Jesuit Educational Quarterly

MARCH, 1967

AIMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

SOCIAL SCIENCES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

SPECIAL STUDIES

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Vol. XXIX, No. 4

Our Contributors

FATHER ROBERT J. HENLE, S.J., is the Vice President in Charge of Academic Administration at Saint Louis University. His article was written primarily for a talk which he delivered at an academic convocation at Boston College.

FATHER THOMAS A. McGRATH, S.J., is the Chairman of the Department of Psychology at Fairfield University. He was one of the participants at the 1966 JEA Workshop on the Christian Formation of Jesuit High School Students.

MESSRS. R. EMMETT CURRAN, S.J., and JOSEPH M. KAKALEC, S.J., are theologians from the Maryland Province currently studying at Woodstock. Mr. Curran is in second year and Mr. Kakalec in third.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

March 1967

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.

EDITORIAL STAFF

ADVISORY BOARD

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

Jesuit Aims in Higher Education

Robert J. Henle, S.J.

First, I would like to describe some features of the current context, of our time and our country, which are relevant to a discussion of Jesuit aims in higher education.

It must be said that the United States, at its birth as a nation and for many years thereafter, was essentially a Protestant country. There were, to be sure, pockets of genteel and original Catholicism as in Maryland. There were a few Catholic leaders like the Carrolls. In the main, however, the society of the new republic was Protestant in ethos and ethic, by belief and by tradition. Moreover, its Protestantism was militant, divided indeed in itself, but united in its anti-Romanism and its anti-Spanish prejudice. Into this Protestant society there poured what was to be the strength of the American Church—the waves of European immigrants, very largely Catholic, almost all poor and uneducated. To the immigrants were added, as America moved westward, groups of Catholic Indians and the Latinos of Texas, of the west and the southwest. Within the total society, Catholics were a sub-culture itself divided into nationalistic groups.

The Catholic immigrants brought with them a traditional faith and often a fierce loyalty to their Church. They reacted defensively against the Protestant cultural, social, and political domination. It was in this context that the Catholic School System was established and developed. The Public Schools were, in the eyes of the newly arrived immigrants, Protestant. There were Protestant prayers and the Protestant bible; the teachers were Protestants, and the values of the school were Protestant values. It was to protect the young, to save the Faith that Catholic schools were set up. The development of this great system out of the pennies of the poor and the endless labor of devoted Sisters, Brothers, priests, and lay people, is one of the great glories American Catholicism and unique in the history of the Church. But the school system itself was part of the inferior sub-culture which was American Catholicism. It had the same militancy, the same defensiveness, the same separation. As the system moved upward, as high schools multiplied, as colleges and universities were founded, these characteristics clung to each new institution. Everything formed part of the general apologetics

–History, Literature, and, above all, Philosophy. To the "state-of-siege" mentality of post-Reformation European Catholicism, we added a ghetto mentality and a somewhat belligerent sense of inferiority.

But the Church was educating a whole generation of new Americans, who, in addition to loyalty to their Faith, had a driving ambition to "get ahead". Poor illiterate immigrants were eager for their children to have the benefits of schooling and to move up in society. The sons of hod carriers and motormen went, for example, to night law school, or even to college, and thus slowly the Catholics spread through the society and moved upwards economically, socially, politically.

We have done better than we could have anticipated. America has almost become a truly pluralistic culture. Will Herberg has expressed it thus:

> "Today, to be born an American is no longer taken to mean that one is necessarily a Protestant. Protestantism is no longer the obvious and 'natural' religious identification of the American. Today, the evidence seems to indicate, America has become a three-religion country: the normal religious implication of being an American today is that one is either a Protestant, a Catholic, or a Jew. These three are felt, by and large, to be three alternative forms of being religious in the American way; they are the three 'religions of democracy,' the 'three great faiths' of America. Today, unlike fifty years ago, not only Protestants, but increasingly Catholics and Jews as well, feel themselves to be Americans not apart from, or in spite of, their religion, but in and through it, because of it. If America today possesses a 'church' in the classical sense–that is, a form of religious belonging which is felt to be involved in one's belonging to the national community–it is the tripartite religious system of Protestant-Catholic-Jew."[1]

Today, Catholics can be found, increasingly, in all levels of society, in all the professions, and in every sort of political, educational, and intellectual activity. A generation ago, the percentage of Catholics completing high school was notably below that of Protestants. Today, the percentages are about the same, while the percentage of Catholic college graduates going on to advanced professional schools or graduate school seems to be slightly higher. The symbol of the final acceptance or integration of Catholicism was, I suppose, the election of a Catholic President.

---

1 Will Herberg, *A Journal of Church and State*, "The Integration of the Jew Into America's Three-Religion Society," V, No. 1 (May, 1963), 28.

We need no longer be forever closing ranks to defend ourselves against a hostile society. The ghetto mentality, our sensitive defensiveness can be discarded. The Catholic educational system must reflect all these changes. I will return to this point later.

The second point I want to make is this: We are living in an age of change and criticism. There have been in our history periods of consolidation and slow growth, periods when development seemed to reach a plateau and settle for a bit. But our age is an unsettled age.

There are many factors—technological, scientific, political, cultural—which are making of our age one unprecedented in its accelerated rate of change. This has been almost universally accompanied by the practice of a frank, acid, and even brutal criticism. No phase of living, no institution, no custom or belief has been immune from it. It has swept through the Catholic Church, from bottom to top, in a way that has not been seen since the sixteenth century.

In such an age, that which is outmoded, historically anomalous, or accidental must be swept away. It is an age in which all superficialities must be penetrated and the basic fundamentals rediscovered and reaffirmed. It is only in this way that criticism and change will move towards reconstruction rather than towards chaos. Our educational system must meet the demands of a critical and fast-moving age. To this also I will return later.

The next point I might call, if you will bear with me, Henle's Law of Church History. The Law involves two basic statements. The first statement is that the development of the Church through history cannot be depicted on a graph as a straight line rising at a steady angle; rather it must be pictured as an ascending series of waves. The peak of each wave is higher than the peak of the previous wave, indeed, but the vitality of the Church seems to surge upward in a great sweeping movement and then to fall back and fade for a time. We can identify at least three "peak" periods—the great patristic age of the third-fourth century, the full-tide of medieval culture in the thirteenth century and the great reform of the late sixteenth century.

The second part of the Law lays down a list of characteristics of any age in which the Church is moving upwards. This list is derived empirically from the three great periods just identified. Such periods are marked by:

1. A renewed interest in the study and use of scripture.
2. A new development of religious life: renewal of some older Orders; introduction of new types.
3. A renewal and reform of sacramental and liturgical life.
4. A deepening and widening of philosophy and theology.
5. An active and positive approach to non-Catholic culture.
6. Outstanding ecclesiastical leadership, especially in the Papacy.

Now let us apply Henle's Law to our own time. From the high point of the counter-reformation through the eighteenth century, the vitality of the Church seemed slowly to ebb. I mark the trough of this wave at about 1815. Now, if you take the list of criteria I have just enumerated and apply them to the period from 1815 to the present, you will find all of them increasingly verified. According to Henle's Law we are living in an age of upward surge towards the peak of a wave that is not yet in sight. How high will we be able to ride? I dare to say that the height of our achievement will be proportioned to our ability to keep all these movements going in a way that is fundamentally sound yet continuously creative.

