

FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE TO
PRIVATE ROOM

9961 6 NNR

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

MARCH, 1966

EDUCATIONAL APOSTOLATE

SOCIAL APOSTOLATE

HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH

SPECIAL STUDIES

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Vol. XXVIII, No. 4

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Our Contributors

FATHER FERDINANDO TROSSARELLI (*Turin Province*) is National Prefect of Studies for the Provinces of Italy and Rector of *Civiltà Cattolica*.

FATHER EDWARD B. ROONEY, retiring President of the JEA needs no introduction to our readers. As his article mentions, this is the 24th article he has written on this subject.

FATHER CHARLES FRANKENHOFF (*New York Province*) is a member of the staff of Instituto Ignaciana at the University of Puerto Rico.

FATHER LOWRIE DALY (*Wisconsin Province*) is professor of history at St. Louis University and is in charge of the Vatican microfilm project at the St. Louis University library.

RATHER LEONARD WATERS (*Wisconsin Province*) appears in the pages of the JEQ for his second article. He teaches English in the Wisconsin Province Juniorate at St. Bonifacius.

MR. WILLIAM J. SNECK (*Maryland Province*) is a philosopher at Fusz Memorial in St. Louis. He is in charge of the Social Apostolate Program at Fusz.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

March 1966

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL CONGRESS, MADRID 1966 <i>Ferdinando Trossarelli, S.J.</i>	219
STATUS OF SPECIAL STUDIES, 1965-1966 <i>Edward B. Rooney, S.J.</i>	234
"JESUIT, PRIEST AND SCHOLAR" <i>Charles Frankenhoff, S.J.</i>	245
IS EDUCATIONAL WORK ANTI-IGNATIAN? <i>Lowrie J. Daly, S.J.</i>	249
WHAT DOES COLLEGE EXPECT OF HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH? <i>Leonard A. Waters, S.J.</i>	255
SOCIAL APOSTOLATE: A COMMUNITY'S GROWTH AND WITNESS <i>William J. Sneek, S.J.</i>	263
NEWS FROM THE FIELD	273
INDEX TO VOLUME XXVIII June 1965 to March 1966	277

THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.
Assistant Editor

PAUL A. FITZGERALD, S.J.
Managing Editor

EUGENE F. MANGOLD, S.J.
Advisory Board

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

JOSEPH T. BROWNE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
CORNELIUS J. CARR, S.J.	<i>Buffalo Province</i>
BERNARD J. DOOLEY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JAMES E. FITZGERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
HERMAN J. HAUCK, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
ADRIAN J. KOCHANSKI, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JOHN V. MURPHY, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
WILLIAM D. RYAN, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
PAUL V. SIEGFRIED, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JAMES F. WHELAN, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y. 10028

COPYRIGHT 1966

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

International Educational Congress - Madrid

January 1966¹

FERDINANDO TROSSARELLI, S.J.²

The International Congress held at Madrid, January 7-12, 1966, continued the discussions initiated at two preceding congresses held at Lyons (1954) and at Rome (1963).³ The generous Spanish hospitality encouraged a profitable meeting between nineteen competent and qualified representatives of thirteen different countries in which the Society labors in the field of education.

The Congress was convened at a particularly critical moment. On the one hand, Vatican II had just concluded its sessions with its important documents (especially the Declaration on Christian Education, the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, the decrees on the *Apostolate* of the Laity, on Religious Liberty); and as Jesuits we find ourselves in the intersession of the XXXI General Congregation which, as far as can be ascertained, must continue to concern itself with the work of the schools. On the other hand, the profound changes, both qualitative and quantitative, in the modern world force the Society to undertake an accurate assessment of this work which, by reason of these changes, now confronts the Jesuits with an increasingly perplexing situation.

The topics upon which the Congress dwelt with special emphasis, and which I shall try to gather together in a personal synthesis, were therefore those relating to the present work of the schools of the Society (with particular reference to atheism); the admission of students; the complete integration of our lay colleagues; the disciplines to be taught and the kinds of schools; the cooperation among the schools within a given province or country, and even in the world, with the offer of specific help to Father General by means of this collaboration; and finally, possible solutions to the pressing economic problems.

¹ The editors of the JEQ thought that this paper would be of special interest to its readers. It is an account of the meeting of the Prefects General in Madrid with some interpretation and additional insights by the author. We judged that it would be helpful for American Jesuits to have the timely comments of an experienced European Jesuit on the important topic of the apostolate of Jesuit education in general and of secondary education in particular. As everyone knows, it is sometimes difficult, if not impossible, to transfer the exact nuance of a romance language into the Anglo-Saxon mold.

² Translated from the original Italian by Father Paul A. FitzGerald, S.J., Jesuit Educational Association.

³ Both of these meetings were also concerned with various aspects of the Apostolate of Education in the Society of Jesus.

The Current Task of the Schools of the Society:

The first, and perhaps most important, topic which claimed the attention of the participants was that of the present day task of the schools of the Society. By schools, we mean here all the academic institutions of the Society, whether at the secondary level or at the university level. It was conceded (for the sake of argument) that scholastic education in general is today the number one problem in every country. The right and the fact of the presence of the Church in the world by means of formal schools was also conceded; in addition, of course, there is the vast participation in the apostolate of all the students of whatever kind of school. The problem, however, which interested us was the one regarding the Society. It is clear that the Society has indeed exercised in the past a very important academic influence; it has left its mark on academic curricula and scholastic methods in a notable way; it has in very fact bequeathed a goodly number of academic institutions at the secondary and university levels. However, it now finds itself at a necessary examination of conscience to meet a situation so profoundly different in which the Society more and more finds herself. This new situation is characterized by:

The so-called educational explosion which each day reduces ever more the percentage number of teaching scholastics;

The nationalization of educational services, which often exists with Statism and with a certain form of state monopoly;

The social democratization by which not only the school is ever more open to all in the upper secondary area with easy admission to the university; but also a tendency to a leveling of values with consequent widespread mediocrity;

The ever more professional character of the task of teaching which makes it less attractive to a priest, who by his profession is not a teacher of profane disciplines and who is drawn to and must also engage in other duties;

The existence of many Catholic institutions (some with priests, some without) engaged in this kind of work;

The necessity and at the same time the opportunity to leave to laymen those forms of the Apostolate for which they are qualified; all the more since there are such urgent requests in other areas for priests and religious who, unfortunately, are every day less numerous.

In other words, in the past the world was much more simple from a Christian and professional viewpoint. The problem consequently must be fitted into the changing times. So, the preceding reflections

force us to consider how the school in the Society has adapted itself to the present times. The answer to this question would seem to be clearly negative, even if not in an absolute form. In this way, it differs somewhat from the answer which those give who consider as completely out-of-date or inadequate this particular work of the Society. And at the same time, it can also be distinguished from those who do not want to give too much importance to the changing times and are content to continue as in the past, since, as a matter of fact, even in that way we would still continue to do some good.

The Society, according to what was said at the Congress, has it in its power today to give, and can give, a very significant contribution to scholastic education, if it remains in this work that is proper to it, and it can also contribute much to Catholic schools in general. The Society, as a religious family and in its apostolic endeavor, has precise characteristics; those, namely that constitute its specificity. This specificity refers not only to educational and academic works; it refers really to all its ministries. In order to understand it and define it, we will have to rethink the whole business in the manner in which *hic et nunc* St. Ignatius would have resolved the apostolic problems. This has in fact specifically been summarized in the formula A.M.D.G.; as principles, it is collected together in the Spiritual Exercises and in the Constitutions. As an effective ministry, it is present as the force directed by a group of men spiritually motivated and truly qualified in the sciences of theology and philosophy, and open to the contemporaneous culture of their time and country so as to permeate this culture with Christian faith. Naturally all of this will not remain in the order of speculation only, but as a positive help in the work of grace as it affects each individual.

But how can we translate all of this into educational concepts? When we speak of Jesuit pedagogy, we ought to think in terms of an historical fact. Why, in point of fact, were the Jesuits for almost two centuries the schoolmasters *par excellence* of Western Europe? Or ought we to think again about the specific educational offerings? And are these crystalized in formulae or in points of view which, although informed by pedagogical constants, take full cognizance of the men, of the time, and of the place? And do they take cognizance by diluting them or rather by a mutual synthesis of values?

It is unanimously recognized that there is a fundamental and specific content which renders fully effective the activity of the

academic institutions, properly so called, of the Society (and not only those of a more generic educational character) which is not proper, historically or pedagogically, to other Catholic enterprises in the field of education. The hope is to effect at an educational level a synthesis of values, a living and vital synthesis of modern culture and of Christian faith. It is the effort made to confront, to fulfill at the time of education, the Christian faith in all that is most valid, that is most vibrant in the culture of every age and of every country. This synthesis, as Vatican II warns us in the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (N. 53), does not wish to impose a form of culture, but to offer the richness of faith to the culture of every age and of every country and also to the different scholastic levels and to the different types of schools. Culture necessarily varies with the times; it is different in different places by reason of the influence of complex traditions and by the levels of living. But in every case and at all times, the synthesis requires that faith in Christ the Redeemer be embodied in a culture which in turn will render man truly whole. (Vat. II, Nos. 59-60-62.) Naturally, the synthesis so effected will not only be conceptual but will be dynamically progressive, irradiating, I would say, an existential wisdom. By contributing to the formation of authentic men of their times, the integration of Christianity with the work of the schools serves to influence and increase the Christian zeal of the same educators, in relation, naturally, to the religious orbit in which they find themselves.

In practice this synthesis is achieved by educating the young man to complete self-fulfillment in the world in which he lives and at the same time as a son of God, albeit an adopted son, to live a life of grace. With such perspectives, there will be an orderly development of his attitudes, a good start for overcoming possible difficulties, and, as an ultimate objective, the acquisition of a mode of thinking in which culture, in its fullest and most complete sense, is harmonized with faith.

In retrospect, it is possible to establish how the schools of the Society, at least in their original design, tried to effect this synthesis, "this spiritual teaching of letters and virtue," as St. Ignatius wrote, obviously in different fields according to the times. First the emphasis was in the humanities, then in the sciences, and now in technical and social areas following the gradual modification of the prevailing cultural expressions. Yet precisely through this continual

adaptation to and incorporation with these new movements, one can say that the schools of the Society were and are, in a certain sense, institutions undergoing continual evaluation. This work of review, which is imposed upon us by the very fact that we are Jesuits, places our educational institutions themselves in a kind of normal and perennial crisis of change; and the crisis is all the greater the more rapid and profound is the change of culture as is happening at this very time. Obviously, this crisis has nothing to do with another crisis which can develop from a refusal to follow the rhythm and the variations in culture.

This synthesis has a particular validity today. It is the most efficacious form for allowing us to combat contemporary atheism with a real weapon. Modern atheism manifests itself, as a matter of fact, with two specific characteristics: in the first place, it is a synthesis of all values as being in constant flux which in time leads to a denial of God; it is also a well-organized entity that rests upon the local social structure. The Jesuit school, which by its very nature tends to vitiate the first aspect, ought today to overcome every possible deficiency in the second, opposing modern atheism ever more with solid groups of apostles. In fact, we can no longer be content to speak of the formation of *men* (Epit. N. 381); we must speak rather of preparing *groups* for an acceptable social order.

In order to achieve the *specificity* of Jesuit schools, according to the example of St. Ignatius, it is necessary to operate within the institutions and with the most efficacious methods. For this reason, it is not only necessary to assign the very best men, but we must also take advantage of the latest research in pedagogy and psychology; without neglecting at the same time the pedagogical experience which the Society has garnered as a result of the educational treasury provided by the Spiritual Exercises.

In the past, in official documents relating to our schools, there was much insistence on religious and moral formation, calling by another name what was elsewhere referred to in general as the Christian education of youth. (Epit. 381 sqq.) Certainly, all of that remains substantially and fully valid even today, although one must make the necessary distinction between the specific scope of the academic institutions of the Society and their objectives as educational institutions in general. In this way, one can better understand the insistence on the synthesis between the values of modern culture and the problems of faith, not only, as has already

been said, at the intellectual level but in a vital and dynamic way. All of this requires, therefore, a moral and religious formation, but on two conditions: The first is that this formation, primarily religious, takes account of the world in which we live. I am thinking, for example, of the situation in certain missions, and also, to be realistic about it, the situation in several countries where there is progressive de-Christianization. The second is that we do not expect automatic results from the application of certain means, though religious in a strict sense, even if we are dealing with the teaching itself of religion. The results in this enterprise will depend very much on a necessary balance in the use of these means, in conjunction with the grace of God and the cooperation of men, both students and teachers.

Before concluding these brief notes on the genuine function of the schools of the Society, it is necessary to explain further two additional points. What I have said about the specific role of the schools of the Society of Jesus may be interpreted by some as having little respect for other Catholic schools and in general for the public school. It is necessary to clarify this delicate point which has its origin, I think, in a pejorative interpretation of democracy, which for some people means only a leveling. With regard to the specificity, I do not intend to say here that we ought to keep for ourselves only the elite, while leaving to others those students of lesser talent. The specificity does not of itself imply anything with regard to the selection of students or the kinds of school; neither do I want to indicate that these are better than others, but only that they ought to accomplish what is proper to a specific religious family. Without this specificity, which is what permits a Jesuit to be what he is, there would be a vacuum in the very heart of the work of the schools of the Society. For the Jesuits to align themselves, as a working policy, with other educational institutions would be to abandon their own. For they could not, in that way, achieve this synthesis which was the reason why the Society from the very beginning undertook the work of education. As a matter of fact, and with due respect to all, we must in truth say that other religious educational institutions have undertaken their own activity for excellent but different reasons: For example, for reasons of charity, or for a general apostolate among students in a particular social class. *A fortiori*, does this apply to non-religious educational institutions. As a matter of fact, for all educational institutions the specification proper to the schools of the Society can

be of help in defining and solving other problems of a common nature.

