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JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY
Theology's Disturbing Presence in the University

Theodore J. Mackin, S.J.

An analysis of the current mood of the professors of theology on more than a few Catholic campuses would undoubtedly reveal a nervousness that is perhaps slight; but it is also persistent and, strangely, ironic. Noting the persistence is simply a matter of keeping one's eyes and ears open. Accounting for the irony is a matter of understanding the uniquely privileged situation of theology on the Catholic college campus. This does not mean the condition of theology as an integral part of liberal education understood Christianly, because in this light its situation is not a privileged one. But estimated juridically it is the closest approach to an Establishment among all the disciplines populating the American university scene. It is liable to fall and banishment only when and if the clerical (and in the majority of cases, regular clerical) government of Catholic colleges in America falls.

Yet the nervousness is there. It is the kind of nervousness inevitable to the privileged position that is the more readily criticized because it is not only privileged but impregnable. (The writer knows of one institution in which the quinquennial visitors from the accrediting agency were assured by a non-theologian professor that if the matter were put to a vote of the faculty at large, theology would be removed from the curricula altogether.)

The point of this essay is not to defend theology anew. It is rather to suggest the ambiguity of the role of theology in any university; and thereby to suggest more viable reasons why the university itself should feel nervous in company with the professors of theology. It may be nervous if theology has its place in the school's program of liberal studies, nervous if it is excluded.

PART I

Whether one agrees or not that theology is a science, he may legitimately grant for the sake of discussion that when a theologian does what theologians do he proceeds scientifically. Now, it is evident that for every kind of scientist there is a unique and character-

1 In its original form, this essay was delivered at the intersemester convocation, February, 1964, at the University of Santa Clara.
istic moment in which his scientific process comes to birth: wherein the mathematician first perceives and recognizes a specific how much or how many; wherein a physicist first perceives and recognizes measurable movement or mass or weight; wherein a philosopher first perceives and recognizes existence or becoming. This first perception and recognition of his aspect of reality is for each the beginning moment of his career of scientific knowing. All his future work is a continuation of that moment, protracting it in an organic wholeness; that moment, its perception and its recognition, are the impetus for all that he will ever do; the implications of that moment, its suggestion of great potential for knowledge, are the attraction drawing the scientist ahead in his career of observation and experimentation.

The theologian, too, experiences a moment of birth of his process of knowing; a moment at least as characteristic and unique as that of any other kind of knowing, and (to understate it deplorably) rather more so.

This is the experience of the divine communication to men; of revelation, to use the traditional term for it. If the critical mind objects right away that the theologian apparently begins by begging the question whether God can communicate to men, and whether He has and does, one can say only that the theologian is eventually driven to begging: not the question, but help from the metaphysician in determining whether communication from God to men is possible; and help from the historian to determine whether, under conditions clarified by the metaphysician, God has in fact communicated.

But the theologian is not being coy when he insists that God need not wait on the metaphysician before He communicates; and that He may have his own way of making men sure that He has communicated (and thus turning them into incipient theologians) long before the metaphysician helps make them reflectively and scientifically sure of it.

It is upon this moment of theology’s birth in the particular theologian (when God communicates, even in the 20th century, and the man receives) that this paper wishes to reflect. What is singular about this moment for the newly aborning theologian is that it is possible for him to assume towards his discipline’s birth-evidence a variety of attitudes available to none of the other scientists. A physicist either accepts movement and mass and weight as unquestionably there or else he does not do physics. He may be unsure of
the location of the particle, unsure of its direction, unsure of its velocity, unsure of its rate of de-acceleration, unsure even whether the source of these elusive phenomena is in fact a particle. But that the phenomena are there he does not doubt; and, most significantly to the point here, the phenomena make no other demand on him qua physicist than that he accept and observe them, albeit most painstakingly.

But consider the poor theologian and the ambiguities available to him. The communication of God, though divine, comes in humanly phrased assertions; the assertions, though humanly phrased, come in a divine communication; the communication, because divine, is asserted in the most rigorous sense of that word. The theologian is vulnerable to the temptation to attend to one of these elements of his birth-experience while ignoring others. He could consider the assertion simply as a proposition. For example, he could consider that in God there is a threeness of distinct persons; and while doing so he could ignore that the assertion purportedly comes from God himself. He could analyze the proposition for its possibility. He could marshall many such propositions and arrange a structure of credal commitment. He could compare and correlate them with propositions belonging to the religions of other cultural milieux.

Some thinkers about religions and their creeds do these kinds of things. They are sometimes thought mistakenly to be theologians, whereas they are really only historians of religious belief or students of comparative religions.

Or the nascent theologian could accept the divine assertion precisely as that: not simply as a statement in a gospel or a proposition in a creed, but rather as coming from God in its full-dimensional, concrete and existential reality. Not merely as having come from God in times past, not as having been deposited in a corpus of revelation; but as asserted continually by the timeless God for a future that is future only to men but is a continuous present to Him.

The same point may be put in another, quasi-poetic way. If the birth-experience of theology is the accepting of the divine communication, and if this is accepted for all that it is, namely, the demanding God getting at a man's mind here and now, then the birth-experience is a religious experience. This first act of perception, so morally innocent in the other sciences, is here the act of faith. Or if the perception is, after reflection, refused, then the experience
is whatever one calls the refusal to make the act of faith. This sug-
gests another element of the available ambiguity. The theologian
can turn second thoughts on the experience, can become reflectively
critical and ask with a too-human audacity: "Is it really the Lord
who is speaking?"

Here is the substance of the indictment that theology tends to
bring a unique and alien nervousness on to the campus. By no one's
estimation do the act of faith, religious experience and crises of re-
jection and agnosticism bring sedation to the campus. Indeed, what
place do these have in a university?

What lies before a theologian if he chooses to accept the divine
communication as real and for him? All the work of theologizing
does; and it is to the point to itemize some of the academically
honorable things a theologian has to do. He must first set to work to
understand the vocabulary of the divine communication. Because
it is historically Hebraic in the Old Testament and Greek in the New
Testament, he finds himself paying his first call on Hebrew and
Greek grammar, rhetoric, history and anthropology.

Again, so much of what is divinely asserted is asserted by im-
plication. To cite but one example, nowhere in the New Testament
is it said explicitly that there are in God three persons, distinct in
their personhood but one in existence and equally divine. But
liberally scattered through the New Testament are assertions of
divine performance on the part of the God whom Abraham, Isaac
and Jacob worshipped; on the part of Jesus of Nazareth; and on the
part of a second advocate whom this Jesus prayed the Father to give
his disciples on the eve of his departure from them.

Because so much of the divine assertion is assertion by implica-
tion, the theologian must do an apprenticeship in logical reasoning
so as to learn the art of inference; as he must also do an apprentice-
ship in metaphysics to learn the recognition of kinds of existence
and therefore kinds of meaning when asserted by God. But still his
theologizing is always a religious experience; it is always the work-
ing out of a first act of faith. But it must be that if he is to come to
know anything. And this means "to know" in the most rigorous sense
of the term; not as opinion, not as useful erudition, not as a struc-
ture of hypotheses. A man truly knows some element of reality when
he is certain by reflecting on his perception of that reality that the
sole, or at least dominant cause of that non-reflective perception is
the reality itself. This is the kind of knowing that is intuitive or
perceptual knowing.
But the task is not always that simple. If the reality in question does not come within perceptible experience, it can be known only if it somehow acts in its imperceptible way to give perceptible evidence of itself.

Now, it is accurately said that no man has ever seen God. We go beyond that and say that no man can see God and no man ever will, because God is immaterial and therefore imperceptible. And it is beyond even God himself, no matter what St. Augustine says, to put into the perceptible world veritable evidence of such realities as the threeness of persons in himself. It is beyond even God to put into the world such evidence that men can carry on interpersonal communication with Him. And most disconcerting of all, it is beyond even God to put into the world evidence that human history has any meaning in the sense that the affairs of men make any sense; that they began with an orientation and may yet be moving along that orientation towards a goal.

To accept and know that there is a “yes” to these questions, a man either accepts God’s assertion that there is, or he lives forever without an answer. He may develop opinions about them; or he may have opinions about the opinions of other men about them. But for the realities behind the questions to be real to him to the point of making up his mind, he must surrender his mind to the asserting God. And where it is an asserting God to whom the surrender must be made, the emotions and will surrender too, or surrender there is not.

But there is something worse about a theologian than his attitude of surrender, and surrender to a possibility of realities that are not empirically observable phenomena. Worse, apparently, is the persuasion that a kind of reality imperceptible to men has communicated itself from beyond the limits of perception in a way that is yet comprehensible to men. And worst of all is the surrender to both the possibility and the fact because a certain kind of theologian’s Church tells him to. What chance has scientific objectivity? What chance the neutral approach, the unbiased observation, the detached and impersonal finding? What, in fact, is theology doing out of church and in the university?

If detached objectivity really is difficult for the reason just indicated, it may be even more difficult for yet another reason, subtle and not easily explained. This has to do with the apparent necessity to abstract in one’s act of knowing if one is to know scientifically. What a scientist works with is, to be sure, individual and con-
crete things and their here-and-now performance. These are what he first perceives and judges. But this acquaintance with the individual is hardly what he is seeking for. He seeks to understand it only in that it is a kind of thing; a kind of thing that carries on its kind of activity. Though his knowledge begins in the individual and concrete, it must take leave of it while retaining understanding of the kind of thing it is and the kind of action it carries on. Failure to do this is to leave his comprehension as limited as the one thing with which he started. We pay no compliments to the psychologist who, after months of granted and funded experimentation with the Jones child, announces at the end: "Well, now I know all about the Jones child."

If his work is to be scientific, he must abstract his knowledge from the Jones child; or more accurately, abstract the Jones child from his knowledge. Where the parents began the trouble by pushing the child out of the nest, the psychologist can begin to alleviate the kind of trouble only by pushing the child out of his mind.

There is another and less common way in which the scientist abstracts. The subjects of some observation and experimentation carry in themselves a demand for moral response. Again with the Jones child, a psychologist studying the effects of too early and too precipitate unnesting on a little one will surely come upon this moral dimension. The very subject of his observation cries out to him to relieve the misery that had attracted his attention in the first place. The psychologist may indeed respond in a helping way; but his helping will not be impelled by his observation and experimentation, nor will it be an organic part of his observation and experimentation. It is not as psychologist that he will help, but as a compassionate human being.