One remark in passing. We have never yet had a Christian culture in which lay people and clerics, seculars and religious, participated equally and cooperatively. The Council of Trent, in order to effect a radical reform of clerical life, separated the seminaries from the central institutions of culture and education. This has resulted in the unfortunate development of two Christian cultures, a lay culture and a clerical culture. The movement to reintegrate the intellectual training of clerics and religious into the main stream of current culture is well underway. We have an opportunity, especially here in America, of destroying this cleavage. We need and shall have monks who are scientists, Sisters who are scholars, priest scientists and priest artists as well as lay theologians and lay scripture scholars. I remember a time when Catholic philosophy was regarded, in many quarters, as the peculiar preserve of priests, and the layman who invaded it was regarded as dangerous and unwanted. By contrast, today at Saint Louis University, for example, we have laymen, laywomen, and Sisters as well as priests teaching *theology*!

There is one other relevant movement which is sweeping through the Christian world and even beyond. This is the "ecumenical" movement. From the standpoint of the Catholic Church this means a positive and sympathetic approach to all religious, especially to

dissident Christian bodies. It means an openness on the part of Catholics for debate and discussion, a readiness to reexamine traditions, to discard what is dated, unnecessarily divisive or historically accidental. It means also within the Church a mature self-confidence, a levelling of the seige-walls, a serene conviction that scholarship, that criticism, that sympathy for others will confirm what is essential in Faith and morals and will draw all men together.

Now the modern Catholic University in the United States must not only adapt itself to all these movements and changes, it must itself be an active center in all of them. It is most fortunate that at this juncture American Catholicism has itself come to an intellectual maturity. We are producing, in increasing numbers, lay and clerical leaders in almost all fields. We need no longer look to Europe for Catholic scholarship and intellectual leadership. The very criticism of our own past efforts, of our culture and our educational system is a sign of this maturity and a practical testimony to the effectiveness, in its own time, of the education we, from a higher level of expectancy and potential, now criticize so severely.

The modern Catholic University in America need no longer be a defensive institution, closed in on itself and separated from the culture in which it exists. On the contrary, it is an institution open to the whole of modern culture. There was a time when Catholic institutions were suspicious of some fields and Catholics were warned off of certain fields—such as experimental psychology—as being dangerous to the Faith—and perhaps, in the given historical circumstances, they were. At any rate, these things are no longer true. All fields of culture, science and scholarship are welcome on the Catholic campus. It is a mark of the intellectual maturity of Catholic educators and of their serene confidence in the Faith, that they are prepared to approach the whole of modern culture without fear or reservation and to follow the argument wherever it goes. The role of the Catholic University has changed but it is even more indispensable, for it must now be a center of fullness and depth, of a rich vital Catholic culture which is also a Catholic culture, producing graduates who are wholly citizens of their own age and their own country and yet who are Catholics, morally and intellectually, of personal conviction and of genuine depth.

To come to our main point. To speak of Jesuit aims in higher education is to discuss the nature of Jesuit education.

The terms "Jesuit education," "Jesuit philosophy of education," and the like have frequently been used as though there were a specifically Jesuit kind of education and educational theory.

Those who believe so have tried to describe this education by reducing it to a combination of specific characteristics.

Actually the essential documents of the Society give little assistance to such an effort. In the first place, the Society was not founded primarily to fight the Reformation or, as is often thought in the United States, to carry on educational work. Its original mandate was much broader and allows for an almost unlimited set of possible activities. The Jesuit can properly do whatever needs doing or needs doing most for the good of the Church and the good of mankind. There is an old ecclesiastical joke about the three things God Himself does not know. The first is how many congregations of religious women there really are, the second, how much a Dominican really knows, and finally, what a Jesuit will do next. The constitutions of the order designate education as one of the important works of the Society. It gives regulations governing the organization of universities and apostolic directives for educational work, but no specific characteristic of Jesuit education as such. The famed *Ratio Studiorum* does not contain a theory of education, much less a theory of Jesuit education. It is simply a good practical handbook for the conduct of a Renaissance-type school. It never governed all the educational activities of the Society, was never universally accepted, and has now long been only an historical document.

If we examine the actual history of Jesuit activity in education, training, and intellectual endeavors, we find an amazing diversity in activities. Jesuits did indeed lecture on Greek poetry and teach Latin Grammar in the schools of Europe, but in the Paraguay reductions they were masters of carpentry, animal husbandry, painting, and all the basic crafts of ordinary living. In China they made themselves masters of classical Chinese letters, lectured on Chinese philosophy, and composed essays and texts. In fact, they taught everything from catechism to gunnery and naturalized themselves in a dozen exotic cultures.

However set the seventeenth century Jesuit school of France might seem, the Jesuits in general showed an amazing readiness to adapt to the circumstances of time and place and to varying needs as they found them. They showed a certain ruthlessness in

striking away the accidental and the merely traditional. In an age when christianization was commonly thought of as inseparable from Europeanization, the great Matteo Ricci, father of modern Chinese Christianity undertook to make himself thoroughly Chinese. He went through the rigors of Chinese scholarship, made himself a master of Chinese language and literature, formally became a "scholar" of the Empire, and became in all matters other than his Faith, thoroughly Chinese even to the slightest point of food, dress, and etiquette. He even received permission (from Paul V, in 1615) to establish a liturgy for the Mass using Chinese instead of Latin. Robert de 'Nobili, in India, became, except for his Faith, a Brahmin —even cutting himself off from all personal contact with the Europeans, whether Jesuits or not. He followed all the ascetical practices of the Saniassi and lived in every last detail like a Brahmin of the Brahmins.

There is then no way in which Jesuit education can be defined as a set of specific traits. I myself have made various attempts so to define it, but I finally became convinced that the effort was futile. I think we must say that *Jesuit education is education given by Jesuits.* Jesuit education cannot be described in a set of specific educational traits, specific subjects, procedures or methods; it can be described in terms of Jesuits, in terms of Jesuit character.

For men do recognize a characteristic Jesuit stamp—the Jesuit has emerged in history—both in the eyes of friends and of foes—as a man with a unique and uniform character. Garcia Moreno in 1851 said of the Jesuits, "The Jesuit of today is like the Jesuit of St. Ignatius' time, and the Jesuit of China is no different from the Jesuit of Rome or the Jesuit who teaches catechism in the mountains."

There is a Jesuit character, a uniform character, one which, within its very uniformity, allows for the development of striking personalities with marked individual differences and common traits. The "gentle" adventurer Marquette, the selfless slave of the slaves Peter Claver, the learned Clavius, the genial hobbyist Kircher, the ascetic St. Francis Borgia, the humor-loving martyr, Miguel Pro, the Indian missionary DeSmet, the brilliant Teilhard de chardin, Schmidt, the hero of Nazi concentration camps, and the great ecumenical Cardinal Bea—a gallery of sharply defined personalities, yet all Jesuits, and, by a true paradox, characteristically so.

There is no work that is by definition specifically Jesuit, but if Jesuits, men like these, put their hand to a work they leave upon it the mark of their own character. Jesuit education is education inspired, directed and given by Jesuits who leave upon it—no matter what kind it may be—elementary, classical, technical, professional, theological,—in craft, technique, skills, research,—their own mark.

