Jesuit Educational Quarterly

JUNE, 1966

The 1966

JEA NATIONAL MEETING

□ □ □

ADDRESS OF FATHER GENERAL

HIGH SCHOOL SESSIONS

Vol. XXIX, No. 1

Our Contributors

FATHER JOHN H. REINKE, S.J. (Chicago Province) is the President of Loyola Academy, Wilmette. Father Reinke is the former Principal of the Academy.

FATHER JACQUES L. WEBER, S.J. (New Orleans Province) is the new President at Jesuit High at Shreveport. He formerly taught Latin and English at Strake Jesuit High, Houston.

FATHER PATRICK L. RICE, S.J. (Detroit Province) is the Director of Counseling at the University of Detroit High School.

FATHER EUGENE E. GROLLMES, S.J. (Missouri Province) is a Tertian at St. Joseph's Hall, Decatur.

FATHER THEODORE V. PURCELL, S.J. (Chicago Province) is the Director of the newly established Cambridge Center for Social Studies.

FATHER JOHN K. MOTT, S.J. (Detroit Province) is Assistant Principal at University of Detroit High School.

MR. TERRENCE P. TOEPKER is a layman teaching physics at St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati.

The papers delivered at the opening session and at the sessions on Higher Education at the 1965 JEA National Meeting will appear in the October 1966 edition of the JEQ.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

June 1966

CONTENTS

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.

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR
1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

The Jesuit Apostolate of Education

VERY REV. PETER ARRUPPE, S.J.*

For me this is a proud and gratifying experience. I am delighted that circumstances permitted my visit to our beloved America to coincide with this Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association.

Everyone has heard of the heroic effort and sacrifices which your predecessors and you have made for the excellent educational system you have constructed.

We turn back the pages of history to our saintly colleagues Isaac Jogues, John de Brebeuf, and their martyr companions of northern New York State. They are symbols of our many fellow Jesuits who gave their lives to make America better. Some gave up their lives through relatively quick and excruciating martyrdom, but many more through day-to-day devotion to rudimentary missionary education. We may find their monument in the *Jesuit Relations.* These carefully written periodic reports from New France to Old France about the discoveries made by the Jesuit missionaries remain even to this day as the finest and the earliest source material available on the Indians and the fauna and flora of the new continent.

Your esteemed President, Lyndon B. Johnson, has recently commissioned a national celebration between 1968 and 1973 of the 300th anniversary of our beloved Jesuit colleague, Father Jacques Marquette. When his discovery joined Canada and the Great Lakes with the Mississippi River, he accelerated the flow of culture, education, morality, and civilization throughout mid-America. Down these waterways and across the land trails poured other Jesuit replacements. France sent some members. Others came from Germany, from the Netherlands, from Spain, from Italy, and from other nations of the old world. America was mission territory. The native Indians needed the simplest elements of education. Many of the early immigrants, too, were very little better than the Indians in formal schooling. And so the teaching missionaries found themselves interspersing the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the catechism with the alphabet, arithmetic, simple reading and writing, and the story of the world.

---

* An address delivered at the J.E.A. National Meeting, Loyola University, Chicago, April 11, 1966.

It is incredible to see what gigantic strides America has taken in the short span of years between those American frontier days and the recent rendezvous in space of four American astronauts in twin spacecraft. The growth, too, of American Jesuit Education has been amazing. Jesuit missionary priests and brothers preceded or accompanied the pioneer explorers. They settled ordinarily in what proved later to be the population centers of America. The parish school emerged. Then came the private high school, the seminary for training the clergy, the local college, and finally schools of business, law, pharmacy, medicine, dentistry, engineering, journalism, nursing and others were incorporated. The community school became national and often international.

Our schools expanded into graduate education. Some universities developed. Georgetown was opened in 1789 and Saint Louis University was founded almost thirty years later in 1818; eleven colleges were established by the time the Civil War ended. In a prodigious effort between 1870 and 1891, eleven new American Jesuit colleges came into being. These Jesuit colleges and universities now total twenty-eight. They have grown step by step with the growth of America. They have injected into the life of the young nation men, and later women also, who were well-grounded in liberal arts, in professional skills, and in graduate education. Their graduates have gone forth, many as community, national and ecclesiastical leaders. Today American Jesuit colleges each year enroll almost 150,000 young men and women, many from remote foreign countries.

Similarly I am impressed with the fine records of our fifty-three American Jesuit high schools. It is a great contribution you are making to this country. You are providing challenging educational opportunities for more than thirty-five thousand highly selected young men. Each high school is filled to capacity, and I am importuned by citizens to expand existing schools and to open new high schools.

The importance and relevance of our educational apostolate in our secondary schools, in our seminaries, and in our colleges and universities would be hard to overestimate. The relevance of these schools will be even more dramatically apparent in the years ahead. The spirit of Vatican Council II opens the way to increasing the unique services which we can provide for priests, brothers, and women-religious through high schools and colleges of the first order. The great and abiding influence of our Seminaries will continue.

We shall, moreover, be asked to assume more and more responsibility for the full education of seminarians and religious, both men and women, in our institutions for lay persons. This the Church expects of us: a penetrating study to the very depths of theology and philosophy. This must be according to the finest tradition of scholarship and research and according to our dedicated loyalty to the service of the Church. This is the express wish of the Holy Father for our Society.

The opportunities of our age must stimulate us towards constant improvement. I am proud that everywhere in your marvelous country you have qualified our schools professionally; you are recognized and accredited. You sit in high level deliberation at planning tables with your fellow educators from state schools and from other private schools. Men of good will everywhere look upon our Jesuits in education as partners who are intent on developing constantly better schools. They consider us as peers and colleagues who furnish a component part of the total American educational program.

The United States has a richness and diversity of secular higher education that is admirable. America will always need a parallel educational system that can speak with positive conviction and teach with authority of absolute values, a system where morality and virtue can be explicitly and formally cultivated. We will continue in our schools to believe that scientific Theology is an integral and irremovable part of the full and complete education of a son or daughter of our Heavenly Father.

Every day I am impressed with the reliance and trust placed upon American Jesuit education. Profound men who are high in your government, and grateful Bishops in your dioceses, tell me that the contribution of our Jesuit schools is irreplaceable. They tell me how important it is that many strong religiously orientated schools should continue to flourish. The dynamics of American history have in a certain sense determined our Jesuit educational apostolate in America. The thirst for knowledge, for wisdom, for an ordered vision of reality, for education, and for self development, has been insatiable. This is most fortunate. In any country education is the key to leadership. In the United States this is true to an eminent degree.

I realize full well the constant struggle to finance your operations. It calls for massive funding through tuition of students, by many

other modest contributions which you literally beg from persons of every faith, by governmental assistance, but most of all by your own personal dedicated service and that of your lay faculty members, whom you enlist in great numbers to fill important teaching and administrative positions and advisory posts in your schools.

Let me insert here that I am deeply pleased to know that our American Jesuit schools enroll large numbers of the sons and daughters from your low-income and middle-income families. Despite the relatively high tuition which you must charge, these young people of yours are willing to work, often at manual labor, to help pay for their high school and college education under Jesuit auspices. I congratulate you for the supplementary loan programs, the institutional gifts, and the scholarship plans which make possible equal opportunity in our schools for so many able students.

God has blessed our efforts to instruct and counsel your young people both in our high schools and in our colleges and universities. We are privileged to have these students during the golden years between the ages of fourteen and twenty-two. These are the malleable, formative years of personal development when the quality of their religious faith, their citizenship, and their competence for business are fixed; it is at this period that their attitudes toward God, their neighbors, and themselves are established. Ours is a great responsibility and at the same time a splendid opportunity.

Historically we Jesuits are noted for our common philosophy of life and singleness of spiritual purpose. Those who know us least think we are all fashioned in the same mold. The longer one lives, however, the more he realizes how highly individualized each Jesuit truly is. No one is more aware of this than the Superior General. There are many ways and many talents which we can use to achieve the greater glory of God and the expansion of His Kingdom. Consequently there must be room for experimentation and innovation in our educational planning. For example, the Jesuit high schools here in Chicago are not and ought not be patterned rigidly upon Jesuit high schools in New Orleans or Los Angeles. Similarly, we can justify differences that may exist in higher education. Thus, while they may admittedly have much in common, the Jesuit Colleges in Seattle or New York or Saint Louis may be quite different because of geographical site, sociological reasons, local objectives, or their particular historical milieu.

This adaptability must show itself in a special way. Our historical educational principles could never anticipate the size of our schools today. How are we to keep a semblance of the personal, individual interest in students which has been an identifying mark of Jesuit education for four and a quarter centuries? Personal influence is our Jesuit heritage and will be the key to our effectiveness. It cannot be maintained by a simple mandate from the mountain-top. It can, however, be realized if we can impress this close teacher-student relationship in our lay colleagues and, most of all, if each individual member of the Society extends himself by imaginative modern methods to assure the student that he is respected as an individual person and a special object of Divine love. If some modern machines have succeeded in depersonalizing him, perhaps there are other mechanical products such as television, radio, and audio-visual aids, which may extend the ability of the teacher to reach more students even more meaningfully.

We Jesuits in education are ordained Priests or on the way to the priesthood, or Brothers. I encourage you to devote yourselves unquestioningly and unreservedly to the life of scholarship, of classroom teaching and to the operation of our schools.

There is harmony and high compatibility in the role of priest and teacher. We search for relevance between our profession and the real world. For the teacher, the problems of one's student and his family, the character of the particular high school or college, or the city or neighborhood in which the school is situated may well furnish the optimum relevance to the teacher who is also empowered to act sacramentally on behalf of men. I repeat the sentiment of my August, 1965, letter to the Fathers of the French Schools:

> "Certainly this is not the hour for us to relax the effort that we expend in this Ministry, which I consider so important, but rather to make our schools ever more adapted to a world which is being constructed and put together under our very eyes."

Education has always been one of our Order's most effective ministries. "Some say that other apostolic efforts are today more efficacious. I cannot believe it, for nothing is more useful to contemporary society than to prepare for it the men and women of solid character and personality whom that same society now so critically needs."

We Jesuits devote ourselves to our missionary ventures but the only lasting impact can be had when the mission school is estab-

lished. Only through education can the missioner consolidate his gains.

Both as a worker in the field and now as your Father General I know one thing well. It is a frustrating and almost insuperable task to lay the groundwork and see to completion a strong and approved school in one of today's emerging or educationally deprived nations.

You American Jesuits have a unique opportunity to serve God and all mankind through your far-flung system of high schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities. You live so close to this educational establishment that sometimes you are blind to its achievements and to its vast potential. Sometimes I think that an American Jesuit has to leave his native country and look back at it from foreign shores to comprehend the imagination, the special instinct, and the unselfish courage of the pioneer American Jesuits and their successors.

As their legacy they put into our hands the tools which we Jesuits need today for today's ministry. This is not to say that our educational challenge is less difficult. Most parents would agree that the actual birth and infancy of a child may well be less painful and agonizing than the care and nurture over many years as the child moves on to full and responsible maturity. But in America we have the means to reach effectively the greatest number of people. In America, education is the mechanism which can move out through individuals to improve the government, the art, the culture, and the morality of society as a whole.

My visit to this country has only increased the awareness I had of the tremendous possibilities of our educational institutions. Two things I would underline as of crucial importance:

1. The need to think and plan on a national level.

   This must result in cooperation on a significant level among our colleges and universities in this country.

2. The need of our Society to think and plan on an international level.

   Never before in history has education been so directly and intimately connected with every phase of national and international life. We have a built-in international factor which we must activate. In this decisive moment of salvation history, our great possibilities must be made a reality. This requires careful planning and bold vision. If we are to serve the Church according to her needs and according to our

> finest contribution, we must think "World." This is the Society in all its relevance, at the service of the Church as she enters a new era.

There are problems which face us now, and in the days ahead, in our educational apostolate. These are real problems which will require all our intelligence, our dedication, our imagination and our hard work.

Let us face these problems with the honesty and courage of those who have gone before us.

When you return to your daily work in our schools, I would ask you to carry to your colleagues there, Religious and Lay, my personal gratitude for their very real contribution to the uplifting of our civilization, to the growth of faith, and to the readiness for peace in our times.

To all of you and to them, I extend my warmest Easter greetings.

The 1966 High School Meetings: A Report

John K. Mott, S.J.

This year's meeting was, once again, the story of men in crisis. The foe this time was internal, and the sessions may have seemed like an exorcism of the devils of discontent. Voices of doubt have been heard in the land. This meeting tried to help us confront ourselves and clarify our educational identity. The Sunday evening and Monday morning sessions were pointed in this direction. On Monday evening the ultimate voice was heard, the voice of Father General present in our midst, assuring and strengthening our present dedication.

This report is written for those interested in the high school aspects of the meeting. The formal papers are reprinted in this issue. The pages that follow are a synopsis of the oral reports and a record of reactions experienced or observed during their presentation.

MONDAY MORNING

On Monday morning, April 11, the high school delegates assembled in the Loyola Community Theatre to hear a presentation by five panelists on "The Priestly Apostolate in Jesuit Secondary Education." Many delegates voiced their feeling afterwards that this session was one of the best in recent memory. The vindication of the priestly role was not based on theological or historical inquiry, but rested mainly on propriety.

Fr. Reinke discussed the priestly apostolate in administration. The academic and social significance of our schools relies heavily on good administrators, and good administrators are trained, not born. The provinces must put more effort into training administrators who are open to new ideas, who can create the climate and collective consciousness that is open to change. The good administrator must know the theological justification for our schools, be aware of our responsibilities to the children of the poor (it is significant how often this problem came up), carry on a fruitful dialog with the public school system, and maintain some form of communication between the school and the scholasticates. Perhaps the solution to some of our problems will come from transcending

munity. The student must see that the priest cares for him as a person. Too often the priest is an authority figure for the boys; even in confession a boy may feel he is simply the "next in line." In counseling a boy may meet a real "father" for once in his life, somebody who cares for him as a person and to whom he can return in the future. Finally, the boy needs a "Christ-figure," and the priest is in the best position to be this. Counseling, then, is a witness to Christian love, loving one's neighbor regardless of his behavior.

Fr. Kammer explained the role of the priest in moderating activities. The priest does not belong in extra-curriculars as a moderator or as a hobbyist but as an educator. The priest should be in only those activities that are an extension of the classroom. Dramatics was considered at length as an example of education outside the classroom. After high school most men will never again produce a work of art. When a student works in a play, he becomes the partner of a great man, e.g., Shakespeare (not the moderator), and experiences what it means to finger the fabric of a work of art. While becoming educated he also becomes cultured, doubling his pleasure, for he begins to realize how a work of art is made. The boy begins to learn the music of his own voice and his own language. He comes to grips with what poetry really is. In all of this, boys become aware through a cultured priest who himself has eyes to see. And the best vision should be seen through the eyes of a priest.

