uses of science have on more than one occasion proven massively destructive, and the reflections on religion have too often been sterile. We need each other to be what we must be, what we are called to be.”

Conclusion

In an address to the provincials and central government of the Society of Jesus in 1982, Pope John Paul II focused on the great importance of “the Christian penetration of the culture of the world around us” (O’Keefe, 1988, p.68). It was this concern that led his Holiness on May 20, 1982 to institute the Pontifical Council for Culture, a special permanent body for the purpose of promoting the great objectives which the Second Vatican Council proposed regarding relations between the Church and culture. The Pope said:

“Since the beginning of my pontificate, I have considered the Church’s dialogue with cultures of our time to be a vital area, one in which the destiny of the world at the end of the 20th Century is at stake. Now people live a fully human life thanks to culture. Yes, the future of people depends on culture” (O’Keefe, 1988, p. 69).

One of the most important ways by which mankind today refines and unfolds his manifold spiritual and bodily qualities and thus brings “the world itself under his control is by his knowledge and labor”, as *Gaudium et Spes* recommends. The Pontiff goes on to further describe what he means: “Finally, it is a feature of culture that throughout the course of time man expresses, communicates, and conserves in his works great spiritual experiences and desires, so that these may be of advantage to the progress of many, even of the whole human family” (O’Keefe, 1988, p. 69).

Certainly the role of research and publication is a most vital one in developing, communicating and preserving the great experiences of the mind and heart. (O’Keefe, 1988, p. 63) has identified as “a characteristic of Jesuit Education. . . “a full blown concern to develop intellectual probity, critical intelligence, and responsible freedom.” “We look to an enquiring mind because we are dealing with true education and not just training.”

Daley discusses the question of how Jesuits and others make sense “of the commitment of this body of Catholic priests and their associates to an enterprise that is not, in itself, explicitly religious at all, and that necessarily occupies itself much of the time with purely secular pursuits?” Daley responds that “the continuing connection between Jesuits and humanistic or liberal studies is not fortuitous” but because of the recognition from the earliest days of the Society’s existence that “the value of liberal education as a Jesuit priestly ministry” is “not simply in the possible personal influence of the teacher on his pupils but in the very content of educational enterprise (Daley, 1988, p.5).”

In the last analysis the value of research and publication seems to lie primarily in the intellectual worth of the research and publication and in the academic integrity, or in Lonergan’s term, the authenticity of the scholar. Scholarship is an heuristic activity that is fundamental to human nature, to the human spirit, and when carried out with fidelity to the transcendental method, scholarship cannot fail to produce positive results in the realm of

“the never ending buildup of knowledge (Gregson, 1985, p.36) that is “the natural consequence of the methodological structure of our knowing (Gregson, p. 36).” I believe that Teilhard de Chardin, S.J. would whole-heartedly have endorsed Lonergan’s assessment of the qualities of one who is an authentic person. Moreover, in the spirit of Teilhard, I would add that by fidelity to these transcendental precepts, the researcher builds up the Noosphere and thus hastens the coming of the Kingdom of Christ. Teilhard believed that the committed Christian should be fully involved with the culture of the age, and that “the sons of heaven... should “compete on the human level, in conviction and hence on equal terms, with the children of the world (de Chardin, 1965, p. 65).” For Teilhard, as a priest and Jesuit, geological research was the highest and all-consuming activity of his life. At the same time his life as a scientist was suffused with and enlivened by a mystical sense of the presence of Christ in every aspect of this activity. He expresses this as follows: “Let us look at ourselves in one of those places of dominant activity and try to see how, with the help of our activity and by developing it to the full, the divine presses in upon us and seeks to enter our lives (de Chardin, 1965, p. 50).

In discussing the age old question of the value of “secular” versus “religious” activities Teilhard left us no doubt that he considered that distinction as having little meaning. He says on this point: “Nothing is more certain dogmatically, than that human action can be sanctified. ‘Whatever you do,’ says St. Paul, ‘do it in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ’.” Teilhard believed that at the same time it is written by his teacher, St. Paul, as well as in the human heart by nature that the believer “must be an example to the Gentiles in devotion to duty, in energy, and even in leadership in all the spheres opened up by man’s activity.” His resolution to the question is amplified further, “we can reconcile, and provide mutual nourishment for, the love of God and the healthy love of the world, a striving towards detachment and a striving towards the enrichment of our human lives” by a full involvement in human activities, the highest of which for him was research (de Chardin, 1965, p. 51-53).