And so the common notion that Jesuit education essentially aims to produce graduates in the mold of a Renaissance scholar is simply untrue. This notion arose from the fact that the first great educational experience of the Society took place within a culture in which that was the kind of education that the men of influence and learned people had to have, but there is no particular reason whatever why Latin and Greek should constitute a Jesuit education any more than Chinese or Quechua or any other language that might have a cultural use within a given historical context. So that in one sense you come to the conclusion that there isn't anything educational that is specifically Jesuit; and yet coming back again to what I have said, there are things in the Jesuit motivation and the Jesuit outlook, in the character which are to influence whatever the Jesuit does with regard to any kind of activity but influence it in relationship and in function of a given situation and of given purposes and potentialities. So that you can proceed to draw, I think, from Jesuit principles and characters something of what must be done in given circumstances if it is to measure up to the kind of goals a Jesuit would set himself or a Jesuit would see as being the way to carry out the Christian mission within that kind of framework. And, therefore, I come back to what I said at the beginning of this section. I personally have given up any effort to describe Jesuit education as a set of specifics. This just is historically unsound. I think it is unsound philosophically and in principle. I think it blocks our proper approach to educational problems in the future and particularly in an age like this, an age of great change. This is not to say of course that there are not very fundamental things that the Jesuit does regard as essential and that will show up in any kind of activity that the Jesuit puts his hand to. The fundamental thing about the Jesuit Order is that it was instituted to further the work of Christ in the world and to bring Christ to all levels of society and to all individuals, and by bringing Christ to individuals to sanctify the whole of society and all parts of society, to promote its welfare, to use individuals for social reform and for the development of

societies which would be humanly good societies and supernaturally holy societies.

Therefore, of any institution that the Jesuit moves into and thus therefore of a Jesuit university, the first thing that you have to say about it is that it is fundamentally what we call today in the United States a "committed" institution. I think this is a bad name,—though it is one of the common terms, because there is no such thing as an "uncommitted" institution. The question is one of what kind of commitment, to what, and to what extent. No institution can survive as a university or a college or anything else unless it does have some kind of fundamental commitment. The American Medical School, for example, is committed. It is committed to a certain basic view of what medical science is and medical practice is. It is not universally accepted, that the view of our medical schools is the best, only, or objective view of what medical education should be in our own society. We have people that disagree with the commitment of our medical schools—Christian Scientists, osteopaths, chiropractors, etc. But our medical schools will not permit a lot of people who are, in a sense, practicing medicine in the United States to appear on a medical faculty. Some years ago, for example, there was a news item to the effect that the Association of Witch Doctors of South Africa had petitioned the government for a charter to establish a four year college and to establish a licensure for Witch Doctors in Southern Africa. There is a committed institution that I am sure would have quite different commitments from an American Medical School. And in some of the great cultural countries of the East, China, and India, along side of, sometimes across the street from, medical schools which are teaching modern western medicine, you have schools which are teaching the older traditional medicines of these countries and ancient forms of treatment. In fact I heard of one place in India where medical students went to the modern western university in the morning and to the old Indian medical school in the afternoon, so that they may be said to have the best of both commitments out of this situation.

The same thing is true with regard to morality. There is no institution that does not have some kind of commitment to a code of ethics. Our medical schools fall somewhat in the center of the spectrum. I think, if you line the spectrum for example with regard to experimentation on living things and put at one end of the spectrum the extreme vivisectionist and at the other extreme, if you

want, the Nazi doctors or perhaps the mad scientists of science fiction, in between our medical schools would accept it as ethical, I think, to operate on dogs, to induce cancer in them, and so on, but do not think this is proper with regard to human beings. So that there is a commitment in any institution. The question is what kind of commitment and where does the commitment stand. So that when I say that the institution run by Jesuits must be a committed institution, I am talking of course of it being committed in a definite way. It must be committed to the intellectual principles of Catholic theology, divine revelation, and to the moral principles of the Catholic tradition. This is a commitment that, no matter what a Jesuit does, he can't go back on, although as you know, he has even been accused of doing this in order to get the job done in some cases. But at this point the line must be drawn because this is the basic ultimate commitment of the Jesuit and therefore of any Jesuit institution.

Now, the Christian commitment places primary emphasis on the welfare of human beings, both natural and supernatural, on the welfare of individual human beings, not of "humanity" or "classes" or "groups". This Christian concern becomes in a special way a driving personal concern of the Jesuit, because of his religious dedication. And so this concern will be reflected in every Jesuit institution, no matter what its specific purpose may be. Hence the Jesuit University is going to have to be interested in the total development of the student, it is going to be interested in the total development of each student as a person. It is going to be interested in the development of this student within a commitment to Christianity. It is going to be interested in the development of this student in the world in which we find ourselves. Consequently, a total development of a human being. The University run by Jesuits which would become simply and solely a kind of vocational school would be very difficult to think of because even when a Jesuit runs a vocational school, he ought to have some interest in the total personality of the people that are being taught this vocation.

But if you move into a liberal arts college in the modern university, and you say, "What are we doing in the modern university or what are we doing in these?", in all of those, we are interested in doing something to the students who come to us. And the best thing we can call this I think is the total human development of this person at a high intellectual level. To move them from unconscious

thinkers to conscious thinkers. To move them from people who have their values from tradition to people who have a reflective grasp on their values. To move them from people who must depend on what other people say to them and do for them, on directions they receive, to something approaching a situation in which they are self-motivating, in which they can, in the best meaning of that ill-used term, perhaps think for themselves. This means that in the curriculum of a Jesuit institution, particularly in reference to the liberal arts college, the dimension of reflective knowledge will become important. In our retreats the Jesuit asks the retreatant to be reflective, meditative. Each Jesuit is urged and asked to be reflective and meditative. To reflect upon himself, upon his own motives, upon his reasons, to find his prejudices, his biases; to become self-aware, to become aware of oneself. The reflective dimension which is an essential dimension of liberal education, because it is the essential dimension of the opening of a mind, is essential from a Jesuit standpoint for any kind of human development, because it is the way a person begins to move from more or less mechanical reactions to things, and more or less going along with things, to an attitude of true personal freedom, true personal motivation, and so on.