Yet another troublesome characteristic of theology is that it disallows these two kinds of abstraction. It disallows them because it cannot permit them and remain theology. It keeps the theologian rooted in individuality and concreteness and involved with the morally demanding.

He cannot abstract from individual and concrete circumstances because the ultimate subject of his study, who is God, is not a kind of being; and the proximate subject, the assertions of God, are literally like nothing a man has ever heard before. This not only means that there are not many Gods of the same kind whom he might observe and on whom he might experiment with impersonal and fruitful multiplicity; but because the one God himself is not a kind of
being, a number of unsettling consequences follow from this transcendant singularity. One is that for the theologian the subject of study cannot be controlled by that controlling act of the mind which is conceptualization, wherein other scientists may sometimes and legitimately speculate on the natures of things without having to bother always with the capricious things themselves. But also, because God is not a kind of thing, men can never become shrewd and expert about him and thus subject him to controlled observation in the sense suggested by the sometimes remark: "Prof. Smith knows all about that kind of thing."

Indeed, in theology it is the subject of the purported scientific observation who controls the observation. Theology is the one science that can go on at all only on condition that the scientist and his subject of study play one another's roles: the theologian can observe God's performance, which is his revelation, only if God experiments with the theologian by subjecting him to his uncontrollable and transcendentally originating revelation.

Neither can the theologian abstract from the moral demands of his subject-under-observation. This is not in virtue of some prior moral imperative demanding that all theologians be good men. There is none. And in addition, some theologians have not been very good men. It is rather due to the fact that the divine assertion specifically as evidence offered to human consideration is moral. The reason for a man's taking God's assertion seriously is not simply that it is there, which is the honestly sufficient reason for taking seriously the phenomena of any other science. In theology, the reason is that the assertion is made by Him who claims "I am the Lord." And the name "Lord," as we know from its semitic origin, signifies "He who causes all things to be." This includes the theologian. To consider seriously the subject of theology is to make personal encounter with a being claiming to be the source and the goal of one's own very existence.

More than that, beyond merely encountering the subject of theology, to have knowledge therein is to intensify all the most unsettling elements of this personal encounter. As suggested earlier, a man truly knows in any experience with the real when he is reflectively aware that the cause of his perception is that reality acting upon his faculties of knowing.

Now, in theology the only sufficient cause of a man's judgment is this: that God presents to him accurately the kind of reality that God alone can present. Much of that reality, indeed most of it,
otherwise escapes human experience because it cannot enter into it. As examples, consider again two of the realities cited earlier: that God's existence is a threeness of distinct persons; that men can enter into an interpersonal communication with God. One can say with accuracy, "Yes, it is so" to them only if one first accepts the veracity of God. But God's first challenge to one's willingness to accept his veracity is the highly personal and moral challenge to accept him as first cause of one's existence and ultimate source of one's happiness. One cannot reject him as this while trying to accept him as veracious. This is a contradiction.

Thus to have knowledge at all in theology, to be able to say "yes" with good cause to the reality presented, a man must first say with the apostle Thomas: "My Lord and my God." Putting it yet another way, in theology the here-and-now causing of the theologian's knowing is God here and now asserting his identity as cause of the theologian's existence. Little wonder that the prized features of scientific investigation—leisure, independence, control, objectivity, serenity—seem so lost to the theologian. And honestly little wonder too that there is such reluctance to allow that theology is a science. For if it is somehow true, as the medievals insisted, that theology is the queen of the sciences, it is nevertheless hard to see how she is a member of the royal family. Hers must be an imported and imposed royalty.

A point-for-point and sufficient resolving of these difficulties is hardly feasible in an essay of this size. But a not unprofitable beginning can be made by suggesting that the difficulties may not be here proposed with thorough accuracy.

Implicit in the indictment of the theologian for denominational bias is the failure to understand that a theologian does not really have to adhere to a denomination in order to theologize. More accurately, he does not have to be a member of the Church. Provided he accepts the fact of God's assertion to men, and indeed accepts the assertion, and labors to understand that assertion, he is knowing theologically. He may not yet and may never understand that God wills the union of men in a society we call the Church. Consequently no threat of churchly prejudice need keep a man from seeking to understand what God has revealed. There is a subtlety here: he need not be in and of the Church in order to theologize, but he cannot do so without it, as will be said later; just as, in analogous fashion, a man can be brought to salvation while outside the Church, but not without it.
Also implicit in the indictment of the theologian for pre-scientific loyalty to a Church and its consequent bias, is a failure to inquire accurately into the reason for his loyalty. Every Christian man who takes thought must come some day to a moment of critical choice about the Church. This is true even despite his being baptized into it as an infant, since baptism gives him the habit of faith; and this faith, if it be not neglected, leads to understanding, whose first move is to inquire.

The theologian will probably come to that moment of choice more frequently and forcefully than others just because he is forever inquiring into the evidence. Which, then, comes first for him: the evidence that is God's assertion? or what his Church says of the assertion? Does he accept God's assertion because his Church tells him to? Or does he accept the Church because he is convinced God's assertion tells him to?

The answer here is not easy, and certainly not easy enough to approach in this paper. Indeed the question about the nature of theology itself, is one of the most difficult in theology. This is a rare paradox among the sciences and a disturbing one for the theologian, namely, that only his science can tell itself what it is. Every other science known to men enjoys the luxury of having philosophy able to tell it what it is, and often the philosophers ready to tell it.

But we may at least point out, before leaving the question, that though seemingly so fairly put here, it is really put in a falsifying way. For what is true is that the theologian finds God's assertions within the Church. He does not find them in a Book simply, because the Book in question is not a simple one. This, in turn, means that there is more meaning in it than meets anyone's eye, or even anyone's expert intelligence; its deepest meaning can be comprehended only on being explained by someone equipped to do so. But it is self-evident, provided one concedes that the Book carrying the assertions of God had to come from God, that whoever is equipped to penetrate and illuminate its profoundest meanings can do so only if equipped by God. One may rightly suspect that in saying that, we have just about defined the Church. That is really the fair and accurate way of getting at the question: to allow the Church her necessary role in the science of theology. But again we have trouble. For if the Church is in theology, and theology is allowed into the university, plainly the Church is in the university too.
But if that is yet another reason rightly making a university nervous about including theology among its disciplines, there are nevertheless profound counter-reasons demanding its presence there. The up-shot of it all may be that universities, to be truly universities, should be nervous places indeed.

I take it that a university is well though not completely defined as a community of learners, some of them called professors, others students, who are learning to know. The apparent redundancy is intended here: “Learners learning to know.” Admittedly the students and professors are learning about things. But that is secondary to the work of the university; and it is not what legitimizes the institution’s claim to the universality implied in the name university. Surely there are more things to learn about than can possibly be included in any one institution’s program of learning.

The universality of learning is found more justifiably in the students’ striving to gain competence in all the kinds of knowledge a man is capable of: in empirical knowledge, in mathematical knowledge, in metaphysical knowledge. And each of these kinds of knowledge rendered scientific by a disciplined defining and analysis of its subject matter in terms of its first principles.

If one asserts that even with competence gained in all these kinds of knowledge the student is still incomplete without theology, one does not say he is incomplete only because he has not yet considered the most knowable reality of all, who is God. That is true, but to stay with it alone as an explanation would be to turn back and define universality of knowing again in terms of subject matter.

The student is incomplete in his humanity without the experience of knowing theologically; and knowing theologically in the troubling way described above. Why incomplete in his humanity? Apart from theological knowing the most excellent way of knowing available to a man is metaphysical knowing. This is because in it a man knows what is in itself the most intelligible of all dimensions of reality; that is, existence apprehended as existence. He knows that dimension of reality most transcendentally universal, since whatever is real and knowable exists in some way; and in metaphysics alone can a man, of his human initiative, know about God. This is so, since only in metaphysics does a man find evidence demanding the here-and-now existence of a being whose existence must be un-caused, namely, the inability of the kinds of existence he observes with his senses to account for their existing at all.
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But though that would seem to be the final and completing experience of human knowing, it is not. It is not because, though it attains to God, it does so in the conclusion of a deductive inference. God, though known to be personal and individual, is not attained in his individuality and personhood. But it is plain from human experience that knowledge not involving a man in individual and personal existence cannot be the best kind of knowing, because it does not make him happy as a man. It might otherwise make him happy as a metaphysician, except that there is no such thing as a metaphysician; there are only men who happen to be competent in metaphysics.

What about other kinds of knowledge than metaphysics? It is true that they involve the scholar in individual and sometimes in personal existence; but as the beginning and not the end of his scholarly effort. Besides, none of them deals with anything better than other human beings, at the best; and it is plain again from experience that human beings are not made happy by other human beings.

Now, theology does not claim to make human beings happy, any more than it is the responsibility of the university to make the scholar happy. But how could the university validate its claim to universality if it omitted from its effort at human knowledge the one discipline, namely, theology, within whose kind of knowing an individual and personal existence is encountered that holds promise of being able to make human beings happy in the knowing?

There is another aspect of universality about which the university must be concerned. We have just spoken of the most universal kind of knowing; and if to know is to have an answer, then it is also the most universal kind of answer. I think that without forcing language we can also identify the most universal of all questions. Strangely, it is not an exact correlate to the answer; but then how frequently the truly serious questions, as asked by limited human intelligence, fail to hint accurately at their astonishing answers.

Whatever a student comes upon in his study, he comes upon the world in process, in movement. If one thinks through the liberal disciplines and even the technical trainings for a moment, one will see how true this is. If this or that discipline deals not with process (though one is hard put to think of any), at least its own contemporary history as a discipline shows change that tries to be movement towards a more perfect version of itself. This last is true about
that discipline otherwise thought by the unknowing to be least concerned with movement, namely, mathematics.

Granting that the proper study of man is man, then in the subject of study most native to the student and most enticing to his curiosity—himself and his brothers and sisters in the human race—he finds movement, change, process at their greatest acceleration. And how easy it would be to itemize the most frantically increased acceleration of virtually every human process in the world in which students live.