The youthful critics of the role of the priest in the Jesuit high schools had a voice in the person of Fr. Eugene Grollmes, a tertian from Decatur, Ill. In a frank but refreshing presentation, Fr. Grollmes summarized what many young Jesuits think is wrong with our high schools.

A Jesuit should justify his teaching not by its effects but by his vocation. If he is not called to teach he should not be forced to teach. Likewise, the Order should not try to be the best in the educational business; rather we should try to be ourselves. Unlike their view of the colleges, the young Jesuits do not question the existence of the high schools, only their quality. The young Jesuits bewail the lack of creative thought on the part of our teachers, especially some of the veterans. Why are our schools so weak in teaching the students to appreciate the fine arts? (One wonders if this is not a consequence of the heavily rationalistic education of so many of our present Jesuit teachers.) We must devise ways for

better personal contact between our students and the Jesuit faculty. We must have more effective educational aims; we should run our schools well or not run them at all. We should accept only those students we can educate to their full ability and in the image of Christ. A teacher should not be permitted to teach in a field for which he is not trained. A regent should not be allowed to hurt himself and the school by teaching something for which he is unprepared. More responsibility should be given to the students in the running of the school, allowing them to live with the consequences of their decisions. Vertical communication must be improved between the student body and the administration. Administrators should provide creative leadership, and the young Jesuits want the Principal independent of the Rector. Time must be available for teachers to read and research in their fields. The image of the high school teacher must be refurbished. Regents should be treated as human beings; these are the ones who will or will not return to the high schools after ordination on the strength of their memories of their experiences in the high school.

DISCUSSION

As the discussion period started, Fr. Joseph Labaj, the chairman of the session, heaped lavish praise on the panelists for their outstanding presentation.

One question pitted the "evocative" teacher of Fr. Weber against the problem of covering matter. Fr. Weber reminded us that the truth transcends its particular formulation by a textbook, and the full and rich approach to the matter will not only communicate the basic material to be covered but will evoke the student's response. Fr. Kammer agreed that covering matter was incidental, although a teacher will become sloppy if he doesn't try to cover the matter. But he stated that the inferences of a subject are more important than its matter. As Ignatius says, stop where you find fruit. One of our ultimate aims should be to give our students the habit of reading to educate themselves, and our attitude towards knowledge and our excitement over it will help them in this direction more than a slavery to "covering the matter."

Another question dealt with trying to persuade an evocative teacher to teach the fundamentals of a subject, such as Latin I, where drilling and tedious labor are of the essence of the job. The panelists tried to untangle this one by urging the teacher to promise

and deliver some introduction to the literature for which they were preparing even in first year. Another panelist suggested that no matter what you are covering you are presenting and teaching an ideal of manhood through your own activities in the classroom. Fr. Rice, who teaches Latin I himself, says that even here the students begin to respect themselves as learners and as growing in intellectual perfection. Understandably, the problem was not solved.

MONDAY AFTERNOON

On Monday afternoon the delegates returned to the Loyola Community Theatre to hear Father Theodore V. Purcell, Director of the Cambridge Center for Social Studies, and Mr. Terrence Toepker, a lay teacher at St. Xavier, Cincinnati, address themselves to the topic of "The Social Apostolate in the Jesuit High School." Fr. Purcell took the topic from the faculty and curriculum point of view, Mr. Toepker from the student's point of view.

Fr. Purcell defined the social apostolate as an intelligent awareness among the faculty and student body of the social problems of our times and a desire to do something about them. He presented a series of graphs to illustrate his points. I trust these graphs are reproduced within his published article. Several points struck this observer. About 50% of our schools directly solicit disadvantaged students for our schools, and 36% of our schools tutor possible candidates for our schools. On the other hand, half the students of half our schools do not take a course in Civics, and those who do take the course are usually poorer students. His survey showed that 84% of the principals think that the social apostolate contributes much to the formation of the students, but the number of students actively engaged in this apostolate is usually small. He suggested that the presence of Negro students in our schools is educating for the other students, and when friendship develops between the Negro and the other students, prejudice inevitably dwindles. In the question period Fr. Purcell said he did not know what social sciences should be preferred and put into the curriculum.

Father Purcell's talk was mainly a statistical report of his survey, and the meaning and implications of his talk will depend on our interpretation of his findings. The main conclusion of his talk was that in the area of curriculum our social studies program is still weak, in spite of all we say about its theoretical importance.

Mr. Toepker's address was both inspiring and informative. He could not but reveal himself as a literate, articulate, devoted Christian in the modern world. Somebody must introduce our students to the problems of society; otherwise they will not find them. The student's values and goals are set during his high school years, and we educate him best by giving him something concrete to do. Yet for some reason the student approaches these problems with a mixture of idealism and cynicism.

Mr. Toepker gave several examples of what he tries to do. His Community Action Program, Parent Education Program, and Home Visiting Program are three examples. His proposal of the religion "lab" is interesting. We take it as a matter of course that there will be a physics lab and a chemistry lab; why not a religion lab? At least we should require some outside effort on the part of the student as a practical application of what he has learned in religion class.

In the question period, Mr. Toepker said he found other faculty members very willing to help out with these projects. He did not know whether the Fichter report[1] showed that St. Xavier students ranked higher in their attitude toward the social apostolate, or whether they had a better spirituality as a result of their work. (At this time the Fichter report was not common property.)

The conclusion of the afternoon session was that there is much room for improvement in the curricular and apostolic side of our committment to the social apostolate. The question of what to do or how to do it seems inevitably the job of each school to determine and implement.

MONDAY EVENING

The high point of this year's meeting was greeting and hearing Very Reverend Father General at the dinner which concluded this year's meeting. In his 22-minute address Father General stressed that America will always need a parallel system of education to speak to our citizens of absolute values, that there is a definite need for experimentation and innovation in our schools, that personal interest in our students is a cherished Jesuit aim and heritage, that the role of the priest and the teacher are compatible, that

---

[1] Fichter, Joseph H., S.J., *Send Us A Boy . . . Get Back A Man:* Cambridge Center For Social Studies, Cambridge, Mass., 1966. A Report prepared for the 1966 JEA Workshop "On the Christian Formation of Jesuit High School Students," Loyola University, Los Angeles, August 1966.

nothing is more conducive to helping modern society than the work of education, and that we live so close to our schools that we are often blind to their achievement and their potential.

But even more important than what he said, his mere presence seemed to instil into everyone a sudden sense of family and community, of importance and enterprise. The Jesuit mystique seemed to focus before us, incarnate in this small but dynamic man.

CONCLUSION

The mood of these meetings was pleasant. Perhaps we intuit the tremendous value of our work, though we may have a hard time proving it scientifically. Now that definitive reports are coming out, as the Notre Dame study of the private schools and the Fichter report concerning our own high schools, perhaps the question can be asked: what are we willing to settle for statistically? Should we open, close, or revamp our schools on the basis of these studies? What will be the cut-off line? These are some questions that await us.

If this was an exorcism, how well did it take? The generous banquet Monday evening showed signs of little prayer and less fasting. But this is a different kind of devil, driven out not even by money and manpower, but ultimately by the vision each Jesuit has of himself and his vocation.

The Priestly Apostolate in Jesuit Secondary Education From the Standpoint of Administration

JOHN H. REINKE, S.J.

Over the past few years a number of our priests and scholastics have raised pertinent and, at times, urgent questions about the heavy committment of Jesuits to secondary education and, in fact, to college education as well. It has been felt that there may be other, more pressing modern outlets for the zeal of so many Jesuits. These are certainly legitimate questions and should be in the background of our discussion this morning. In the background, because I do not think that we can give a direct answer to the question without some larger perspective. And this larger horizon should take account of some dimensions in Jesuit secondary education as it exists today. It is this larger horizon which I propose to explore.

I will discuss the apostolate of secondary education from the standpoint of administration . . . and this, for two reasons: it is an assigned topic, designed to be part of a total discussion; secondly, it is only by examining the function of administration in Jesuit secondary education as this structure currently exists that we shall be able to approach the larger question of whether or not we should be so heavily committed in this area. It is altogether possible that the larger problematic of whether Jesuits should be committed to secondary education stems not so much from the academic issue or from genuine social concern as from a certain malaise in the face of ineffective or univisionary administration. Thus, I would propose this paper as a prolegomenon to the question about the apostolate of our high schools.

Let me begin, then, with a tentative description of "administration" or "administrator" in the Society. If we speak of administrators who work in the context of the Christian revelation, administration is largely that earthly power which guides and directs the Church through service. In the people of God there is a hierarchy; there is, further, delegation and recognition of heads of religious orders, on down to rectors and superiors of individual houses. These people are entrusted with certain powers of authority. The immediate excellence of a Jesuit school will, thus, depend in large

measure on the ultimate choice by a Provincial of a Rector and, after that, on the appointment by either the Provincial, the Prefect of Studies or the Rector, himself, of a Principal and of good personnel. Weakness will, of course, be inevitable. But, the focus of the Provincial should always be on having excellent people in demanding jobs. He will be limited in this by the existential history of the Province of which he is head, by the number and gravity of the problems and empty offices which he inherits from a predecessor, by his own and his consultors' ability to judge the competence of men for a particular form of leadership, and by the training and environment in our scholasticates.

The concern of the Provincial, moreover, should be not only *having* and *finding* excellent people, but on *creating* them. This latter point, in my own opinion, merits more study. For, we must assume the existence, and that not infrequently, of prophetic gifts in some administrators and in some members of the comunity. Therefore, a Mark of the competent spiritual leader would be his ability to recognize and embrace good ideas presented to him by competent people. It may not be totally unnecessary to mention that in this day and age the administrator must provide a climate favorable not only to the emergence of *good* ideas but also to the genuinely *prophetic* idea. High school administration will profit only to the extent that this climate exists in the Province and in the Assistancy. And largely in proportion to the degree to which this climate exists does our basic question gain or lose its urgency.

This climate is not an amorphous and totally undeveloped thing as far as what we may call the collective consciousness of the Church and the Society are concerned. We may cite three statements which must modify and give some guide lines to administrative thinking. First, Vatican II on Christian Education; Second, the letter of Very Reverend Father Arrupe to the French schools; and, third, the minutes of the recent meeting in Madrid of the representatives from fourteen countries to discuss the questions pertinent to the apostolate of the secondary school. These three documents reflect the collective mind of a large body in Christendom today. None of them was intended to be a static declaration or, as it were, a new *ratio Studiorum.* Rather, they are to be thought of as a challenge for the future. And, while they are important, we must not forget that the American Catholic educational scene is unique. Thus, American thinking must solve American problems. It is, in

my own opinion, useless to look outside the country for solutions. And, it would be ill-advised and hasty simply to say that American Jesuits should not be involved so heavily in secondary education and let it go at that.

Thus far, the climate in which administration should operate. Let me move, now, to some more specific areas concentrating, at the end, on one problem which I think is of the greatest importance in this whole context.

First of all, the administration, either personally or with help, ought to attempt to master the underlying *theological justification* for the apostolate of the school. It is in and through this theological thinking that the question in the background of our discussion . . . whether or not we should have Jesuit high schools . . . will receive both the theoretical and practical consideration it deserves. For, administration must always concern itself with justifying its existence; and, more concretely, Jesuit administration must consistently ask itself: which, of various alternatives, is *most* to the glory of God?

The Rector, then, ought to see that this theological justification or, better, the *theological problematic,* is explored or, at least, considered by his staff. He ought to go further than this and see that it is a concern of the civic community, of the parents of the students, of all those who have a stake in the excellence or mediocrity of what a given school is attempting to accomplish. Thus, he must familiarize himself with the whole range of the interjection of government aid into the school question. This was needless some five or six years ago on a high school level. He ought to know what the civil law says with respect to the prior rights of parents as against the rights of the state. He ought to know that Catholic education comes under questioning more severely in suburban areas today because of the temptation to utilize the rich facilities that are at hand in suburban public schools, due to the fact that the population in these areas can more easily support a high tax base. This whole large area I call the area of the theological problematic. I cannot foretell what answers will emerge from the considerations; I do, however, think that we, members of the Province and even of the Assistancy, should be more concerned with the questions than we currently are. Nor am I so naive as to think that one Rector or one school can solve this total question. Only by transcending our

currently existing provincial and local lines can we hope for a reasonable posing of the problem.

This day of increasing social consciousness and stress upon the Gospel imposes upon administration the task of finding some modest solution to the problem of the *exclusion of the poor* from our schools because of rising costs. This is a very serious problem and one which involves not only our own city, but concern for the solution of this problem in the missions to which our men are committed. This again is a theological issue, with very concrete ramifications.

Administrators must be leaders in bringing about more *cooperation and coordination with public schools.* Only by such dialogue will we have evidence for posing the larger question suggested in this paper. Rectors must have an open mind on shared time according to the circumstance, the location and the financial ability of our schools to improve themselves with or without a shared relationship. Our professors should be encouraged to enter into an ecumenical and secularized climate, to encounter the wisdoms and the needs of the world. It is only by discovering the needs of the world as well as its wisdoms that one may talk about applying effective remedies to the contours of the problems. I am here suggesting, of course, a sort of community of interpretation or dialogue.

A word on *curriculum* is in order. I believe that, in this day, when changes are taking place at a very swift pace, the Rector cannot dissociate himself from the function or the activity of his Principal. He must know a good deal about curriculum and about modern methods of implementing curriculum. In terms of structural process, the curriculum is constantly developing. What we knew as a fixed curriculum is, by this very principle, out of date. If we refuse to read again the signs of the times in which we live we shall provide our students with an education which was suitable for their grandfathers. All these are new and exhausting demands for inspired leadership. It is in the matter of curriculum planning, perhaps more fully than anywhere else, that the Rector will be heavily dependent upon the particular contributions that he can evoke from members of his teaching community, as well as from the ecumenical and secular dialogue suggested in the preceding paragraph. We would fail adequately to understand the problems of our day if we did not put all these demands on our administrators.

In passing, we may pose the serious question of whether or not our present *scholasticate training* adequately prepares a man to take on these diverse and exhausting problems, whether the course of studies is designed to bring about very readily the type of inspired leadership and concern of which I am speaking.

Since we are talking about problems of great magnitude, the Rector of a Catholic secondary school must concern himself seriously with what I may call *team spirit.* He should endeavor to find out the degree of personal pride in one's school on the part of teachers and others. Is this sense of pride and cooperative effort declining? I speak of team spirit as the people of God working together in a particular enterprise. It is derived from the biblical notion of a body having many members, all working together; or, of the people of God performing specific functions for human betterment.