Now when you put this kind of reflection into the world of learning, into any kind of profound study, you immediately find that you are going to force yourself beyond any single given piece of study. You can concentrate if you want on pieces of mathematics, you can look into poems, you can study linguistics, you can study physical theory, you can study biochemistry, you can study the history of the French Revolution; but even to understand these separate bits, to a certain extent you have to have a reflective attitude with regard to them, you have to begin asking questions about them, pushing back. You push back in history, you push out into the universe. Eventually, if your reflection goes far enough, you are going to arrive at a point where you are pushing out beyond the individual pieces of knowledge and beyond disciplines and you are pushing to some kind of general framework. You are pushing out to ultimates, you are pushing down to foundations—however you want to say this— and find yourself asking questions that transcend the limits of any one discipline. At this point you are, therefore, becoming philosophical minded, and theological minded, because the ultimate questions will turn out to be theological questions, whether you end in a Christian theology or not. So the point is here that if

you are reflective to a high level with regard to what is being done in intellectual development, this reflection ineluctably pushes you beyond any kind of limited study, any kind of limited discipline; it pushes you into the area of broader questions and therefore into an area of philosophy and theology. Now if a person has no particular interest in ultimates, if an educator doesn't care about them, doesn't believe in them or doesn't think there is anything to be said about them, then this becomes an open-ended questing that raises problems without solutions. But in the Christian tradition this has not been the basic intellectual stance. Relativism and skepticism with regard to ultimate is not a Christian position. It is not a Catholic position, it is not a Jesuit position. And consequently, the Jesuit will attempt to pick up this kind of questioning, to formalize it, to put it into some kind of formal training, so that the person who pushes himself up out of physics into broader questions or up out of literature into broader questions will have a training that will enable him to deal with these in a mature and intelligent way instead of as an amateur, instead of trying to work at them with some inadequate kind of methods. Chesterton somewhere says that the penalty of not having a philosophy of your own that is formal and thought through is that you end up actually using the worn out tags and bits of other people's philosophy without even realizing it. So that I cannot see in the scene we are in today when we are really thinking of producing mature human beings, in a university, but what one dimension of the educational experience of the student has to be formal philosophical training and one dimension has to be formal theological training. Without these either we don't get reflection far enough, or, if we get reflection far enough, the student cannot handle it. He needs the resources of the hundreds of years of philosophical discipline, the resources of revelation and the hundreds of years of theological discipline.

This is exactly what we do for the particularized problems within a discipline; we put all the resources of that discipline at the student's disposal.

I don't believe that the introduction of philosophy and theology into the essential work of college education is a mere accident of the American Scene. I think it is essential to any kind of mature human intellectual development, doubly emphasized by the characteristic reflective stance of the Jesuit.

The second point that I would like to make here again comes out

of this general appreciation and conviction on the part of the Jesuit with regard to persons and the formation of a person, as an individual and as a totality. Again, we assume that we are talking about collegiate education in the United States where we are trying to bring people to maturity, we are trying to make them intellectually independent and humanly independent, able to function as persons at a higher level of development than the level at which a good peasant might function or a good craftsman might function. To do that, once again, the Jesuit would want to see the total human resources of the individual developed and disciplined. I am not talking here now about intellectual discipline. I am talking about the inner development of a person's resources to feel, to love, to appreciate, to tie together imagination and intelligence and emotion; to bring the total human person to full potential in this whole gamut of human emotions, will, intellect—working together in some kind of integration. The well developed person is not like a block of ice, cold and emotionless; it is not the silly-headed teenager that is emotional and excitable about everything regardless of what it is; it is not somebody who has got such powerful feelings that he constantly loses control of himself; but it is someone who has strong emotions, who has strong feelings and strong sensibilities, and strong convictions and yet has these all worked together into a disciplined pattern. This means that you cannot simply think of higher education for this person as consisting in intellectual disciplines, in learning the purely intellectual fields of knowledge in which the non-emotional stance is a necessary part of the method. There are whole areas of intellectual effort in which we must try to close out our emotional life, in order to maintain the stance of a pure scientist. But this is not a continuing human stance, and if we are to bring this out and make this a permanent pattern of life, we would have a truncated individual.

Here then I am referring to the humanistic dimension of college training and universal education. This can be developed with Ming vases and old Chinese music or Japanese prints. It can be done with Persian poetry. It can be done with African art. It can be done anywhere that the human spirit has expressed itself and expressed itself in any kind of disciplined ways, but disciplined ways that do not kill the kind of thing that we are trying to develop. This is strengthened by the fact that in Jesuit spirituality this is the kind of reaction that a man is called upon to make to his God. St. Ignatius

felt that the man who could live Jesuit spirituality ought to be a man of very powerful and deep feeling; of an ability to love with the force of a tremendous personality; that these were necessary prerequisites to being the kind of a force in the world and being the kind of a sanctified human character that he wanted his Jesuits to be so that they would be great leaders of men. This is the kind of thing that he had in mind, and the Jesuit therefore must think in any kind of formation of people and therefore above all in the liberal arts training, at the university level of training young people —must think of this kind of development. Therefore it would be very difficult for me to conceive of a Jesuit institution in which the humanistic dimensions were not strong and highly emphasized. I repeat, I am not talking about specifics. It does not have to be Greek language, it does not have to be Latin literature, it does not even have to be the literature and language of the West.

I am sure that Matteo Ricci was doing this with the Chinese disciples of his in China by reading the Chinese classics with them, and incidentally, contributing to the Chinese classics himself. This was a kind of development on the part of his neophytes that put them in a position to become well developed human beings but they did not have to read Virgil or Sophocles. China had its resources for a humanistic development too. But the point I am making is that a higher education which would not emphasize by some instrumentalities this kind of development on the part of the student would not be the sort you would expect from Jesuits or from Jesuit inspired and directed institutions. This would have to be part of the total pattern. Now these three basic dimensions I think are absolutely essential to the kind of view of the development of the human being that a Jesuit institution would have to operate towards.

I would like to make another comment here in regard to the world in which we live. I mentioned that we are in a world of change and criticism. We are in a world in which many new things are happening and many old things are being discarded. The cry is for "modernization." We have got to be up-to-the-minute; we are not in the thirteenth century anymore; there is no use arguing with Averoes; he's dead and nobody ever hears of him any more and so on. All of which is true. We've got to live in the world in which we live. But this is not, it seems to me, the same thing as being contemporary. I think the most disastrous thing we could do with the educational system is to attempt to use totally contemporary in-

strumentalities. I would say that the one way you could be sure that the next week you would be out of date would be to be completely contemporary this week. The instrumentalities, whatever they be, whether they be Chinese or Swahili or whatever—the instrumentalities for the things I have been talking about here, seems to me would have to be—in a restricted meaning of this word—"classical." I am not referring to Renaissance classicism or the classicism of Greece or Rome. What I mean is that the things you use, whether they are ideas or theories or books or poems or paintings or pieces of music—basically, you have got to have a store of instrumentalities which have managed to be either never wholly contemporary or contemporary to every age. They have managed to serve beyond contemporary fads, contemporary interests and all the passing show and fury of human living and life. Very often there are accidental things about these classical pieces which make it a little difficult to use them. But if they have so survived and have so managed to be of interest beyond contemporary periods, and passing moods, then they have got a kind of value that in a sense is demonstrated. They have got something we can be sure is worthwhile. What of the contemporary that we have got now can we be sure people will even be talking about ten years from now. Particularly now that Madison Avenue is in the culture game. When I read these jackets on books or the book announcements or even some of the book reviews, I have to think, there isn't a book in the whole of Western civilization that I could really honestly say that about. The stepped up notion that this is the book of the century and the book of the year and the best thing in a decade and it is final and it is definitive. How many "definitive" books have we thrown away or replaced with subsequent "definitive" books? The danger of being contemporary—is a very grave danger, in the world in which we are. The student is impatient of things which he thinks are outdated; he wants things that are red-hot right now, that are coming off the presses. The last thoughts of the last leaders of European existentialism—this is what he wants to be reading, and he doesn't want to put his time in on the things which I have called "classical." I can remember my own education. I studied Plato, for example, but I also read a good bit of things about which in a sense I was more excited because they seemed very contemporary. They were modern books, they were the live movements. I can remember reading these things and talking about how these were going to

change the world. But I find now, thirty-five years later, Plato is still contemporary. Everything that I studied about Plato I can still use. Nobody now has ever heard about the books that I was most excited about. I have a hard time finding some of these books in libraries now. They were completely contemporary and dated and they passed. Some of the movements of which, when I was a young man, we were saying, "These are the movements of the future, this is what is going to happen in the world", now I have to explain in great length to some of my students what these movements were. Who were these people that said these things and did these things? It is hardly worth talking about. They proved themselves historically to be completely third rate, and hardly worth the effort of studying them.