Finally, the specific role of the Society in the modern world cannot be achieved, in the best way, through the individual participation of Jesuits in other institutions. With the exception of the case of the teaching of religion in other schools—which is entirely proper to a priest, and hence also a Jesuit—experience gained in different countries has shown that the influence of a Jesuit teacher in other secondary schools, and sometimes in universities, for example state-supported, is noticeably reduced; or at least is confined to the extraordinary gifts of a single person. For this reason, the Society has always been concerned with its own educational associations; just as from the early days St. Ignatius and his first companions planned to associate themselves religiously in an organized and hierarchic form. In the Society, great importance was always attached to organization, in the conduct of affairs, even if there are individual men who ought to develop a particular talent of the first order; not indeed as isolated individuals, left exclusively to themselves, but rather as people who work in an homogeneous and structured group; who ought not to improvise their activity every day, and who can thus associate themselves also with other men of lesser talent.

A fortiori, these general reasons have a particular validity in relation to the effort that the Jesuit ought to expend in confronting education. The synthesis of culture and faith, on which note I will conclude this section of the paper, demands a homogeneous group of teachers and students. A school of the Society is just that.

The Problem of the Students:

Evidently, not all students are suited to this type of school; on the other hand, it seems necessary to draw from a sufficiently homogeneous circle, since the class of students in itself is a factor in their education.

With this premise, it seems that a student ought not to be excluded who in good faith embraces the objectives of our institutions, and who is seriously drawn toward them, according to his personal gifts of nature and grace. The responsibility of the school toward those whom it has already accepted, will be to help each one to fulfill himself to the limit of his possibilities. In the case of students who do not seem capable of benefiting from this

type of formation, we must not abruptly eliminate them, but rather persuade them that, of their own accord, they should seek another institution.

In the case of non-Christian students, the specificity of the school remains unaltered. In this case it ought to be placed on the level of the religious and human conscience of the individual students who, however, ought not to put any obstacles in the way of the ordinary business of the school.

The Problem of the Teachers:

The theological and human synthesis, of which I spoke, can only be effected by teachers who have already achieved this in themselves. This is the source of many problems. Some consider the training of the Jesuits themselves, others that of the lay professors; others profess to see the existence of a community of scholars similar to the religious community of the teachers of the Society. It goes without saying that the educator in a school of the Society should be, at least to some degree, a theologian, and at the same time know this changing and complex world in which he must enkindle the faith; beyond this he must be an educator as well. That is to say, he must know the principles and the techniques of the educational process and so become in a certain sense a professional.

Certainly it is imperative that the educator of the Society of Jesus have ever greater professional competence. This kind of work in general cannot be fully accomplished by dilettantes, or by people who do not have the proper gifts or preparation or specific and consistent responsibility, or who have no desire to participate in such a community operation.

The problem assumes different aspects for the lay teacher, who has not had the spiritual, philosophical and theological training of the religious, which is a necessary foundation for the synthesis that the school hopes to achieve. Up to now the presence of the layman in the faculty (Epit. 398) was considered in the nature of a substitution to which we had to have recourse in cases of urgent necessity. The reality, as has been said, is however not now one of substitution. Necessity itself obliges us to have recourse ever more often to the laymen, who for their part are real professionals in a teaching situation and, as a matter of fact, are a very stable element in a school of many Fathers. But after the Vatican Council,

and after what I have said, this reality cannot be resolved only as a function of necessity, but rather of a real opportunity. Beyond the invitation of the Council, certain general economic criteria operate with regard to the religious personnel, rendering ever more opportune the educational witness of the lay professors, whose less restricted formation is particularly adapted to the present pluralistic world.

Every solution, however, has advantages and disadvantages. If on the one hand we are concerned by the absence in the lay professors of a deep spiritual and theological formation, as is demanded of the Fathers, the experience of these lay professors who are more immediately immersed in the every-day world can help the sought-for synthesis. Obviously we assume that not all the professors will be laymen, nor will all be religious, but all must work side by side together in a common enterprise. One can understand, therefore, how in the United States, for example, the accreditation of a school demands as a requirement that the personnel be mixed.

But even when the material difficulties have been adequately resolved, there really is not a very large number of these teachers immediately available for work in a school of the Society. It is clear that we are speaking here not so much of the technical qualifications, but more of the theological. It seems that, in the basic assumption, we ought to apply here the same criteria as for the acceptance of students, that is, the lay teachers must sincerely accept the educational philosophy of the institution and pledge themselves to honor it. It is necessary, in other words, that there should be a cohesive and integrated ideology.

In the case of a non-Catholic professor—as may happen in special situations—we ought to require that he discharge his obligations according to conscience and that his orientation be such that it does not constitute an obstacle to the general objectives of the school.

But the whole question of the lay teachers cannot be limited today to clarifying the greater or lesser opportunity presented by their presence in our schools; nor even to the criteria by which they are selected and the manner in which they are formed. It is not sufficient that they remain good teachers, under every formality, but at the same time limited to their assigned tasks. If we are convinced that the educational efficiency of an academic institution

depends on the cooperative work of the teachers, it will be necessary to consider the manner of responsibly integrating the laymen into the very operational heart of the school.

The solution to the problem is not easy. It is necessary, in the first place, to overcome certain difficulties of a material order, such as for example, an acceptable salary scale, tenure and pensions. These difficulties are most easily resolved in countries where the state intervenes with substantial subsidies; they become more involved in other countries, where it would be necessary to devise solutions based on the local practice of the Province. There are also psychological difficulties. The fathers are very often considered by the lay professors as their paternal masters, or the subjects of a filial relationship, while the professors themselves are simply dependent clerks who feel that they must find some solid guarantee, either in civil or corporate regulations. Some of the Jesuits, as a matter of fact, do not seem very happy about integrating themselves with the lay teachers. (It has even been suggested that at times they have difficulty integrating with themselves and with their own superiors). As is clear, these are not insuperable difficulties, but they require time and perseverance to bring about a change in mentality. It is a question of getting across the concept of co-responsibility at the same level and therefore of a true integration.

Moreover, there appear other difficulties of an administrative and juridical character. It would be a question, according to some, of considering the faculty of teachers together with the immediate head (the president) as a functioning community formed by religious and laymen and in a certain sense independent, at least in its technical aspect, of a strictly religious regime. In certain countries, such a set-up is fairly routine and more easily attainable; in others there is less chance for it.⁴ Fundamentally, it is a question of getting the religious, on the one hand, to understand the structure and its operational advantages, even the apostolic advantages, outside of the regular religious community and to collaborate responsibly without forgetting or placing in a subordinate position the religious community to which they belong. On the other hand, it is a question of educating the superior to appreciate the technical work that must be done, regulating in an orderly way the proper

¹ It was noted that not infrequently the religious superior was not the administrative head of the institution and therefore not responsible for the educational aspects of the enterprise.

hierarchy of responsibility. In other words, it is a question of adjusting the religious to work in an area of activity beyond the confines of the religious family, even though substantially dependent on it. It is a question of men but also of mentality and attitudes.

Finally, with regard to the presence of women on the teaching faculty (of secondary schools), it was agreed that there were no substantial difficulties in relation either to necessity or even to local opportunities.

Disciplines to be Taught and the Types of Schools:

The evolution of culture, together with its variant manifestation in different countries, no longer allows us to settle for a single academic program or curriculum. Even less can we assert the superiority of the classical languages. However, along very general lines, there was a reaffirmation, first and foremost for the secondary level, of the importance of a humanistic formation; one that is really solid and geared to the local requirements. The word "humanistic" was used advisedly to play down the coldly intellectual and impersonally professional type of program which unfortunately tends to grow beyond bounds these days; instead the idea is to insist on a formation which will help develop the human faculties with special emphasis on the capacity *to understand, to reason and to express oneself* in the concrete language of today—literary, scientific and audio-visual.

Many different kinds of schools can be adapted to the synthesis explained above as a specific function of this activity of ours. Some spoke of the opportunity, if not of the real necessity, to create some prototypes in various academic categories (classics, science, technical, agriculture, professional) in answer to the requirements of time and place. In this way, the decisive role of our apostolic undertaking would appear to better advantage.

Collaboration Among the Schools of the Society:

The present-day technical aspects of the apostolate of education and the necessity of a closer collaboration of the different institutions of the Society on a world-wide basis, suggest that more expert assistance should be given to Father General; these developments also require a permanent liaison between our institutions. Some suggested, in the first place, that a qualified assistant should be

available to Father General for the work of the sub-commission in the General Congregation. More attention, however, was given to the possibility of setting up a regular office on a permanent basis. Among the more acceptable solutions proposed was that of regional Federations among the schools or at least among the Prefects of Studies, the representatives of whom would constitute a world-wide confederation on which Father General could rely in order to evaluate the incoming data pertaining to the schools of the Society and in order eventually to establish an educational secretariat of the Society. Periodic meetings of this Confederation, or by other agreed upon procedures, would help to promote a common source of information and collaboration.

It was also proposed that there be a sharing of pedagogical data and experience at an Ignatian Center common to all the works of the Society, since obviously we ought to suppose and hope that the schools of the Society, in their own specificity, are likewise inspired, as are the other ministries, with Ignatian spirituality. This participation, naturally, does not exclude the possibility that in the future we might have a Center devoted exclusively to the study of pedagogical problems since these, becoming every day more technical, restate some fundamental ideas which in one way or another inspire them.

The necessity of a close collaboration among different schools at the provincial level, and perhaps national, was unanimously affirmed. This means that there must be a man, at the provincial or national level, completely free from other responsibilities, whose essential task it would be to assist the Provincial or Provincials in ordering, promoting and coordinating studies in the schools and performing any other task that may be referred to his initiative. This *Prefect of Studies*, as he should be called, ought not to have ordinary jurisdiction (except in a particular case and for a stated time) but ought to be consulted in matters of greater moment, especially when it is a question of special studies for ours who are destined for a teaching career in the schools. In every nation or region, or if there is question of a group of provinces, there ought to be an educational association, the president of which ought to coordinate the work of the Province Prefects and to supply for them in cases where they have not yet been appointed; at the same time it would be his responsibility to represent our schools in national organizations.

The Economic Problems of Our Schools:

It is quite clear that institutions of quality must have economic means to sustain them. Quality cannot be reconciled with indigence. The fundamental problem is how to find this necessary economic means. For a solution suited to the problem, it is necessary to consider over and above the two elements already cited—quality and economic means—two others, namely, the relative freedom of educational work and the possibility of accepting free of charge talented and deserving students. Unfortunately, as a matter of fact, whatever be the origin of money, it tends to make us lose some part of our freedom; at the same time our apostolic mission does not allow us to discriminate among students according to the social and economic position of their families.

Many feel that the only possible solution is quite frankly one of state subsidies, and that therefore it is necessary to promote suitable plans in countries in which these subsidies are not yet granted. Others insist that state support is only possible in certain circumstances:

In countries where there is a deep and broadly-based conviction of the pluralism of education and of the necessity of state support. Practically, these are countries where there is a widespread and well-established tradition of private schools;

In countries in which there is a relatively stable political situation. Otherwise, a change in the political balance could place us in a difficult situation with regard to the orderly expansion of our schools or the even tenor of life itself;

In countries which allow a sufficient measure of teaching and administrative freedom, naturally in accordance with the local standards of education. In this connection, and above all, a system must not be imposed whereby institutions, which require a mixed personnel, progressively and irrevocably pass into the hands of lay teachers.

Others make the point that the question is essentially a political one. So that even in countries which do not enjoy these benefits there is the dangerous temptation on our part to defer the specific and technical accreditation of our schools and their opening to all social classes until the arrival of such subsidies. Moreover, there remains the fact that even with state subsidies, which ought to render gratuitous access to our schools, there are all too often additional auxiliary expenses (transportation, a certain style of living,

cultural and even charitable activities) which in the end have the effect of reserving our schools for those who have money.

It remains, therefore, to reaffirm before all else the principle that we must take care, day in and day out, that our schools are open to young men who are capable of receiving a solid formation, prescindendo from their economic backgrounds. This principle is fully consistent with the proper function of the schools of today; it is also fully consistent with a culture in which the social factor and the abolition of all discrimination, in relation to economic backgrounds, have been placed in proper perspective. This principle has a special relevance at the present time in regard to construction of schools, the location and the material, in the types of schools, in the academic offerings which, however, ought to remain always of a high order. For this reason, it is hard to understand why the schools at the present time "*in primis*" (Epit. 515, 4) must contribute to the "*arca seminarii*" or be at the disposition of continuous collections of money on the part of ecclesiastical authorities or Catholic associations.

In many cases, to be sure, when foundation sources or assistance on the part of the state are lacking, recourse to fees remains the only solution to obtain the necessary funds. In some countries, for example in the United States, at least for schools of a certain class, there is an additional moral necessity because the esteem of the school is somehow equated with the amount of the fees, the amount of student aid and the possibility of student employment.

In order that the fees, and other source of revenue, may appear as a necessity for the quality of the institution and not for the enrichment of the religious community, it will be necessary to keep two sets of books; one for the academic enterprise and one for the religious community. In the first, there must be listed as debits the salaries of the religious personnel (at the same rate naturally as the others); at the same time, in the accruals there should be noted the contribution of the religious community to the academic enterprise, assigning part of this contribution of the religious surplus to the support of the community. Such a financial statement, when made known, would make clear our own poverty, and serve as an example to others who collaborate with us. Also, in the case of these necessary fees, there are even stronger reasons in our schools to avoid all other kinds of expenses.

To sum up, the economic problem will necessarily have concrete solutions that will differ in relation to the complex local situation.

These solutions ought to try to reconcile three conditions, which at first sight seem incompatible: the prestige of the institution and therefore the necessity of relatively high fees; the relative administrative and functional independence of the institution; the accessibility of the institution, measured in a sense by the admission of those who are economically deprived.