None of these qualities of an administrator should be dependent on individual genius. Thus, I am proposing that our scholasticates and all those concerned with training our men should take some time to concern themselves first with the question of leadership, then with the means of encouraging and nurturing it. I am likewise proposing that our scholasticates, transcending provincial lines, seriously concern themselves with the nature of our apostolate here in the U.S., as well as with the theological formulation of principles by which the apostolate is chosen and then exercised. The various forms of dialogue and interpretation we have proposed will not be successful if they take place only in one city or one province, or in one school. That is why I bring up the question of "team spirit," which must exist in the total Society, then in the Assistancy, then in the Province, then in the individual houses. This immediately suggests that scholasticates should, first of all, combine and locate in urban, academic areas, i.e., that they be "where the action is;" secondly, that they should be in the largest theological centers; and, thirdly, that they should somehow or another be constantly involved in the apostolate. We are not here urging diminution of academic interest but, rather, its increased concern with the practical and theoretical problems of the Jesuit apostolate.

I come, now, to the final and, possibly, the key portion of my presentation. I have indicated a series of problems, any one of which could be the subject of a very useful discussion. Due to the

limitations of this symposium I am going to pick out one topic as, perhaps, transcending all the others in its urgency.

If all these theological and educational theories and practices of which I have spoken are handled well, the goal of the school may still be easily aborted by inefficient management of the temporal gifts of God . . . or, in short, by poor *fiscal management.* Why speak about fiscal management? Our institutions do exist; and, while the larger points mentioned above begin to be investigated, one must focus on the major task of administration here and now. A fiscally unsound school will encourage rash solutions to the major question of whether or not we should be so heavily committed to high schools. This question should not be asked out of desperation, but in tranquility. And, I suggest, no one is tranquil . . . from General to Provincial to the least member of the community . . . if he feels he is on a sinking ship, or if he is invited to board one. Secondly, poor fiscal management leads to lack of excellence and distinction in the school. And, perhaps, the larger question about our committment to secondary education is really the question about whether or not we should continue to run schools which are not, to the highest degree, excellent and distinguished.

Few questions appear so grave to the Catholic educator and to those concerned with the status of the Catholic schools as those of finance. Suggestions for solutions to the financial dilemma range from candy sales to massive federal participation. If the services of Catholic schools are to be maintained, responsible solutions must be found. Both research and practice indicate that the degree to which the administration adheres to accepted and established business practices indicates the extent to which it minimizes loss and waste in the utilization of the financial and material resources which suport and make possible the educational program. The evidence almost overwhelmingly indicates that the efficiency with which the functional business and financial management is discharged within a school or school system is indicative of the instructional program which it supports. Thus, one can readily say that effective use of the common denominator, the dollar, not only increases the number of dollars available but also tends to improve the organizational structure.

Research indicates that in actual practice there is too little concern for good business administrative procedures in Catholic schools in the United States. The evidence recorded so far in the Notre

Dame-Carnegie study indicates that those who are ultimately and immediately responsible for the management of Catholic schools have generally failed to utilize adequate business and management practices as a means of supporting the effort to reach the goals of these schools. Too many people in charge of Catholic secondary school treasurers' offices have neither a business degree nor any business training. All authorities concur in the view that the formal budget is the very art of fiscal management, being a translation of the school program into dollars; and acknowledge it as being the greatest single tool administration has available for overall administrative efficiency. Yet, according to the Notre Dame study, 75% of the Catholic secondary schools do not use a formal budget document. I am of the opinion that the record of our Jesuit schools is better than that of the generality of Catholic secondary schools in this regard; but I am also aware that there remains a considerable, even a vast, area in which improvement is possible.

The same study showed, further, that 60% of the Catholic schools do not employ accounting methods or systems which can provide accurate information on financial progress and performance of the schools. Only ¼ of these schools have objective appraisals of their management through auditing. Most of our schools make annual reports to the Fr. Provincial through the treasurer. Rarely are we visited or given norms to follow, or do we find ourselves being insistently urged to use better management practices. Intervention on the level of Fr. Provincial usually only takes place if the administrator of a given school is simply unable to pay his bills. (I need not call to your attention the fact that the *informationes ad gubernandum* say practically nothing about this facet of government . . . an aspect which concerns the success of any educational institution today. Thus, as in so much of what we have brought up, our problem is larger than one or other school.)

On the level of public relations, the Notre Dame study has shown that there is a high and direct relationship between the support people give to an enterprise and the management efficiency which is evident. I think it is safe to say that the vast majority of our secondary schools do not utilize the readily available free services of business men whose sons are often in our schools, who would be honored, were they asked, to set up for us business procedures and financial accounting, and to oversee this operation at regular intervals. In the spirit of Vatican II, certainly here is a place for the

cooperation of the priest and the layman . . . in the field in which the layman is not only more competent, but in which, in many instances, he spends all his working day gaining more and fuller knowledge of the proper use and management of money. I am saying, in short, therefore, that there ought to be a serious examination of our various treasurers' offices, of our investment policies, of our budget procedures; and, in general, that modern methods should be instituted and quickly in each of our schools.

Even if the Notre Dame-Carnegie study were not completely valid, still we would have to concern ourselves with the problem herein pointed out, because we have all experienced in our houses good and bad management. Good management will not come about automatically, but only through utilizing the resources of modern techniques.

To conclude, what I hoped to achieve in this paper was to suggest that there lies before us a series of new horizons in creative leadership. These horizons are continuous with the great Judaeo-Christian tradition begun in the Old Testament, continued in the New Testament and carried out through twenty centuries of efforts to understand Christian revelation in its pertinence to man and his world. The entire human community demands that this cooperative exploration be undertaken again with vigor, and history will not judge us kindly if we fail to meet these demands.

The Role of the Priest-Teacher In Secondary Education

Jacques Weber, S.J.

This paper is predicated on a number of assumptions: (1) the only good teacher is the *evocative* teacher; (2) the Jesuit priest will want to witness the full truth of Christ where that witness is most needed and will do the most good; (3) we are in a transitional period of development toward a time when religiously oriented laymen will fill the major role of witness to Christ in education.

What is an evocative teacher? In my youth the ideal priest-teacher was the man of large memory, limited culture, clear and fearless defense of oversimplified systems of thought, and strong, almost athletic, discipline. He entertained the class with the same stale jokes year after year, dominated them with the same shouting, and taught with the same jejune outlines: he defended the truth fearlessly and trained boys of prodigious memories tolerant of domineering lovable priests. One of my teachers had memorized all of *Paradise Lost* and delighted in having us test his memory by starting him at any line we chose: as he went on for the longest time, we could hardly have cared less for *what* he was reciting. Another kidded Homer daily out of it's beauty, but he could speak five languages.

Admittedly these are caricatures; but in some strange way, almost all the Jesuit alumni I've talked to feel that they were taught by just such a caricature. None of these men was stupid or intolerant or bad. What was bad, however, about this type of teacher was that he failed miserably to *evoke* any response that could be called personal, dynamic, individual. Assent took precedence over investigation; memory over understanding; collective recall over individual response. The tried formula was preferred to the new idea; school spirit was a better word than *my* spirit; the period was more popular than the question mark; a closed universe truer than an open-ended one. It may well be that what leadership we have lacked among the Catholic laity in the past is at least partially due to this kind of good-hearted entertainer.

The evocative teacher, on the other hand, is an entirely different kind of person. For one thing, though he respects systems of

thought, he respects the person more; and so he is fearless about investigation, encourages his students to investigate. Believing strongly in God and in His grace and firmly in man and in his native honesty, the evocative teacher rejoices when a student inquisitively departs from the truth because he is convinced that the student will discover the truth. "God is dead," from the student agnostic evokes from the teacher, "Which God?" And when the student explains which God is dead, the evocative teacher may often answer, *if he has truly listened without fear*, "Thank God!" This desire to evoke response applies not only to theology and philosophy but as well to the humanities and the sciences. The evocative teacher knows that human growth is experimental, slow but curious, real only if independent, assisted only if encouraged, successful only after floundering. One of his biggest and most constant acts of faith is addressed to the fact that *God* made man, that God knew what He was doing when He made man.

Now such a teacher, the evocative one who knows and sees the relevancy of the full truth of Christ, is precisely the one that must witness Christ in education. He need not be a priest; he may well be a layman. In some future period of history, it may even be better that he be a layman: and in that period the priest who asks the question, "Where can I do the most good for God and man," may well search for another apostolate than that of education.

But that period has not yet come for a number of reasons, only one of which I shall mention here. To paraphrase Teilhard, we are in a period when all the disciplines of education are rising in order to converge. There is no such thing as a course in literature: any evocative teacher knows that students discussing *Hamlet* will challenge and defend, reject and adopt the most philosophical and theological of concepts. A single course in literature, sociology, history, ends up borrowing from nearly all the disciplines; and a student in secondary education, in and through each course and all his courses collectively, is forming—and this is the heart of the matter—the principles of his life, the truths he will live and love by, and the uncertainties plus intuitions that will guide him.

Here is where the action is: where the only worthwhile questions in life are being asked. And here is where the evocative priest-teacher is still needed: he must witness to the full truth of Christ at this time when all things, at an increasing pace, rise in order to converge. He may not have been needed in a system of fragmented

education where each discipline stayed in its own little hut, but he is terribly needed when the disciplines are "rising and converging." In a word, all education is rapidly becoming, phychological, Philosophical, and theological. And this is why the objection that the priest if he teaches should teach only theology and philosophy and not the humanities and the sciences is a bit silly.

There are today a large number of good priests who tell us priest-educators that we should go "where the action is," and quite obviously the "action" is not to be found in the classroom, not in the *Devil's Advocate* or in Prufrock or in the *Brothers Karamazov,* not in evocative theology or Philosophy, but for some strange reason only in the slum district (but strangely not in th eclassroom of the slum district but on the streets or the playground or the cars or the scooters of—usually teenagers.) For, you see, the teenager, it is still feared, is the measure of the future adult: it's hard to dodge that rather basic principle.

I can't help but feel that these priests (and certainly they are good and certainly they are needed) are ordained for emergency and that they are committed to the apostolate of emergency. And this apostolate I respect. But it is one thing to say that we do have and must fill the apostolate of emergency but quite another thing to deny the day-by-day apostolate of normalcy. There is something to the concept that the solving of emergency situations only makes it possible for the real apostolate, where something really worthwhile is done, to take place. Let's have apostles of emergency, but let's not lose our sanity. The same can be said for CCD: let's have our CCD (it's been long overdue); and let's have our Newman Clubs and our philosophy and theology departments on secular campuses and our released time in secondary education; but let's *not* denigrate the only system of religiously oriented schools in the country. The former things are in embryo form while the latter is close to adulthood and it had better stick around for a long time to supply the former with maturity, balance and truth.

A final word on the apostolate of emergency: I find that the priest of emergency, with rare exceptions, usually ends up doing rather dull administrative work from 8:00 A.M. till 5:00 P.M. because whatever action teenagers are involved in is taking place in Public School 207 and whatever action adults are participating in is at Southwestern Electric. And, if he finds his work days dull, I do recommend that he get *not* into Southwestern Electric, at

which job he would lack competence, nor into Public School 207, where he's not yet welcome, but into Christ the King High School —where the action is.

The first half of this paper is based on the assumption that no one, priest or layman, will be an educator unless he is an *evocative* teacher. The non-evocative priest-teacher will only create anti-clericalism and cause his students to look back on their Schools with a sense of distaste and of having been cheated. Given the fact we are dedicated to being evocative teachers, the priest-humanist and the priest-scientist are needed as witnesses to Christ in this period when the here-to-fore disparate disciplines of education are converging on God and man and are concerned with the psychological, philosophical, and theological implications of reality. If and when religiously oriented layman of the future—products, we hope, of the education of today—rise in great numbers to witness Christ as truth continues to converge upon itself, then the role of the priest-teacher in formal education may lessen. Until that time the priest-teacher's role is essential to the life of the religiously oriented school.

It is one thing to ask, as we have done above, if the priest-teacher has a role in education today. The answer, as I see it, is in the affirmative. But it is another question to ask, can the *Jesuit* teacher remain in education today? Are we training evocative teachers today? Are Jesuits psychologically ready to remain in education? And particularly in *secondary* education? In a word, the first half of this paper may be addressed to a question that is a bit factitious (Oh, yes, we *should* stay in education); the real questions are whether the individual Jesuit *can* stay in education and whether he *wants* to and whether he *will.*

I suggest that the Jesuit won't stay in secondary education and shouldn't stay there if uncultured teachers continue to teach him. In his day, a day of rich culture, Ignatius introduced into that culture the spirit of action, the spirit of the promoter. Today the times, at least in this country, are reversed: In our day of great action and great promotion, I think Ignatius would well introduce a return to a *genuine* spirit of culture. Perhaps we have misread Ignatius. Be that as it may, I venture to suggest that most Jesuit high school teachers today are *promoters* of culture, men of generous exhausting action but not men of culture. And I further suggest that, as long as we remain mere promoters of culture, our day

in education and our success in that field is limited psychologically for our teachers and effectively for our students.

If Jesuits were generally men of deep culture, why is it that our authorship abounds so much in works of action (sociology, morality, theology, the new philosophy) and so little in the humanities? Can we name one great Jesuit novelist? (I'm not even saying there should be one. But it is certainly strange that men of culture had not produced at least one.) The reason might lie in the fact that, unlike Newman who saw knowledge—and therefore culture—as an end in itself, the Jesuit sees knowledge as a means to an end and so he became a promoter of culutre.

If Jesuits were men of deep culture and if their provincials, rectors, and principals were men of culture rather than of action, would our teachers have a workload, a student-teacher ratio, and an extracurricular burden that make it possible for these men of culture only to work, work, work—never to read, never to discuss. Is the gradual demise of the classics in our school due to the fact that we are gradually becoming uncultured men who do not love the humanities. If we were men of culture would we have so many teachers of Jesuits who have not learned even the basics of the art of oral communication?

If these accusations have any foundations (and accusations are always easy to make), then the action of the moment is in our own home: the production of men of genuine culture.

Secondly I suggest that we won't stay in secondary education if we keep training romantic Jesuits who really believe in the "beautiful hands of the priest." (Adolescents will never notice those beautiful hands and could hardly care less about their benediction.) Nor can we stay in secondary education if we produce Jesuits who pursue authority and its fruits with an empty hunger that is almost paranoid. (Again adolescents have a way of stripping a man of this kind of authority and driving him out of the classroom into the arms of adults.) Nor will we survive in education if we train Jesuits who believe more in the apostolate of emergency than in the apostolate of normalcy: such a man will speak of being content with his teaching assignment because it gives him time to give retreats and days of recollection. What he really means is that it becomes possible to excape from the drudgery of the high school classroom to a place where "the beautiful hands of the priest" or his authority in Godly matters will once again be recognized.