References Cited

Alpha Sigma Nu Newsletter, Spring 1989.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1988, Leading Research Universities, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Sept. 6, 1989, p. 24.

de Chardin, S.J., P. T., 1965, *The Divine Milieu*, Harper Colophon Books, Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 160p.

de Chardin, S.J., P.T., 1964, *The Future of Man*, Harper and Row, Publishers, New York and Evanston, 319p.

Daley, S.J., B.E., 1988, “Splendor and Wonder: Ignatian Mysticism and the Ideal of Liberal Education,” p. 3 - 20, in William J. O’Brien (editor), *Splendor and Wonder: Jesuit Character, Georgetown Spirit and Liberal Education*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 106p.

Dodd, C.H., 1957, *The Meaning of Paul for Today*, Living Ages Books, published by Meridian Books, New York, 190p.

Egan, S.J., H.D., 1982, *What Are They Saying About Mysticism?*, Paulist Press, 134p.

Fitzgerald, S.J., Paul, 1984, *The Governance of Jesuit Colleges in the United States 1920-1970*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1984, 310p.

Gregson, Vernon, 1985, “Lonergan, Spirituality, and the Meeting of Religions,” *College Theology Society, Studies in Religion*, 2, University Press of America, Inc., Lanham, Md and London, Eng., 154p.

John Paul II, 1988, “Message to the Reverend George V. Coyne, S.J., Director of the Vatican Observatory,” p. M1 - M14 in *Physics, Philosophy, and Theology: A Common Quest for Understanding*, Russell, R.J., Stoeger, S.J., W.R., and Coyne, S.J., G.V., Editors, 419p.

King, T.M., 1982, *Teilhard's Mysticism of Knowing*, The Seabury Press, New York, 154p.

Lonergan, S.J., Bernard J.F., 1978, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, Harper and Row, San Francisco, 785p.

Lonergan, S.J., Bernard J.F., 1972, *Method in Theology*, Herder and Herder, New York, 403p.

O'Keefe, S.J., Vincent, 1988, "Jesuit Education: Myth and Reality, Context and Mission," p. 591 - 92, in William J. O'Brien (editor), *Splendor and Wonder: Jesuit Character, Georgetown Spirit, and Liberal Education*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 106p.

Science/Technology Education in Church-Related Colleges and Universities		
ID	Article Title	Author
BK022-001	Table of Contents	
BK022-002	Foreword	Father Robert Brungs, SJ
BK022-003	Keynote Address	J. A. Panuska, SJ
BK022-004	Reflection: Imaginative Learning in Theology, Science and Technology	J. Cross, C. Ford, G. Magill
BK022-005	A Pilot Study of the Present Condition of Undergraduate Science and Technology Education in Church-Related Colleges as Perceived by Department Chairpersons	Charles E. Ford
BK022-006	Feasibility of Developing Adequate Natural Science Programs in a Church-Related School	J. Richard Chase
BK022-007	Why Church-Related Institutions Should Be Involved in Science/ Technology Education	Sr. Rosemary Connell, CSJ
BK022-008	Science and Technology in Jesuit Education	Robert A. Brungs, SJ
BK022-009	Science/Technology Education: An Administrative Perspective	James Bundschuh
BK022-010	The Ideal and Reality of Science Education in Catholic Colleges and Universities	Thaddeus J. Burch, SJ
BK022-011	In What Ways Can Science/Technology Education Enrich the More General Liberal Arts Emphasis of Many Church-Related Schools?	Sr. Mary Virginia Orna, OSU and Sr. Angelice Seibert, OSU
BK022-012	The Role and Importance of Research and Publication in Church- Related Schools	James W. Skehan, SJ
BK022-013	Developments in Science/Technology/Society Curricula at the Secondary Level and How Colleges Can Connect and Continue	Marie Sherman
BK022-014	STS: A New Opportunity for the Re-Integration of Christian Concern into American Academic Life	Rustum Roy
BK022-015	Session 1: Discussion after Keynote	
BK022-016	Session 2: General Discussion	
BK022-017	Session 3: General Discussion	
BK022-018	Session 4: General Discussion	
BK022-019	Session 5: Small Group Reports	
BK022-020	Session 6: General Discussion	
BK022-021	Session 7: General Discussion	