They do pause and ask at times a question deemed universal enough: “Whither is it all going?” A synonym to that stating of the question is: “What does it all mean?” This is synonymous because the meaning of any process is its goal.

Does a university have some responsibility to suggest to the student the answer to that question? Or, turning the cutting edge of the query aside just a bit, does the university have a responsibility to suggest at least with which kind of knowledge he may best hope to find the answers for himself?

If theology has been having its difficulties until now, now the other disciplines begin to have theirs. For to find the direction of a process empirically, one must know the starting point, or at least the goal, or at very least the direction (which, if one think on it, presumes knowing the goal). But none of the disciplines working from empirical observation can do this, because there is no record of the beginning of the human process; and the end has not yet been sighted empirically because it does not yet exist. Philosophy may try fairly to answer the question of whither the human process, but it ends trying to guide and even prod men with the end of a syllogism.

Should the theologian say now arrogantly that his discipline does the job? Not if he keeps the factual history of theologians in mind: they have succeeded as well as any and better than most in confusing men. But theology at least claims to have been given evidence out of which the answer can be wrung. And here we are back to the over-riding question of this essay: what ought a university to do about this claim? Perhaps it ought now to take it up in a responsible way—if only for the sake of validating its claim to universality.

But there is a more demanding reason than that. The question of goal and the direction of history interest more people than those who inhabit universities. Indeed, these other people are so interested in it that they are willing to steer history towards its goal, and
are even willing to decide what its goal is. It would be at least a shame for the universities, because of the fears outlined earlier, to turn the question over to them by forfeit. It has happened more than once and can happen again that the universities are eventually forced to look at the question, but in the flickering light of those other people’s answer.

IT MUST NEVER be forgotten that the subject of Christian education is man whole and entire, soul united to body in unity of nature, with all his faculties natural and supernatural, such as right reason and revelation show him to be.

—Pius XI, Divinus Illius Magistri.
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EUGENE F. MANGOLD, S.J.

HIGH SCHOOL STATISTICS
FOUR YEAR ENROLLMENTS

The official listing of Jesuit American high schools shows the names of 51 high schools. Two of the 51 high schools however are in South America and have different time schedules and different classifications of students. For these reasons, Colegio San Jose of Arequipa, Peru, a Chicago Province school and Colegio San Mateo of Osorno, Chile, a Maryland Province school, are not included in the present study of the 1964-1965 high school statistics of American Jesuit high schools. Both of these high schools, however, are officially listed as American high schools.

The present enquiry on high school enrollment for the scholastic year will thus deal with 49 American Jesuit high schools. Of these 49 high schools, 46 high schools report on full four year enrollments. For the current year, Brebeuf Prep of Indianapolis has only the first three years of high school; Jesuit High of Sacramento has only the first two years of high school; Xavier of Concord has only the first three years of high school.

A general study of the enrollment statistics of American Jesuit high schools shows that they may be broken down into three fairly even categories of size. In the category of 127 students to 500 students, we have 17 schools; in the category of 500 to 900 students, we find 18 schools; in the category of 900 to 1599 students, we find 14 schools.

In the first category (127 to 500 students) are the following 17 schools, in order of enrollment size, Loyola of Missoula (127); Bishop’s Latin (165); Jesuit of Sacramento (202); Loyola of New York (202); Cranwell (221); Georgetown Prep (244); Xavier of Concord (304); Colegio San Ignacio (311); Jesuit of Shreveport (315); Cheverus (381); Jesuit of Tampa (391); Jesuit of El Paso (408); Scranton Prep (411); Bellarmine of Tacoma (415); Jesuit of Houston (418); Brebeuf (465); and Seattle Prep (497).

In the second category (500 to 900 students) we have the following 18 schools: Jesuit of Portland (511); Brophy (553); Chap-
lain Kapaun (565); Jesuit of Dallas (584); Campion (598); Regis of Denver (614); Regis of N.Y. (639); Loyola of Towson (703); Gonzaga, D.C. (728); McQuaid (770); Gonzaga of Spokane (779); Fairfield Prep (802); Rockhurst High (805); Jesuit of New Orleans (818); St. Joseph’s (839); Fordham Prep (858); St. Louis U. High (873); and Canisius High (883).

In the third category (900 to 1600 students) we have the following 14 schools: Bellarmine of San Jose (905); Brooklyn (948); Xavier of N.Y. (953); Marquette U. High (980); U. of Detroit High (993); Creighton Prep (1018); Loyola of Los Angeles (1026); St. Peter’s Prep (1069); St. Ignatius of San Francisco (1090); St. Ignatius of Chicago (1104); St. Ignatius of Cleveland (1120); St. Xavier of Cincinnati (1232); Boston College High (1281); and Loyola Academy (1599).

If one were to check the enrollment figures in the tabular table of high school enrollments for the current year he would find three apparent discrepancies in the figures listed in the above categories. In the tabular figures the enrollment figure given is for total enrollment of the school. In the categories listed above the enrollment figure given is for high school students only. The schools affected are Colegio San Ignacio with a high school enrollment of 311 but with a grammar school enrollment of 233 for a total of 544, Georgetown Prep has a high school enrollment of 244 but with an enrollment in grammar grades of 57 for a total enrollment of 301. Loyola of New Orleans has a high school enrollment of 818 and a junior high enrollment of 101 for a total of 919.

To continue the study of the general enrollment picture of the American Jesuit high school a bit further we could say with accuracy that a student population of between 300 and 900 is the general enrollment pattern of the Jesuit American high school. The first category (127 to 500) contains Loyola of Missoula which could be described as the only diocesan or parish high school which the Society administers in the United States. It also contains Bishop’s Latin which is primarily a prep seminary. Jesuit of Sacramento, another entry in this category has only two years enrolled. Loyola of New York, Cranwell Prep, and Georgetown are all strictly prep schools and prefer to keep their enrollment low. Xavier of Concord has only three years enrolled at the present time.

This further study shows, therefore, that 29 of the 49 American Jesuit high schools are in the enrollment category of 300 to 900 students.
The nine largest high schools—all over 1000 students—have a total student population of 10,539 students or 30.9 percent of the entire student population of all 49 high schools. The nine largest high schools are: Loyola of Chicago (1599), Boston College High (1281), St. Xavier of Cincinnati (1232), St. Ignatius of Cleveland (1120), St. Ignatius of Chicago (1104), St. Ignatius of San Francisco (1090), St. Peter's of Jersey City (1069), Loyola of Los Angeles (1026), and Creighton Prep of Omaha (1018).

High school enrollment will be on the rise for the next few years since plans have been announced for three new American Jesuit high schools. The Detroit Province has already begun building operations on Walsh Jesuit Memorial High of Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio and on St. John's Jesuit High at Toledo, Ohio. An interesting feature of these two schools is that they are both being built on identical building plans. The twin high schools are planned to open with Freshmen classes in the Fall of 1965. The Missouri Province is deep in plans for the new De Smet Jesuit High which they hope to open in St. Louis, Creve Coeur section, in the Fall of 1966.

INCREASES AND DECREASES
FOUR YEAR ENROLLMENT

Of the 49 high schools listed in this year's survey, 24 high schools show all-over increase and 25 show all-over decreases. This breakdown includes the three high schools which do not yet have full four year enrollment, namely, Brebeuf (3 years), Jesuit of Sacramento (2 years) and Xavier of Concord (3 years). In treating of notable increases and decreases, both numerical and percentage, we shall not consider the following schools which are in the process of growing into a full four year enrollment and thus show only the accretion of another scholastic year: Bishop's Latin, Brebeuf Prep, Jesuit High, Houston, Jesuit High, Sacramento, Xavier, Concord. Colegio San Ignacio is being considered in this section only in the light of its increase of high school students. A large portion of its increase as noted in the tabular table is in primary grades.

The high schools showing the most notable numerical increase in full four year enrollment are: Jesuit High of El Paso with an increase of 73 students; St. Peter's Prep of Jersey City with an increase of 69 students; Colegio San Ignacio with an increase of 60 high school students; Loyola High of Los Angeles with an increase of 57 students; Bellarmine of Tacoma with an increase of 49 students; Rockhurst High with an increase of 38 students; Fordham Prep
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with an increase of 36 students; and St. Joseph's with an increase of 31 students. All of these increases show the increase of at least an average class.

The only high schools showing a notable percentage increase are: Colegio San Ignacio with an increase of 23.9 percent; Jesuit High of El Paso with an increase of 21.7 percent; Bellarmine High of Tacoma with an increase of 11.3 percent. All other percentage increases are less than 10 percent of total student population and are not especially significant for the purposes of this survey.

The schools showing numerical decreases loom larger than those showing increases. Only 8 of the American Jesuit high schools showed evident numerical increases of at least a full class; 12 of the American Jesuit high schools show a marked decrease of at least a full class. The schools in question are: Brooklyn Prep with a loss of 79 students in full four year enrollment; Xavier of New York with a loss of 74 students; Loyola of Towson with a loss of 67 students; Fairfield Prep with a loss of 52 students; St. Ignatius, Cleveland with a loss of 51 students; McQuaid of Rochester with a loss of 39 students; University of Detroit High with a loss of 39 students; Cheverus with a loss of 37 students; St. Ignatius of Chicago with a loss of 36 students; Jesuit High of Dallas with a loss of 34 students; Boston College High with a loss of 30 students; and Chaplain Kapaun of Wichita with a loss of 30 students.

Again percentage decreases are not specially noteworthy and only three American Jesuit high schools are indicative enough to cite. The three high schools and their percentage decrease for full four year enrollment are: Loyola High of Missoula with a 10.2 percent decrease; Cheverus High of Portland with a 9.7 percent decrease; and Loyola High of Towson with a 9.5 percent decrease.

A check of statistics in last year's enrollment article shows that Boston College High, Brooklyn Prep, Chaplain Kapaun, Fairfield Prep, Jesuit of New Orleans, and Loyola of Towson all showed losses in full four year enrollment. All the above appear in this year's articles with notable losses. Jesuit of New Orleans was not mentioned above but shows a loss this year of 28 students.

HIGH SCHOOL FRESHMEN ENROLLMENT

Forty-nine of the 51 American Jesuit high schools report on freshmen enrollment for the scholastic year 1964-1965. Of these 49 high schools, 22 show an increase in their freshmen classes and 26 show a decrease. One school, Campion, shows the same freshmen en-
rollment as last year. Because we are dealing with but a single year and thus with a smaller number of students the increases and decreases both numerical and percentage are more sharply defined.