Thirdly, I suggest that we will not stay in secondary education unless something is done about the second-class citizenship that Jesuit teachers have in *secondary* schools. In order to give them a citizenship equal to college and university, I make the following, perhaps wild, recommendations:

(1) That high schools cease to be considered as secondary houses of probation for the training of scholastics;

(2) That the discrimination implied in the factual policy of "lots of rights and privileges" for university Jesuits and "regularity and discipline" for high school Jesuits be corrected;

(3) That the chain of frightened interaction from provincial to rector to principal to teachers to student be broken;

(4) That we stop accepting into the Society the autocratic, frightened, non-evocative type of person whom we then assign to frightened high schools;

(5) That more and more PhD's be stationed in high schools and that present high-school teachers be encouraged to get their doctorates for high school teaching;

(6) That just as in college, high-school teachers should not be an extension of administration but administration should be subservient to the teacher;

(7) That the effective high-school teacher who is an eccentric be allowed to be what he is as is the eccentric college teacher. (Dylan Thomas would be fired from most of our high schools.)

(8) That the high school teacher be king of his classroom as long as he produces.

(9) That high school and university professors be periodically exchanged lest they become monad capsules insulated against one another.

The Priestly Apostolate in Jesuit Secondary Education . . . in Counseling

Rev. Patrick J. Rice, S.J.

Despite the obvious needs of the Inner City and the secular college campus and a dozen other areas, and despite the obvious restlessness of not a few American Jesuits to abandon our schools—or thin part in our schools—and go out to meet those needs head-on, a preponderance of evidence strongly suggests that many Jesuits in the United States will remain involved in secondary schools. Evidence for that probability is to be found, for instance, in the minutes of the Madrid Congress on the Educational Apostolate of the Society,[1] held in January of this year. Evidence is to be found, as well, in Father General's recent letter to the Fathers of the French Jesuit schools.[2] Evidence is to be found, it would seem, in the title announced for the address that Father General is scheduled to deliver to this audience tomorrow. Contrary evidence is difficult to find either in the Vatican II Declaration on Education or in the reports of key participants in our ongoing General Congregation.

There is reason to believe (and reason to hope) that the orientation and structure of the Jesuit high school in the United States may change in some respects, perhaps rather drastically and perhaps fairly soon. But it seems certain that the traditional Jesuit commitment to quality secondary education will not change, however the Society in America may see fit to redefine "quality."

One ideal of Jesuit education that seems certain to remain unaltered is what Father General's two immediate predecessors called *personalis alumnorum cura*[3]—personal concern for our students, concern for our students as persons. That *personalis alumnorum cura* appears as a distinctive dimension of Jesuit education not only in the documents[4] but also in the memories of the most grateful alumni of Jesuit high schools.

The position of this position-paper may be briefly stated: granted

---

1 *Minutes of the Congress on the Educational Apostolate of the Society of Jesus* (Madrid, Spain, January 7-12, 1966), translated from the French of Fr. Jean Gonsette, S.J., by Fr. Paul Andrews, S.J.

2 *JEQ*, vol. xxviii, no. 2 (October 1965), 69-74.

3 *Instructio pro Assistentia Americae de ordinandis universitatibus, collegiis, ac scholis altis et de praeparandis eorundem magistris* (New York: Jesuit Educational Association, 1948), Art. 7.

4 Cf. *Manual for Jesuit High-School Administrators* (New York: Jesuit Educational Association, 1957), 1, 233.

that American Jesuits are going to remain devoted to excellence in the education of adolescents, and granted that concern for our students is going to continue to be one of the touchstones of Jesuit education, then priests—more priests—should be allocated to the work of counseling in our secondary schools.

If I am to make my case for counseling as a legitimate priestly work, I must focus clearly what I mean by counseling and offer a defense against the charge that counseling is a luxury in a Jesuit school.

Counseling in schools has historically been tied to testing. But perceptive counselors have long since learned that dealing with a counselee in the light of test-scores is apt to make him feel more like a profile than a person. The more thoughtful counselors in schools today maintain that testing and test-interpretation should be the task not of the counselor but of the "psychometrist"—a person who has yet to find his way onto the staff of the average Jesuit high school.

Counseling in schools has also been historically tied to guidance. But counselors have come to realize in recent years that counseling is not guidance. The label "guidance counselor"—still widely used —has become a contradiction. In the strictest sense of the phrase, a "guidance person" in a school is one who gathers information (about courses and careers and colleges) and communicates that information, perhaps with appropriate advice.

Counseling in Jesuit schools has historically been tied to spiritual direction and moral direction. But counselors today do not see counseling as primarily spiritual or moral; and, to greater or lesser degree, they do not see it as direction.

If counseling is not testing or guidance or spiritual and moral direction, what is counseling? Let us suppose that a boy named Dennis knocks at the door of an office that bears the sign "Counselor." What happens if behind that door sits a professional counselor?

The counselor welcomes Dennis into an attractive and private room and sees to it that he is as comfortably seated as a boy can be under the circumstances. The counselor has already begun to communicate what an effective counselor must believe: that Dennis is, at least for the present, the most important person in the counselor's world. When the counselor says: "How goes it?" (or words to that effect), Dennis begins by telling him that he is having

trouble with his Latin—and with his Latin teacher. Dennis is a freshman. He is failing Latin. He is doing only somewhat better in his other subjects, though he was an honor student back in grammar school. He has also alienated his Latin teacher (and the prefect of discipline, as well) by etching his negative sentiments about the teacher deeply into the surface of his classroom-desk. The counselor listens, saying perhaps nothing more than: "Things seem to be going really wrong in the Latin department of your life." Because Dennis senses that the counselor is really hearing him and understanding his situation from his point of view, he goes on to tell the counselor of other things—deeper things—that are going wrong in other departments of his life. Dennis, it develops, is a diabetic. He has been feeling shaky lately; he hasn't been getting his insulin on schedule, now that his mother has decided that Dennis is old enough to give his own injections. He was embarrased at a recent gym night because he couldn't last in a basketball game and couldn't share the Cokes that were served—and the others didn't understand. When Dennis finished grammar school, he applied to a minor seminary. He was turned down because of his diabetes. He has given up all thought of the priesthood. In fact, he has been skipping obligatory Mass at school. After a thoughtful pause, he wonders aloud: "Do people ever marry diabetics?" Because he is not doing well in his studies and because he is becoming irregular about his insulin, he feels irritable most of the time. He is the only child of a late marriage. His father is at home all day, recovering from a coronary. And one thing really worries him, he says on the verge of tears: when he shows his irritation around the house, his mother keeps screaming, "You're driving your poor, sick father to his grave!"

This is, of course, merely the skeleton of the story that Dennis tells the counselor. It is not really what the counselor hears, because it is stripped of the feeling-tone, the implications, of Dennis' words and looks and gestures. The counselor hears Dennis expressing feelings and emotions and judgments about his environment and about himself—feelings and emotions and judgments that Dennis probably has not fully recognized before. He hears Dennis saying: "I feel that my mother has rejected me in giving up the responsibility for the insulin on which my life depends"; "I'm puzzled and worried because I don't seem as bright as I used to be—and I wonder if that means that there's something wrong with my mind

as well as my body"; "I wonder whether anyone could love me, or whether I'm doomed to a lonely life"; "I've been skipping Mass because I'm mad at God, Who gave me diabetes and then turned me down because of it"; and "I'm really worried because maybe I am driving my poor, sick father to his grave." This is what the counselor hears.

What does the counselor do? When Dennis has finished his story (or the present installment thereof), the counselor has already done his job—except for inviting Dennis back. If he had not been doing his job throughout—if he had interrupted, for instance, to inform or advise or reproach—the story would probably never have unfolded beyond the Latin and the disfigured desk. The counselor has done his job by communicating to Dennis his eagerness to understand and his willingness to accept the person behind the story. The quality of the counselor's listening and the quality of his response combine to say: "Yes, Dennis, I understand how you feel; and I can accept you. However the environment may judge your behavior—however you may judge yourself—I see you as a person of worth."

Let me not be misunderstood to mean that the counselor *approves* of Dennis' unacceptable *behavior.* The counselor's response is not to behavior. The counselor responds to the person. If the counselor does his job well, Dennis will not confuse acceptance of him as a person with approval of his behavior.

In communicating understanding and acceptance of the person who is Dennis, the counselor has done his job. He has helped Dennis to understand and to accept himself. An expert on the counseling process claims—and considerable research supports the claim—that a counselee who meets with understanding and acceptance "will find himself becoming better integrated, more able to function effectively; will become more similar to the person he would like to be; will become more self-directing and self-confident; will become more of a person, . . . unique and self-expressive; will be more understanding, more acceptant of others; will be able to cope with the problems of life more adequately and more comfortably."[5] Surely these words describe a growth toward the psychological maturity that is one of the goals of Jesuit education. Such maturity will not result, of course, from a single counseling-session. But experience has shown that growth toward maturity

5 Carl R. Rogers, *On Becoming a Person* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961), 38.

can be expected from a series of counseling-sessions over an extended period of time.

Counseling of this sort is not a luxury in a Jesuit high school. The adolescent needs such counseling because he is a developing person in search of selfhood. Anyone who says, for instance, that "freshmen don't need counseling" either doesn't know freshmen or doesn't know counseling.

But please note what I am *not* saying when I say that the high-school boy needs counseling: I am not saying that 100% of our student-body needs to be "seen by a counselor" on a given number of brief occasions with a certain regularity each year. The adolescent needs *counseling*—not just "being seen." And he needs counseling when he experiences the need. An adolescent's need for counseling is not experienced on schedule or in alphabetical order—and it cannot ordinarily be met in a 10-minute conference —regardless of what the practice of some schools suggests. The best counseling session is the one initiated voluntarily by the counselee. The degree to which students voluntarily seek counseling is probably the most reliable criterion of the quality of the counseling offered.

If Jesuits propose to conduct excellent schools distinguished by their concern for the students as persons, then quality counseling is not a luxury. But the calibre of our counseling will be no better than the calibre of our counseling-personnel. Our schools cannot afford to staff their counseling-office with men who have demonstrated their incompetence elsewhere.

Effective counseling presupposes certain natural traits in the counselor. In the counselor in the Jesuit high school, perhaps the most desirable natural trait is a positive tendency to respect the boy who is fumbling toward adulthood. But the counselor must also be a man humble enough to be taught how to communicate his respect.

For counseling does demand training—however simple it may sound, however well endowed the counselor may be by nature. A number of agencies[6] have blueprinted minimal training programs demanding two years of graduate work for counselors. There are in those programs some content-courses without which a Jesuit counselor can probably function adequately. But no counselor can do without the excruciating experience of the supervised prac-

---

6 Cf., for example, *American Psychologist*, vol. 17, no. 3 (March 1962), 149-152.

ticum in which he is forced to hear himself—and hear himself criticized—as he strains to listen and struggles to communicate understanding and acceptance of a real person. Perhaps few Provinces can see their way clear to give their present counselors time out for extensive study. But perhaps more Provinces could do what the New England Province did at Fairfield in the summer of 1964: offer an in-training practicum in counseling under excellent supervision. At the very least, the recommended two-year programs indicate the direction in which Jesuit counselor-training should move. The Jesuit school cannot afford to be content to retitle courses in education and in pastoral and moral theology or to invoke grandfather clauses in a frantic effort to simulate a counseling-staff to meet minimal regional accreditation requirements. Perhaps it is such emergency measures in our past that account for the marked absence of Jesuit leadership even in Catholic associations of secondary-school counselors, which are capably dominated by nuns and brothers and laymen and other priests.

If Provincials and Province Prefects have chosen counselors carefully and trained them well, it remains for the individual school to provide them with a framework in which they can counsel. Suitable space is important for counseling—suitable in terms of comfort and privacy. Suitable time is even more important. If a counselor is to provide professional counseling on a voluntary basis, he must have large blocks of time in which he is available during the class-day to students who can be readily released from class for counseling. The counselor cannot function well if other duties force him to relegate his counseling to odd moments of the day. That is not to say that a counselor should not teach at all, particularly if he is a good teacher. Good teaching most quickly establishes a man's competence in the eyes of the student-body of a Jesuit school; and because the counselor should be seen as someone not totally outside the school, it is probably wise for him to spend a few hours in the classroom each week, teaching something well—preferably, perhaps, not religion.

Why, finally, is it appropriate that at least some of our trained counselors should be priests?

Let me admit clearly that a competent lay counselor makes a better counselor than an incompetent priest. But, other things being equal, (especially training in counseling), there does seem to

be a peculiar connection of propriety between priest and counselor in the Jesuit high school.

Priests are the stable element in our schools. As a group, the scholastics perhaps most clearly communicate *personalis alumnorum cura.* But the concern that they communicate is bound to vary as the scholastic personnel varies from year to year. The *personalis alumnorum cura* will be more surely and more permanently communicated if more priests are allocated to counseling. If priests are not generally engaged in functions that most clearly express concern for the student as a person, our students may judge that the scholastics "care" simply because scholastics are young. They may conclude, unjustly, that even these scholastics will cease to care when they "grow up to be priests." Such a conclusion is fraught with obviously undesirable implications for the Church.

Adolescents are not by nature trusting. Yet the ideal counseling relationship can develop only in an atmosphere of trust. In the counseling relationship, the adolescent satisfies primarily his need to be understood and accepted. He wants to be understood even at his "worst." He knows that unless someone really understands what he considers to be the "worst" about him—and accepts him as so understood—he can never be sure that he is being accepted by anyone as he really is. The priest, whom he is pre-conditioned to trust and to whom he is already accustomed to confiding some of the "worst" (his sins), has, if he does not misuse it, an advantage in establishing a counseling relationship that neither the scholastic nor the layman has as such.

Despite *The National Catholic Reporter,* the American priest is still known as "Father." Many boys in our schools today are plagued specifically by "father-problems." Their fathers have given them physical life and then proceeded gradually to abandon them psychologically. It is good for such a boy, if only because he may someday be a father himself, to encounter a "Father" who is deeply interested in him as a person and can communicate his interest, as a good counselor can.

Similarly, the priest is an authority-figure. In virtue of his ordination and the powers that it bestows, the priest stands for the authority of God and the authority of the Church more clearly in the mind of a boy than does the layman or even the scholastic. Adolescents, striving for autonomy, are notoriously troubled by authority. In every other situation in the Jesuit school, the boy

experiences the priest precisely as an authority-figure. It is helpful for him to experience the same priest in the counseling-situation primarily as one who understands and accepts him. The ordained representative of God who communicates understanding and acceptance of a boy's free will and a boy's ultimate responsibility for what he makes of his own God-given life will help that boy to understand that God, "the great authority-figure," can be understanding and accepting of the person even when He must disapprove of the person's behavior.