I noted above that history reveals the Jesuit as particularly flexible in his ability to adapt his activities to changing circumstances. (Obviously this is not true of *all individual* Jesuits; some of the most conservative people I know are Jesuits). There is about him an Ignatian insistence on using the means necessary to get the job done. This implies a constant concern and effort to drive through to fundamentals. And so it is altogether in keeping with the Jesuit's character that he choose instrumentalities which are—in the sense in which I have used the terms "classical." That is to say, things that are not tied down as dated and contemporary sorts of things, but things that have life in them, that has gone beyond the short period in which they might have attracted attention because they were written in a mode that then was part of a fad or that had some contemporary interest because of accidental circumstances. As a matter of fact, you know, in the world of art the survival of a contemporary mode of writing is almost a test of being classical. That certain Greek plays out of hundreds of others have survived to be instrumentalities of modern education is despite some of the very funny conventions of Greek drama, and ones which you and I, I am sure, find difficult to get accustomed to. The play has survived this very dated way of putting on plays because it wasn't dated and it wasn't contemporary, it managed through the genius of its author to rise superior to its own time and therefore can speak to our time as a universal document. The same thing is true of every great painting; it is not the genre, the mode or the historical school that makes it great, it is because simply it has gone beyond the school and through it done something greater than a manner or a mood.

Obviously, also the Jesuit institution will have to provide for academic majors and professional majors within this framework and these of course should be at the very best and highest level, levels of excellence. The Jesuit university should also be open to everything in the world of scholarship and learning; it should be open to every methodology, embrace every kind of method of reaching out for more truth, for developing new disciplines, these all should be at home on the Jesuit campus. They should be creatively at home on the Jesuit campus. The Jesuit university therefore, as an instrument within this world development, as leading forward at this Renaissance of the Church, as establishing the kinds of centers of culture that are necessary in the modern world must bring to bear within the framework that I have outlined, the full wealth of all of our culture and our cultures today. It must be a Catholic university in every sense of that word. It must have a universal outlook and a universal acceptance. And returning to what I said in the beginning I think it is a mark and sign of the maturity of Catholics and of Catholic intellectualism in the United States that we are in a position, without any fear whatever, or without worrying about historical accidents and difficulties and backlogs of prejudice and so on, so to face the totality of the modern world, serene and confident that we are living in a modern age in which we can move the dedication of Christ into every phase of this world, in which we can bring together, into a Catholic center of learning, reunite the two Christian cultures, the lay culture and the clerical culture, bring together here all the different strands of human learning, putting them, however, within some kind of framework that is humane and philosophical and theological, a framework which recognizes their autonomy, which does not impose and push in upon the disciplines, but rather brings out their ultimate meanings by keeping them in a total framework of human culture and divined revelation. The modern Jesuit American university will be an instrumentality therefore for the reform of the world through knowledge and learning and insight and finally an institution in which truth is venerated, in which truth is regarded, in which human persons are regarded, human persons are venerated, and all of this under the rubric of divine charity.

The Catholic and Jesuit University must be a university in which learning is a sacred vocation, and in which truth is not only human truth but a Divine Name.

Formation Through Guidance and Counseling

THOMAS A. MCGRATH, S.J.

INTRODUCTION

Formation in the sense often used by Jesuits, is a strange and uncomfortable word for most modern psychologists. It has a passive connotation. It makes one think of something being impressed from without rather than an internal force, or self directed form of development. One imagines immediately a mold being imposed on impressionable material.

Modern psychology has become so dynamically oriented in terms of self actualization, as the supreme value of man, that it is imperative, (if we are to draw any profit from this science) to give consideration to a dynamic concept of "formation."

Guidance is the total process of helping the student in self-formation and experience. It includes orientation, testing, imparting information, giving of advice, exhortation, and above all, counseling in the professional and technical sense of the word. What was once called "counseling" is no longer a valid concept. The appropriate term for the traditional Jesuit effort in "counseling" students should be called "guidance." Counseling as it is understood today is a precise, technical process based on a one-to-one relationship of a professional nature, requiring special training, and specific skills.

It is imperative that these semantics be clear if one is to appreciate the ideas exposed in this paper. Traditionally, Jesuit educators have been strong in giving "guidance" to students, but weak in "counseling" students in the new, technical meaning of the word.

This paper addresses itself to "formation through counseling" in this modern sense only.

Counseling, therefore, may be defined as that process whereby a professionally trained person helps the client who seeks his service to make his own decisions *responsibly*. This has to be accomplished *by the client*, through his own individual skills, motivation, and the necessary freedom from his own negative emotions which all decision processes demand. The biases, blind spots, and psychic "scar tissue" of the client are slowly exposed to him through counseling so that he becomes *free* to call his "own shots" in a responsible way. This self direction comes about in a mature and full way only when

the subject has evolved and brought to conscious level efficacy his own internalized value systems. This means that during mid- and late adolescence many, but not all, must re-examine under direction the values presented to them by their parents, school, and Church; look at them in relation to the values penetratingly impinging on them from the American culture in which they live, and finally come up with their own personalized values which will *from inside* direct them in the supreme human process of making their own decisions and directing their own lives in a mature, productive and happy way.

VALUES

At this point it might be well to clarify the emerging concept of "value." It is very much what St. Thomas meant by "sentiment" —truth about which we have feeling. Psychologists have during the past decade finally made an effort to understand and experiment in a real way with the dynamics of personal values.

Values can be understood only in light of the concept "motive." A motive is anything that energizes man to behavior. The whole gamut of motives starts at the rather primitive level of instinct, and moves up in a hierarchical way to: drive, need, emotion, value, goal, and finally ideals. These are the forces that impel man to act.

Values, as part of the motivational system, whether externally imposed and/or internally realized, motivate man to act, to direct his energies in a specific way. Obviously internalized values are the only truly mature form of self direction. They lead to greater productivity, and richer mental health.

Values, too, are thought to be arranged in a hierarchical order. Following a modification of the Maslow system in this matter, the development and hierarchical structure of value systems is as follows: trust values, safety values, pleasure values, social values, love values, honor values, and supreme and above all, the value of self actualization.

Values are learned. Therefore, they must be taught from the first moment of the individual's existence. If all goes well, values at first external, (imposed from without) are internalized throughout the life span. A value that stays external is a weak energizer of human behavior and usually begets only conformity. Values that are internalized are part of the maturation process that must never stop in man's fulfillment of himself. Only internalized values bring about

action, courage, creativity, heroicity. The most severe time of stress as far as internalization of values is concerned is during the adolescent years. There can be no maturity without internalized values.