There is an evident numerical increase in the size of the 1964 freshmen classes in the following high schools: St. Peter’s Prep with an increase of 94 freshmen over last year’s entering freshmen; Jesuit High of El Paso with an increase of 51 freshmen; Loyola Academy with an increase of 48 freshmen; Fordham Prep with an increase of 46 freshmen; St. Joseph’s with an increase of 34 freshmen; Jesuit High of Sacramento with an increase of 26 students; Canisius High with an increase of 22 freshmen; St. Xavier of Cincinnati with an increase of 20 freshmen.

Percentage increases in the freshmen class are noted in the following high schools: Jesuit High of El Paso with 49.0 percent increase; St. Peter’s Prep of Jersey City with a 36.6 percent increase; Jesuit High of Sacramento with a 28.8 percent increase; Fordham Prep with a 20.3 percent increase; St. Joseph’s of Philadelphia with a 16.6 percent increase; Colegio San Ignacio of Puerto Rico with an 11.5 percent increase; and Loyola Academy and Loyola of New York both with a 10.2 percent increase.

Eight high schools showed an evident numerical decrease in their freshmen classes. These high schools and their decreases are: St. Ignatius of Cleveland with a loss of 53 freshmen; St. Ignatius of Chicago with a loss of 28 freshmen; McQuaid of Rochester with a loss of 27 freshmen; Brophy Prep of Phoenix with a loss of 25 freshmen; Xavier of New York with a loss of 18 freshmen; Creighton Prep of Omaha with a loss of 17 freshmen; Bishop’s Latin of Pittsburgh and Jesuit of Dallas with a loss of 16 freshmen.

Worthy of comment were the percentage decreases in eight of the high schools in their 1964 incoming classes. Bishop’s Latin showed a 37.2 percent decrease; St. Ignatius of Cleveland an 18.9 percent decrease; Brophy of Phoenix, a 17.9 percent decrease; McQuaid of Rochester, a 12.9 percent decrease; Jesuit High of Dallas, a 10.3 percent decrease; Loyola High of Missoula, a 10.0 percent decrease; St. Ignatius of Chicago, a 9.8 percent decrease; and Scranton Prep, a 9.3 percent decrease in freshmen classes.

SUMMARY—HIGH SCHOOL STATISTICS

There are 49 American Jesuit high schools in this enrollment survey of students for the scholastic year 1964-1965. The enrollment for all schools for FRESHMAN YEAR is 9551 Freshmen, an
increase of 93 freshmen over last year’s total of 9458 freshmen or a percentage increase of 0.9 percent. **SOPHOMORE YEAR** reports an enrollment of 8584 sophomores, an increase of 16 over last year’s enrollment of 8568, or a percentage increase of 0.2 percent. In **JUNIOR YEAR** we find 7967 juniors, or a decrease of 97 students over last year’s total of 8060 juniors, a decrease of 0.5 percent. The **SENIOR YEAR** shows an enrollment of 7605 seniors, an increase of 97 seniors over last year’s total of 7508 or a percentage increase of 1.3 percent. **SPECIALS** with 401 students enrolled this year, indicates an increase of 117 students or 4.1 percent over last year’s total of 284 students.

The **total** enrollment for all 49 American Jesuit high schools for all four years plus Specials is 34,108 students, an increase of 280 students over last year’s total of 33,828, or a percentage increase of 0.8 percent.

### COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

**GRAND TOTAL ENROLLMENT—1964, 1965**

As is indicated in the titling of this section, the figures reported in the college and university section of our enrollment are always the **Grand Total** enrollment. This comprises all students enrolled in the college or university, both full and part-time, both tuition and non tuition and all students enrolled in off campus extension courses. It is important to note exactly what figures we are using in our present survey since many colleges and universities use varying figures in their publicity releases and information brochures. For various reasons colleges and universities sometimes use only full and part time students without indicating extension and no tuition. Others will not indicate adult education and cultural non credit courses. In any case, as has been customary in past years, our report deals with the figures on **Grand Total** enrollment as reported by the official Registrars of the 28 colleges and universities of the American Assistancy. The JEA Central Office collates and records only the figures that are given it and all interpretations are based upon the figures furnished to the JEA Central Office. For instance even in the present article we have figures and percentages listed which we know are at variance with news releases on enrollment statistics at several of our colleges and universities. In all cases we have seen we have checked with the figures which were furnished by the proper officials of the schools concerned and were forced to rely on the figures which we had on file.
We should note also that inasmuch as we are using a new report form this year for gathering our information from the various Registrars minor variations especially in the area of comparative figures from last year's enrollment figures may have crept into this year's report. In those cases where there seems to be a notable discrepancy over last year's figures we shall try to call it to your specific attention. Another result of the new report form is the dropping of the usual tabular table on Freshmen students in the colleges of Liberal Arts, Commerce, and Engineering. This table caused much confusion since many mistook the figures for total freshmen enrollment. The new report forms give a much more clear and more complete picture of freshmen enrollment and the summary figures from these reports are given in the composite tabular table of college and university enrollment.

The 28 American Jesuit colleges and universities reporting for the scholastic year 1964-1965 show 26 colleges and universities showing increases in Grand Total enrollment and 2 report decreases. The colleges and universities showing an evident *increase numerically* in Grand Total enrollment are: Loyola of Chicago with an increase of 1628 students; Marquette of Milwaukee with 1196 students; St. Joseph of Philadelphia with 801 students; Santa Clara with 613 students; Boston College with 532 students; Xavier with 509 students; and St. Louis with 477 students.

*Percentage increases* were more indicative in the following schools: Santa Clara with a 16.7 percent increase in Grand Total enrollment; St. Joseph's with a 14.3 percent increase; Wheeling College with a 14.3 percent increase; Loyola of Chicago with a 13.4 percent increase; St. Peter's of Jersey City with a 12.7 percent increase; and Loyola of Los Angeles with an 11.6 percent increase.

*Numerical and percentage decreases* are not notable in either of the two colleges reporting decreases in Grand Total enrollment. Canisius College reports a loss of 172 students or a loss of 5.9 percent. Regis College of Denver has a loss of 11 students or a percent loss of 1.1. In fairness to Canisius we mention we have seen publicity figures which indicate an increase rather than a decrease. However as reported earlier in this article we must follow the figures given by the official registrar's report rather than the figures given by the publicity department.

The listing for the seven largest institutions in the line-up of American Jesuit colleges and universities remains in the same alignment of size as in the last scholastic year 1963-1964. The schools
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and their Grand Total enrollments for 1964-1965 are as follows:

13,782 Loyola University of Chicago
13,163 Marquette University
11,142 University of Detroit
10,782 St. Louis University
10,339 Fordham University
9,329 Boston College
7,461 Georgetown University

All seven schools showed increases in Grand Total enrollment. Their combined enrollment of 75,998 students comprise 54.6 percent of the total Grand enrollment of 139,172 of all 28 American Jesuit colleges and universities for the scholastic year 1964-1965.

Many of the accrediting agencies and professional societies look at Full-Time enrollment only when considering a college or university. For this reason and also to give a slightly different picture, we are giving the enrollment of the first seven colleges and universities in the light of their Full-Time enrollment only. You will note the different alignment of schools, although all seven schools are the same as in the first alignment.

7,824 Marquette University
7,416 Boston College
6,875 Loyola University of Chicago
6,629 St. Louis University
6,201 Fordham University
6,141 Georgetown University
5,151 University of Detroit

FRESHMEN ENROLLMENT

We have not seen any advance figures on the annual enrollment survey conducted by SCHOOL AND SOCIETY but preliminary reports from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare as cited in the New York Times indicate a projected 6 percent increase in freshmen enrollment with 64 percent of this increase indicated for public colleges and universities. Figures in this year's report of freshmen enrollment show that our 28 American Jesuit colleges and universities have more than doubled that estimate since the 28 colleges and universities report a 15.7 percent increase in freshmen enrollment in all schools. Of the 28 colleges and universities reporting, 24 show an increase in freshmen enrollment in all schools and departments; 4 show a decrease. The figures both numerically and
percent-wise are much more noticeable than the decreases. Many of the schools showed sizeable increases both numerically and in percentage. A reading of the tabular table on Freshmen enrollments will reveal at least 11 of the 28 colleges and universities are reporting sizeable numerical increases this year. Because we are treating of a single year rather than the full Grand Total enrollment increases are much more noticeable in any given year. Even so, this year the **numerical increases** in Freshmen enrollment are more in evidence than in previous years. Eleven schools show more than ordinary increase in this year's Freshmen class. The schools and their increases are: St. Joseph's of Philadelphia with an increase of 592 freshmen; Fordham with an increase of 403; Loyola of Chicago with an increase of 293; University of San Francisco with an increase of 292; Marquette with an increase of 237; St. Peter's with an increase of 224; Boston College with an increase of 218; University of Detroit with an increase of 190; Holy Cross with an increase of 173; Santa Clara with an increase of 128; and Xavier with an increase of 119 freshmen.

So too are the **percentage increases** very noticeable in this year's Freshmen class. It is of course in this category of percentage that the truer picture of increase is to be noted. Seventeen of the 28 colleges and universities had an increase of at least 10 percent in their Freshmen classes of 1964-1965. The University of San Francisco leads off with an increase of 64.0 percent in Freshmen students. St. Joseph's follows with an increase of 46.0 percent; Wheeling with an increase of 39.2 percent; St. Peter's with an increase of 37.8 percent; Fordham with an increase of 37.7 percent; Holy Cross with an increase of 35.1 percent; Rockhurst with an increase of 33.5 percent; and Fairfield with an increase of 20.6 percent. Following in close order are the following schools: Santa Clara with an increase of 19.6 percent; Regis College with an increase of 19.0 percent; Xavier with an increase of 18.8 percent; Marquette with an increase of 16.6 percent; LeMoyne with an increase of 16.2 percent; Loyola of Chicago with an increase of 14.9 percent; Boston College with an increase of 14.1 percent; Loyola College of Baltimore with an increase of 10.6 percent; and the University of Detroit with an increase in their Freshmen class of 10.1 percent.