The authentic priestly function is, surely, to live as a sign of Christ in one's own world. There is a sense, of course, in which the priest in the world of the Jesuit school is most Christ-like—and therefore most priestly—at the altar and in the confessional. But the boy who sees him at the altar sees the priest dealing with "the people of God"—and the adolescent boy yearns to be recognized as a person, distinct from any people. Even in the confessional, a boy may feel that to the priest—and thus to Christ—he "just happens to be the next one in line." The Christ Who healed by laying His hands upon individual "little people" one-by-one (Lk 4: 40), the Christ Who understood what was in (the heart of) man (Jn 2: 25), the Christ Who could look upon a young man and love him (Mk 10: 21)—this is the Christ to Whom the adolescent boy best responds. To this Christ the priest gives witness perhaps nowhere more effectively than in the counseling-relationship.

Surely, finally, it is a valid priestly ministry to witness to Christian charity. Perhaps those who would give up our schools will most of all concede that point. If the charity of the Christian Gospel means what Fr. John McKenzie says it means in his *Dictionary of the Bible*—if it means loving one's neighbor regardless of the neighbor's behavior—then counseling is authentic priestly work because, in a word, counseling is charity.

Jesuit High Schools and The Younger Jesuits

Eugene E. Grollmes, S.J.

To represent the thinking of the younger Jesuits on any topic before any audience would be humbling for any man who, so asked, was aware of the impossible character of this task. To represent the thinking of the younger Jesuits on Jesuit secondary education before an audience of fellow Jesuits who are long experienced and deeply involved in secondary education is not only humbling but, indeed, frightening. I feel somewhat like the worm who crawled into a convention of blackbirds. However, since it is too late to flee the task, I will do my best to represent the thinking of at least those younger Jesuits whom I have known for many years and also those regents, special students, and philosophers with whom I have recently had opportunity to talk.

My talk is based on three presuppositions. First, I presuppose human experience does much to substantiate the belief that a man's vocation is commonly, if not without exception, a complexus. For example, a man called to be a husband and father of a family may also find himself called to be a lawyer, an amateur golfer, a poet, and a teacher of jurisprudence at a nearby university. Similarly for a priest, within his vocation to the priesthood he may find that he is called to be a multiplicity of things, one which may be to be a teacher, and perhaps a teacher of geophysics at that. Hence, if within the complexus of his vocation, a priest finds that he is called to be a teacher, the justification of his teaching, it seems to me, lies not so much in the effects of his teaching as in his vocation. To anyone viewing the long involvement of the Society of Jesus in education, it would seem that history provides evidence in support of the suspicion that many men called to be Jesuits are also called to be teachers. However, I think it should be noted at least in passing that should there be clear evidence a particular Jesuit is not called to teach, he should not be forced to be a teacher.

Secondly, I presuppose that the question of ultimate concern here this morning is not why should a priest be in the classroom but why should a Jesuit priest be in the classroom? Regarding this question, I presuppose that everyone who has entered and

stayed in the Society of Jesus has done so not because of what he could do *alone* but rather what he could do *in company with others.* What Jesuits, through cooperative efforts, have been able to accomplish in their schools is one of the most illustrious chapters of their history. The historical effectiveness then of Jesuit secondary schools in promoting the greater glory of God would be evidence in support of Jesuits, though perhaps not simply priests, continuing to cooperate together in running secondary schools. However, despite their history, the recurring test for the continued existence of Jesuit high schools has to be their present effectiveness and their potential to preserve and improve their effectiveness.

Thirdly, I presuppose, judging from the letter *On Our Ministries,* that Jesuit schools in the contemporary world are to be of the highest quality, a quality measured principally in terms of the accomplishment of stated purposes.

These are the three presuppositions fundamental to my talk.

At the outset I think it is important for all to be aware that the younger Jesuits are more critical of Jesuit colleges and universities than they are of Jesuit high schools. Regarding the colleges and universities, their criticism is aimed at both the continued existence and the quality, whereas, regarding the high schools, their criticism is aimed almost solely at the quality. Also, I think it is important for all to be aware that even as the younger Jesuits criticize the high schools, there is a widespread willingness among them to admit that in general Jesuit high schools are good. As one philosopher put it, "We are of the growing conviction that the high schools are the best thing we have." Hence, before outlining what seem to be their major criticisms of Jesuit high schools, I ask all to remember the younger Jesuits are not unaware of the value of these schools.

What then are some of the points on which their attention focuses when the younger Jesuits criticize Jesuit high schools? Listing them in no particular order, the major criticisms seem to be these.

1) THE LACK OF CREATIVE THOUGHT. The younger Jesuits think there is too little creative thought going on among the faculty, particularly among those permanently assigned to the school. Often enough they find the older Jesuits do not only fail to do any creative thinking or to make any positive contribution to the improvement of the school but are a positive hin-

drance to any such improvement. Yet despite repeated failure to use the time productively, these latter are the ones provided with leisure time in which to do creative thinking.

2) THE NEED TO BE CATHOLIC. Deeply rooted in the younger Jesuits is the conviction that a Jesuit high school should be Catholic in something more than its admissions policy. Theology and liturgy should not only have a place but an important and central role in the school. Moreover, rather than an almost exclusive concern for his own salvation, a graduate of a Jesuit high school should be keenly aware of the needs of and the opportunities for improving society. However, though they are of course concerned about vocations to religious life, the younger Jesuits do not think a lack of vocations to religious life constitutes sufficient reason for starting a high school.

3) AN APPRECIATION OF THE FINE ARTS. Every student in a Jesuit high school, according to the younger Jesuits, ought at least to be given an opportunity to develop a deep appreciation for the fine arts. Why Jesuit high schools have been and remain notoriously weak in this area of education is indeed a puzzle for many younger Jesuits, some of whom would be more than willing to give themselves to the filling of this need.

4) THE IMPORTANCE OF PERSONAL CONTACT. It is a firm belief of the younger Jesuits that in every Jesuit high school there should be ample opportunity for the students to have personal contact with their teachers. Fundamental to this belief is the conviction that the moment of personal contact between teacher and student is, or at least ought to be, the high noon of education. Hence, when a Jesuit high school becomes so big that personal contact between teacher and student becomes a rarity or only the privilege of comparatively few students, the school is too big. Furthermore, it is precisely the personal contact of the student with men who by religious vows have dedicated themselves to the service of God and their fellow man that should be the hub of the moral formation provided by a Jesuit high school.

5) EFFECTIVE EDUCATIONAL AIMS. It is also a belief of the younger Jesuits, and this point is closely related to the foregoing one, that Jesuits should run not a single school more than what they can run well. To their mind educational aims should dictate economic policy and not economic policy dictate educational aims. The kind of education Jesuits want to give (and I re-

mind you that the presupposition is that the education we want to give is of the highest quality) should be the determining principle in deciding all questions pertaining to the number and size of Jesuit high schools. Should anyone still hold the theory that Jesuits run schools primarily to save souls, and the more boys they educate the more souls they will save, the younger Jesuits besides questioning the reasonableness of the major would be quick to point out that the help given towards salvation depends in large measure on the kind of education the students receive. Granting a poor education is better than none, should a willing and able student receive a poor education in a Jesuit school, the Jesuits can hardly claim they have helped this student save his soul. On the contrary, his poor education, and particularly his discovery of it, may prove to be the first step to the loss of his soul. If the purpose of Jesuit schools is to educate boys to the fullness of their ability according to the image of Christ, then they should accept only as many students as, first, they can educate and, secondly, as they can educate to the fullness of their ability and, thirdly, as they can educate according to the image of Christ. Perhaps this threefold purpose is not the aim of Jesuit education. But if it is, then the Jesuits should accept only as many students as they can educate to the fullness of their ability according to the image of Christ. If serious about their aim, the Jesuits might in certain circumstances, rather than open a school, close one.

6) COMPETENCY. The younger Jesuits do not think that anyone, whether he be priest or regent, should be permitted to teach in a Jesuit high school who is not competent. Granting that regency is an important experience in the formation of a Jesuit, the younger Jesuits do not think that this experience should be purchased at the price of detriment to the school. The same standards of competency should be demanded of the Jesuits as of the laymen on the faculty. Those Jesuits who do not measure up to these standards should be directed into some other apostolate more suited to their abilities. Conversely, the younger Jesuits would like superiors and administrators to both recognize and make allowance for whatever competencies a man may possess. For example, should a man have a masters degree in counselling, he should be permitted to counsel whether or not he is a priest. Also, the younger Jesuits are opposed, in general, to any arrangement like having an economics major teach history or a psychology

major teach French. If a regent is competent in a field not included in the high school curriculum, the younger Jesuits believe he should be permitted to teach in college.

7) STUDENT RESPONSIBILITY AND VERTICAL COMMUNICATION. Giving an increase of responsibility to the students in a Jesuit high school has the favor of the younger Jesuits. The theory here is that if the Jesuits are going to produce graduates who are capable of shouldering responsibility, these graduates must have shouldered responsibility as students. Hence, students in a Jesuit high school should be afforded ample freedom to make decisions and to live with the consequences of these decisions. Too often, it seems, students in a Jesuit high school have little opportunity to decide anything other than to do willingly or unwillingly what they have been told to do. The younger Jesuits would even like to have, in so far as it is possible, the students represented in the government of the school. The improvement of vertical communication from all levels of the school should be a serious, if not constant, concern of the administrators of a Jesuit high school.

8) CREATIVE LEADERSHIP. Along with promoting creativity among the faculty, the younger Jesuits would encourage more and more creative leadership among the administrators of Jesuit high schools. To foster this creativity, they suggest that the principal of a Jesuit high school should be, by reason of his office, independent of a rector in his direction of the high school. If for some reason long administrative experience proves that it is desirable to have not only a superior of the community along with the principal but a rector over the principal, then only men of long experience with high schools and, even more important, men with a thorough knowledge of contemporary trends in high school education should be appointed to be these rectors. Since, in all likelihood, it would be very difficult to find such men who are not already needed as principals, perhaps it would be better to let the principals of Jesuit high schools be free of rectors.

9) PURSUIT OF TRUTH. If justice is to be done to the students in a Jesuit high school, the younger Jesuits believe there must be an obvious pursuit of truth among the faculty. If this kind of pursuit is going to occur, then all the members of the faculty—regents, laymen, and Fathers—must be given schedules that provide time to do research. This is to say, their schedules

must provide them with time to read books and current articles on the matter they are teaching and not just the chapter assigned to the students. If the number of students makes such schedules impossible in a Jesuit high school, then it would seem that possibly the school is too big for its present faculty. As a footnote to the above, it would seem only fitting in view of the general high calibre of the members of a Jesuit high school faculty, that at least occasionally from this faculty some published articles appear.

10) THE REINSTATEMENT OF IMAGE AND PERSON. The younger Jesuits think that somehow the status of a high school teacher has to be reinstated in the Society of Jesus. There seems to be a rather general devaluation of his work as something minor league or something to be done when a Jesuit cannot do anything else. It is significant, as one of the regents pointed out, that of all the representatives of the American Assistancy attending the General Congregation not one of them is presently involved in secondary education. If adequate numbers of the younger Jesuits are to be attracted to high school teaching, it seems that the restoration of the high school teacher's image is a necessity. If this image is to be restored, it also seems a necessity that the life of a regent be a little more human, for the younger Jesuit's image of a high school teacher is mightily influenced by his personal experience during regency. Unfortunately, as a regent he too often found or finds himself treated as a cog in a machine rather than as a person with obligations to himself as well as to others. As one regent put it, when asked about teaching in high school after ordination, "I don't want to get stuck in the situation." Rather than get stuck in the situation, many of the younger Jesuits are aiming at being college teachers or are looking about for another form of the apostolate in which to work. To many the social apostolate seems an open door.

Rather than be disheartened by these criticisms of Jesuit secondary education, it would be well, I think, for you as Jesuit high school administrators and teachers to remember that in many, many instances it was you who taught the men who are now the younger Jesuits to be creative; it was you who taught them that faith should be central in the thought and life of a Christian; it was you who taught them to value and appreciate the fine arts; it was you who taught them to love and have a personal concern for their fellow man; it was you who taught them to be men of

principle and to be discontent with mediocrity; it was you who taught them to regard and respect the competencies of their fellow man; it was you who taught them the educational value of carrying responsibility; it was you who taught them the necessity of freedom for creative thinking and leadership; it was you who both taught them and instilled in them the desire to pursue truth, and finally, it was you who taught them that a person is not and, according to the law of God, cannot be treated as a thing. And now, both to your credit and to their credit, they are demanding that what you taught them be regarded.

Letting the past and the present be a reminder in the future and believing that Jesuit administrators and teachers are eager to improve their schools, I would like to take this occasion, if I may, to propose that rather than trying to be first, Jesuits try to be themselves. I propose, and this proposal has won the acceptance of the younger Jesuits with whom I have discussed it, that rather than simply imitating what is being done elsewhere, Jesuits run schools that only Jesuits can run. This is to say, there should be a genuine uniqueness about the schools Jesuits run. In determining and developing this uniqueness, not only the present state of Jesuit high schools should be considered, but also the history of the Jesuits, the training of the Jesuits, the spirit of the Jesuits. It probably exceeds the capabilities of one man to describe the ideal Jesuit school. But I think such an ideal might well emerge from the concerted and sustained thought and discussion of men with the capabilities and long experience of the Jesuits here today.

As possible guidelines for this thought and discussion, I would suggest that:

First, the ideal Jesuit high school derives its uniqueness not so much from what is taught as from what the Jesuits are. Hence, There is indeed a necessity that the Jesuits be authentic.

Secondly, the school should be much involved in relating modern youth to Christianity and Christianity to modern youth, and some of the courses offered should manifest a concern for not only the theological, but the historical, the sociological, the psychological, and scientific aspects of this question.

Thirdly, the school should produce students who have an education unexcelled in breadth and depth and who are not only obedient to legitimate authority but, more important, because of the example given them, are obedient to the grace in their lives.

In a word, they should be truly educated young men who are humble enough to be obedient and obedient enough to be brave.

Whatever may be the unique qualities of a Jesuit high school, fundamental to them all there will be among the religious administrators and faculty a humble but motivating awareness: We are the Jesuits.

Horizontal Aspects of Christianity Applied to Youth

TERRENCE P. TOEPKER

In his book *The Christian Commitment,* Carl Rahner says that it is difficult to say the right thing and more difficult to say it at the right time. Today I have been asked not only to say the right things and at the right time; but, also, to the right people.