Conclusion:

These were the general lines and the fundamental ideas presented in the preliminary papers and the subsequent discussions at the Congress in Madrid. It is now clearly necessary to rethink in modern terms our whole educational activity. The result will prove that even today this work is crucial and worthy of our particular responsibility as apostles, as priests and as Jesuits. This work of education, in summary, is predicated on the condition that it is open to, and affects an authentic and relevant understanding of, the values which exist in the Church, an appreciation of the reality of modern culture, a use of the latest methodological techniques geared to the education of modern youth; on the condition, moreover, that this work be open to, and depend courageously on, a younger generation capable of receiving a solid formation, prescind-ing from its economic situation; and, finally, on condition that it be open to an honest and integral collaboration with lay teachers.

With this triple opening, it will be possible to bring about a rebirth of faith within the context of modern culture at this level of education which, indeed, still remains the goal of apostolic educators who fervently wish in this way to exercise a decisive role in the world in which they live.

Status of Special Studies¹

1965 - 1966

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

Like the Sundays after Pentecost, this is the twenty-fourth and last of the reports on the Status of Special Studies in the American Assistancy to be prepared by the present writer. With this issue of the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* he bows out as its editor, yielding his office to Father Paul C. Reinert, S.J., recently named president of the Jesuit Educational Association.

Before commenting on this year's report, I wish to make public acknowledgment of the very important part taken in the preparation of these annual reports by Father Eugene Mangold and his predecessors in the office of Assistant to the President of the Jesuit Educational Association. These reports have really had the dual authorship of the President and his able Assistants since it was Father Mangold and his predecessors who gathered the facts and prepared the tables. My own was only the task of examining the tables, comparing them with those of previous years, and commenting on certain facts revealed by the tables. It is a pleasant duty to acknowledge publicly the dual authorship of these annual reports, and to thank my Assistants for their work in preparing the data on which my report is based.

One who has held an office for about twenty-nine years is very naturally tempted to look back to the early days of his term of office. In yielding to this temptation as I write my final report on the Status of Special Studies, I would remind readers that these reports have always had a forward look. It was this forward look, a look of hope, that made it possible for the writer to make use of them in his annual reports to the Board of Governors of the Jesuit Educational Association as an incentive to greater fidelity in carrying out the prescriptions of the *Instructio* on Studies sent to the American Assistancy by Father General Ledochowski on August 15, 1934.² As we shall presently see, the Tables in this year's report again give a basis for that same forward, hopeful look.

Since most of the terms used in Table I are identical with those used in the 1942-1943 report, the first of the series, a comparison

¹ Tables and factual data prepared by Eugene F. Mangold, S.J.

² *Instructio Pro Assistentia Americae de Ordinandis Universitatibus, Collegiis, ac Scholis Altis et de Praeparandis Eorundem Magistris.*

TABLE 1—COMPARATIVE STATISTICS, 1961-1966

	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66
Full Time	314	309	306	365	412
Priests	202	210	220	274	314
Scholastics	112	99	86	91	98
Ph.D.	196	195	185	214	211
Other Doctor	39	38	48	58	89
M.A.	27	31	24	30	51
M.S.	17	10	20	23	19
Other Master	10	4	4	7	8
Other Degree	6	15	7	7	7
No Degree	19	16	18	26	27

of the two years is possible.³ While this year's total of 412 special students represents a remarkable increase of 47 over last year's, it marks an increase of 332 over 1942-1943 when the total number assigned to special studies was 90. Compared with the 314 priests and 98 scholastics engaged in special studies this year, there were 63 priests and 27 scholastics in 1942-1943. While 47 American Jesuits were studying for Ph.D's. in 1942-1943, and 27 for the Master's, this year 211 are working for the Ph.D. and 89 for other doctorates, and 78 are completing their work for a master's degree. Bear in mind, however, that Assistancy manpower which is 8,317 in 1966 was only 5,912 in 1942.

It is worth noting that this year's total of 412 special students is an all-time high. It is likewise worth noting that of the 412 special students, 199 are newly assigned this year while 213 are continuing students. These figures should be a source of satisfaction to higher superiors for, after all, they are the ones who bear ultimate responsibility for the status of the program; and they are the ones who must pay the bills. They must have tremendous confidence in the educational work of the Assistancy for they are investing heavily their men and money in it. Their confidence and their liberal investment in the future of our educational work is the best answer to those who would question the value of that work.

Taking the totals yielded by Table I, Table II breaks them up according to provinces. This table will, no doubt, be examined with an eagle-eye by school administrators in individual provinces since it gives an indication of the future trained manpower of the province.

³ *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, 1942-1943, Vol. V, No. 2, p. 129.

TABLE TWO—DEGREE SOUGHT

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N. Eng.	N.O.	N.Y.	Or.	Wis.	Total
Full Time	22	32	32	34	46	40	62	18	56	34	36	412
Priests	17	32	27	24	31	27	48	8	43	31	26	314
Scholastics	5	0	5	10	15	13	14	10	13	3	10	98
Ph.D.	11	21	20	14	22	19	28	16	15	22	23	211
Other Dr.	3	7	8	11	10	5	21	1	15	3	5	89
M.A.	4	1	4	4	10	3	7	1	9	5	3	51
M.S.	1	0	0	1	3	7	1	0	2	1	3	19
Other Master	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	8
Other Degree	0	2	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	7
No Degree	2	0	0	3	0	5	3	0	13	0	1	27
New	9	10	11	17	26	18	33	8	41	12	14	199
Continuing	13	22	21	17	20	22	29	10	15	22	22	213
Total 65-66	22	32	32	34	46	40	62	18	56	34	36	412
Total 64-65	24	34	30	31	34	36	48	14	45	29	40	365
Plus or Minus	-2	-2	+2	+3	+12	+4	+14	+4	+11	+5	-4	+47

The bottom line of Table II shows the provinces of Maryland, New York, Oregon, Missouri, New Orleans, Detroit, and Chicago with increases of from two to fourteen special students, while Buffalo, California, and Wisconsin have dropped behind their 1964-1965 record.

While examining the totals for the various provinces, however, it is well to keep in mind the following distribution of the total manpower of the Assistancy in 1966: New York, 13.56; New England, 13.37; California, 10.67; Maryland, 10.06; Missouri, 9.41; Wisconsin, 9.23; Chicago, 8.27; Oregon, 8.16; New Orleans, 6.90; Detroit, 6.40; and Buffalo, 3.93.

School administrators who are looking forward to receiving some of these special students on their teaching staffs when they have completed their studies will wish to give more than a passing glance at Table III. From this table they can learn in what fields our students are working. They will learn, for example, that our students are working in 49 different subject areas. The following list of thirteen fields, together with the number of special students in each, will please or not, according as it seems to meet the needs of the individual administrators. Incidentally, it should be noted that these 13 fields account for 340 or 82.5 per cent of the total number of special students: Theology, 85; Languages, 38; English, 36; Philosophy, 28; History, 26; Physics, 24; Economics, 16; Psychology, 14; Sociology, 14; Mathematics, 13; Political Science, 13; Chemistry, 12; Biology, 11. (Text continued, p. 241)

TABLE THREE—MASTER FIELDS

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Maryl.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Or.	Wis.	Totals
American Studies								1 PhD				1 PhD
Anthropology	1 PhD										2 PhD	3 PhD
Art			1 PhD	1 ND								1 ND
Astronomy												1 PhD
Biochemistry					1 PhD							1 PhD
Biology	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	1 PD	2 PhD		1 PhD		1 PhD	1 MS	1 PhD	9 PhD 1 PD
Business Administration	1 MBA		1 MA								1 PhD	1 MS 1 MBA
Canon Law						1 JCD	1 JCD				1 JCL	2 JCD 1 JCL
Catechetics						3 ND	1 STD 1 Cert					1 STD 1 Cert 3 ND
Chemistry				1 BS	1 PhD 1 PD	1 MS	2 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD 1 MS 1 ND		1 PD 1 MS	5 PhD 3 MS 1 BS 1 ND
Communication Arts					1 MA	1 PhD	1 PhD		1 PhD 1 MA 1 PhD	1 PhD 1 ND	1 PhD	5 PhD 2 MA 1 ND 1 M Ed
Counseling			1 MA		1 M Ed							1 PhD 1 MA
Drama			1 PhD					1 PhD				2 PhD
Economics	1 PhD 1 MA	2 PhD		1 PhD 1 PD	3 PhD	1 PhD 1 MA	1 PhD		1 MA	1 PhD 1 MA	1 PhD	11 PhD 1 PD 4 MA
Education		2 PhD	2 PhD				1 PhD 1 D Ed	1 PhD	1 PhD 1 MA	1 PhD		8 PhD 1 D Ed 1 MA
Engineering							2 PhD				1 MS	2 PhD 1 MS
English	2 PhD	2 PhD	2 PhD	3 PhD 1 MA 1 ND	1 MA	2 PhD 1 MA	1 PhD 4 MA	5 PhD		4 PhD 1 MA	5 PhD 1 MA	26 PhD 9 MA 1 ND
Fine Arts							2 PhD					2 PhD
History	1 PhD	1 D'Univ	2 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD 3 MA	4 PhD 1 MA 1 MS	4 PhD	1 PhD	2 PhD 2 ND	2 PhD	1 PhD	19 PhD 1 D'Univ 4 MA 2 ND 1 MS 1 MS
Hospital Administration												
Industrial Relations												
Languages												
Arabic							3 ND					3 ND
Classics	1 PhD 1 MA		1 PhD	1 PhD 2 MA	1 PhD 1 MA Oxon		1 PhD 1 PD	1 PhD	1 ND	2 PhD	1 PhD 1 MA Oxon	9 PhD 2 PD 4 MA 2 MA Oxon 1 ND

TABLE FOUR—SCHOOLS

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Maryl.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Or.	Wis.	Total
Al Hikma*	---	---	---	---	---	---	3	---	---	---	---	3
American Class. Acad.*	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Bank St. College	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Biblical (Jerusalem)*	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1
Biblical (Rome)*	---	3	---	---	---	2	---	---	1	---	---	6
Boston College	---	---	1	---	4	---	3	1	1	---	1	11
Boston University	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Brandeis	---	---	---	---	3	---	2	2	---	---	---	7
Bristol*	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Brown	---	---	---	---	---	---	4	1	1	1	---	7
Buffalo	3	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	3
California	---	2	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1	---	4
California (Berk)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1	2
California (LA)	---	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	3
Cambridge*	---	---	---	---	2	---	1	---	---	---	1	4
Case	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Catholic U.	1	---	1	---	4	1	3	---	2	---	1	13
Chicago	---	3	2	1	---	1	---	1	1	1	---	10
Cincinnati	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Clark	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Colorado	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1	---	2
Columbia	2	1	---	1	---	1	4	---	4	---	---	13
Cornell	1	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	3
Detroit	---	---	---	3	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	4
Duke	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Duquesne	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	2
Florence*	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Fordham	6	2	1	2	5	1	4	---	6	1	1	29
Frankfurt*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1
Freiburg*	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	2
Fribourg*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Gregorian*	2	2	3	1	2	2	5	---	4	3	2	26
Georgetown	---	---	2	2	3	---	1	---	1	---	1	10
Gonzaga	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Harvard	3	---	1	2	1	2	5	---	2	---	1	17
I. I. T.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Illinois	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1
Instit. Cathol.*	2	2	2	---	1	---	2	---	1	---	2	12
Instit. of Living	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
John Carroll	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Johns Hopkins	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1	2	---	---	4
Kansas	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	2	3
Lausanne*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1
Laval*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1
London*	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	2
Louisiana State	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	---	---	2
Louvain*	---	---	1	---	---	1	---	1	---	1	1	5
Loyola, Chicago	---	---	4	3	2	---	---	1	---	---	1	11
Loyola, N.O.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Lumen Vitae*	---	1	1	---	---	1	2	---	1	---	---	6
Madrid*	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Mainz*	---	---	---	---	3	---	---	---	---	---	---	3

* Non-United States Schools

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Maryl.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Or.	Wis.	Total
Marquette	---	---	---	2	2	2	---	---	1	4	1	12
Maryland	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
M. I. T.	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Massachusetts	---	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	---	---	2
Menninger	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Michigan	---	2	1	1	---	---	1	---	1	2	1	9
Minnesota	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	1	3
Munich*	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	---	1	---	---	3
Munster*	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	2
New York U.	---	2	1	---	1	---	1	---	2	1	---	8
North Carolina	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	2	4
Northwestern	1	1	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	3	6
Nymegan*	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Ohio State	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1
Oriental*	---	---	---	---	---	---	3	---	---	---	---	3
Ottawa*	---	---	---	3	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	5
Oxford*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1	2
Paris*	---	1	---	1	1	1	---	---	1	---	---	5
Pennsylvania	---	---	1	1	1	1	1	1	---	---	1	7
Pittsburgh	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Princeton	---	1	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	2
Private Study	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	5	---	---	5
Rio de Janeiro*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Rochester	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Rome*	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Rutgers	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1
Skt. Georgen*	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
St. John's	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
St. Louis	---	---	---	---	1	9	---	---	---	2	6	18
San Francisco	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1
Scranton	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Sint Pietersabdij*	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Southern Cal.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	1	---	---	3
Stanford	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1	2	1	5
Strasbourg	---	---	---	---	2	1	1	---	---	---	---	4
Syracuse	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Texas	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Toronto*	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Trier*	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	2
Tubingen*	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	2
Union Theological	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	2
Vanderbilt	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Washington	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	3	1	5
Wayne	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1
Wesleyan	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Western Reserve	---	---	1	---	---	1	1	---	---	---	---	3
Wisconsin	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	4	---	5
Woodstock	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Xavier	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Yale	---	1	1	1	1	1	---	2	---	---	1	8
Yeshiva	---	---	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	2