The four schools showing losses are minor both in **numerical and percentage decrease**. The four schools and their decreases in Freshmen enrollment are: University of Scranton with a loss of 20 freshmen or 4.7 percent; Spring Hill College with a loss of 9 fresh-
men or 2.7 percent; John Carroll University with a loss of 9 freshmen or 0.7 percent; and Canisius College with a loss of 1 freshman, or 0.1 percent.

INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS

Despite the fact that the enrollment figures were reported on a new form this year the same general 14 categories plus Miscellaneous category still holds true. We know and realize the difficulty, nay, anguish, that some registrars and department heads feel when various schools or departments are relegated to the catch-all category of Miscellaneous. But we are bound by the restrictions of a printed page and just so many lines and spaces. The twelve categories chosen for specific inclusion in our master table were chosen simply because at least several schools would report under that specific category. We are not decrying the importance of a school or department because we list it under Miscellaneous. It is just that no matter how large or how important the school or department is we simply cannot give it a column on our tables if only one school is to report under that column. Even a casual glance at the listings under Miscellaneous given later in this article would show that if we listed all categories our tabular table would swell to a gargantuan table of some 65 columns.

All the material described here is to be found in the tabular material accompanying this article. However some may find the complexity of the columnar entries and the size of the type face a problem so we include the general information in an easier-to-read format. Liberal Arts, Day, 28 schools reporting, indicates a total enrollment of 43,986 students, an increase of 2621 students or an increase of 6.3 percent over last year. Liberal Arts, Evening, with 18 schools reporting shows an enrollment of 13,904 students or a loss of 1450 students or a percent loss of 4.3. One reason for the loss is that 19 schools reported in this category last year as against 18 this year. Commerce, Day, with 21 schools reporting has an increase of 573 students and a present enrollment of 11,027 students. This is a 5.5 percent increase over last year. Commerce, Evening, 18 schools reporting is showing a similar loss to last year. This year's enrollment is 7,113 students, a loss of 403 students or a loss of 5.7 percent. Education, in 5 schools, shows up in the loss column with 3,968 students reported for this year, or a loss of 376 students and a loss of 9.5 percent. The University of San Francisco reported under this category last year but does not report this year. Engi-
neering, in 7 schools, is continuing on the same downward trend it has shown for the past several years. The loss this year is 188 students, or a loss of 4.6 percent. The present enrollment for Engineering is 4,085 students. Nursing in 9 schools has an increase of 104 student nurses to bring this year's total up to 3,323. The increase is 3.2 percent.

Pharmacy in 3 schools took a slight rise this year after last year's loss. The rise was 19 students, an increase of 4.1 percent to bring the present Pharmacy enrollment to 483 students. The figures in the column on Social Work do not present a true picture since only 2 of the four schools having this school report under this category. Two of the schools, Loyola of Chicago with an enrollment of 186 students and St. Louis University with an enrollment of 128 students, report Social Work enrollment under their Graduate school figures. With the inclusion of these enrollment figures with the other two schools as has been the custom in past surveys we get a different picture than that portrayed in our Master Table. Revised figures on Social Work would read 886 students instead of the 552 listed in the table. The loss is still indicated but it a loss of 64 students not 378. The loss is 10.7 percent. Medicine in 5 schools shows a minor loss of 1.8 percent or 33 students. The present enrollment is 1821 aspiring doctors. Dentistry shows a fractional increase of 1 student or less than 0.1 percent. The current enrollment is 2070 students. Day Law shows an increase and Evening Law shows a decrease in this year's figures. A contributing factor to both the increase and loss is furnished by the fact that Gonzaga previously reporting under Evening Law only, this year reports under Day Law only. Day Law, 13 schools this year, 12 last year, shows an increase of 584 students for a total of 3289. The increase is 21.6 percent. Evening Law, 10 schools this year, 11 last year, shows a loss of 162 students, or an 8.5 percent loss. Present enrollment is 1894. Graduate schools in 23 schools, indicates an increase of 1973 students to make a total for the current year of 20,256 graduate students. This is an increase of 10.7 percent. As was indicated earlier in this article, 314 students in the Schools of Social Work at Loyola of Chicago and St. Louis are now listed under the Graduate school category.

The question of increase or decrease with regard to the category of Miscellaneous is not of too much importance. Since there are some 50 different schools and departments listed under this Miscellaneous category it would be impossible to spot any trend on enroll-
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Any influence this category would have on enrollment trends would appear only insofar as the figures listed here would contribute to the various totals of full and part time students and to the Grand Total enrollment figures.

Since we do not have the room on our Master Tabular report for the various schools and departments reporting under this classification because they are, in many cases, single instances, we are listing the various schools and departments which the individual institutions reported under the category of Miscellaneous. The figure listed in parentheses after the institution’s name is the total number of students listed in Miscellaneous, after that we will list the breakdown of the total number. The various entries under Miscellaneous are: Boston College (597): Philosophers, 49; Novices, 114; MBA Business, 434. Canisius College (124): Pre-Clinical Nurses, 124. Fordham University (558): Graduate Education, 558. Georgetown University (1737): Foreign Service, 967; Institute of Language and Linguistics, 770. Gonzaga University (109): Novices and Juniors, 109. College of the Holy Cross (6): Specials, 6. Loyola University of Chicago (409): Rome Center 220; Philosophers and Theologians, 189. Loyola University of Los Angeles (133): Advanced Placement, 21; Evening Division, 112. Loyola University of New Orleans (313): Music, 69; Dental Hygiene, 49; A.B. and Criminology, 195. Marquette University (1543): Journalism, 311; Nursing BS. Evening, 114; Speech, 219; Dental Hygiene Degree, 105; Dental Hygiene Diploma, 21; Medical Technology, 136; Physical Therapy, 106; Engineering Evening, 531. Regis College (225): Natural Science and Math, 157; Social Science, 57; Philosophy and Theology, 11. St. Joseph’s College (1876): Certificate Evening, 723; Isolated Credit, 1153. St. Louis University (777): Aeronautical Technology, 587; P. and L. Letters, 88; P. and L. Philosophy, 102. Seattle University (618): Pre-Major, 364; Transients, 23; Sister Formation, 231. University of Detroit (972): Architecture, 181; Novices and Juniors, 74; Dental Hygiene, 68; General Studies, 505; Engineering Evening, 144. University of San Francisco (662): Science Day, 428; Science Evening, 157; Presentation Novitiate, 32; Mt. Alverno Novitiate, 45. University of Scranton (539): Pre-Engineering, 56; Natural Science, 403; Evening College, 80. Xavier University (104): Novices and Juniors, 104.

SUMMARY OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STATISTICS

The fourteen basic categories used in Table TWO, the Master
Table for colleges and universities fall equally into 7 increases and 7 decreases for the scholastic year 1964-1965. As was noted before we do not classify the 15th category Miscellaneous as an indicative increase or decrease. The following schools or departments in the 28 American Jesuit colleges and universities show increases for the current scholastic year. Liberal Arts Day has an increase of 2621 students or an increase of 6.3 percent. Commerce Day has an increase of 573 students or an increase of 5.5 percent. Nursing has an increase of 104 students or 3.2 percent. Pharmacy has an increase of 19 students or 4.1 percent. Dentistry has an increase of 1 student or less than 0.1 percent. Law Day has an increase of 584 or 21.6 percent. With regard to this increase note that Gonzaga has transferred to reporting under Day Law. Graduate reports an increase of 1973 or 10.7 percent.

Decreases are to be noted in 7 categories also. It is interesting to note that in three categories, Liberal Arts, Commerce, and Law, the Day division reports an increase and the corresponding divisions for Evening all report decreases. Liberal Arts Evening has a loss of 1450 or 4.3 percent. Commerce Evening has a loss of 403 or 5.7 percent. Education shows a loss of 376, or 9.5 percent. Engineering has a loss of 188, or a percent of 4.6. Social Work shows a loss on the tabular table of 378. As indicated in the text of this article the correct figure should be a loss of 64 since Loyola of Chicago and St. Louis reported under a different category for Social Work students. The corrected loss is 10.7 percent. Medicine has a loss of 33 students or 1.8 percent. Law Evening has a loss of 162 students or 8.5 percent.

Full-Time Totals for the scholastic Year 1964-1965 are 84,339. This is an increase of 6241 students over last year’s total of 78,098. The increase is 7.9 percent. Part-Time Totals for the current scholastic year are 44,103 students. The increase is 143 or 0.3 percent over last year’s total of 43,960 students. Full and Part-Time Totals for the current year are 128,442 students. The increase of 6384 students over last year’s total of 122,058 represents an increase of 5.2 percent. Extension and Low Tuition adds a total for this year of 10,730 students. The combination of Full and Part-Time students plus Extension and Low Tuition students form the basis of Grand Total Enrollment. The full enrollment of all 28 American Jesuit colleges and universities listed under Grand Total Enrollment Totals is 139,172 students. This represents an increase of 8962 students over the total for last year of 130,210 students. The increase is 6.9 percent.
ENROLLMENT IN EDUCATIONAL HOUSES FOR OURS

TERTIANSHIPS: AURIESVILLE—46 Tertians; CLEVELAND—30 Tertians; DECATUR—33 Tertians; POMFRET—29 Tertians; PORT TOWNSHEND—33 Tertians. The total number of Tertian Fathers in the United States Tertianships is 196 Tertians. There are 25 Tertian Brothers at the Brothers' Tertianship at CLEVELAND.

THEOLOGATES: ALMA—29 in First Year; 21 in Second Year; 28 in Third Year; 23 in Fourth Year, for a total of 101 Theologians. NORTH AURORA (West Baden)—24 in First Year; 22 in Second Year; 25 in Third Year; 25 in Fourth Year, for a total of 96 Theologians. ST. MARY'S—38 in First Year; 46 in Second Year; 46 in Third Year; 32 in Fourth Year, for a total of 162 Theologians. WESTON—24 in First Year; 22 in Second Year; 28 in Third Year; 35 in Fourth Year, for a total of 109 Theologians. WOODSTOCK—62 in First Year; 63 in Second Year; 54 in Third Year; 54 in Fourth Year, for a total of 233 Theologians. Assistancy totals for the five American theologates are: 177 in First Year; 174 in Second Year; 181 in Third Year; 169 in Fourth Year, for an all-over total of 701 Theologians.