In order that we might establish some sort of common ground, I thought that I might mention that we probably have been reading much of the same literature: Encyclicals, Council Documents, Chardin, Rahner, Greely, Fromm, Lepp, Suenens, Cox, Martin Luther King, and many others. (This is not intended to be anything more than a brief mention of some authors. It certainly is not a "bibliography.")

Certainly we have at least one common interest—the training of young men in the Image of Christ. It is this common interest that has brought me here today. As a first parry with the topic, I would like to ask whether we, on a high school level, are attempting to train young men in His full Image or just a partial one. If the definition of a Jesuit High School is to be arrived at by means of statistics or by means of an operational definition, then I think that the definition would be as follows: a school which prepares young men to enter into college. If the school does this, and only this, then I feel that it is no better than its public school counterpart and is less justified. It seems to me that a Christian education cannot consist of a core of the three R's and a discussion of the 6th and 9th commandments. Somehow or other we must find a way to communicate the true hierarchy of values. We must somehow be able to put the "tantum-quantum" rule of St. Ignatius into a positive light: use things to the *best of my ability* and not in so far as they do *not lead me to sin.* We must see things in this positive light, a light that is polarized by a real Christian love and not just a fear of not knowing the answer to question number so and so of the Baltimore Catechism! If most Jesuit students were questioned about the meaning of the word *magis* in the Ignatian context, they would probably translate it into *more* fees, *more* homework, and *more* jugs.

The problem is a formidable one. And it is somewhat com-

pounded by those who ask the question: why approach youth at all? Why not let them grow to adulthood and then evangelize them? As you walk around school, or on a downtown street, or chaperone a sock-hop, you can take a good look at the "kids." The girls have ironed-hair and the boys have theirs in curls. Just last week, one of the players on an opposing tennis team had to use a couple of hair pins to keep the hair out of his eyes! You get the impression that you have about as much in common with them as Leonard Bernstein and Batman! It is very easy to think (rationalize) that the communication barrier is not worth attempting to break.

Yet we do have something in common with them. Something so glaring that I am almost embarrassed to mention it (especially here). It is the overpowering awareness of the Mystical Body and a concern for *all* the people of God. This is the reality in which we eat, sleep, live, breathe, work, and play. It is in the light of this reality that I have enough courage to approach this platform today. This is our reason for being. But this awareness *is not* and will not be incorporated into their young lives unless some one whom they can respect and trust introduces them to this new experience. They will reach chronological maturity regardless of their knowledge of Christ and His mission. Christian maturity is not just assumed at age 21 as is the right to vote. Christian maturity is both a psychological and spiritual experience. Values are formed and life goals are set. During these crucial teen years the intensity of the commitments is almost unbelieveable.

I would like to borrow Fr. Greely's anology here for a moment. Imagine that you were born blind and at age 16 or 17 you suddenly received your sight. What a glorious and splendid place, full of color, motion, light and shadows. Both a marvelous and a fearsome place. Now in much the same way, for the child and early adolescent who has taken the world and himself pretty much for granted, there comes a time, amidst great stress and some confusion, when he discovers the world and he sees himself mirrored in it. This is thrilling, exciting, and fascinating. Now, for the Christian, this discovery experience should be many times more dazzling. The discovery of the mighty reality by which the entire human race is one. Is there a more advantageous time than these transitional teen years for undergoing a conversion? What better time for seeing all things in a new light? What better time than these enthusiastic youthful vigorous years is there for waking up

from the trance of childhood. What better time to "see God in all things." This is the key to horizontal Christianity. A young person can go up only by looking at the things which are spread out around him.

As we approach youth, what should be our objective? It should be to help the young man to grow in Christ, to become fully the self that he is capable of becoming. As Fr. Chardin has put it: "to become aware of that magnificent responsibility and splendid ambition that is ours—of becoming our own self." What a tremendous and worthwhile effort on our part!

But the realist quickly will ask: "How?" Practically speaking, it is a process of education. (e duco; to lead out of) Not in the sense of a classroom situation but by bringing out what is there potentially by giving him a way to practice something specific that he *can* do.

And what are our tools? First and foremost is your own personality. Those things which make you you. There cannot be any phoniness or holding back. They will trust you in so far as you are willing to give to them. Your way of living is most important. What you say means nothing if you are not true to your vision. How can a Christic view of reality be identified with if you don't know someone who believes in Him with all his heart—and lives likes he believes it!

Christ really did suffer and die for us. Christ really did rise from the dead. And the Church really does continue His work in the world. We are all part of this magnificent work on which the future of man depends. It is not like the Easter Bunny or Santa Claus. This is the reality. It is the reality that we live in and it is the reality that I want to live in.

Why approach youth? Because of all the people of God, they have perhaps the greatest potentiality for becoming the Christianizing force in the world of tomorrow. Our objective is to have them grow in Christ, to become fully human, and to fulfill themselves. Our basic tools are who we are and what we are becoming.

But what about all the difficulties? You must be a realist! It seems to me that if you tell a player about all the injuries that football players can possibly receive, about all the long hours in the sun, about all the ridicule from the coaches, and so on, you will shortly find out that you don't have any players! Of course there are difficulties, but you can't start there. With regard to problems and difficulties, it is my general impression that more

things are solved with perspiration than with inspiration. You just can't wait for a lightning bolt to knock you off your horse.

The most obvious difficulty is just one of age. Youth simply lacks experience and maturity. This presents a difficulty; but, on the other hand, youth has the advantage of seemingly tireless amounts of energy and enthusiasm. So maybe I should say that age presents more of a problem for the adults than it does for the teen-ager.

It seems to be that the biggest and toughest problem that youth faces is one that I have labeled the "real world problem." What is the real world all about? What is important in life? What part is the truth and what part is just a game that the adults are playing? What part is sleight of hand and adult chicanery?

Are the young people prepared to come to grips with the whole reality? Or have they been environmentally conditioned like a hot-house plant, one that will quickly wilt under the radiation of natural light? Do we teach them to cram everything into prefabricated boxes or pigeon holes? If they come across an unusual piece of information, do we cut it, push it, twist it, normalize and distort it in such a way that it will fit into an already existing conformity pattern? It seems to me that this smells a bit of Pavlov's poor dog. I heard one person say that religion was just a "whistling in the dark." Is this the reality that we are presenting?

In the modern world it is very difficult to hide the truth. Especially since most of today's kids are "T.V. Precocious." They know what is happening all over the world right when it happens. Birmingham, Vietnam, Mississippi, Washington, Los Angeles: all are as close as Huntley-Brinkley. Through television they can experience things vicariously which their parents never had or knew: a presidential inauguration, a space shot, a civil rights demonstration—all right in your own living room. The young people have the opportunity to form a social conscience that is more world-inclusive than at any other time in history. Television plays but a small part of this complicated social matrix. Their school, friends, family, work, and so on: each forms an element in this complex structure.

This past summer a high school girl asked me: "Why do the people who tell us about the Good Samaritan, live like the priest and the Levite? Why are they content to walk right by without noticing or caring?" Why do people argue about the better or

the best thing to do and fail to do even the good? Somehow we must show them the common thread running through this matrix, the diagonalizing factor, the Body of Christ.

If Christianity is so great why don't Christians pass up their cocktail parties and spend some time in a poverty program? Why do Catholics react against integration so strongly? If I may quote from *America:* "It cannot be too strongly emphasized that racial segregation is a moral question; in plain words, that it is a grave sin, just as adultery and murder are grave sins." This was from an editorial May 17, 1947. I feel sure that most Jesuit boys would not think this way. Where have we been? The average "Christian" thinks that he is fulfilling his obligation to love if he doesn't hurt anybody. Love isn't merely a vacuum. It isn't not hurting or ignoring. Love by its very nature is active. When a man takes a wife, his promise does not mean that he will merely not go out with anyone else. There must be something positive or there is nothing.

Youth approaches this whole problem of the real world with a two edged sword: the sword of idealism and cynicism. Idealism drives the young person to reach for the heights. With idealism they can cut through many of the artificial barriers that adults have erected. They can poke their fingers right through the paper thin walls of adult rationalizations. These young people indeed see visions. They very often can see things in a much clearer light than any of us can. Since they have had very little environmental conditioning, no past programming needs to be erased. They can go straight to the heart of the matter without some background noise masking the reality. This, then, is an adult problem. I have a feeling that our so called prudence covers a multitude of sins. If we speak with forked tongues (and I don't mean in the sense of the Holy Spirit) we can very quickly alienate the young person. They look at us and, with all the honest of youth, they say: "He is a real person; he is not much; and he is a real phony." If they reject you, then they reject what you stand for. They reject religion, not *qua* religion; but, religion as you present it. They reject God, not as such; but God as you present Him. They reject Christ and His Mission because they have never really seen Him.

Adults must have patience and more patience. At times it is doubly difficult for the adult. For he must not only be concerned

with the social apostolate as such, but he must also put up with the shenanigans of the youngsters. It is very tempting to step in and correct all mistakes. The adult must learn to recognize that the young person learns much by doing—even if it takes twice as long and the work is dotted with mistakes.

I remember when I was a young boy and my father would let me help in the garden. We would tie up the tomato plants with cloth strips so that the wind would not break them off. If they were tied too tightly though, then the plant would break off and die. It had to be just right: not too tight and not too loose. Every couple of weeks the strips had to be changed. The old ones had to be removed so that they would not hold back the growth of the plant and new ones had to be attached up higher. From this I might say that we must somehow direct but not choke; we must inspire but not impose; we must be willing to recognize change and growth and adjust to this. We must realize that our yardstick for responsibility must be a flexible one.

This adjustment is sometimes very hard for the adult. We tend to have fixed policy molds rather than flexible ones. There is an appropriate story about famous physicist, H. A. Lorentz. Lorentz is famous for his work in the theory of relativity. At about the age of 70, after having taught classical physics for his entire life, a new approach (quantum theory) was brought forth. He could have rejected it or ignored it. He did neither. He studied it thoroughly and even studied under some of his former students. At age 70 he completely changed his concept of physical reality. To me this is the sign of a great man—not because he changed—but because he was still open to hear what someone else had to say.

With adults the problem is "impeccability." With the young it is reverse hypocrisy. Since it is generally accepted that adults don't make mistakes (just ask one), adults are rather leery of trying something that isn't tried and true! Since we don't want to run the risk of losing, we will never win. If you don't start the game, you can never lose—you just sit there and look at the ball!

For the young person the result is often quite the same, but for a different reason. The young person doesn't try something because of a lack of confidence in self and a lack of self-knowledge and self-realization. They just feel inadequate. This is one area where upper classmen can be a very big help to the freshmen and sophomores. They can help with projects, take frosh with

them, lead them by the hand, instruct, and in general, be real leaders.

What is the largest problem facing you people with regard to youth and the Social Apostolate? Practically, I think that it is one of *time*. Where do you fit in a social apostolate? How do you fit it into the schedule? How much time do you give to it? Frankly I don't know. Each person must decide the relative importance of this horizontal aspect of Christianity. Then, either as a group, or as individuals, you can figure out a program.

Maybe I should have started here. Perhaps all else has been a beating around the bush. You just have to decide that some program is important and then work it out. Of course the easiest thing is never to change anything—just keep doing it in the same seemingly adequate way.

I would like to read a statement that was released from the theological conference held recently at Notre Dame. "The burning scandal of Western indifference to world poverty makes a mockery of all pretensions to be a Christian and human society." If this is true, then the implications are . . . damning. And to those who would say that they have been "in business for a long time" I would say that they are merely claiming more of the responsibility for the affluent indifference of American society!

To be a Christian does not necessarily imply that we form deep inter-personal relationships with everyone whom we meet. Harvey Cox makes this point about the Good Samaritan. He saw another human in trouble; he stopped, did what he could and then went on his way. Nothing really tremendous. Nothing except that he had to overcome the tendency to structure his space and time this way (outward gesture) instead of this way (inward). He merely acted fully human; he was wholly human and therefore a holy man.

Maybe the whole thing that I am trying to say is what Fr. Chardin has said so beautifully in the *Divine Mileiu*. Somehow we must love the world with all our hearts for it is only through it that we will come to God. We must see Him in all things. We must piece the fragmented Image of Christ into a Oneness. We must be willing to undergo a process of depersonalization in Christ. "I live, not I, but Christ in me."

It might be profitable for me to mention briefly at this time some of the programs that I know about. Not that any of them are very outstanding; but they might form the point of departure for your own original thinking. Programs help to develop skills that

a classroom could never develop. Classroom concepts can be tested and strengthened by means of specific programs.

First, I would like to mention that, in connection with my physics classes, I also run the physics laboratory, as does every other high school physics teacher. I imagine that the scheduling of classes and lab periods for science teachers can be somewhat of a headache for principals. But we continue to have labs because they have very concrete and practical value. Students can see the lens focus the image on a screen or they can burn their fingers on a heat experiment. Lately we have had a run on lab methods: language labs, English workshops, PSSC physics, and so on. But where, may I ask, is the religion laboratory? Occasionally I have asked a student this question and the reaction is almost universal: Mr. Toepker has really gone off the deep end again! Of course you can shrug off anything that I suggest as easily as I can suggest it. But seriously I think that we need some kind of practice to supplement the reading of the social encyclicals. If we do not attempt to make religion real and relevant, then we will continue to develop people who end their day with prayers like the following: God bless mother, the poor, and my dog.

How do you set up a religion laboratory? I don't know. Perhaps a once-a-month commitment to an orphanage, a Bible center, a tutoring program, a hospital, or some other existing institution. I say existing because there is no need to manufacture artificial apostolates. Of course there will be a tremendous problem selling this kind of program to the students. It certainly could not be done with a single letter or a general convocation in a gymnasium!

Maybe the program that I have in mind is the CAP program at St. Xavier High. It was modeled after the Georgetown Community Action Program. Our program was started by sodalists and was deliberately not listed as a Sodality project. The program consists of one Coordinator of activities and a list of various possible areas where a student can work. The entire student body was asked to participate; but none was forced. About 300-350 signed up. The only pre-requisites were: 1) interest, 2) time, 3) small amount of ability. Through CAP we now have boys working in hospitals, slum areas, orphanages, CCD, and the like. Many of these boys are not sodalists and some even are from other schools.

At St. Xavier this past year another type of program was started. Two days a week every junior and senior must attend a particular

seminar (with the exception of the advanced placement students). They were free to elect one seminar from a variety of areas: Problems of the Inner City, Human Relations, Negro Problem, Current Events, Drama, Modern Novel, and others. I think that the strength of the program lies, not so much in the topic material, important as it may be, but in the fact that students can sit in a small group and discuss intelligently a world situation and not just girls and sports. They can also experience a faculty member in a unique way, a way that was formerly had only through extra-curricular activities. I think that all too often we offer just a facade to the students and they never see the genuine person. In my seminar the boys knew that we could talk openly about anything: parents, teachers, neighbors, dates, race relations and so on. I am sure that was also true in the other seminars. Myron Kilgore told me that this was very much true in his seminar on the Negro Problem.