* Non-United States Schools

American Studies (1) Brown (1); *Anthropology* (3) Catholic U (1), St. Louis (1), Wisconsin (1); *Art* (1) Florence (1); *Astronomy* (1) Georgetown (1); *Biochemistry* (1) Clark (1); *Biology* (11) Brandeis (2), Buffalo (1), Calif (Berk) (1), Colorado (1), Cornell (1), Johns Hopkins (1), Kansas (1), Marquette (1), Munich (1), Princeton (1); *Business Administration* (3) Xavier (1), Northwestern (1), Harvard (1); *Canon Law* (3) Gregorian (2), Oriental (1); *Catechetics* (5) Inst. Cath. (1), Lumen Vitae (3), Strasbourg (1); *Chemistry* (12) Brandeis (2), Cambridge (1), Detroit (1), Fordham (1), I. I. T. (1), Johns Hopkins (1), Louisiana State (1), Massachusetts (1), Ohio State (1), St. Louis (1), Wayne (1); *Communication Arts* (8) Columbia (1), New York University (3), Sou. Cal. (1), Stanford (2), UCLA (1); *Counseling* (3) Boston College (1), Menninger (1), New York University (1); *Drama* (2) Northwestern (1), Yale (1); *Economics* (16) Boston College (1), Columbia (1), Fordham (3), Maryland (1), Massachusetts (1), Michigan (1), New York University (1), Pennsylvania (3), St. Louis (1), Vanderbilt (1), Wisconsin (1), Yale (1); *Education* (10) Bank Street College (1), Chicago (2), Harvard (1), Michigan (4), Minnesota (1), Pittsburgh (1); *Engineering* (3) Case (1), Pennsylvania (1), St. Louis (1); *English* (36) Boston College (2), Brandeis (1), Brown (2), Buffalo (1), Calif. (Berk) (1), Chicago (1), Colorado (1), Detroit (1), Fordham (2), Gonzaga (1), Harvard (3), Johns Hopkins (1), Kansas (1), London (1), Louisiana State (1), Loyola (Chi.) (1), Michigan (1), North Carolina (4), Pennsylvania (1), Rutgers (1), St. Louis (2), Syracuse (1), Toronto (1), Wisconsin (2), Yale (2); *Fine Arts* (2) Columbia (1), New York University (1); *History* (26) Boston U (1), Brandeis (1), Brown (2), Columbia (1), Detroit (1), Duke (1), Fordham (1), Georgetown (2), London (1), Michigan (1), Minnesota (1), Paris (1), Private Study (2), Rochester (1), St. Louis (3), San Francisco (1), Scranton (1), Stanford (1), Texas (1), Wisconsin (1), Yale (1); *Hospital Administration* (1) Chicago (1); *Industrial Relations* (1) Loyola (Chi.) (1); *Languages: Arabic* (3), Al Hikma (3); *Classics* (18) Amer. Clas. Acad. (1), Boston College (1), Buffalo (1), Cambridge (2), Fordham (2), Louvain (1), Loyola (Chi.) (2), Nymegan (1), Oxford (1), Pennsylvania (1), Private Study (1), Rome (1), Sint Pietersabbij (1), Washington (2); *French* (2), Boston College (1), Laval (1); *German* (5) Fribourg (1), Mainz (2), Northwestern (2); *Semitic* (6), Chicago (1), Johns Hopkins (1), Harvard (4); *Spanish* (4)

Calif. (1), Madrid (2), Washington (1); *Law* (2), California (1), Yale (1); *Library Service* (1) Columbia (1); *Linguistics* (3) Georgetown (3), *Literature, Comparative* (3) Michigan (1), Paris (1), Southern California (1); *Mathematics* (13) Boston College (2), Brown (1), Cincinnati (1), Detroit (1), Illinois (1), Loyola (Chi.) (1), Marquette (1), Saint Louis (2), Washington (1), Yeshiva (2); *Medicine* (2) Harvard (1), Western Reserve (1); *Middle East* (1) Harvard (1); *Music* (1), Columbia (1); *Patrology* (2) Cambridge (1), Institute Cathol. (1); *Philosophy* (28) Bristol (1), California (1), Chicago (1), Duquesne (1), Fordham (8), Freiburg (2), Georgetown (1), Gregorian (1), Louvain (4), Munich (1), Paris (2), Saint Louis (3), Southern California (1), Yale (1); *Physics* (24) Boston College (3), Catholic U (1), Columbia (2), Fordham (5), Georgetown (1), Harvard (1), John Carroll (1), Kansas (1), Loyola (N.O.) (1), M.I.T. (1), Pennsylvania (1); Rio de Janeiro (1), Saint Louis (3), Stanford (1), Wesleyan (1) *Physiology* (1) Saint Louis (1); *Political Science* (13) Cal. (L.A.) (1), Chicago (3), Columbia (2), Cornell (1), Fordham (1), Georgetown (2), Lausanne (1), Oxford (1), Stanford (1); *Psychiatry* (3) Harvard (2), Inst. of Living (1); *Psychology* (14) Duquesne (1), Fordham (1), Harvard (2), Loyola (Chi.) (5), Michigan (1), Minnesota (1), Northwestern (1), Ottawa (2). *Religious Education* (5) Brown (1), Catholic U (2), Marquette (2); *Scripture* (6) Biblical (Jerusalem) (1), Biblical (Rome) (3), Catholic U (1), Munster (1); *Social Work* (2) Chicago (1), Fordham (1); *Sociology* (14) Brandeis (1), California (1), California L.A. (1), Columbia (1), Cornell (1), Fordham (3), Harvard (1), Loyola (Chi.) (1), New York University (1), St. Johns (1), Washington (1), Western Reserve (1); *Speech* (1) Northwestern (1); *Speech Therapy* (1) Western Reserve (1); *Theology* (85) Biblical (3), Catholic U (8), Columbia (2), Fordham (1), Frankfurt (2), Gregorian (23), Institute Cathol. (10), Lumen Vitae (3), Mainz (1), Marquette (8), Munich (1), Munster (1), Oriental (2), Ottawa (3), Paris (1), Princeton (1), Private Study (2), Strassbourg (3), Toronto (1), Trier (3), Tubingen (2), Union Theological (2), Woodstock (1), Yale (1).

If we list the 49 subject areas under four main general subject fields, we find the following division of this year's special students: Ecclesiastical Studies, 135 students (32.8 per cent); Humanities, 83 students (20.1 per cent); Social Studies, 72 students (17.5 per cent); Science and Mathematics, 69 students (16.7 per cent). In this listing, we have put philosophy (with its 28 students) under Ecclesiastical Studies. We could just as well have listed it under Humanities which, of course, would make for a big shift in the totals of these two general subject areas. A still greater shift might be shown if we made a special category for philosophy and psychology. This might very well give a more correct picture of the subject area spread.

Where in the world are our special students? Table IV will help to give the correct answer to this question. First of all, they are studying in 102 different institutions, 71 of them in the United States, and 31 outside the United States. Of the 412 special students, 305 are in United States schools and 107 in schools outside the United States. Of the institutions in which our students are working, 27 are Catholic and 75 are secular. Forty-four schools have a single enrollment; 46 have an enrollment of 2 to 10 Jesuits; and 12 have an enrollment of ten or over.

The twelve institutions with an enrollment of ten or more are as follows: American Schools: Fordham, 29; Saint Louis, 18; Harvard, 17; The Catholic University, 13; Columbia, 13; Marquette, 12; Boston College, 11; Loyola (Chicago), 11; University of Chicago, 10; Georgetown, 10. Non-United States: Gregorian, 26; Institut Catholique (Paris), 12. These twelve institutions enroll 182 or 42.2 percent of all Jesuit special students.

As I bring this last report to a close, I must make a confession. My confession is that some years, when writing the report I was strongly tempted to discouragement: that was when the report showed a drop in the number of special students. More often, however,—and especially this year—the temptation has been rather to pride over the great progress the report has shown. The temptation to discouragement when the report was not so good as well as the temptation to pride when it was had the same source in the particular interest that I had always taken in the program of special studies for Jesuits. I am sure that God and my superiors will forgive me if this year I have yielded just a bit to some sense of achievement.

But lest readers of the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* think that I have lost my sense of balance, I hasten to note that I am well aware that nothing that I could have done to stimulate and further the program of special studies would have been effective had not the Provincials of the American Assistancy been even more aware than I of the importance of this program in preparing future leaders for our ministries, and especially for the ministry of education.

I hope and I shall pray that my successor will have the satisfaction of reporting each year even greater progress in the program of special studies. For I am convinced that by this program and the leaders it prepares the Society will be in a better way to achieve its goal, the Greater Glory of God.

SOME COMMENTS ON:

“Jesuit, Priest and Scholar”¹

CHARLES FRANKENHOFF, S.J.*

If the measure of a good article is the thinking it stimulates, then Father Paul Quay's essay “Jesuit, Priest and Scholar” should receive high marks. He has touched on a delicate, largely unresolved question at the heart of the Jesuit intellectual apostolate. Even though I find myself in vigorous disagreement with the “theory” (may it be called rather an “hypothesis”?) presented in the article, it has forced me to question my own thinking on the subject.

The article begins by presenting and rejecting two extreme positions or theories which have been used to justify Jesuit participation in the field of secular scholarship. One extreme is the “fishing theory” which sees the Jesuit intellectual apostolate as one of baiting a hook in order to attract those souls who would otherwise ignore the Church. The other extreme is the “autonomous discipline” theory which sees every body of knowledge as justifying complete scholarly dedication. Father Quay rejects the “fishing theory” as degrading the search for truth and then rejects the “autonomous discipline theory” as ignoring the essential hierarchy among the knowledges and implying that no Christian value can be found in human learning. (p. 102)

After rejecting these polar theories Father Quay presents us with his “*datur tertium*,” the “apostolic scholarship theory.” This theory is presented in no uncertain terms as “demanded by the very nature of the Jesuit priest's vocation.” In Father Quay's words, “The Jesuit priest to whose lot the task of scholarship falls is to use a full and integral scholarship as an apostolic means for the conversion and spiritual perfecting of men, for the building up of the Church.” In this theory scholarship is directly subordinated to apostolic ends. In fact, we learn at the end of the paper that the Jesuit scholar apostolate is really an apostolate “by default”. The Jesuit should engage in them only until a layman can come to relieve him. Indeed the Jesuit should not spend any more time in the intellectual apostolate than his priestly duties permit. (p. 110)

¹ Paul M. Quay, S.J., “Jesuit, Priest and Scholar: A Theory of our Learned Apostolates” in *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol XXVIII, No. 2 (October, 1965): 98-121.

* Father Frankenhoff has been teaching Economics as a full time member of the Faculty of the State University of Puerto Rico for the past four years.

Father Quay's analysis has the advantage of touching almost all bases, including that of the position of the modern Jesuit scholastic. It has the disadvantage of trying to prove too much with arguments based on traditional distinctions, e.g. priest versus layman, diverse apostolates, not directly relevant to the question under consideration.

In the first place, the reasoning of the article posits some kind of essential distinction between the priest and layman. In effect we are assured that "priests are priests and laymen are laymen" and, at least in the area of scholarly studies, the two only meet by accident. And they never meet on par. Neither do the priest scholar and lay scholar feel at home with one another. The entrance of the priest into secular (i.e. non-theology) scholarship, we are told, creates suspicion "somewhat as American Catholics tend to regard a priest's entrance into politics." And Father Quay is quite prepared to admit that the priest does not really act as a priest in the scholarly apostolate. (p. 104-110)

A brief look at the Vatican Council's decree on *The Church* Chapter Four, presents a far richer view of the priest-layman relationship than that of the merely juridical distinction so commonly presented in moral theology. With priests and bishops the laity constitutes the people of God. They are one, and in spite of sacramental differences, priests and laity are *equal* "with regard to the dignity and to the activity common to all the faithful for the building up of the Body of Christ." Priests and laity are brothers in Christ, sharing in His royal priesthood. They also share in the prophetic or teaching office of Christ, responsible for bringing God's word to all men.

If instead of seeing the communion perspective of the priest-laity relationship, one stresses their essential difference in terms of the sacraments they receive, we find ourselves asking the wrong questions. We ask, for example, Is scholarship a priestly function? On the other hand, if we take what might be called an Incarnational view, the question is quite different. How does the priest share with the layman in the intellectual apostolate of the Church? The priest and layman are seen in terms of union rather than as separated essences or contradictory categories.

The conclusion of Father Quay in his "apostolic scholarship theory" is essentially to deny that scholarship belongs to the priestly vocation. Scholarship is "primarily a layman's function." "The priest is free to engage in scholarship to the extent that his priestly

duties permit." An important consequence of this conclusion is that each priest should only receive that learning which he needs. (p. 109) Let the learning be tailored to the use to be made of the individual priest instead of helping him to develop to the full his God-given talents. This argument suggests that man may be used as an instrument (apostolic, of course) by other men.

The view of the Jesuit intellectual apostolate presented in this article is a rather depressing one. It hardly appears to justify the severe sacrifices demanded by the scholarly apostolate. The problem, of course, is to offer something in its place. I do this with diffidence in the hope of furthering the dialogue on this important question rather than presenting any position as "demanded by the very nature of the Jesuit priest's vocation."

Let us return for a moment to the rejected "autonomous discipline theory." Instead of stressing the autonomy of any discipline, let us stress its relation to truth. In fact, bodies of knowledge are related among themselves precisely in their relationship to truth. What is truth? The Christian does not accept Pilate's question. For the Christian truth is seen in the Person of Christ. It is a Who. The Christian vision of scholarship involves the search for a truth which is radically Christian.

From this point of view, no science is more Christian than another. Neither do we find ourselves as Christian scholars in the false position of having to inject Christ into the search for truth. He is already there, waiting. There is not body of knowledge in which He is not at home. There is clearly a hierarchy among the knowledges; there is also a divinely fashioned unity, a *worldly unity* which is indestructible and lovely.

Among its priestly members the Church has traditionally called upon the Jesuits to dedicate themselves to the intellectual apostolate, to be at home with the truth in a particular science, to belong to and suffer with a particular fraternity of "searchers for the truth." His membership in that fraternity may at first be suspect by those who confuse "Jesuit" with "jesuitical," but traditionally Jesuit scholar and suffer with a particular fraternity of "searchers for the truth." their field.