PHILOSOPHATES: ASSUMPTION HALL—28 in First Year; 35 in Second Year; 25 in Third Year, for a total of 88 Philosophers. FUSZ MEMORIAL—64 in First Year; 62 in Second Year, 47 in Third Year, for a total of 173 Philosophers. MOUNT ST. MICHAEL—50 in First Year; 40 in Second Year; 45 in Third Year, for a total of 135 Philosophers. NORTH AURORA (West Baden)—27 in First Year; 32 in Second Year; 34 in Third Year, for a total of 93 Philosophers. SHRUB OAK—75 in First Year; 63 in Second Year; 61 in Third Year, for a total of 199 Philosophers. WESTON—35 in First Year; 27 in Second Year; 18 in Third Year, for a total of 80 Philosophers. Assistancy totals for the six American philosophates are: 279 in First Year; 259 in Second Year; 230 in Third Year, for a total of 768 Philosophers.

JUNIORATES: PLATTSBURGH—No Juniors. COLOMBIERE—14 in First Year; 7 in Second Year, a total of 21 Juniors. ST. BONIFACIUS—21 in First Year; 24 in Second Year, for a total of 45 Juniors. MILFORD—15 in First Year; 14 in Second Year, for a total of 29 Juniors. WERNERSVILLE—22 in First Year; 19 in Second Year, for a total of 41 Juniors. LOS GATOS—29 in First Year; 29 in Sec-
ond Year, for a total of 58 Juniors. ST. ANDREW—29 in First Year; 24 in Second Year, for a total of 53 Juniors. GRAND COTEAU—14 in First Year; 11 in Second Year, for a total of 25 Juniors, SHERIDAN—20 in First Year; 13 in Second Year, for a total of 33 Juniors. FLORISSANT—19 in First Year; 17 in Second Year, for a total of 36 Juniors. SHADOWBROOK—34 in First Year; 28 in Second Year, for a total of 62 Juniors. Assistancy totals for the 10 American juniorates are: 217 in First Year; 186 in Second Year, for a total of 403 Juniors.

**NOVITIATES:** PLATTSBURGH—15 in First Year; 17 in Second Year, for a total of 32 Novices. QUEEN OF PEACE—14 in First Year; 11 in Second Year, for a total of 25 Novices. COLOMBIERE—31 in First Year; 22 in Second Year, for a total of 53 Novices. ST. BONIFACIUS—33 in First Year; 28 in Second Year, for a total of 61 Novices. MILFORD—36 in First Year; 28 in Second Year, for a total of 64 Novices. WERNERSVILLE—35 in First Year; 19 in Second Year, for a total of 54 Novices. LOS GATOS—26 in First Year; 21 in Second Year, for a total of 47 Novices. ST. ANDREW—36 in First Year; 27 in Second Year, for a total of 63 Novices. GRAND COTEAU—20 in First Year; 18 in Second Year, for a total of 38 Novices. SHERIDAN—31 in First Year; 25 in Second Year, for a total of 56 Novices. FLORISSANT—30 in First Year; 22 in Second Year, for a total of 52 Novices. SHADOWBROOK—30 in First Year; 21 in Second Year, for a total of 51 Novices. Assistancy totals for the 12 American Novitiates are 337 in First Year; 259 in Second Year, for a total of 596 Novices.

House Totals for the various Novitiate-Juniorates are as follows:


To summarize, the enrollment in the various Houses of Formation
of the American Assistancy for the scholastic year 1964-1965 is: 196 TERTIANS in five tertianships; 701 THEOLOGIANS in 5 theologates; 768 PHILOSOPHERS in 6 philosophates; 403 JUNIORS in 10 juniorates; 596 NOVICES in 12 novitiates. Grand total for all 38 Houses of Formation is 2664 students.

Comparative figures with the enrollment in the Houses of Study for the past scholastic year (1963-1964) show a loss of 102 students. Individual breakdowns (the 1963-1964 figures are in parentheses) show the individual categories for both years. TERTIANS 196 (156), a gain of 40 students. THEOLOGIANS 701 (744), a loss of 43 students. PHILOSOPHERS 768 (788), a loss of 20 students. JUNIORS 403 (464), a loss of 61 students. NOVICES 596 (614), a loss of 18 students.

MINOR SEMINARIES: Students in this category, as most of our readers know, are students preparing for the diocesan seminary and not for the Society. All three minor seminaries are under the direction of provinces of the American Assistancy. Mundelein is not listed in this article since although Ours teach the philosophical and theological subjects, the seminary as such is not under Society administration. CORPUS CHRISTI—34 in First Year; 28 in Second Year; 15 in Third Year; 17 in Fourth Year, for a total of 94 students. RYAN—26 in First Year; 29 in Second Year; 10 in Third Year; 18 in Fourth Year; 9 in Fifth Year; 8 in Sixth Year, for a total of 99 students. AIBONITO—28 in First Year; 12 in Second Year; 5 in Third Year; 4 in Fourth Year, for a total of 49 students. The summary of minor seminaries is 225 students in high school studies, 17 in college studies, for a total of 242 students. ST. PHILIP NERI which has closed its boarding branch at Haverhill enrolls 91 students for delayed vocations at the Boston site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS UNDER JESUIT INSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IN 119 HOUSES UNDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESUIT ADMINISTRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN ASSISTANCY 1964-1965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>139,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>High Schools</td>
<td>33,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Houses of Formation</td>
<td>2,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor Seminaries</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>St. Philip Neri</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>175,997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Jesuit Educational Association
### High School Enrollment 1964-1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE ONE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jesuit Educational Association</strong></td>
<td><strong>High School Enrollment 1964-1965</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Freshmen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellarmine College Preparatory, San Jose</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellarmine High School, Tacoma</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop’s Latin School, Pittsburgh</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College High, Boston</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brebeuf Preparatory, Indianapolis</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Preparatory, Brooklyn</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brophy College Preparatory, Phoenix</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion Jesuit High School, Prairie du Chien</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius High School, Buffalo</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain Kapaun Mem. High School, Wichita</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheverus High School, Portland</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colegio San Ignacio, Puerto Rico</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranwell School, Lenox</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton Preparatory School, Omaha</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield College Preparatory, Fairfield</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham Preparatory School, New York</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown Preparatory School, Garrett Park</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga High School, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga Preparatory School, Spokane</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School, Dallas</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School, El Paso</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit College Preparatory, Houston</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School, New Orleans</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School, Portland</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School, Sacramento</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High School, Shreveport</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit High, Tampa</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Academy, Wilmette</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola High School, Los Angeles</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola High School, Missoula</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola High School, Towson</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola School, New York</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University High, Milwaukee</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuaid Jesuit High School, Rochester</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis High School, Denver</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis High School, New York</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhurst High School, Kansas City</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ignatius High School, Chicago</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph’s Preparatory School, Philadelphia</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis University High School, St. Louis</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter’s Preparatory School, Jersey City</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton Preparatory School</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Preparatory School, Seattle</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Detroit High School, Detroit</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier High School, Concord</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier High School, New York</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals 1964-1965 | 9,551 | 8,584 | 7,967 | 7,605 | 401 | 34,108 |
| Totals 1963-1964 | 9,458 | 8,568 | 8,010 | 7,508 | 284 | 33,828 |

| Increase or Decrease | +93 | +16 | -43 | +97 | +117 | +280 |
| Percent | +0.9 | +0.2 | -0.5 | +1.3 | +4.1 | +0.8 |

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts</td>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic University of America</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyola University, Chicago</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>2,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyola University, Los Angeles</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>1,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyola University, New Orleans</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regis College</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle University</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>3,652</td>
<td>4,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Santa Clara</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>1,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of the Pacific</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xavier University</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>1,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48,339</td>
<td>48,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase-Decrease</th>
<th>Boston College</th>
<th>Catholic University of America</th>
<th>Fordham University</th>
<th>Georgetown University</th>
<th>University of Notre Dame</th>
<th>Loyola University, Chicago</th>
<th>Loyola University, Los Angeles</th>
<th>Loyola University, New Orleans</th>
<th>Marquette University</th>
<th>Regis College</th>
<th>Seattle University</th>
<th>St. Louis University</th>
<th>University of Santa Clara</th>
<th>University of the Pacific</th>
<th>Xavier University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>1,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 1964-1965**: 48,339