I am sure that this seminar program provided some headaches for Fr. Beckman, the Principal. However, I feel that much credit is due him. He could have continued with the old schedule since it worked out fairly well. But he chose to change—I don't know his complete thinking—but I do know that without him we would not have had this program. Any changes are going to bring about a certain amount of difficulty. Change doesn't necessarily mean "upsetting the apple cart." But it might mean taking all the apples out and rearranging them in a better way.

Another program that I think could be effective would be a parent education program. This might consist of a series of talks and discussions held at the high school. Somehow the talks and discussions could also be worked into the high school religion schedule. This type of program just might change the topic of conversation at many of the evening supper tables. If you are thinking about all the meetings that you already have—and this is the reason for not changing anything—then I feel that something is wrong. While it is true that parents want to know facts about the school and the future college prospects for their son, I think that we have an obligation to go beyond this. Just as a sponsor at Confirmation is impressed by the beauty and enthusiasm of the little ones, maybe parents can learn through an interest in their children and vice-versa. Perhaps a home visitation program could be worked out between two schools. Maybe a boy could spend a day in a Negro home and then at a later date reverse the pair.

Granted that this would not be easy—neither was the crucifixion. As soon as you say that an idea is impossible, you are right! Fr. Bernard Cooke hit the nail on the head when I heard him say, "Dare We Believe?". Dare we believe that Christ actually lived and died for us? Dare we believe that there is a real brotherhood of men? Dare we believe that man will bring the love and understanding of Christ to all mankind?

Sometimes I get the impression that the boys are way ahead of us. (And that we have to hurry to keep up.) In St. Louis, the JCIC (Junior Catholic Interracial Council) organized "Pray Ins." These consist of "scouting" a white suburban parish; find out what hymns were sung, what liturgy was stressed, etc., and then report back to the JCIC. Then on the following Sunday members of the JCIC would attend Mass at this church. They would participate to the best of their ability. The boys told me that many adults seemed shocked to see a Negro boy or girl in their church and the shock turned to trauma when the boy or girl went to Communion.

Maybe this is too radical? Maybe we should not upset the vacuum-like tranquility of suburbia with problems like racial discrimination, disease, poverty, mental illness, starvation and other such trivialities. Maybe we shouldn't upset ourselves. Maybe Christ really didn't mean what He said: "Whatever you do to the least of these, you do unto Me."

In closing I would like to say that the magnitude and direction of your involvement depends on you. The enthusiasm and interest of those under your care will be one degree less than your own interest. You hold the pulse of the future power structure. You can change the shape of social history. If a southern governor can influence people with a set of prejudiced, unjust, and totally unchristian norms, then what can you do? Or dare you believe?

One final observation. Perhaps it is one of those giddy jokes that God plays on us, if, indeed, God does play jokes. With all our efforts and prayers and programs, with all that we think is so tremendous, we feel that we are saving the world, when in reality we are merely working out our own salvation.

Administrators Look at the High School Social Apostolate

THEODORE V. PURCELL, S.J.

This article reports the results of a modest research project into the practice of the social apostolate by American Jesuit high schools. I sought the opinion of the rector and the principal of each of our fifty-one schools. I used the rector's judgement regarding student selection practices and the principal's judgement regarding the social aspects of curricular and extra-curricular activities. One could argue that the opinion of the rector or the principal might be biased in favor of the school's present policy and practice. I suppose that is true. Yet, no matter who answers a questionaire—administration, students, faculty, or alumni—there will be some leaning toward personal value positions. Judging from the variety of responses I received (some of which were frankly critical) I think I can report a reasonably objective study of the American Jesuit High School seen through the eyes of its administration. Incidentally, the one-hundred percent response I received from the Jesuit administrators, indicated exceptional cooperation and interest.

At the outset, let us define what we mean by the "Social apostolate" here. I mean simply a sense of Christian obligation among our high school faculty and students, and intelligent awareness of modern social problems, plus a willingness to do something about solving those problems.

The recent JEA profile of the Jesuit college graduate gives us a point of departure. A Jesuit high school, as a college preparatory institution helps to sketch out the beginning of that profile. The JEA profile states that the ideal Jesuit college graduate is to be "Generously committed to creative involvement and leadership in the intellectual, social, cultural, religious life of his world. . . . ." In addition to academic competence, "he should be open in love to God and man of every race and creed; this will enable him to live sympathetically yet apostolically in a pluralistic world."[1]

What are we now doing to sketch social awareness into the profile of that ideal Jesuit student? My research sought the an-

[1] *Final Report of JEA Workshop on the Jesuit College Student,* August 6-14, 1962, Vol. V, Page 414, 37 ff.

swer by exploring three aspects of the social apostolate in the Jesuit high school. First, we asked about the "mix" in the student body. We asked how much the Jesuit administration was trying to bring in boys from a variety of backgrounds—ethnic, racial, etc. Did the school include in its student body qualified boys but boys of "Disadvantaged" backgrounds?

A mixture of backgrounds is important for the social apostolate of the Jesuit high school. This assumption is based on the findings of social psychology. Most studies show that in contrast to merely casual contacts, true *acquaintance* between groups of different status lessens prejudice and makes for charity. We see this in housing projects, army, education, and work acquaintance. The *raison d'etre* for this fact lies in the following parable: Someone asked: "Do you see that man over there?" "Yes." "Well I hate him." "But you don't know him." "That's why I hate him." We know that students can greatly influence each other merely by dealing with each other at school. Peer group influence is undubtedly a part of the educational process. As far as possible, it is the task of the educator to give one race or ethnic group direct school experience with other races or ethnic groups by fellow students qualified in every way except by so-called racial or ethnic status.

Social psychology does not assert that any kind of contact will diminish prejudice and further charity. Familiarity may breed either love or contempt. Everything depends on the kind of contact, as to whether stereotypes are reinforced or weakened. Gordon Allport puts it this way in his definitive Study of Prejudice:

> "Prejudice (unless deeply rooted in the character structure of the individual) may be reduced by equal-status contact between majority and minority groups in a pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports (i.e. by law, custom or local atmosphere), and if it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups."[2]

With qualified students, the institutional support of the school and the centrality of Christian charity, the Jesuit high school can meet Allport's three qualifications.

---

2 *The Nature of Prejudice,* Gordon Allport, Doubleday Anchor Books, Garden City, N.Y. 1954 and 1958, page 267. See also Chapter 7, "The Changing of Attitudes," especially pages 253-7, *Individual and Society,* David Krech, R. S. Crutchfield and E. L. Ballachey, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962.

Now to report the first part of my research findings: Are Jesuit high schools deliberately trying to bring members of disadvantaged minorities into their student bodies? Table 1.1 gives a partial answer.

TABLE 1.1

Jesuit Schools Giving Financial Help To Disadvantaged Students

N=47

Yes	77%
No	23%

Considering the modest income of many of our schools, it is gratifying that over three-quarters provide scholarship help. Some of this money goes to boys who are simply disadvantaged economically rather than disadvantaged nationally or ethnically. However, the rector of one large Jesuit school said, "Our scholarship program is open to any worthy student who applies, no matter what his faith, race or color might be. We do have full scholarships specifically for Negroes, two of them. Last year we gave out sixty-six thousand dollars in financial aid, 20 percent of this coming from our own funds and reduced tuitions and 5 percent coming from outside sources, such as pastors, alumni and friends who wished to help students."

Nearly three-quarters of our schools give either full tuition, or as much tuition as is needed. (See Table 1.2) This seems to be a generous effort to help the qualified needy student.

TABLE 1.2

Amount of Financial Help to Each Disadvantaged Student

N=38

Full tuition or as needed	74%
Partial tuition only	26%

As we would expect, we see in Table 1.3 that the percent of our students receiving financial help is a rather small minority, mostly under 10 percent of the student body.

TABLE 1.3

How Many Students Get Financial Help?

N=39

Percent of Student Body	Percent of Schools
1-10	77
10-20	5
20-30	3
100	5
None	10

If we ask the question: Are we actually *seeking out* disadvantaged but qualified boys for our schools? the answer is encouraging. In Tables 1.4 and 1.5 we find that two-thirds of our high schools are directly soliciting disadvantaged students from the primary schools and half of our schools are sufficiently concerned to go out and tutor 7th and 8th grade potential candidates. (These figures should be taken with caution because a number of principals did not answer these questions and we can only judge on the basis of the thirty-eight who did answer).

TABLE 1.4

Jesuit Schools Directly Soliciting Disadvantaged Students From Primary Schools

N=38

Yes	66%
No	34%

TABLE 1.5

Jesuit High Schools Tutoring Possible Candidates

N=36

Yes	50%
No	50%

There are explanations for those schools that are inactive in solicitation or tutoring. One principal reports as follows: "We have two Negro students, brothers, in school at the present time. Their father is a doctor, and they have no need for financial aid. Our main difficulty is not being able to find students of Negro or

Mexican origin who can qualify academically for this high school. There are so many demands made on us at entrance-exam time, that we have made little effort to find boys of Mexican or Negro origin who have the academic qualifications."

A rector makes a valid point: "The difficulty for boys in underprivileged groups is lack of qualifications. We have scholarships go begging because of this. This school is strictly college preparatory. It seems to me that lack of trade and vocational courses minimize our effectiveness in reaching these boys."

There is an obvious problem of high schools that have recently moved from the inner city to the suburbs. Such schools are at a distance from disadvantaged groups. A rector of a large suburban school says: "Except for active response to summer school programs, almost none respond to our invitation to attend during the year. It would appear to be because of our distance from areas in which these minorities live, and the reluctance of many to move into suburban association."

It is not easy to find qualified members of minority groups and it is dangerous to bring in unqualified boys who might perpetuate the stereotypes already held by our students. Studies of intelligence show that members of minority groups have about the same proportion of high I.Q.'s as the rest of the population, yet, some of these boys come from homes where good English is not spoken, or where the parents' aspirations are not high. Such boys might find our selective schools difficult. Nevertheless, we must be leaders in the search for students qualified not only by intelligence, but by home background, whatever their race or nationality.

If we accept the findings of social psychology that prejudice diminishes by *acquaintance,* then about one-third of our American Jesuit High Schools have yet to participate in this peer-group educational process by directly seeking disadvantaged students for their student bodies.

I come now to my second point: What are American Jesuit high schools doing for the social apostolate by their courses in social studies and by the social content of their religion courses? My assumption is: *Some* social content should be part of the curriculum of Jesuit high schools if our students are to have an intelligent knowledge of the social problems of our times and if, as preparatory schools, we are really preparing that profile of the ideal Jesuit graduate.

First, how many of our schools offer social studies? We see in Table 2.1 that Civics is offered by most of our schools. Sociology and Economics come next.

TABLE 2.1

Proportion of Jesuit High Schools Offering Specific Social Studies

N=43

Civics	72%
Sociology	51%
Economics	47%
General Social Studies	9%
Others	4%

Others: Communism, International Relations, Geography, American and International Problems, Foreign Relations, Anthropology, Social Attitudes, World Culture, Social Encyclicals, Political Science, Seminars in Latin American History, Social Work Lectures, Etc.

If we ask how many of our students take social studies in our schools, we find in Table 2.2 that about three-quarters of our schools are reaching less than half of their students with the social sciences.

TABLE 2.2

Number of Students Taking Social Studies

N=39

Percent of Student Body	Percent of Jesuit Schools
0-5	8
5-10	10
10-20	18
20-30	23
30-40	10
40-50	5
50-100	26

Putting it another way, and not counting history as a social science, most of our students are not getting *any* content studies in the social science area.

This does seem incredible. A full blown course in sociology or economics may not be essential for all our high school students. Civics is the course most widely taught. Perhaps civics if broadly presented, would be sufficient. It would seem from Table 2.2 however, that half of our students are not even being exposed to civics or any social science.

These findings confirm the statement made by a Jesuit college dean in 1952: "Jesuit high school graduates are definitely weak in knowledge and interest in social problems, current events, citizenship and allied areas."[3]

A recent study by Richard A. Twohig, S.J. comes to the same conclusions. Twohig compares the curricula of Jesuit and non-Jesuit high schools and concludes that "Statistically, the two groups are on a par in the area of social studies regarding course requirements . . . However, the statistics are deceptive, since the majority of the Jesuit curricula requiring more than four semesters are those followed by our poorer students. As a result the majority of our students receive no course in political science and current social problems."[4]

Our findings confirm Twohig's about the poorer students:

TABLE 2.3

Academic Level of Social Science Students

N=37

All students and levels	38%
Average students only	32%
Poorer students only	27%
Superior students only	3%

According to Table 2.3, 59 percent of our high schools reach only the average or poorer students with social science instruction. In these schools the superior students are not exposed to social studies at all. Such schools must see little importance or value in

[3] "College Deans Evaluate Jesuit High Schools," Roman A. Bernet, *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. 15, October, 1952, Page 109.

[4] "A Statistical Comparison of the Curricular of Jesuit and Non-Jesuit Schools," Richard H. Twohig, S.J., *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XXVII, No. 4, March, 1965, Page 250.

the social sciences. If they are trying to develop leaders who understand our times, should they not rather try to get some social content courses into the curriculum of their best students?

Now let us ask how Jesuit principals evaluate the effectiveness of our courses in social studies.

TABLE 2.4

Principals' Reactions to:
"Social Studies Are Failing to Produce Much Social Awareness In Our Students."

N=44

I agree	34%
I disagree	34%
I don't know	21%
I am neutral about it	11%

Table 2.4 gives the answer. Granted that this is not an easy question to answer, nevertheless the findings of Table 2.4 leave much to be desired.

Turning to religion courses and their social content, Table 2.5 shows that 91 percent of our religion courses get into matters of marriage and the family, with 85 percent treating race relations.

TABLE 2.5

Percent of Religion Courses Treating Specific Social Problems

N=46

Marriage and family	91
Race Relations	85
Peace	54
Labor and industrial relations	48
Business and political ethics	46
Population	43
Crime and delinquency	43
The big city	26

We then have a sharp drop. High school theology is apparently not very relevant to problems of peace, industrial relations, business and political ethics, population, crime and delinquency, the big city.

Finally, what do Jesuit principals have to say about the social effectiveness of our religion courses

TABLE 2.6

Principals' Reactions To:
"Some Say Our Religion Courses Are Failing to Produce Much Social Awareness In our Students."