How does the Jesuit scholar differ from the lay scholar? Both are witnesses. Both have vocations. Generally the Jesuit has a theological background not possessed by the layman, but this need not be so. The basic difference seems to be in the Sacrament of Holy

Orders received by the Jesuit priest and not received by the layman. Does this sacramental distinction express itself directly in the scholarly search of the scientist? Not necessarily. The lay scientist comes to the search probably with the graces of his vocation and of the married state; the Jesuit priest comes as a religious, bringing with him the graces of his state. As brothers in Christ the lay scientist and the Jesuit scientist share their scientific vocation, seeking to deepen man's communication with the truth. If they are not formally brothers in Christ, they are at least united in their search for a truth which is radically Christian in a world in which "all things hold together in Christ (Col 1)."

In presenting arguments in favor of the scholarly apostolate of the priesthood, Father Quay includes this excellent description of the intellectual apostolate:

Every priest receives a "mission", is sent by the Church to some more or less clearly specified group of men, becoming their apostle. It is with this group (in our case, the scholarly fraternity) that he should be identified . . . as Our Lord did with regard to His own people. (p. 105)

The priest becomes part of this group precisely as a priest, contributing to it the unique dimension of the sacrificing priesthood, the unifying action of the Mass.

The conclusion is that the scholarly search for truth belongs at the very heart of the Jesuit enterprise. The famous letter of Father Janssens "On the Ministries" implies this conclusion. The traditional call of the Church to the Jesuits for scholarly vocations confirms it. The intellectual apostolate is not in any sense an apostolate "by default." It is a treasured mission of our least Society.

Is Educational Work Anti-Ignatian?

LOWRIE J. DALY, S.J.

With the ever-increasing demands made upon American colleges and universities for trained scholars in so many different fields both academic and technical, it would seem rather naive to wonder whether being in the educational business is really worth it. Yet there has arisen some complaint that modern American religious orders and congregations are too deeply involved in educational work. Had the complaint come from elements in our population hostile to Christianity, this would not seem strange; but that it should come from some Catholics is more difficult to comprehend. There has been even some suggestion that Jesuits in educational work may be in the wrong profession despite the long and glorious history of Jesuit education. Fortunately the recent letter of Father General should set those doubts at rest.¹ Still, one of the interesting facets of the discussion has been the proposal of a hypothesis that Jesuit education is really anti-Ignatian and fundamentally opposed to the constitutional framework of the Society. With this hypothesis, essentially historical in character, the present article deals.

When one recalls that by 1960 the Jesuits were maintaining 878 educational complexes (including 4,059 different schools with more than 900,000 students) and that the faculties of these institutions aggregated some 32,000 non-Jesuit and about 12,000 Jesuit teachers (about one-third of the entire membership of the order),² it would seem that the hypothesis needs considerable demonstration. It is with this hypothesis that the present article deals, and its aim is merely to make accessible in summary form some of the data presented by Jesuit scholars in recent issues of the *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu*.

To substantiate the hypothesis that the genuine Ignatian purpose was to found a Society whose fundamental duty was to preach and whose essence was to be a group of itinerant missionaries or preachers, arguments based on the following have been offered: (1) the illumination which the Saint had received at Manresa at

¹ "Letter of Father General on Education," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, XXVIII (October, 1965), 69 ff.

² John W. Donohue, S.J., *Jesuit Education* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1963), p. 5; William J. Mehok, S.J., "Jesuit Schools of the World, 1961," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, XXV (June, 1962), 42-56.

the River Cardoner, (2) the illumination which the Saint had received at the spot where the present chapel of La Storta has been erected, (3) the wording of the first *Formula Instituti*, (4) the silence of the Constitutions regarding colleges, and (5) the testimonies of the early members of the Society.³

The vision which Ignatius received near the River Cardoner at Manresa is thus considered to be a vocation to the ministry of the word and so contain *in radice* the future vocation of the whole Society to this form of apostolate. One does not have to be an expert in Ignatian lore, however, to know that our actual knowledge of the content and influence of this Manresa illumination is far from complete.⁴ In any event the procedure of limiting the whole ambit of divine illuminations made to Ignatius to this single one is certainly arbitrary. From the relatively few bits of diary materials which have come down to us regarding the spiritual life of Ignatius, it is evident that he was the recipient of a large number of divine favors and was surely a true mystic. Frankly, however, we have no way of knowing how many these were or which ones influenced his thoughts and decisions on this or that detail of his plans. Still it is clear enough that Our Lord's messages to Ignatius did not stop at Manresa. To say that this single episode determined fully and finally Ignatius' concept of his own vocation, and that of his companions as well as his plan for the whole Society down to such a detail as the exclusion of the teaching apostolate is to make an unprovable assertion.

Any argument drawn from the revelation to the Saint in November, 1537 at the intersection of the old Roman roads of Claudia and Cassia (now the place of the Chapel of La Storta) to prove the exclusion from the ministry of the Society of the teaching apostolate is to run counter to what historical knowledge we have.⁵ It would seem that from this great and signal grace the Saint came away deeply conscious of three things: his own mystical incorporation in Christ, the mission of service entrusted to him and the guarantee of the Divine Protection.⁶ The word

³ Cf. the long and detailed review (in Italian) of *Ministerium verbi Dei*, auctore Stephano Miecznikowski, S.J., by M. Scaduto S.I. of the Jesuit Historical Institute in Rome in *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, XXIX (Jul.-Dec. 1960), 399-406. This is a remarkably critical and well documented review and this summary owes much to it.

⁴ Cf. the important article of José Calveras S.I., "La ilustracion del Cardoner y el Instituto de la Compania de Jesus segun el P. Nadal," *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* (henceforth AHSI), XXV (Jan.-Jun. 1956), 27-54; P. Dudon, S.J., *St. Ignatius of Loyola*, translated by W. Young, S.J. (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1949), pp. 64-65.

⁵ Cf. for instance the article of T. Baumann, S.J., "Die Berichte über die Vision des heiligen Ignatius bei La Storta," AHSI, XXVI (Jul.-Dec. 1958), 181-208.

⁶ Scaduto, *op. cit.*, 401.

“service” is to be taken in the sense it has in the *Spiritual Exercises*; namely, that of absolute dedication to the designs of God, to the work of saving the world through the means which Christ put at his disposal. Any attempt to use this revelation to limit the concept of Ignatian service merely to one phase of the apostolate (that of itinerant preaching) is to set up an arbitrary standard. Even more seriously, it tends to limit the broad-mindedness of the man and the boundlessness of his view of the means to fulfill this service to his Lord and Master. We have to remember the words of advice which Ignatius gave to his men when he sent them to Ferrara, Florence, Naples and Modena: “. . . but however many means are proposed to help the neighbor and the many pious works, only discretion will teach if these or those ought to be embraced; not being able to do all and having always an eye to the greater service of God, the common good, and the good reputation of the Society.⁷ These words are very characteristic of Saint Ignatius.

It was a momentous year when in 1539 Ignatius and his companions decided to found a society and to admit new members.⁸ As soon as this decision was taken an immediate question had to be faced. Should the new members be mature and educated men ready for the works of the Society or should young, untrained postulants be accepted? Men mature and perfectly trained were hard to come by, and it was soon evident that the new organization would have to accept young and untrained volunteers. From this decision another immediately and necessarily followed: that the organization would have to make provision for the training of these “scholastics” and so colleges would have to be founded. Such early colleges of the Society were really “hostels” and were independent of any university; they were only for scholastics and it was explicitly stated that there were to be no scholarly lectures there (“No estudios ni lectiones en la Compania”).⁹ This was the attitude of the first *Formula Instituti* and one can see immediately its possible utilization in the hypothesis we have been discussing, for it is clear that at this time ordinary teaching and university lectures were not considered part of the collegiate function.

⁷ *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu, Monumenta Ignatiana, Epp. III, 546.*

⁸ L. Lukács, “De Origine Collegiorum Externorum deque Controversiis circa Eorum Paupertatem Obertis, Pars Prior: 1539-1556,” *AHSI*, XXIX (Jul.-Dec., 1960), pp. 191 ff. This article and its sequel in Vol. XXX of *AHSI* have appeared in book form, *De Origine Collegiorum Externorum deque Controversiis circa Eorum Paupertatem Obortis 1539-1608* (Rome: Institutum Historicum S.I., 1961).

⁹ *Monumenta Ignatiana, Constitutiones*, 47 and Lukács, *loc. cit.*, 193.

Then in 1545 the paragraph of the new formula regarding the founding of colleges included the term "*praeceptores*." In effect the formula was now sanctioning teaching in the colleges though it did not say whether this teaching was to be public or private. Nevertheless, this apparently represents a change of mind in Saint Ignatius and his companions, and one wonders what might have caused it.¹⁰ Two things can certainly be instanced. First there was the poor quality of teaching at the universities where the scholastics were studying (classes met infrequently and materials of the courses were not adequately covered), and this led to the demand that Jesuits be taught in their own colleges. Secondly, there was the institution of the college at Gandia through the persuasion of Francis Borgia where extern students were admitted to the philosophy courses in October 1546.¹¹ There were no public schools at Gandia and so it was decided that extern students should attend and the college was given the status of a university in 1547.¹²

During the following years Saint Ignatius directed the establishment of various types of colleges, some for Jesuit scholastics only, others both for scholastics and extern students, and lastly some for extern students only. By the time of his death in 1556 the Society had some 46 colleges (some of them just beginning), and of these there were about 15 that had no Jesuit scholastics at all among their student body.

Thus one can see that any argument from the first *Formula Instituti* which attempts to prove that St. Ignatius always limited the Jesuit apostolate to that of preaching, founders on the rocks of history. In summary, the fact that the founders themselves discussed as early as the spring of 1541 the possible need for a change in the Bull of Paul III approving the first formula,¹³ then the change in the formula regarding the foundation of colleges, and finally the fact that there was even a third document requested of Paul IV although due to other circumstances it was not given, all show clearly that the first *Formula Instituti* was not the unique, definitive and only formulation of the Jesuit apostolate. Any attempt to "freeze" the evolutionary processes of the Society's early development to the year 1541 cannot be sustained

¹⁰ Lukács, *op. cit.*, 198.

¹¹ Allan P. Farrell, S.I., "Colleges for Extern Students Opened in the Lifetime of St. Ignatius," *AHSI*, VI (1937), 288.

¹² Lukács, *op. cit.*, 200.

¹³ *Monumenta Ignatiana, Constitutiones*, I, 45-46 and Scaduto, *loc. cit.*, 402.

in the light of historical research.

The argument from the "silence" of the Constitutions is a complicated one. Fr. Lukács in the article already mentioned has very carefully analyzed the various manuscript copies which form the textual basis for the Constitutions.¹⁴ Briefly his conclusions are as follows. In the oldest manuscript of the Constitutions ("a" written before 1550) two types of colleges are outlined; one is the type of college intended only for scholastics while the second is the newer type with public lectures and hence opening its doors to extern students. In the chapters to the fourth part of the Constitutions which were added after 1550 (and according to Lukács *before* the death of Saint Ignatius)¹⁵ there is a third type described; namely, one open to externs but undertaken so that it can also serve as a seminary for Ours. Thus he concludes that the Constitutions *even in their earliest form* approve of the teaching ministry in the Society. The lengthy and detailed textual and historical argumentation which solidly supports these conclusions must be read in full to appreciate the cogency of the author's scholarly treatment.

From what has been seen it is evident that the companions of Saint Ignatius recognized the founding and direction of colleges and teaching in them as one of the forms of Jesuit apostolate. We have noted the importance of the college which Saint Francis Borgia persuaded Saint Ignatius to open at Gandia. Nadal, whose opinion is very important because he has always been considered to have understood so well the mind of Ignatius, remarked with regard to the studies in the Society that there were three types of colleges: first one for scholastics attending the lectures of others, a second type where Jesuits taught, and finally the type of colleges (*integras academias*) which Jesuits set up and administered.¹⁶ Here one can clearly see the triple evolutionary stage from the time when Lainez suggested the college for the exclusive benefit of Jesuit scholastics until the time when Ignatius made of them a ministry for the education of lay youth.¹⁷ Lainez himself, soon after his election to the Generalate, noted how conformable to the Institute was the ministry of teaching and especially stressed the good which could be done in teaching the lower class-

¹⁴ Lukács, *op. cit.*, 214-226.

¹⁵ Otherwise the first General Congregation should have said something about such an insertion, Lukács, *op. cit.*, 219, note 133a.

¹⁶ *Monumenta Ignatiana, Fontes Narr.*, II, 7 n. 17.

¹⁷ Scaduto, *op. cit.*, 404.

es. He also noted the importance of the influence which such training exerted upon the students for the whole of their future lives. Another important witness of the early companions is Polanco, the indefatigable secretary. Writing in 1560, he says: ". . . there being for us, generally speaking, two ways of helping the neighbor, one in the colleges with the formation of youth in letters, doctrine and Christian life, the other by aiding universally all with preaching and confession work."¹⁸ Not only were these men close to Ignatius, but they would have been the last people in the world to go against his wishes or to introduce or approve a course of action which went against the spirit and letter of his Institute.

As the reader will have noticed, all the arguments for the hypothesis that a teaching ministry violates the purpose of Ignatius in founding the Society and goes against its constitutional framework rest upon the assumption that Ignatius had a complete and final sketch in his mind which he never touched or altered from 1541 onwards. All evolution and development in his plans and aspirations is denied (though such development is a clear historical fact), and the gradual unfolding of the Society's organization is arbitrarily frozen to a given year or a first draft. Subsequent events are simply ignored.

What is true in regard to the hypothesis is that there *were* changes from the first *Formula Instituti*. There was an evolution from the first college or hostel for scholastics studying at a university to the college for externs taught and administered by Jesuits. But it was Saint Ignatius who made the changes.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, V, 165 and quoted by Scaduto, *loc. cit.*, 404.

What Does College Expect of High School English?

Leonard A. Waters, S. J.