Granted that values are correctly taught (quite a concession!), it is during the years of adolescence that negative dynamics come into force which interfere with the efficacy of the value system and therefore with good judgment and responsible decision making.

PSYCHODYNAMICS

Perhaps a word on psychodynamics at this point might be in order. Psychodynamics as understood by psychologists today simply means that there are in all of us negative, unconscious and sub-conscious forces at work which interfere with good productivity, healthy relationships and responsible decisions. Almost every psychologist has his own way of explaining this. Here is a modification of the Maslow position which is considered most workable. One must distinguish between: 1) the situation, 2) the reaction or feeling brought on by the situation, and 3) the unconscious or conscious behavior determined by the feeling. This can be stated quite simply in a paradigm:

Situation	Feeling	Behavior
1. frustration	hostility	aggression or apathy
2. conflict	anxiety	general inefficiency or depression
3. threat	fear	fight or flight
4. violation of value	guilt	rejection of value or contrition and renewal

The paradigm above merely means that behavior is just a symptom of emotion, and emotion is produced by a situation. For example—granted that a person is in a situation which he finds frustrating, he cannot but feel hostility, and hostility must come out, express itself, be consumed in some way, or it destroys. The two most common ways for hostility to "will out" are by aggressive behavior, or even worse, by apathetic behavior.

What has just been said about frustration is *pari passu* true of conflict, etc., as explained above in the paradigm.

There are many other ways of stating this. The point made here is that it is important not to look merely at behavior, but to go back deeper into a search for feeling, which precipitates the behavior. The next step is to search for the situation which produces the feeling which causes the behavior. *This is what a good counselor does!* To do this, specific training is necessary! And not everyone is capable of profiting from such training!

Simply put, a good counselor is situation oriented, is exquisitely sensitive to the conflicting negative dynamics, and finally leads the counselee to see these dynamics at work in his life and thus be free to make his own responsible decisions.

Until recently Jesuits have confused guidance with counseling. And our guidance has so often had only a moralistic orientation, rather than a "total man" orientation. The "total man" view must be a mental health orientation.

All counseling, spiritual, academic or personal should be done in view of mental health. If all could realize this and accept it as the ultimate rationale of counseling, the trivia, the obstacles that exist in many minds would be dissipated.

Mental health (maturity) may be defined as follows: a mentally healthy (mature) person is one who can: 1) accept himself, 2) accept others, and 3) make responsible decisions. This definition is deceptively simple. It has, however, extensive ramifications. Another way of stating it would be: a man is mature, 1) when his self concept is realistic, 2) when his relationships are healthy, and 3) when his decisions are responsible, sound. You might say these are the hallmarks, the characteristics of a mentally healthy person.

This definition needs detailed explanation.

I. SELF CONCEPT

The first hallmark of a mentally healthy person is the *realistic* acceptance of self. There are five areas of self acceptance: sex, body, intellect, social nature, spiritual nature. These are the five aspects of self in light of which we secretly pass judgment on ourselves, i.e. make value judgments about our own worth in terms of sexness, bodiness, intelligence, social personality, and moral goodness or worth.

1. *Sexual Self Concept.* First, a person must be able to accept

himself in terms of his own "sexness." This means if he is male, he must be happy to be male, consciously and unconsciously. Now this seems to be pretty simple, direct, obvious. Actually it is so primitively simple that if there is any confusion in this area, it becomes one of the major roots of mental disorder. The whole problem of sexual self acceptance is important because this is one of the areas in which we have strong feelings of acceptance or rejection of selves. Most of the time these feelings are formed early in life, are forgotten or repressed, and therefore, deeply unconscious. These feelings were formed in the psyche at about the age of four. At about that age the child starts to understand that there are differences between male and female not only in body but in comportment. He should, at this point, identify himself with his appropriate parent, e.g. the father figure, in terms of his learning to be masculine. If the child does not make this identification, he becomes to some degree psychosexually confused. If he is overly attached to his mother, or if his father is an absent person, or a cruel, or threatening, or punishing person, or an inadequate male, then the father-son relationship is weak, or negative, and no identification takes place. Today, in our society where the good father is very often absent from the home because he leaves early in the morning to go to work, and comes home late at night, the boy-child is deprived of the father, does not have him to imitate and so becomes confused. His self concept of his own masculinity is not formed just because he did not see enough of his father. Many fathers rationalize and say, "When my son is fourteen I will spend some time with him, but right now I don't have the time." At fourteen the boy does not need his father. It is too late to make this relationship. At the age of *four* a child needs his father in order to establish his sexual identity. To know how to act as a male, he needs a worthy image to imitate. Deprivation in this area is the root of psychosexual confusion which we see in the high school (and college) male student. It is the root of homosexuality which we see more commonly than ever before. Then, too, in some families it is easier to be a girl than a boy. He wishes, therefore, in the dumb simplicity of a four-year old mind, to be a girl. This wish is unacceptable, of course, so he represses it, but he lives with this confused desire the rest of his life to some degree. Back at the age of four the child must learn to have positive feelings about himself as male. At manhood, for mental health, he must be consciously and unconsciously happy to be a male.

2. *Body Self Concept.* The second aspect of self concept is the feeling of worth that one has about oneself in terms of body, i.e., image of body. Children think of themselves as worthwhile or worthless, good or no good, in terms of the pulchritude or lack of pulchritude of their bodies. In the simplicity of youth one learns to have either positive or negative feelings about one's body. All, perhaps, would like to change their bodies in some way or other if this could be done, to make them more perfect, to make them more beautiful. This is impossible and therefore one has to form an attitude. Usually this attitude is learned from the parents. Children see themselves through the eyes of their parents. If this learned attitude toward body is negative, it can be the root of deep-seated inferiority problems. The most common source of inferiority problems, strangely, is not in the area of the mind, but in the area of body and body-acceptance. The fat, awkward, ungainly child, or the thin, sickly, unathletic child, is almost always scarred in his psyche in terms of personal body inferiority.

In early childhood all very definitely form, as seen through the eyes of their parents, a body concept that can last for life. If parents, no matter how ugly the child is, think he is beautiful, or at least thoroughly acceptable, the child tends to accept self. If the parent thinks the child is not attractive, or is an awkward child, an ungainly child, or if the parents themselves have negative feelings about the bodies of their children, the children pick this up. This is especially true if the father is handsome, athletic, strong, and gives birth to any sort of delicate, sensitive, non-athletic son. The son makes the comparison and picks up the rejection even though it is never verbalized by the father. Very often a child cannot possibly accept or tolerate on a conscious level these negative feelings about himself so these feelings are also buried deeply in his unconscious and he goes through life with feelings of self-rejection, of inadequacy in terms of body. Americans live in a very body-conscious culture, and men are accepted or not accepted by the culture very largely in terms of body. The body is glorified in America. All of us, therefore, in our growing days form a concept or an image of the perfect body, or the body beautiful.