**Total 1965-1966**: 48,339
## Jesuit Educational Association
### Composite College Statistics, 63-64, 64-65

#### TABLE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>1964-1965</th>
<th>1963-1964</th>
<th>Increase-Decrease</th>
<th>Freshmen Enrollment</th>
<th>Increase-Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numerical</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numerical</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>9,329</td>
<td>8,797</td>
<td>+532 +6.0</td>
<td>1,768 1,550</td>
<td>+218 +14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius College</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>3,074</td>
<td>+172 +5.9</td>
<td>709 710</td>
<td>-1 -0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton University</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>+176 +4.9</td>
<td>710 649</td>
<td>+61 +9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield University</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>+103 +4.9</td>
<td>404 335</td>
<td>+69 +20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>10,339</td>
<td>10,018</td>
<td>+321 +3.2</td>
<td>1,473 1,070</td>
<td>+403 +37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>7,461</td>
<td>7,142</td>
<td>+319 +4.5</td>
<td>1,084 994</td>
<td>+90 +9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga University</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>+171 +7.0</td>
<td>570 561</td>
<td>+9 +1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross College</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>+177 +9.6</td>
<td>666 493</td>
<td>+173 +35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carroll University</td>
<td>4,292</td>
<td>4,197</td>
<td>+95 +2.3</td>
<td>1,263 1,272</td>
<td>-9 -0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Moyne College</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>+54 +3.5</td>
<td>380 327</td>
<td>+53 +16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola College</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>+228 +9.7</td>
<td>270 244</td>
<td>+26 +10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University, Chicago</td>
<td>13,782</td>
<td>12,154</td>
<td>+1,628 +13.4</td>
<td>2,257 1,964</td>
<td>+293 +14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University, Los Angeles</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>+242 +11.6</td>
<td>358 339</td>
<td>+19 +5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University, New Orleans</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>+275 +7.9</td>
<td>643 611</td>
<td>+32 +5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>13,163</td>
<td>11,967</td>
<td>+1,196 +9.9</td>
<td>1,668 1,431</td>
<td>+237 +16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis College</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>+11 +1.1</td>
<td>269 226</td>
<td>+43 +19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhurst College</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>+128 +6.2</td>
<td>323 242</td>
<td>+81 +33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph’s College</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>+801 +14.3</td>
<td>1,878 1,256</td>
<td>+592 +46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>10,782</td>
<td>10,305</td>
<td>+477 +4.6</td>
<td>1,724 1,675</td>
<td>+49 +2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter’s College</td>
<td>2,854</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>+321 +12.7</td>
<td>817 593</td>
<td>+224 +37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle University</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>4,222</td>
<td>+22 +0.5</td>
<td>1,161 1,105</td>
<td>+56 +5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill College</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>+47 +3.4</td>
<td>333 342</td>
<td>-9 -2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Detroit</td>
<td>11,142</td>
<td>10,795</td>
<td>+347 +3.2</td>
<td>2,062 1,872</td>
<td>+190 +10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>4,567</td>
<td>+234 +5.1</td>
<td>748 456</td>
<td>+292 +64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Santa Clara</td>
<td>4,277</td>
<td>3,664</td>
<td>+613 +16.7</td>
<td>782 654</td>
<td>+128 +19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Scranton</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>+48 +1.8</td>
<td>428 446</td>
<td>-20 -4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling College</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>+81 +14.3</td>
<td>245 176</td>
<td>+69 +39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier University</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>4,154</td>
<td>+509 +12.3</td>
<td>751 632</td>
<td>+119 +18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** 139,172 130,210 +8,962 +6.9 25,742 22,255 +3,487 +15.7
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Jesuit Education and the Contemporary Adolescent

Robert J. Starratt, S.J.

Secondary education is a complex process involving numerous components which, in the ideal order, should complement one another. The Jesuit teacher or administrator, like a circus juggler, must adroitly manipulate the firebrands of public relations, academic experimentation, extra-curricular activities, examinations, discipline problems, religious training. Or the Jesuit educator is like the weaver of an oriental rug. He must not only have a pattern in mind, but also possess the practical skills to weave the multicolored strands into the actual harmonious pattern. Some educators prefer to emphasize certain colored strands—citizenship training, for example—and the design of their program would differ from the design of programs which emphasize other strands—say, technical vocational training. Jesuit educators tend to emphasize the strand of academic excellence for college and graduate school work, and this emphasis gives a certain pattern to our educational process. The pattern, however, still requires complementary strands that will lend fullness, variety, and harmony to it.

I would like to discuss some of these complementary strands in our educational process. The strands I wish to consider are concerned with psychological and social forces that affect the student. In his high school years a student moves out of the world of children into the world of adults. During this intense period of change he must come to grips with himself and with the adult demands of the social order. Since the home often fails to provide direction or challenge, the student looks to his Jesuit teacher to help him understand the complexities of his personal and social situation, and to point out on the expanding horizon the meaningful goals which demand Christian commitment. Although not pretending to exhaust the subject, the following treatment of psychological and social influences on our students may suggest some salutary responses to their needs, and thereby lend a new vitality to our educational pattern.

In Jesuit schools we are forming adolescents who are going through what Erik Erikson calls a crisis of ego identity.1 Although
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identity formation is a lifelong process, in adolescence it becomes a critical phase of the individual's growth. Two factors account for this crisis of identity: rapidity of physical growth, and the sudden awareness, with the onset of puberty, of the individual's social role. This social role actually includes several roles: the role of a man, a prospective husband, a father, a breadwinner, and an adult member of the community. During this period the adolescent rejects being a "little boy" and yet he must retain much of his childhood learning. He seeks to discover what it means to be a man, and hence his explorations into the adult roles of dating, of being a "he-man" in athletics or in delinquency, of holding his own opinions. But the processes of rejecting, retaining, and exploring cause conflicts and uncertainties in the adolescent. Erikson thus speaks of adolescence as a necessary moratorium when a youth tries to bind together his past, his present, and his future into a coherent whole, when he can achieve the feeling of inner self-sameness.

To allow himself elbow room for interior growth, the adolescent employs various methods or devices, developed throughout childhood, for warding off frustration, defeat, pain, and humiliation—all of which constitute a threat to his inner security. During adolescence he may employ these devices more frequently because of his increased uncertainty about himself. An adolescent who fails an algebra exam or receives a severe reprimand from his Jesuit teacher may react in several ways: "I don't care whether I pass or fail; let them throw me out of school"—thus he denies the relevance or importance of his school status and hence the importance of the painful incident; "It's all their fault, they've got it in for me"—thus he projects his frustration onto the teacher, the fault is not his but the teacher's; "I'm just no good at all, I guess"—in this way he reduces the present conflict by exaggerating his own guilt and inability to do anything worthwhile. The catalogue of defenses includes other, more pathological denials of the real world. When, therefore, a Jesuit teacher sees a student reacting in some such way to a school or home situation, he should recognize that the boy is not maliciously "alibi-ing." To prevent damage to the student's psychological growth, and to be a truly effective teacher, he must help the student understand that a failure or a reprimand does not imply a condemnation of the student's total person, but that, even while failing or reprimanding the boy, he nevertheless respects and cares for him.

Besides attempting to develop an inner consistency and self
esteem, the adolescent also strives to present a consistent self to others in the increasingly complex social environment. As a result he tends to be hypersensitive about his appearance in the eyes of others. Society at large, as well as the adults in his immediate environment thus play a large part in his identity synthesis. They can help the adolescent establish a working life plan with its hierarchical order of roles: creature of God, citizen, father, neighbor. Adults also provide ideological and religious challenges which channel the "forceful earnestness, the sincere asceticism, and the eager indignation of youth" toward the frontier of responsible social action. And very important, adults in the family, neighborhood, and school provide contact and experimental identification with adult models. The adolescent looks to adults in his environment and asks himself, "Do I want to be like Mr. So-and-So?" This process of identification with an adult model, however, causes the contemporary adolescent particularly acute problems, say some sociologists, because the contemporary American male, as he becomes more and more like the "organization man," presents a devitalized model for the adolescent to imitate. Bettelheim states the problem clearly.

If manhood, if the good life in the good community is the goal of adolescence, then the goal is clear, and with it the direction and the path. But what if existing manhood is viewed as empty, static, obsolescent? Then becoming a man is death, and manhood marks the death of adolescence, not its fulfillment. The buoyancy of youth is fed by the conviction of a full life to come, one in which all great things are theoretically attainable. But one cannot believe in the good life to come if the goal is suburbia. One cannot realize one's values by climbing the ladder of the business community, nor prove one's manhood on the greens of the country club.

This anti-bourgeois bias is typical of many adolescents. Yet they do not at the same time realize that their own values are frequently as superficial. The Holden Caulfields of our Jesuit schools, like the caricatured organization man, vacillate from one insecure day to the next. But should not the school provide a forum for discussion on the insecurities and superficialities of contemporary living, on integral personal growth, and on public responsibility? What account do the academic and extra curricular programs take of the
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2 Ibid., 158.
3 Ibid., 114.
adolescent's quest for identity, and of his need to exercise responsibility? Does the school consciously and consistently provide an atmosphere that encourages initiative, and even wholesome risk-taking behavior in academic as well as extra-curricular activities? Obviously, a freshman should not have as much freedom or responsibility as a senior; school programs could gradually encourage independence and maturity commensurate with the development of the student. Certainly student counselors could provide professional advice for other teachers on various aspects of adolescent psychological growth. For whether they intend it or not, teachers do affect the maturing process of the student either by providing roles and identities in which the student feels he can develop security and self esteem, or roles and identities against which he feels he must rebel.

But let us look at this youth we are forming from a different perspective, that of the adolescent society, or peer group. In *The Adolescent Society*, a study of the value system of contemporary adolescents, James Coleman demonstrates the high value adolescents place on athletics and social popularity. School leaders, for example, invariably come, not from the minority of academically successful students, but from the athletes and more socially outgoing boys. When a bright student does become a leader in the school, his status frequently owes nothing to his first-honors report card, but rather to his social or athletic talents. Coleman’s survey reveals that adolescents frequently look upon the bright student as a drudge, as one who accepts the passive dependency that schoolwork imposes. They also interpret their peer’s drive to achieve high marks as a manifestation of selfishness, a serious fault in a world where activity for social togetherness counts the most.

Perhaps an indignant reader at this point will speak out for the highly motivated and independent students in his own school. Certainly the increased pressure to gain the prize of college admission, the traumatic experience of college board examinations, and the glamor of a national merit award provide incentives for serious academic industry. For the most part, our students are quite
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6 James S. Coleman, *The Adolescent Society* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961). Coleman's study applies especially, but not exclusively, to public school students. His study indicates that some other adolescents place high value on individual industry and are indifferent to social groups. But these values are found most frequently among adolescents from rural and economically deprived areas. Since the majority of our students come from a middle class suburb or city environment, I have used information that Coleman received from this type of student.
conscious of the competition engendered by these exterior motivations. But that is the point; these incentives come from outside the school, not from within the school programs nor from the learning process itself. To allow only these exterior motivations to goad the student on to academic achievement seems to me an abdication of responsibility.

Coleman reports that the school's present system of recognition and reward does not recognize or reward the bright student as one who has done something significant with and for others. He has won no dramatic victory for the school; his academic victory concerns only himself, and to some degree even sets him against his fellows. Since the school provides no competition in which the school's honor and the honor of his peers whom he might represent are at stake, the bright student, as such, has no visible status or visible function that relates him to his classmates. He may win a medal for academic achievement, but he stands on the stage alone.