I have several times been asked by nuns—infrequently by Jesuits—what a college teacher of English expects to find, or is most delighted to find in a high school graduate's English accomplishment. Also, as a former editor of a high school English text, long since revised, reviewed, and retired, I have kept a somewhat jaundiced eye on modern texts. More seriously, I know of two or three very capable and very professionally edited Catholic high school English curricula, and I have been impressed. I have read with great admiration Fr. O'Malley's articles on the problem of high school English teaching in the *J.E.Q.* I know something of the results of the newest revisions of the Thomas More Series and of the controversy which has arisen over the introduction of paperbacks both as textbooks and as outside reading aids. I suppose there is much more going on in Jesuit thinking about high school English that I do not know.

All of this is, of course, a Ciceronic proem to my theme, which is to tell your readers what one college teacher does wish to find in a high school graduate's English repertoire. Moreover, since I have been teaching young jesuits coming from predominantly Jesuit sources, I feel I have a pretty good realistic picture of what these graduates actually do know as a result of their high school course. And to add a bit of salt to the fare, I am willing to go on record as saying that, in the last five years, graduates of non-Jesuit schools have quite dramatically outclassed our own graduates in English. They have more originality, more desire to learn and to know, and more professional knowledge of literature and of language. I judge that English—and perhaps a good deal more—is too-often a student-faculty game. The student is entertained and quite often awed by his Jesuit instructor's English. Nevertheless, he feels little desire like the desire he feels in science, of making any real transfer of this knowledge to himself. It does not seem attractive or useful. His reading is usually as extensive as non-Jesuit graduates display, but for him reading and testing have always been a classroom game. By its rules any shortcut to a good grade is a score, and the slow and painful pursuit of a theme or a text, or the serious inquiry into strange experiences or attitudes

is a fumble. Little things like words and punctuation and rhythms, even syntax and structure are brushed off as pitfalls in the pathway to "big ideas". I have thought that partial explanations for this art of gamesmanship may be the fact that our students are in all-male classrooms, that they are generally taught by Scholastics relatively near their own age, and that they are not being held to professional standards. When you teach a while in college you do realize that the woman's touch is very important. And when the all-male approach is also one that is contemptuous of art, as it often is, the English course disintegrates. In those bad hours it becomes a sneak pre-view of world problems in social justice, race relations, Freud, Communist errors, teen-age moral questions, and how to succeed in the adult world without really trying. Novels, short stories and poems, as well as essays, are simply springboards for forum discussion.

I do not want to seem negative since I do have great respect for the teacher of high school English and I know some of his difficulties. So, lest the salt lose its savor, let this simply be my apology for offering a positive, and even idealistic, profile of what the model freshman English student looks like in the dreams of the ordinary college English teacher—or one of them.

It is the vocation of the English teacher to teach the *ART* of literature in English. This is the assumption which underlies all I have to say. We must bring eddieandbill and bettyandisbel to cultivate sight and insight. We want them to look at human experiences humanly, with depth and breadth and sympathy; to contemplate life. Things and the self are brought together through words—in literature. Literature is not meant to give us answers to life. It stops us, makes us savor things, feel their dimensions and dilemmas. The work of literature appals us, delights us, makes us reverent before a freely-spoken *yes* or *no*. And it does this because it is artistic. These works, through the instruments of words, have form and meaning, and wholeness. They are patterned, designed, and if the student learns to read the design he will be a deeper, wiser, more humane person. He may, indeed, not have the answers to life but he will be alive.

In all of this process words are crucial. They are the keys, the instruments, through which an object of beauty is made. But words are likewise, and far more commonly, the tools which serve all the workaday purposes of man. Words are instruments of truth,

of power, of persuasion. And they may be the resource of wise men, liars, or fools. Words are utilitarian, in short, and there is a great temptation to make the English class no more than a service—like typing or shop work. Perhaps a great deal of what the college teacher finds wrong with the high school English course is the fact that it is too often utilitarian instead of humanistic. It attempts to teach the grammar that is useful and the rhetoric which is functional and the style of the term paper. And it culls through such authors as are readily adaptable for our moral and religious exhortations. The constant frustration of the college English teacher is that our own preparatory graduates have been conditioned to reject anything artistic as dangerous to their masculine ethos. It is a shock to find our own students teach graduates.

The College teacher, then, looks for a student who knows words, and through them knows what literature is, respects it, and can traffic in it. Words! This is the heart of the matter. And if words are not, in high school, displayed, and cultivated, and savored to the accompaniment of organ rolls of rhetorical music, of exuberant, fresh imagination, and the derring-do of keen emotion, they are not really grasped at all. The *Ratio* succeeded in its day because it recognized gradations and divisions in a curriculum. A high school is such a grade, and it must gladly teach high school people. The words it uses and the words it teaches are being felt, and seen, and used and understood by boys and girls. I am sadly sure that our high schools have forgotten the *Ratio*. Their English is graduate school English and their literature is deadly with "a little learning". Of course a mature man (or woman) in his thirties doesn't read *Tom Sawyer*, or *Alice in Wonderland*, or J. Fenimore Cooper for his own relaxation, but he is *not* the educand. English must be scaled to the average fourteen-to-eighteen year child, and much more important than that, it must be taught from that immature and romantic viewpoint. All that a becassocked oracle has to do is to reflect, as he can so attractively do, his own cynicism or amused tolerance, and a student will never learn a word, even read a word of his high school selections. And if the sophisticated teacher is allowed to introduce his master's thesis on the *Lord of the Flies*, or Henry James, into sophomore year and he will end the educational process in English. The multisyllabic freshman who deals out bits of *The Golden Bough* and French Symbolism with bored assurance has been observed by more than

one College teacher, and behind every one of them is a frustrated high school teacher who has succeeded in killing the whole imaginative process.

Certainly it is not easy to teach immature people. Nevertheless, the remedy is certainly not to pretend that they are mature. There is a particularly dangerous heresy here. It is the *person*, the existential being, who is immature in adolescence. And in that immaturity the mind may be capable of rapid and subtle thought so that purely rational disciplines like science and math can be stepped up to remarkable speed. That is also why memorization, spelling, paradigms and such merely rational elements of literature should be taught rapidly and continuously through grade and high school. But the person still remains immature and the literary heresy is to attempt to make the English course rival the math by stepping the student up to College readings and College criticism by simply concentrating on the rational and ignoring the imaginative and emotional and sheerly musical quality of language. Or worse—scorning and satirizing it. Nothing could be worse. Boys learn very fast to be ashamed of their emotions, to keep them out of sight in the classroom, to be hypocrites and to mimic totally unfelt adult opinions. The whole artistic process is short-circuited and literature comes to be hated and piled with sarcasm. The mind races forward, indeed, but the pathetically immature person is now left to achieve personal growth and sympathy and balance outside of literature and certainly outside of the classroom. The music, the dances, the horseplay, and the pathetically, even sinfully, violent attempts to express emotion and break into the dialog of the mature world—all these should be evidence of what happens when education concerns itself not with the person but with the rational mind.

Literature has its place in education because it is *not* science. The heresy is to teach it as if it were. It is an art and the best test of your orthodoxy, in a college teacher's eyes, is your teaching of *words*. It is a very slow and humble approach to a text—this process of really looking at words. A teacher who is really preparing students for appreciation of literature has no ambition to present more than a short lyric or a brief prose passage in a class meeting. The student must discover the hidden force and beauty of the words; he must find and defend the pattern. Of course the teacher has been over the ground before, but it is the

class that puts the words together and makes them sing. This means that plain ignorance of words will be exposed, and misunderstanding of syntax, and misreading of figures of speech. There will be hot debates on logic, and there will be sentimentality and idealism and wildly impossible hypotheses. Every day something different. But behind it all the student learns to respect the text. He must cultivate a habit of looking at words: their spelling, derivation, synonyms and antonyms, connotations and denotations. He must know the patterns of English grammar and syntax; what it says and what it does not say, and with what force. It takes untold hours, for example, to teach irony and satire and wit.

A student must hear and respond to the rhythm of English sentences and paragraphs and to be tolerant of very different rhythms. Teen-agers have built in sentimentality mechanisms and it takes patient years to adjust them to a real taste for controlled emotion and its expression. Half of the job is done when a high school graduate recognizes the schmaltz in "Excelsior", but it is the easier half. He has to read a great deal of work like Patmore's "Toys" or Dickens's *Oliver* and feel the stronger, surer artistry there. And figures of speech: here is a real test of the freshman English student. Everything is a "symbol" for the badly-trained student, and it can mean anything you imagine; or it reminds him of the lakes, or his summer as a life guard, and he creates his own poem. "Bare ruined choirs where late the sweet birds sang" may be to him a group of singers as well as a place, he sees no allusion to monks, and it often comes as a revelation that a time of year may be "in me". All of this takes teaching, and if it is not done in high school, the College teacher rightly feels he has received a poorly-prepared student.

Much more must be done with words. It is surprising how few students know more than a half dozen color-words, or sound-words, how few find the correct word for a shape or an odor (or fragrance), or know the names of the commonest trees or flowers or landscape features. (They know every chrome-piece on a sports car.) And idiom! It is an endlessly patient task to teach. "No, John, 'anyways' is bad, unless you want to be colloquial." "But 'kind of cute' and 'jive-wise' and 'busted' say something about you, too, Marie." Pronunciation and enunciation have an extraordinary effect on the College English teacher; he hears so little distinction in either. Reading, writing, speaking—by these signs

you will know the student. All are paintsaking disciplines and all have to do with the "Correct handling of the word".

No one needs to tell the College teacher how difficult it is to improve a student's writing. It is a waste-land, a chaos, in every level of education. But that is surely no reason why it can be neglected or abused in high school. It, too, has to do with words and every College teacher has seen more than his fill of the "creative" freshman who has been allowed to murder syntax and diction. True, he has met the deadly-accurate bore, too. And he reads debater's rhetoric and imitation Hollywood side by side; he bumps from cobblestone editorials to stream-of-unconsciousness evocations. He makes precious note-book compilations of "awful things I have seen in themes". Weary with Handbook errors, syntax puzzles, reverse logic, pitiful fourletter-word dialog in pseudo-Salingerze, he grows bitter about all high schools and their English faculties. But in better moments he faces the chaos. He and plenty of College experts have failed to outline a high school writing course that will teach the accuracy plus originality he dreams of. Now the CEEB and the highly attractive Achievement Awards of the NCTE are at the task. They may do better, and they certainly will focus attention once more on the skills of writing, and the correcting of themes in high school English. The kind of creative teaching of composition recommended by Fr. O'Malley here in the *JEQ* is the best I have seen. But in all of this, *words* are still the secret. Artistry is in the *logos* which as Newman explains is the Greek way of saying that thought and expression are one. Artificiality and hypocrisy cannot be good, but the high school writer of fiction invariably believes that this form of writing is one in which one imagines himself, instead of one in which one imagines characters. If he comes to College capable of writing what he himself sincerely and honestly thinks, with force and clarity, he is a very well prepared student. Whether he writes fact or fiction this criterion is valid. He must be clear and he must be sincere—his characters can be imbeciles or rats, but once we are convinced that the writer is such, we lose interest.

To be honest, myself, I must say that this program of mine—this everlasting concern for the individual word—will radically reduce the amount of literature studied in each year. I think anthologies are crammed with excellent selections because they are designed for poor teachers. "Take five poems tomorrow," is a way of being

sure there will be something to talk about tomorrow in class. And it will likewise transfer from teacher to student the apparent reason for failing to know anything about a given line or sentence. If you *have to* talk about fourteen lines for an hour you will have to be accurate about the words, and accuracy can be embarrassing. Likewise, I must say that world-literature courses (in translation) are just dope—pure opium. And in high school they are the quint-essence of all this escape from teaching the English language and its words. How can an epic, or a novel, or a drama of a totally foreign race written in a language which is neither theirs nor ours instruct a child in our native language? And when Milton or Spenser, or for that matter, Fielding or Longfellow or Dickens, have never been read in our own language, how can we learn the artistry of Dante or Tolstoy or Sophocles in a totally foreign tongue? Of course, like visiting a museum or a cathedral, all of these things can be a valuable part of our cultural history. I am glad if a student reads these translations on his own time. But to call the process of “talking about” Dante English and high school English is simply hypocrisy. Moreover, if English is taught in our classrooms, and well taught, it will incline the student to grasp what is artistic even in a translation. But that process is absolutely not reversible. Give a high school student the “big ideas” approach toward English and he simply has to be totally re-taught in College. Ideas are not language. When we were Classical schools teaching Latin and Greek with meticulous care for subjunctives and enclitics we felt the power of the word; our punishment for turning everything into English is that we now cannot distinguish ‘can’ from ‘may’ and other schools are surpassing us in accuracy in our own tongue. At any rate, I am willing to admit that I am not at all impressed, as a College teacher, with the range of a student’s reading—original or in translation—unless I find that he knows words familiarly and uses them with distinction.

This profile of a well-prepared College freshman certainly takes its characteristic features from my conviction that English is an art and an art of words. It is not history or biography or psychology; it is not a rival of science and math. It is an autonomous and eminently worth-while human achievement: the enjoyment of one’s own native tongue in all its forms. Of course that tongue can be and must be put to a thousand practical uses. But first it must be mastered. That kind of mastery of words takes years of

very careful work, and in the process it requires as all arts do a contemplative attitude toward life which patterns, deepens, opens a student's mind. This is all that literature itself can do but I would welcome the day when our high school English teachers were determined to do just this. I believe we as educators are better equipped to deal with words than we are with atoms and it may very well be that in the decades ahead nothing but the inspired handling of the words that touch men's hearts will keep us from the explosion of atoms. But as Robert Frost said, art—and preeminently the highest art of language—is found in the pleasure of taking infinite pains.

Social Apostolate:

A Community's Growth and Witness

WILLIAM J. SNECK, S.J.

In his recent book, *Spiritual Exercises*, Fr. Karl Rahner, S.J. comments on our times:

From an historical point of view, our age, the twentieth century, is more difficult to live in than were ages past. But this is our age; it is an age of momentous change, and therefore also a time of new orientation for Christian living. This is our great opportunity.