N=47

I agree	34%
I dissagree	34%
I am neutral about it	17%
I don't know	15%

Only one-third of the principals are clearly convinced that we are being very effective in producing social awareness through our religion courses. If Jesuit administrators are not more satisfied than this with the effectiveness of a central part of our curriculum, there is work to be done.

One principal says: "there is need to integrate the social-studies courses of our schools with the courses in religion . . . We need advice on how to eliminate strong social prejudices inherited from parents and friends. This value system is deeply imbedded and more readily accepted than any contrary set of values we try to impart. We should no doubt promote summer school programs where needy children are taught free of charge."

A basic question behind this issue may be the following: "The ageless problem exists," says one principal, "in that some Jesuits are assigned to high school work who are really not *with* it—personality problems—unable to teach regular subjects—therefore placed in religion classes. This has a bad effect, for not even in this area are these people really qualified. Religion becomes a dull thing, and certainly not respected. This is something that provincials have to be aware of, and not assign problems from one school to another school. The problems may be solved in one place, but are made to exist somewhere else. These men cannot teach regular subjects, so they are placed in the religion classes because they are told they have to *do* something. If they have to *do* something, then they should be somewhere else, where this something can be done, whatever it is!"

If the "crisis of faith" issue is moving from the college community into the high school community, as some say it is, and if high school theology is what makes Jesuit schools different and worth supporting, then obviously we need professionals in high school religion. Furthermore, I submit that high school theology will have relevance for our students (so concerned about social issues) in direct proportion as this theology, while remaining theology, is relevant to the social problems of our times.

The last part of my research concerns the extra-curricular "social work" activities of our high school students. My assumption here goes back to the findings of social psychology stating the value and importance of *personal acquaintance* between people of different backgrounds.

Table 3.1 shows a striking spread of charitable works done by Jesuit high school boys.

TABLE 3.1

Kinds of Extra-Curricular "Social Work" Activities In Jesuit High Schools

N=50

(in percent of schools)

Tutoring underprivileged youths	36
Working in hospitals	29
Working at youth centers	23
Civil rights work	13
Repairing property for the poor	12
Working at jails	2
Other	26

Other: Xmas work, Discussion Club, Census Taking, Food to needy, Race Relations, Youth Projects, Old Age Home Visits, Migrant Camp Work, Exceptional Children, Ecumenical Work, Social Newspaper, Training Altar Boys, Home Visits (interracial), Teaching Catechism, Recreational Activities, Getting Jobs for Poor, Little Sisters of the Poor, Collecting Food, Teaching CCD, Relief Work in Hurricane, Working in Orphanages.

Tutoring is the most widespread activity and doubtless one of the most beneficial.

As we would expect, we find in Table 3.2 that only a minority of our students are engaged in extra-curricular work of this sort.

TABLE 3.2

Number of Our Students Engaged In "Social Work" Activities

N=48

	Percent of Jesuit Schools
Small minority	79
Large minority	2
One half	17
Most	2

Going into poor neighborhoods and dealing easily and competently with disadvantaged people takes maturity, skill and experience. No doubt few freshmen or sophomores have such maturity. But this is an important apostolate for qualified juniors and seniors providing they are under skillful direction. Disadvantaged people resent patronizing sight-seers, do-gooders or head-shrinkers. When a high school boy begins this work he will doubtless get more out of it than he will contribute. But as he matures and develops experience, such work can be a deeply broadening and fulfilling part of his education.

It is encouraging to see that the attitude of our Jesuit high school faculties is generally supportive to the extra-curricular social work activities of our students:

TABLE 3.3

How Much Does Our Faculty Encourage "Social Work" Activities?

N=48

Very much	92%
Somewhat	56%
Hardly at all	15%

Not all Jesuit teachers get a good mark, however. As the principal of one of our larger high schools says: "It appears that most

of our older Jesuits, forty years old and up, on our faculty, do not see much necessity or desirability for our students participating in activities which would be aimed at developing social consciousness."

Faculty interest is crucial to success. The principal of one of our smaller schools says: "There is no question that a common interest on the part of the faculty in such programs contributes to the atmosphere which is needed. When this filters down to individual homeroom teachers, activities and moderators, then things start moving. At the same time, things have to be organized and centralized a bit. A whole series of "hit and miss" projects, with little or no permanent commitment to them, usually goes nowhere." This principal goes on to say: "We should think new and big, in the area of social apostolate. Our manpower is more than efficient to organize programs on our own. The Higher Achievement Program inaugurated by the New York Province is a case in point. Maryland is taking up this project in four major cities this summer."

Finally, most of our principals place high educative value in social work activities for both the intellectual and the spiritual formation of our young men. Very few principals are opposed to it, or think it a distraction.

TABLE 3.4

Principals' Evaluation of "Social Work" Activities

N=47

Contribute very much to the intellectual and spiritual formation of our students	89%
Rather unrelated to such formation	9%
Distract from and hinder such formation	2%

It would seem that Jesuit high schools are doing a fairly good job here in "social work" activities. My only suggestion is that we need to expand these activities so as to influence a larger number of our students, especially the student leaders in our schools.

Let us leave Jesuit administrators to look at the attitudes of high school freshmen and seniors. At the request of Bernard J. Dooley, S.J., Director of the 1966 JEA High School Workshop,

Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., Research Associate in the Cambridge Center for Social Studies and Harvard Stillman Professor, recently completed a survey of American Jesuit High School students.[5]

One of the questions in the Fichter survey was "To what extent does this school give freshmen and seniors better racial attitudes?" Only about one-half of the students say that their Jesuit high school has very much influence over their attitudes, while one-quarter to one-third say that the school has very little influence over their racial attitudes. However, in some of the attitudes pertaining to race there is an improvement from freshman to senior year. In these areas, our schools would seem to have some impact on student attitudes.

Regarding racial integration in education, not much more than one-half to one-third of our students have positively clear Christian attitudes. Regarding the civil rights movement, only about one-half of our students are clearly favorable. Only 36 percent of the freshmen and 39 percent of the seniors favor laws for integrated housing.

Coming over to the area of economics, only one-quarter to one-third of our students approve of the idea of higher social welfare payments. Only one-half favor a minimum wage of $2.00 an hour; only half are in favor of medicare.

The Fichter study also inquired into the attitudes of sons of alumni versus sons of parents who never attended Jesuit schools. We might expect that sons of Jesuit-trained fathers would have more liberal social attitudes than sons of fathers who never came under our influence. They did not.

In a word, these findings show that many of our students are bourgeois and conservative in their racial and economic attitudes. No doubt they reflect the thinking of their parents. This segment of Jesuit students does not seem to reflect the advanced social thinking of the Church. Nor does it fit the profile we profess to paint.

After the painful facts of the two projects cited above, I hesitate to ask this additionally painful question, but it will be healthy to do so.

We have made good beginnings in the social apostolate. But are we doing this work now because of the leadership coming from

---

[5] *Send Us a Boy . . . Get Back a Man,* Joseph H. Fichter, Cambridge Center for Social Studies, Cambridge, Mass., 1966, Chapter 6.

others, from the Negro civil rights movement, from the poverty program, the Peace Corps idea, etc.?

Father Janssens gave remarkable leadership to the Society when he said, in 1949 referring to our high schools, that it is "Our aim, above all, in educating the young men we have accepted in the name of the Church, to instill in their hearts the charity of Christ as it applied to modern problems in encyclicals and other papal documents . . . Our students should take up the practice, according to their age, of visiting the homes of the poor, the workshops and mines of laborers, and the social centers." Father Janssens wanted our young men to be "freed of that pagan mentality which adores riches . . . steeped in that charity which seeks above all the good of others . . . ready to work with the Church in bettering the temporal and spiritual conditions of the greatest possible number of human beings."[6]

But only in the last few years have letters come from Provincials urging the importance of the social apostolate. These days, there is probably more concern among our scholastics about studying social problems and doing practical works of social charity. But why was such concern not more apparent ten years ago? If I am not mistaken, the CSMC and the Legion of Mary both preceded the Jesuit Sodality in taking a strong stand on the race question.

Whatever the past, there is reason for optimism in the fact that the social apostolate of Jesuit high schools will be treated at the 1966 JEA Workshop. Some Jesuits were not happy with the social relevance of the Workshop. They felt that the same topics "could have been used in a workshop in 1866." But in my opinion, social issues are included in the 1966 workshop topics, although such issues could be brought out more explicitly.

For example the Workshop could ask explicitly how our high schools are relevant to the inner city, to minority groups, and to the non-Catholic civic community? It would ask whether Jesuit administrators can dare to be pace-setters in spite of much financial support coming from conservative, middleclass, white people who "have it made?"

Could the Workshop re-examine the place of social studies in Jesuit high school curricula? Could social scientists study the content and application of our religion courses to see how those

---

[6] *The Social Apostolate,* John B. Janssens, S.J., Woodstock College Press, 1950, Pages 14-16.

courses could be made more socially relevant, without distorting their theological content?

Could the Workshop further develop "social work" extra-curricular activities as an essential part of the educational process for some of our best students?

Finally, could the Workshop uncover methods for encouraging our faculties to become more social-minded and more effective in promoting the social apostolate among their students? Could professional training programs in high school theology treat not only the new Scripture and dogma emerging from Vatican II, but also refresher courses in social science problems? Could Jesuit faculties engage in some social work activities directly thus gaining the benefit of "acquaintance" with disadvantaged groups? Could "acquaintance" be furthered by securing Negro teachers or coaches in Jesuit schools? Following the liturgical guidelines of the Vatican Council could we use the Mass more effectively to unite students and faculty, and to bridge differences in the so-called "mix" we seek to establish on our campuses?

Let me end with this encouraging anecdote: Ralph Dugan, Ambassador to Chile, was President Kennedy's Special Advisor on Latin American Affairs, and he has had a great influence on our government. Ralph Dugan states categorically that he had his first impetus to civic service when he was a senior at a certain Jesuit high school. Jesuit and lay leadership in our American high schools can bring about many repetitions of this experience. The promising JEA Workshop of 1966 should advance us toward that kind of leadership.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

DR. A. RAYMOND BARALT, Dean of the University of Detroit Dental School was recently elected President-Elect of the American Association of Dental Schools. The election is a distinct accolade both for Dr. Baralt and for the University of Detroit Dental School.

TWO NEW NAMES appear in the listing of Province Directors of Education in the opening pages of this volume. Father Jerome A. Petz, S.J., formerly on the staff of North Aurora, succeeds Father Paul V. Siegfried, S.J. as Province Director of Education for the Detroit Province. Father Edward A. Doyle, S.J., former Academic Vice-President of Loyola University of New Orleans, is the new Associate Province Director of Education in the New Orleans Province.

BEA HOUSE is the name of the new dormitory which the Oregon Province is building on the campus of Gonzaga University for the use of the Jesuit scholastics who will be studying at Gonzaga. Named after Cardinal Bea, the $400,000 structure should be finished for the opening of classes in September.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY recently announced a $3 million dollar expansion of their Law School. The new building will be erected on Spring and Lindell and will permit expansion of the student body in the Law School from 200 to 500 students. Plans which are now being readied call for a much expanded library facility as well as classrooms, seminar rooms, Moot court room and faculty offices. Date for the ground breaking has yet to be announced.

Rev. Edward J. Drummond, S.J., vice-president for the Medical Center of St. Louis University, has been elected chairman of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education.

The Federation serves as the agent for six regional accrediting commissions which represent more than 1,600 colleges and universities in the United States. Its chief function is to develop and coordinate national accrediting policies.

As chairman, Father Drummond will be the Federation's principal spokesman. He will take office immediately.

As a primary objective of his two-year term in office, Father Drummond said he hopes to strengthen the Federation in order

to protect the autonomy of colleges and universities against a variety of pressures from both outside the field of education and within. To accomplish this, he said he intends to establish a secretariat in Washington, D.C. to handle the affairs of the Federation and to assist in managing the relationships between the Federation and its regional members, the Federal Government and various professional bodies.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO is going ahead with the final plans for a $3,500,000 addition to the Elizabeth Cudahy Memorial Library on its Lake Shore Campus. The addition which will triple the Loyola library facilities on the Lake Shore Campus was helped along with a $1 million government grant. Loyola, with the recent purchase of the upper floors of its present downtown building, will also substantially increase its library accomodations at its Michigan Avenue Campus.

BOSTON COLLEGE is taking a deep breath and preparing to go into the second phase of their development program with a $25 million dollar goal. Some of the plans envisaged are: a three and a half million Social Science Center, a five million dollar library, a three and a half million dollar graduate center, a four million fine arts center and theatre. Also included in the second development phase will be a million dollar scholarship endowment, a three million dollar faculty endowment, and five million for additional dormitories.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS has received a second government grant of $500,000 for the proposed physics-mathematics section of the Science complex. Loyola had previously received another $500,000 for the chemistry section of the Science complex. Construction is presently slated for January 1967 with 18 months projected for completion. Taking into account the lovely New Orleans climate, the corridors in the new building will open to the outside of the building.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO and Stanford University jointly announced that Dr. James W. McClendon, a Southern Baptist theologian, has accepted a joint appointment at the two institutions. Dr. McClendon will teach a graduate division course in Protestant thought as USF. The appointment is part of the newly expanded department of Theology at USF.

ST. PETER'S COLLEGE recently received a $206,000 bequest from the estate of the late Grace E. Delehanty. The money will be used to establish a special scholarship fund.

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY will bring their student accommodations up to the 1200 mark with the proposed construction of their fifth dormitory for male students. The five story structure will accommodate 287 students.

HOLY CROSS will name their new $4 million Campus Center for Henry M. Hogan who served as National Chairman of the Holy Cross Development Program since the campaign began in 1962. The facility will combine a five-story student activity building with a social and recreational center of four stories. The new Mulledy dorm, named after the first President of the Cross, is expected to be finished in time for the September 1966 semester.

REGIS HIGH of New York and BROOKLYN PREP won First and Second Place in the Sweepstakes Award of the National Catholic Forensic League competitions held May 19-23, 1966 at Miami Beach. They were in competition with 650 high school speakers from some 210 schools from all over the United States. The award indicates the best balanced and talented group from an individual school. It should be remembered that the schools entered in this Tournament first had to win the right to attend in competition within their own diocesan competition. Xavier of New York and Loyola of New York also received national awards in individual competition.

Fourteen of our Jesuit high schools merited the right to compete in this national contest. They were: Loyola of Baltimore, Brooklyn Prep, Boston College High, Canisius High, Loyola Academy, St. Ignatius of Cleveland, University of Detroit High, St. Peter's, Regis of New York, Loyola of New York, Xavier of New York, Fordham Prep, St. Joseph, and Scranton Prep.