The electric response of American youth to President Kennedy's Peace Corps proposal can be viewed as symptomatic of the desperation of youth to do something significant. The Peace Corps presented youth with the opportunity to espouse a cause, to go off to a far land where they were needed, and to preach through dedicated work the good news of brotherhood and friendship. Adolescents likewise feel the urge to participate in such altruistic enterprises. Some educators, however, feel that students need to be controlled by a tight system of discipline. Such discipline keeps student initiative, and hence youthful indiscretions at a minimum, but one wonders whether such discipline stems merely from the excuse of administrative expediency, or from a conviction based on an understanding of human psychology. If a student is never challenged, if he is expected to behave as a child, can we wonder that our schools may not, perhaps, be known for their self-assertive graduates? Would it not be healthier to expose our students to the social and religious challenges that Vatican II, UNESCO, and the Peace Corps have responded to? The spirit of the Church, and the attitude of the late President Kennedy have affected the national and international scene. To prevent our students from relating to this spirit would be less than honest.

Jesuit educators might look into the possibilities of using the student council as an introduction to responsible self government,
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and as a channel of meaningful communication between students and faculty. Some schools have utilized the student council or the key club to develop an amazing amount of student initiative. Some schools, for example, allow the student organization to handle disciplinary problems, to provide tutoring services for the slower or discouraged student, and to engage in school-community projects for the underprivileged.

Jesuit educators could also investigate the possibilities of interschool competition on an academic level. The Jesuit school, for example, might arrange for a city or town wide competition in French, Mathematics, or History. The students who would represent their school in such a contest would have a more visible and acceptable status. The publicity in the school and community newspapers might provide some quiet, studious adolescent with the first public recognition of his young life.

Latin, English, and History teachers might discuss the possibility of a more thematic approach to their subject which would allow for more consideration of recurring themes in the past and present. A theme in English class for one semester, for example, might be concerned with the problem of freedom and authority. The writings of Martin Luther King would not be out of place with this thematic approach in a History or Religion class; nor would a discussion of Christian individuality in a technological milieu be out of place for an English class reading Auden’s “The Unknown Citizen”; nor would a consideration of modern advertising be out of place in a term paper assignment.

Within the broader context of social change, we can also find reasons for reflecting on our educational oriental rug. Recent commentators on the changing American scene have stressed that our entire society is in a state of flux. Traditional experiences of family living, leisure time, the use of property and money, work, and even time itself have changed radically in the past fifty years. Time, for example, as a realized experience, is different now. The Nineteen Thirties are considerably more remote to today’s adolescent than the Eighteen Thirties were to the adolescent of 1864. Jobs that took days or weeks to complete can now be accomplished in a few hours or minutes by mechanized or electronic equipment. Lifelong neighborhood relationships, to take another example, are fast be-

coming a thing of the past for many Americans. People are moving more often, especially when the father works for one of the large corporations. This increased mobility causes unsettling reverberations within the family and the entire social structure. Keniston describes the effects of these sweeping changes.

Rapid changes in all aspects of life mean that little can be counted on to endure from generation to generation, that all technologies, all institutions, and all values are open to revision and obsolescence. Continual innovation, as we experience it in this country, profoundly affects our conceptions of ourselves, our visions of the future, the quality of our attachment to the present, and the myths we construct of the past.

The emergence, moreover, of vast and complex institutions, governmental bureaucracies, and corporations to plan for and manage a national economy, to manufacture and distribute consumer goods and wealth, to govern a large and fluid population, has given birth to the organizational man and his many problems and anxieties. These massive institutions have set up a complex network of social, political, and economic interdependence. Now the whole organization, not the individual, effect the really significant changes in our society. Dr. Bernard Muller-Thym commented in a recent paper on this social phenomenon.

This is the kind of world, therefore, in which you move from having security attached to a thing to security attached to the network, in which you move from security being attached to stasis to security being attached to increased mobility, because it is only at the maximum of mobility, or at the maximum of stasis that you have security. In between, you wobble, as in a gyroscope.

It appears, according to some social commentators, that the contemporary organization man is wobbling considerably. The complexity of his social roles tends to induce in him a feeling of powerlessness in both the social, political, and occupational spheres of his life. In the good old days, the individual was accustomed to think that he could, if not change the world, at least make a significant contribution to his society. But now? Who can make even a complete chair for his dining room, let alone effect a significant political change? Thus the organization man retreats to his private sphere of life—the back yard barbecue, the basement pho-
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8 Miller, op. cit., p. 23.
9 Keniston, op. cit., 146.
11 Keniston, op. cit., 157.
ography shop, the golf course, or his son's little league baseball games—to find warmth, security and self esteem.

In this society with precisely these insecurities the contemporary adolescent must find some kind of identity, some kind of belongingness. To him the present is confusing enough; the past, as represented by the experiences of his parents, is almost incomprehensible; and the future is hardly predictable. He is living in a society where economic abundance has removed many of the more unpleasant challenges that his parents had to face, challenges which might have provided him with the necessary motivation for meaningful achievement. And youth needs some kind of challenge to which he can dedicate himself. Verbal challenge is not enough. He needs to commit himself to action, in the pursuit of which he can develop a sense of identity and personal meaningfulness. As Bettelheim has said, "Youth... is happiest when it feels it is fighting to reach goals that were conceived of but not realized by the generation before them." ¹²

Presently our schools are engaging in various efforts at academic improvement. Honors programs, advance placement programs, departmentalization—these have raised the quality of academic achievement. We have begun to communicate to our students the need for serious intellectual endeavor and scholarship. And we must continue this emphasis indefinitely, because of increasing demands for intelligence and wisdom, not to mention religious commitment, in the changing world. We must, however, continue to evaluate what and how we are teaching. For unless the student can find in this intellectual endeavor a place for meaningful self development, and can see the pertinence of scholarship to the social problems of today, he will either rebel and repudiate the pursuit of knowledge, or he will surrender resentfully to a seemingly outdated, meaningless type of work. In either case, the school may well cause the adolescent to retreat from individual and social responsibility to the private sphere of living—watching television, building up his record collection, sport car racing, and vacationing at Fort Lauderdale.

In the light of these considerations the Jesuit educator might ponder whether the pattern of his educational program has the character and force that an understanding of these issues might provide. He might inquire whether his school should establish professional communications with community agencies such as the

¹² Bettelheim, op. cit., 93.
large local business corporation, research laboratories, fine art museums, political organizations, nearby colleges, and local youth groups in order to bring in occasional speakers or to distribute pertinent information on social or vocational trends. Perhaps several faculty meetings could focus attention on the recent report, *Education in a Changing Society* which raises pertinent questions for the schools in the context of contemporary social change.

But let us remember the complexity of the oriental rug. We have examined only a few strands. We cannot, for instance, substitute discussions of Vatican II or the civil rights question for the necessary learning of basic skills. We can, however, use such discussions to provide a meaningful context for the learning of these skills. Neither can we repeat the mistake of earlier "progressive" schools by abdicating our responsibility to guide, correct, and direct. We have to make heavy demands of our students; we have to set limits and impose regulations. But the question is one of balance (remember the juggler), the balance between encouraging freedom, responsibility, and initiative, and maintaining order, consistency, and direction. The answers to the questions we have raised are not simple, not easy to come by. But these questions demand serious consideration if our educational pattern is to attain its fullness, its character, its integrity.

Miller, *op. cit.*
LOYOLA COLLEGE, BALTIMORE: A charitable bequest estimated at $140,000 has been left to Loyola College, Baltimore by Miss Nina Irvin—a former Baltimore school teacher. According to the will, the gift is to be used for scholarships and educational purposes other than the erection or improvement of buildings.

JESUIT ‘FELLOW’: Henry Ansgar Kelly, S.J., a scholastic of the Wisconsin Province, has been appointed a Junior Fellow of Harvard’s Society of Fellows. The first member of a religious community to receive such an appointment, he will do advanced research in English literature. The junior fellows are a group of young scholars judged exceptionally qualified and appointed to study within the university on their own terms for a period of three years.

HISTORIAN AND HIS CONSTRUCTION CREW TO MEXICO. When classes end this semester Father Charles E. Ronan, S.J., and a fifteen member work crew composed of LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO students, will drive to Mexico for eight weeks of back-breaking work among the Maya Indians.

Father Ronan, who is an authority on Spanish-American history and his crew of volunteers will serve as a “miniature Peace Corps,” as they describe it, building homes for the Indians.

They have been invited, for the second consecutive summer, by Bishop Garcia of the Chiapas diocese to assist the Indians of the area to construct homes.

The students organized bake sales, dances, tag days, and other fund raising activities to secure the necessary $5,000 to finance the Loyola Mission to Mexico.

THE REV. WALTER J. ONG, S.J., professor of English at ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY has been appointed to the Advisory Board of Abstracts of English Studies of the National Council of Teachers of English.

Father Ong is well known as a scholar in both the Renaissance field and the field of contemporary literature, and as a prolific writer on problems of contemporary civilization.

A $300,000 challenge gift to help build a legal research center and to improve MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY’s entire law program was recently announced.
An anonymous donor offered the $300,000 to MU if the university can raise an additional $600,000 by Feb. 26, 1965. Law alumni have already contributed about $125,000 toward the Greater Marquette Program.

A Planning project for a proposed university research hospital has been approved by the board of directors of the MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY School of Medicine. The board approved an expenditure of $20,000 to prepare preliminary plans and cost estimates for a 150 to 200 bed hospital.

A $60,000 grant from the Louis Calder Foundation, New York City, is being used by Marquette University to bring visiting professors to the campus to conduct seminars for doctoral students in religious studies.

The grant provides $12,000 annually for five years for this purpose. Five scholars were named Louis Calder professors for the 1963-64 school year. They are:

Father Hilary Brozowski, S.J., Jesuit College, St. Bonifacius, Minn.; Father John Huesman, S.J., Alma College, Los Gatos, Calif.; Father Dennis McCarthy, S.J., St. Mary’s College, St. Marys, Kansas; Abbot Laurentius Klein, O.S.B., St. Mathias Abbey, Trier, Germany; and Dr. John Macquarrie, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Marquette’s doctoral program in religious studies was begun last September, the first such program for laymen and clergy in the United States.

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY: Devising methods and techniques for lifting the burden of clerical tasks from the shoulders of teachers and administrators is a fundamental goal of a new Marquette University research project.

Marquette has announced a one-year research study of the educational implications of data processing in the administration of non-public elementary and secondary schools.

Marquette has proposed a “status study” of current applications and trends, together with establishment of a resource center for school administrators, and the possibility of publications, conferences, workshops and institutes to communicate the potential of electronic data processing in the field of educational administration.