Usually for boys in our culture, the Mr. Atlas or Mr. Universe type of body is thought to be the perfect body—the huge shoulders, heavy muscles, the thin tapering waist—this is the image that usually dominates the thinking of the American male. This stress

in our culture on body is bound to make the body a major source of acceptance or non-acceptance of self. Once the young boy starts to realize that his body is not that muscled, or that strong, or that attractive, then he needs to find another image. Many of our modern youth have substituted for the muscle image, or a Mr. Atlas image of body, the image of some guitar strumming idiot with his long sideburns, his willowy, undulating frame, his DA haircut, his tight clothes. It is a strange twist. It is a sick twist. Boys are now using feminine tricks: the coiffured hair, the tight, tight bodice, the tight, tight pants, (female tricks!) to establish, God help us, masculinity. This is the saddest twist and the greatest perversion of all. They are confused in body image. All men must have a body image, an attitude toward their bodies that is healthy.

3. *Intellectual Self Concept.* Thirdly, we have very deep feelings about ourselves, either positive or negative, in terms of our own intellect. Today education has become a status symbol; certainly a college education has. You are deemed worthwhile or worthless dependent upon college acceptance. There is a tremendous amount of pressure on the student to go to college. Today in our culture the A student is glorified because he can go to the fine prep school. He is guaranteed college; he is almost guaranteed life, because we are in a mad search for talent. This has left behind the good B student and the C student and they have picked up an attitude on themselves as inferior or second rate. The ordinary student is finding it difficult to think well of himself. Sixty-eight per cent of the population are C students. Years ago we always thought of a college education for fourteen or fifteen per cent of our population. Today we are thinking in terms of 50 per cent. This glorification of the college education has become a status symbol for parents. They think they are acceptable if they can get their children into the fashionable prep school and to get them accepted into one of the major colleges. They exert considerable pressure on their children even in their early school years to get A's. They expect their children to reward them for having borne them, and for bringing them up, by getting accepted into a good college.

It is obvious, of course, that if children are unhappy with their parents for one reason or another, an excellent way of getting back at parents is to fail in high school, or fail to get into college, or once having gotten into college, it is a marvelous way to work off hostility toward parents by failing. This hostility is, of course, very

often unconscious. The student does not consciously punish his parents by failing in college. He does fail because of his unconscious need to get back at his parents for the pressures they have put upon him to succeed, and for making college acceptance the norm of worthwhileness or love.

Perhaps we ourselves are not blameless in this area. We are making too much of college education, high I.Q., etc., which immediately creates a bias in good counseling. More and more the AB or BS degree is thought of as non-terminal, as a stepping stone to graduate or professional school. Today we pride ourselves on the number of students going on from college to graduate school, very much as we did years ago on the number of high school students going on to college. We, too, put pressure on the student. We, ourselves, are pressured because we know that graduate schools will not generally accept any student with less than a B average. Perhaps, then, our attitudes need re-thinking, if we are looking upon the C student and the D student as a non-acceptable student or a less worthwhile being. We must once again remind ourselves that there are likeable and worthwhile C students and D students. We might even stop to consider in a very pragmatic way that our D student is so grateful to us for having gotten him through a good high school he very often becomes a most loyal and grateful alumnus. The stress put upon the student today in light of native talent, makes it very difficult for him to form an appropriate and honest self concept in this area.

4. *Social Self Concept.* The fourth area of self concept is perhaps the most subtle of all—our feelings about ourselves as social beings. We are not meant to be alone. Our happiness depends upon our learning to be comfortable with others—to gain approval and acceptance. If the three aforementioned areas of self concept are sound, this fourth area is most likely to be automatic. There are, however, many possible complications. From our earliest years we learn that what others *think* of us, even over and above what we are, is most important.

In this age of social status symbols the problem can be quite acute for many students. If the student ever gets the idea from his parents or society that he is worthwhile or worthless in terms of a "mink coat for mother", "a two-car garage", "the right neighborhood", "the swish prep school", "a Brooks Brothers suit", "Father's executive

position", etc., he builds within himself a false and stupid approach to life.

Children learn to handle people early in life, dependent upon their relationships with parents. If the "con job" worked with parents, they use it with others; if wooing, they woo; if threatening, they threaten; if aggression, they become aggressive; if fear, they fear; if seduction, they seduce, etc. The social handling of others is learned; it is learned early and permanently. Only counseling and/or therapy can change it.

One other point, a major one, might be made here. We ourselves and the parents of our students have been brought up with much bigotry and much prejudice towards the other children of God. We can only hope that we are less prejudiced and bigoted than our forebears and forefathers. At this time, it may be hoped, we are taking the next step, to teach our students to be less prejudiced and less bigoted than we, God help us, are.

Our students must be led to realize that each one of us is totally unique in terms of body and soul and different from all others; each man has a right to be unique, to be thoroughly an individual; and yet each man must intelligently conform to society. God has reserved to Himself the right to judge others. We teach this to our students only if we live it ourselves.

Youth, especially in his early years, as he starts to realize that he must be "individual", sometimes goes too far, and becomes quite aggressively rebellious against social norms and social mores which would restrict or confine him in his individuality and his search for it. Up until the early teens the student has fundamentally thought of himself as conforming in order that he might gain approval of society and especially of the authority figures in his society. In early adolescence he starts to realize that sheer conformity does not gain him as much as he once thought it would. He does not prize approval as much as he once did. He tries then to seek out his own independence. Without the maturity that he will eventually attain, we see the student becoming what we would call rebellious or moving outside set limits, or trying to, at least, and very often he becomes a problem in discipline. Punishment is negative, but necessary. Counseling is positive, and we must be dedicated enough to try to understand and work through the "why" of repeated infractions. Social self concept, then, is perhaps the most delicately balanced essential for mental health.

5. *Spiritual Self Concept.* In the fifth area of self-acceptance, in terms of personal sanctification and salvation, our student is coming to us (more so than ever before) spiritually confused. We no longer enjoy the strong family security and protection against false doctrine which came in many families when familial ties were stronger. In a very mobile society families have separated, families are smaller, and there is no longer the Irish section or the Italian section, or the Polish section of the city. There is great mixing of not only races, but also creeds. The student has lived all his life in a liberal, secular world, with a liberal, secular philosophy dominating it. This philosophy has penetrated his thinking more than we know, and in spite of efforts to teach him Catholic values and Catholic principles. He has been strongly influenced by modern secularism. He has seen it in the neighborhood, and he has entered into intellectual conflict many, many times in terms of his theological values and his theological dogma. He has heard them challenged and discussed by people whom he likes and whom he respects in the neighborhood. Modern secularism which so defies the human intellect makes supreme the attitude that nobody is going to tell me what to do, what book I will read, what is a just wage, how I will comport myself, how I will interpret scripture etc. This attitude has penetrated Catholic minds and Catholic hearts more than we would like to think. The student looks upon some of the closed circuits of Catholic theology as archaic because they have been so called by people whom he respects and likes. He comes to us spiritually and theologically confused.

More than ever before good spiritual counseling is necessary. This should be the supreme challenge to all of us, teacher and counselor alike. If the student senses within us the closed mind, a narrowness of outlook, impatience, inability to answer the problems of our culture and age he is going to lose respect for us. And this we see not only on a high school level, but especially on a college level. His confusion should challenge us to stay alive and alert, to make spiritual counseling practical and real. The blind faith of his forefathers is no longer a source of security for the modern student. He wants the answers, and he wants them immediately. He wants the answers to be extremely honest, practical, and workable. We must do all in our power to present

these answers, or at least be honest in admitting we don't have the answers when we do not. We must not pretend, or try to hoodwink them. There is no reason for the number of failures in religion. It would make one who is clinically oriented suspect that this was another way that a student could unconsciously work out his hostility, his rebellion, against many of the old theological cliches that some of us are still peddling.