In a spirit of seizing this opportunity, the Fusz Philosophate at Saint Louis University has channeled its energies into an intense program of social action in St. Louis. When the present third year class arrived at Fusz, a handful of devoted pioneers had been teaching catechism and visiting homes in two inner-city parishes. Presently one hundred and thirty-six men direct thirty-four different projects in twenty parishes, hospitals, educational and penal institutions. What explains this burgeoning of interest and activity? How can we ground the theoretical aspects, or grasp the motivation behind our work with the poor?

Basic Notions of Religious Community

To understand social apostolate in a Jesuit seminary, we must view it ultimately as dynamic activity, an extension by a religious community of its members into their environment. Yet a difficulty in comprehending the notion of a community's apostolate derives from the evolving notions within the Church on the meaning of religious life. These new ideas have made some of the routine presuppositions concerning religious—or at least the phrasing of such suppositions—less tenable. The Vatican Council, indeed, has spoken emphatically, theologically, eloquently about the permanent place for religious in the Church's structure. Theologians, however, are just beginning to work out the implications and elaborations of the sixth chapter in the *Constitution on the Church* and the *Decree on the Adaptation and Renewal of Religious Life*. Thus I can but fill in the background on the theory of community with a few bold strokes and must leave the more detailed work to experts.

A religious community might be called a cell in the Mystical Body. The life of the Body and of each cell grows out of the life of the Trinity, the life from the Eucharist. In eternity, the Father generates the Son and from their spiration in love the Spirit proceeds Who is Their substantial love. Analogously, the Father loves His new creation, the total Christ, the Mystical Body, and He breathes a soul, the Holy Spirit, into this Body. It is the Spirit Who enlivens each cell with Christ, each religious community and its members with Christ. The soul of the Mystical Body forms God's people into a real oneness with God's Son and with each other.

At the celebration of Mass, the community encounters their Father by offering His Son to Him in a renewal of The Sacrifice. This celebration reciprocally effects the offerers who receive back their gift as food and thus as their life. This community's primary and most meaningful function is the worship of the Father at Mass: Mass offered, Mass daily lived. Accordingly, the final cause of this community must be an oblation of service: of God and of the people of God. Service means an activated love. Born in a man's spirit of the Holy Spirit, this love "will flame out like shining from shook foil." "Love is shown in deeds rather than in words" is Ignatius's cryptic way of summing up his vision of the Spirit's igniting firebrands of charity within his followers, and the flame's burning them out as they give of themselves—and hence of Christ—to the men of their times and to all time.

Growth and Witness

Each community, however, each cell of His Body, has specifically defined modes of service. Religious in a seminary serve His Body through directed growth: growth toward full Christian personhood, growth toward priestly maturity, growth toward the ideal Jesuit each strives to become. This maturation takes place in five areas: spiritual; intellectual; physical; recreational; social, and cultural; and apostolic. In line with the recent Congregation's decree *On the Training of Scholastics, Especially in Studies*,¹ and even anticipating this decree, Fusz has carried on a variety of works intended to provide our men with opportunities for grow-

¹ In the whole course of training, apostolic experiments should be undertaken in a proportioned way. These experiments should be directed and watched over by experts, who are themselves so filled with the priestly and pastoral spirit that the training, both spiritual and intellectual, will be filled with that same spirit. (Paragraph No. 4.)

ing in pastoral experience. Yet growth is but one facet of our primary aim, service.

We also realize the Church's desire and obligation to give testimony to all men of Her concern and love for Christ's poor. Hence parallel with our service of growth in Christ, we seek to *witness* to the reality of Christian charity in our personal circumstances.

Yet are not growth and witness somewhat contradictory aims? The former seems self-centered, the latter, other-directed. It would truly be selfish of seminarians to participate in apostolic activity for the sake of using people for their own fulfillment and deepening. Simone Weil has rightly said that "God is not present, even if we invoke Him, where the afflicted are merely regarded as an occasion for doing good." Developing this insight, Jean Vieujean in *Your Other Self* remarks, "Loving God implies, includes, and demands above all a real and sincere love of my neighbor, and an engaging of my being in behalf of his being." Nevertheless this sincere love ontologically affects the being of lover and of beloved. Whether through catechetical instruction, education in basic skills, or a visit with a poor family, a relationship of friendship is established, grows, and gives birth to a new communion, a new community, to Christ anew. Thus in the witness-situation, our growth becomes not a merely individualistic self-perfectionism, but a shared communication in the grace and love of Jesus Christ.

From Another Viewpoint

The scholastics' enthusiasm for the apostolates might be further appreciated from discovering a religious community's *entitative status*, just as we had discussed apostolate as a community's *action*, service.

"Community" is losing its narrow geographical connotations of the spatio-temporal confines of a Jesuit house. Our community is really the whole world for which we pray, do penance, offer the frustration, loneliness and successes in the Mass of our life of study.

Yet being contemplatives in action, we must embody even more concretely our community consciousness. This need, this necessity of living out our love is echoed by another need, by the cry of the poor—*Abyssus abyssum invocat*—in our city for spiritual and temporal well-being, for an attainment of at least the "dignified poverty" mentioned in the social encyclicals. Their call bursts from

destitution, despair, hopelessness. Through social action involving much imagination but relatively little time, much thoughtfulness but little money, much loving service but little self-gratification, our scholastics are attempting to answer the plea of the poor, to make real the Christian ideal of community in our city. For our Jesuit community is but one of many in which we share membership. It itself permeates and is enveloped by the larger neighborhood, university, and city communities. We are in and of them all: to each we represent and communicate Christ directly, actively. The apostolate then is a means and focus of God's grace: the Church in action visibly gives witness to the citizens of St. Louis while our men, under the directions of personal prudence and of superiors concerned for our *total* welfare, gradually are approaching a relevant twentieth-century Jesuit maturity.

Problems: I. Apostolate Versus Studies?

We have seen how members of several interrelated and interpenetrating communities become deeper Christians through apostolic service. Formation through the social apostolate corresponds with and widens the goals of a community in a house of studies. However, how can we advise the individual overworked Christian² with duties to all these communities? Will involvement in some form of parish activity, for example, distract a scholastic from his primary commitment to personal intellectual formation?

In the light of the previous theoretical considerations, this turns out to be a pseudo-question. We have reflected that the purpose of men in a seminary is service through a five-fold growth. Granted that studies can manifest dedication to the Mystical Body, to deprive men of their function-as-witness to the poor would place undue stress on the intellectual side of formation with neglect of the pastoral. Even men training for lives of pure scholarship need some experiential understanding of the pastoral office that they may appreciate and relish their priesthood.

If the tension seems to be eliminated in theory, men in community to whom the theory applies still find conflicts. So the difficulty must be investigated more deeply.

² I have purposely used "Christian" instead of "seminarian" here. While this article treats *ex professo* of Jesuits in philosophy, the development and analysis applies analogously to men of other vocations and avocations. E.g., may a college professor use his work as a justification for non-identification with the poor?

Glancing over several documents of the Church and of the Society on seminaries reveals a definite stress on prudential handling of apostolates:

Throughout the time of training and probation, superiors and teachers must not omit to attract the minds of the students towards the apostolate; they should even moderately employ them in it, according to the mind of the Church and the nature and aim of each institute.³

That the social apostolate definitely accords with the nature and aim of our Society's Institute becomes evident from reading Fr. Janssens's letters *On the Social Apostolate, On Our Ministries*, and the decree *On the Training of Scholastics*.

Sedes Sapientiae, quoted above, further legislates:

Throughout the whole period of studies, the apostolic training considered simply as education and practical formation should be pursued without interruption, so that day by day it progresses with the religious and clerical training . . . This, however, must come about without harm to the serious and adequate intellectual training and performance of the students.⁴

Notice here that apostolic formation is clearly distinguished from the religious and intellectual preparation, and that the Church wants the former "pursued without interruption." Furthermore, a very general directive is given that this training be handled carefully so that the growth in the other areas does not suffer.

The Vatican Council's *Decree on Priestly Training* speaks even more positively and less hesitantly. An entire section of this document (VI.) concerns "The Promotion of Strictly Pastoral Training," where besides being given other encouragement we read:

. . . Since it is necessary for the students to learn the art of exercising the apostolate not only theoretically but also practically, and to be able to act both on their own responsibility and in harmonious conjunction with others, they should be initiated into pastoral work, both during their course of studies and also during the time of vacations, by opportune practical projects.⁵

³ *Apostolic Constitution Sedes Sapientiae and the General Statutes*, 2nd. ed., 1957, Pt. I, Title X; Art. 47, No. 1.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, Pt. I, Title I; Art. 14, No. 3.

⁵ Paragraph No. 20.

The following three texts show the Society's more explicit formulation of these principles:

. . . Omnes . . . occupationes quae studiis impedimento esse possint, etiamsi ad auxilium animarum pertineant, ante quadriennium theologicum expletum praecidat; exceptis—prout antiquo Societatis usui consonum est—minoribus quibusdam zeli apostolici exercitiis, quae studia potius juvant quam impediunt . . .⁶

Here we find a stress that echoes the Church's command: the exercises of the apostolate must not be too extensive, and they must prepare for future labors. A new theme is sounded, however: the apostolate must *help* one's studies. Scholastics must not lead fragmented lives. The Society is proposing the ideal that both Superiors and seminarians make the apostolates an integral part of our lives, not just a useful extra. Earlier some ideas for such an integration were suggested.

. . . Reliqua opera apostolica . . . nosse discant nec minus quam opera propria Societatis laudent et aestiment. Apprime doceantur indolem et methodos Actionis Catholicae.⁷

Nor does the Society want her men to adopt the constricting view that our special works of education, scholarship, retreats are all we need familiarize ourselves with. We must not only understand but praise and esteem the techniques of Catholic Action proper to each region and territory where Ours labor.

Speaking directly about the philosophate and theologate, Father Janssens declared:

. . . Haec in primis communis norma sit: numquam, nec pro ullo ministerio, permittantur Scholastici a schola abesse . . . Nec tantum considerandus est materialis numerus horarum quem ministeriis tribuunt, sed etiam et praesertim computandum est tempus praeparationis, tempus impensum in colloquiis . . . cum hoc tempus gravioris studiorum impedimentum esse soleat quam illud.⁸

Father Janssens proclaims some very definite principles for regulating the degree of apostolic commitment. Men may not cut

⁶ *Ratio Studiorum Superiorum, ad Norman Congregationum Generalium XXV- III et XXIX Exarata*; Romae, 1954. 44 No. 5.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, 272, No. 2.

⁸ *Acta Romana*, vol. 13, pp. 146-147 (30 Nov., 1956.)

classes in order to spend more time with the poor. Furthermore, we must check on time spent in preparation for, as well as time consumed in, the actual work.

Granted that these norms are obeyed, does a man with a weekly apostolic commitment still find tensions to be resolved? Definitely, but he is coping with the inherent tensions of Jesuit life: the pull between the pole of contemplation, a being alone with God, with knowledge, and the pole of activity, encounter with his fellow men; between the commitment to the future apostolate of teaching or scholarship, and obligations to his here-and-now communities of home, neighborhood, city.

I suggest that it is *good* to face these tensions and to start resolving them now during the course. A man will not become apostolically oriented to living his Mass fully, in a life of service after fifteen passive years of training if he fails actively to form himself along the way. Similarly he will be a more effective priest if he has dealt with problems of our complex Jesuit lives early in his training. Such experience has wider import. Jesuits have no monopoly on problems of split-level living. Every modern Christian deals with them. A Jesuit will more capably direct men of his age if he has felt and mastered the forces impinging on his contemporaries.

Rather than deny or ignore the apostolate-vs.-study tension, we welcome it! Prudence must order growth in all five areas of our lives. Prudence, though, a virtue of the practical intellect, can be developed only by practice. What I'm suggesting is that decisions about when, where, how much time for apostolates, or how better to order one's study and recreation to make time for social action, are only one species of real responsibility which scholastics need in growing into mature Jesuit Christians. From a questionnaire distributed at Fusz last semester, it is obvious that the vast majority of men view this apostolate-studies problem not as grounds for abandoning apostolates, but as a challenge to their own creative development. The empirical data also established that men highly successful in philosophy and their major field participate in social action, and that men not so successful are stimulated to more serious work at the books.

Problems: II. Apostolates Vs. Community?

Stating the problem this baldly (apostolates *versus* community) should cause confusion! Having followed the development thus far, one might perhaps wonder how apostolate could appose community when he already has grasped apostolate as activity rising from the very nature of a scholasticate. Social apostolate is demanded by the ontological status of a community of seminarians as part of their service and their Mass.

The problem, however, is real, and it follows from interpreting "community" in the narrower but still somewhat prevalent sense of "Jesuits-in-this-house." This is a valid use of the term provided that one does not deny (especially in practice) his membership in the other communities mentioned. True, a Jesuit should give his loyalty and concern first to his brethren, but tensions again arise.

"If I manifest loyalty and love to the poor, although this is good and Christian, won't I have less concern for my Jesuit brethren?"

In some ways, love is like the Eucharistic host: when the host is divided, Christ remains as fully present in each particle as he was in the whole before. Similarly, when one extends his love to many, it does not weaken but remains as firm as ever.

Actually we discover a defect in this analogy. The mistake rests in the fallacy of quantifying a virtue like love. In the Blessed Sacrament, Christ remains the same, *non confractus, non divisus* after the host is broken. Yet when Christian love reaches out to embrace the poor, the love *increases*. Therefore, if I love the poor, I will love my brothers more, not quantitatively "more," but more deeply, more effectively, more as Christ does Whose are the poor and my brothers.

A more correct phrasing of the objection would run: "If I spend time extending loyalty and love to the poor, while this is good and Christian, won't I have *less time* for concern about my Jesuit brothers?"

This time dichotomy, however, we can resolve with the same considerations given to the time problem and studies. Prudence and charity will dictate each man's personal solution, but again we consider this tension a blessing because our future Jesuit lives will present many similar conflicts. Realizing this fact *now*, learning to balance the time spent with the poor and in the "com-

munity" (narrower sense) will insure the formation of a wider richer person. Such a man will not become the impersonally cold priest who has time only for "my work;" nor will he fall into the equally disastrous habits of the "bourgeois" priest whose days are spent on the golf course and whose evenings are passed with cocktail glasses clinking in the homes of the wealthy.

Empirical data again bolster theory: apostolate vs. community (narrower sense) seems to be working itself out at Fusz. In last semester's questionnaires many suggested that they identified those men most involved in social action with those most faithful and available to their brothers at Fusz. Others noted that the apostolates brought them a more definite sense of unity: the philosophers associated and co-operated with men from other provinces and different fields of specialization with whom they would never have become acquainted otherwise. We see the apostolates as a catalyst for the numerous sub-groups which naturally form in any large community.

Recapitulation: Precise Benefits

Social action, therefore, provides seminarians with manifold opportunities for growth and witness in and through community. The two problem-areas recognized present not obstacles but challenges for deepening personal Christianity. But exactly how do apostolates help a man, a community to grow, to offer their "Mass upon the world?" The value of apostolates derives especially from realizations, experiences, and foretastes of the priesthood simply unattainable by study alone.

When I work for the poor, I gain a profound *realization* of the need of persons with whom I have talked and whose divinely ordained proximity to me gives them a claim on me, a responsibility for them; I realize that the tiny bit I can do desperately needs to be done. In contacting my fellow Jesuits I also experience their need. My sensitivity has grown.

If I love the poor, I *experience* failure, the destruction of the self-satisfaction that comes from minor triumphs in studies. Often I experience utter inability to do what only grace or professional competence can do. This experience of ineptitude will drive me to remedy my incompetence by a more effective dedication to holiness of life and study.

Yet failure is not our only reward. The recognizable achieve-

ments of an extensive program like the V. I. P.⁹ also show that apostolic work is no mere waste of time with directionless movement plus good intentions. Insight and planning *can* better our city community.

In the final analysis, my moving among the poor is a foretaste of priesthood. I am often privileged to relish the consolation of serving another person whom God has entrusted to me by making him my "neighbor" (Luke 10, 29). The joy of assisting at the baptism of a convert, or of congratulating an adult student whom I have helped achieve his high-school diploma makes the course not so long, makes the sacrifices of study bearable, and the distant priesthood a hoped-for reality.

⁹ V.I.P. stands for "very important person" and for "voluntary improvement program." Begun by Jesuit Scholastics in St. Bridget of Erin parish under the direction of the pastor, Rev. John Shocklee, this program of adult education has grown, in less than two years, into a government sponsored project involving college students from several of St. Louis' Institutions. Hundreds of students are given personal direction and help to complete their grade school and high school education.

News from the Field

XAVIER UNIVERSITY is going ahead with plans for a new Jesuit Faculty building after receiving a \$750,000 gift from the Walter F. Schott Family Foundation. Present plans call for rooms for 80 Jesuits plus a community chapel and dining hall. The present faculty building was built in the 20s and is inadequate for the present community demands. This will be the sixth building erected on the Victory Parkway campus since 1960. The last building to be erected, the University Center, is now in full operation.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY has signed a five-year \$1,650,000 contract with AID of the State Department to provide technical assistance to the *Universidad Catolica Madre y Maestra* in the Dominican Republic. St. Louis will provide technical advice and guidance and assistance to strengthen and improve the administration, organization and academic programs of the Central American university. It is the only university in the Dominican Republic.

The specific areas in which St. Louis University will provide assistance will be:

1. Creation of a Social Science Department with research capability
2. Development of a library
3. Development of a language laboratory
4. The on-going teacher training program
5. Development of a local level fund-raising operation.

The Dominican program is similar to the AID program St. Louis University has with the Catholic University in Quito, Ecuador. That program, begun in 1962, has recently been renewed for three years and will phase out in 1968 with Ecuadorians replacing the United States faculty and personnel. This phasing out process, which will also take place with the Dominican project, is an essential feature of the AID programs of assistance.

In September the University will send a core staff of eight to Madre Y Maestra. There will be a director of the program (Chief of Party) professors of sociology, economics, anthropology, English and political science, a language laboratory director and a librarian. Qualified people from the U.S. and Latin America are now being recruited by the University for these positions. They will be replaced at the end of the contract by Dominican

personnel trained at St. Louis University and other universities in this country. This phasing-out is a vital element in the purpose of the program.

There will also be a St. Louis-based director who will be responsible for coordinating administrative, training and shipping activities.

The contract includes furnishing of faculty and supporting staff plus some procurement of books and teaching aids.

The University will also provide assistance in administrative and development areas. A fund-raising campaign in the Dominican Republic during the contract period will be conducted with University consultation. Battle Smith, director of the University's Latin American Office, will be the fund-raising consultant. Smith inaugurated the development office at the Universidad Javeriana in Bogota, Columbia and directed it for two years and spent two years in the same capacity at the university in Quito.

One area of particular significance in the program will be the formation of a multiple purpose Social Science Center, not only for the Madre Y Maestra but for the entire country. The planned Center would perform evaluation studies of community development, labor organizations, Peace Corps efforts, design and carry out basic social science research, plan and develop Social Science curriculum and eventually plan a School of Social Service and a program in Public Administration. The core staff of four will be aided with selected Dominican Republic professors and students in carrying out basic research.

St. Louis University has one of the most extensive Latin American programs in any U.S. university. In addition to the large program in Ecuador, it conducts a technical assistance program (under AID) in a radio literacy program in the Republic of Honduras, has a private cooperative assistance program with the Javerina University in Bogota, Columbia which has been in operation since 1960, and a similar program with the Andres Bello in Caracas, Venezuela. Other programs including orthodontics training, teacher training, consultation and workshops have been carried out in the countries of Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Guatemala, El Salvador and Peru. The University has trained three Peace Corps projects for the Republic of Honduras, one for Panama, one for Costa Rica.

Several other University Latin American programs are now pending.

BOSTON COLLEGE is well on its way with the construction of the five story Higgins Science Center which is expected to be completed by November 1966. The new building will house the departments of biology and physics. The departments will share 136,000 square feet of space, 178 rooms for instruction, research, and administration, 17 laboratories and two large auditoriums. The building will be air-conditioned the year around. The new building is adjacent to Devlin Hall which will be devoted exclusively to the departments of chemistry and geology.

With Higgins Science Center well on its way, Boston College will start work next October on the ground breaking for a \$4 million Social Science Center. The building will be quite similar in construction to the Higgins Science Center, that is, with five floors and with 134,000 square feet of space. The building will contain 25 classrooms and seminar rooms, 31 research facilities, Psychology laboratories, and 78 offices for faculty and staff. The School of Social Work long resident downtown on Newbury Street will return home at last to the Chestnut Hill campus. Construction is estimated at about 18 months.

GONZAGA UNIVERSITY is making plans for a \$1,200,000 life sciences building. The building will contain 64,000 square feet. Primary beneficiaries of the new building will be the physics and biology departments. Besides 16 laboratories and 4 classrooms, the building will contain 2 departmental libraries.

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY will develop a University Medical center at the County General hospital grounds in nearby suburban Wauwatosa with joint federal and community financing. The proposed center would include a university research and teaching hospital of about 160 beds and a science building to replace the present medical building in downtown Milwaukee. Marquette is also planning a legal research center and a law library building to house 100,000 volumes. Also in the plans are a four story modern languages building, the first building in a planned series for a communication arts complex.

THE UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT announces that Father Malcolm Carron, S.J., present Academic Vice-President at the University, will succeed Father Laurence V. Britt, S.J. as President of the University of Detroit. The appointment will be effective as of July 1, 1966.

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Index to Volume XXVIII

June 1965 to March 1966

Arrupe, Peter S.J., Very Rev.,: Rev. Fr. General to the Fathers of the French Schools	69
Blind Student, A, —Why Not?: Edward T. Ruch.....	122
Browne, Joseph T., S.J.: JEA National Meeting, Secondary Schools, Afternoon Sessions	38
Canadian National Jesuit Institute: C.J. Crusoe, S.J.....	193
Carr, Cornelius J., S.J.: JEA National Meeting, Secondary Schools, Morning Session	42
Challenge of Our Jesuit National Institute, The: C.J. Crusoe, S.J.....	193
Citation to Rev. Arthur V. Shea, S.J., A: Eugene J. O'Brien, S.J.....	46
Construction Guidelines: Cf. James Kenny, S.J.....	203
Crusoe, Clement J., S.J.: The Challenge of Our National Jesuit Institute.....	193
Daly, Lowrie J., S.J.: Is Educational Work Anti-Ignatian?.....	249
Denver Workshop 1965, On Student Personnel: G. Gordon Henderson, S.J.....	75
Education For the Blind: Cf. Edward T. Ruch.....	122
Educational Congress, International, Madrid, Jan. 1966: Ferdinando Trossarelli, S.J.....	219
Enrollment Statistics, 1965-1966: Eugene F. Mangold, S.J.....	156
Frankenhoff, Charles, S.J.: "Jesuit, Priest, and Scholar".....	245
Gannon, Thomas M., S.J.: Sociology in the High School: Problems and Perspectives	141
Henderson, G. Gordon, S.J.: The 1965 Denver Student Personnel Workshop.....	75
High School English: Cf. L. A. Waters, S.J.....	255
High School Sociology: Cf. T. M. Gannon, S.J.....	141
International Educational Congress—Madrid, January 1966: F. Trossarelli, S.J.....	219
Is Educational Work Anti-Ignatian?: Lowrie J. Daly, S.J.....	249
Is There Anything Distinctive About Jesuit Education?: William D. Ryan, S.J.....	58
JEA Meeting 1965 Secondary Schools—Morning Session: Joseph T. Browne, S.J.....	38
JEA Meeting 1965 Secondary Schools—Afternoon Session: Cornelius J. Carr, S.J.....	42
JEA Meeting 1965 Higher Education: Cf. E. J. Smyth, S.J.; L. P. McLaughlin, S.J.....	7, 21
Jesuit Education, Is There Anything Distinctive About It?: W. D. Ryan, S.J.....	58
Jesuit, Priest, and Scholar: Paul M. Quay, S.J.....	98
"Jesuit, Priest, and Scholar": Charles Frankenhoff, S.J.....	245
Jesuit Scholarly Publications	174
Jesuit Secondary School Curriculum: John R. Vigneau, S.J.....	27
Kenny, Brother James, S.J.: A University Business Officer's Guidelines For Construction	203
Liberal Arts Core Curriculum of the Sixties, The: Edmond J. Smyth, S.J.....	7

Liberal Arts Curriculum: Cf. J. B. McGannon, S.J.....	80
Liberal Arts, Project Models of: L. P. McLaughlin, S.J.....	21
Liberal Education for a Changing World: Integration and the Curriculum: J. Barry McGannon, S.J.....	80
Liberal Education, The Meaning of Our Times: Herbert Musirillo, S.J.....	49
Madrid Educational Congress January 1966: F. Trossarelli, S.J.....	219
Mangold, Eugene F., S.J.: The 1965 JEA National Meeting—	5
.....: Enrollment Statistics—1965, 1966.....	156
McGannon, J. Barry, S.J.: Liberal Education For a Changing World: Integration and the Curriculum.....	80
McLaughlin, Leo P., S.J.: Project Models of Liberal Arts Program.....	21
Meaning of a Liberal Education in Our Times, The: H. Musirillo, S.J.....	49
Musirillo, Herbert, S.J.: The Meaning of a Liberal Education in Our Times.....	49
National JEA Meeting, 1965, The: Eugene F. Mangold, S.J.....	5
News From the Field.....	61, 132, 212, 273
O'Brien, Eugene J., S.J.: A Citation to Rev. Arthur V. Shea, S.J.....	46
Project Models of Liberal Arts Program: Leo P. McLaughlin, S.J.....	21
Publications, Jesuit Scholarly.....	174
Quay, Paul M., S.J., Jesuit, Priest, and Scholar.....	98
Reverend Father General to the Fathers of the French Schools, Peter Arrupe, S.J.....	69
Rooney, Edward B., S.J.: Status of Special Studies 1965-1966.....	234
Ruch, Edward T: A Blind Student—Why Not?.....	122
Ryan, William D., S.J.: Jesuit Education, Is There Anything Distinctive About It?	58
Scholarly Publications of Jesuits.....	174
Secondary School Curriculum: Cf. J. Vigneau, J. Browne, C. Carr.....	27, 38, 42
Shea, Arthur V., S.J., A Citation To: E. J. O'Brien, S.J.....	46
Smyth, Edmond J., S.J.: The Liberal Arts Core Curriculum of the Sixties.....	7
Sneck, William J., S.J.: Social Apostolate: A Community's Growth and Witness.....	263
Social Apostolate: A Common Growth and Witness: William J. Sneck, S.J.....	263
Sociology in the High School: Problems and Perspectives: Thomas M. Gannon, S.J.....	141
Special Studies, Status of, 1965-1966: Edward B. Rooney, S.J.....	234
Statistics, Enrollment: Cf. Eugene F. Mangold, S.J.....	156
Statistics, Special Studies: Cf. Edward B. Rooney, S.J.....	234
Status of Special Studies, 1965-1966: Edward B. Rooney, S.J.....	234
Student Personnel Workshop, Denver 1965: G. Gordon Henderson, S.J.....	75
Teaching Apostolate: Cf. Arrupe, Crusoe, Daly, Frankenhoff, Quay	69, 193, 249, 245, 98
Trossarelli, Ferdinando, S.J.: International Educational Congress, Madrid.....	219
University Business Officer's Guidelines for Construction, A: Br. J. Kenny, S.J.....	203
Vigneau, John R., S.J.: Jesuit Secondary Curriculum	27
Waters, Leonard A., S.J.: What Does College Expect of High School English?.....	255
What Does College Expect of High School English?: Leonard A. Waters, S.J.....	255