Just to be good in this liberal and secular culture today takes heroic virtue. It is much more difficult for the average student to be pure than it was 25 years ago. We should be honest enough to admit this. It just means we must motivate more. We must encourage more. Perhaps at times tolerate more. Spiritual maturity will come only from a Catholic theology that is alive and presented in sound and intelligent fashion. Once the student gets the aroma of the archaic or the unreal we start to lose him. We cannot expect him to be quite pragmatic in all other subjects, as indeed he is, and not be also quite pragmatic about his theology.

Ascetical maturity fundamentally means right relationship with God, that is, 1) sound faith in God's communication to us, 2) absolute confidence (hope) in the promises made by His Son, Jesus Christ, and 3) love, which in itself implies three things: a) communication of love—prayer; b) service of love, life actions in imitation of Christ, and c) union, perfectly experienced in this life only in Holy Communion. Ascetical maturity means right relationship between the soul and the divine person, Jesus Christ. The student should learn religion in terms of relationship, not law. Theology shows the way of this relationship. Ritual gives it form. Counseling can clarify, make it real in the midst of the confusion of living. All that is beautiful and sound in a healthy human relationship can be a beautiful and sound and healthy model for his relationship with the Divine Person whom the student seeks. If we make theology or ritual more important than the Love Relationship we leave the student confused. We might all examine quite honestly and clearly whether we understand *ourselves* that the most important thing is that the children of God be in right relationship to God. Spiritual counseling should be in reference to this relationship.

We accuse our students much too glibly of lacking faith or lacking the conviction that their forefathers had, or that we ourselves have. We see insecurity of faith and morals in our students; we become frustrated by it; our frustration converts itself

into hostility; we start to drive theological truth down their throats. Theology becomes just another academic hurdle that must be survived. Counseling should not fall into this pit. Good counseling looks to relationship. Spiritual counseling focuses on ascetical maturity, right relationship with Christ, of which, knowledge (theology) is but a part. How can a student who sees himself as Christ, the Living Christ, continuing the work of the Kingdom, doubt about his worth? When all else fails in self concept this facet of it can mean survival.

These are the five areas, then, of self concept: sex, body, intellect, social nature, spiritual nature. These are the five areas about which we have strong positive or negative, conscious or unconscious, feelings about ourselves. We look upon ourselves as worthwhile or worthless in terms of these concepts. Our counseling, it seems to me, should be done in terms of self concept. At all times the full and harmonious development of man must be in terms of his own self concept.

The student must no longer think that he is mortally wounded, and therefore is made a horribly imperfect human being by original sin. He mustn't be taught to worry or fret about or fear the innate rottenness or sinfulness of his own person. This is a negative concept. It is in fact a rather stupid concept to be propounding to a student who is searching for his own identity. Ultimately and pervasively he should be taught that his primary source of identity lies in the fact that Christ is the firstborn and he the second born of the children of God.

Guilt which is redeemed nature's price for a violation of redeemed nature can be seen and utilized positively, if it is seen in terms of relationship. Every relationship entered into by the children of God, whether it be on the human-human level, or on the divine-human level, will be strained from time to time. It is part of the love-price that we love enough to say, "I'm sorry, I'll try never to do it again." Guilt can mobilize us to goodness, to reparation of relationship, to maturity of relationship.

II. *RELATIONSHIPS*

The second hallmark or characteristic of the mentally healthy person is his ability to relate to others in a healthy and productive way. This ability, of course, will depend fundamentally upon his own self concept. If his own self concept is sound, usually the second step comes automatically. But since in none

of us is the self concept perfectly healthy, since none of us has been able to get through life without some psychic scar tissue, there is going to be some degree of problem in relationship.

Relationship is not something that just happens. *It must be learned.* The student must know from us and experience from us counselors the living example of a sound relationship. (It is a truism now to say that counseling *is* relationship. It certainly is relationship rather than technique.) The student must come to know from us that in all relationships there is the act of faith (communication of truth), the act of hope (trust), and the many, many appropriate acts of love (service). He must realize that at times in any healthy relationship, since we are imperfect, there is the need for the act of contrition in order to repair the relationship.

Relationship, more than anything else, must be learned early in life, and it must be learned in the home. Many students who come to the guidance office come there only because never once in their lives have they had an experience of a sound, healthy, productive relationship. They may have learned early in their lives from their relationships with their parents that the best way to enter a relationship, the best way to handle another person, is to con him, or to threaten him or to woo him, or defy him. This is the only way they know how to relate. They do this with a considerable amount of unconscious dynamics, therefore, blindly.

Perhaps the best way to know what type of relationship a student is capable of forming is to watch the way he relates to you as a counselor. Is he wooing you, conning you, seducing you, threatening you, manipulating you? What is the student trying to do to you as he sits with you in counseling session? This will perhaps more than anything else give you insight into how this student goes about relationships.

It need not be stressed, because it is obvious that the only source of happiness in the lives of the children of God is relationships. Things will please us, distract us, keep us busy, reward us many, many ways, but true and abiding happiness comes only from relationships. All academics, all spirituality, all morality, ought to be taught in terms of relationship, the relationship of the children of God, one with another, and the relationship with God, the eternal Father.

The key to sound relationships, of course, is a person's ability to accept others. If he is a non-accepting person, if he does not

have reverence for the complete individuality of all others with whom he comes in contact, if he is "judgmental", if he is bigoted, if he is prejudiced, if he is arbitrary in his norms for the acceptance of the other person, he will not enter into healthy relationships and therefore not be a happy person.

He must be counseled to accept others realistically. This means, of course, avoiding the two extremes, 1) a blind and stupid acceptance of others, and 2) an arbitrary rejection of others. He learns this fundamentally in his home, and secondarily in our school. He relearns this and makes repairs in counseling.

The counselor, of course, must know himself, and watch his relationships. If *we* do not enter into healthy relationships, we will not present the model nor the theory, no matter how we try, in a convincing way. If we are bigoted, if we are prejudiced, if we are unsound in our acceptance of other people, we do not enter into healthy relationships with students.

More so than in any other school setting, the student is at the mercy of the counselor. Only the best should be chosen. Only the trained can succeed. No matter what the student's problem is, he has a right to have his problem. God left him free even to sin. God left him free to be ignorant. God chose that he should exist, and in this choice even committed Himself to the ignorance and sin of all of us. This should be the basis for our own acceptance of our students.

However, we find it hard at times to accept the sinfulness of the children of God or the confusion of the children of God. A homosexual enters our office. Are we repulsed by him? He is still a child of God. It perhaps again comes down to the old platitude, loaded with wisdom, that although we reject the sin, we must not reject the sinner. This attitude of acceptance is not a pollyannish sort of thing, it is not a weak thing, it is not so permissive that we tolerate what should not be tolerated. It means that on a personal counseling level we should be big enough to accept the children of God as they really are, weak, dumb, sinful at times, but always and from all eternity, *chosen*, created in the image and likeness of Christ.

III. *RESPONSIBLE DECISIONS*

The third hallmark of a mentally healthy person is his ability to make responsible decisions. We have come, in our culture, to revere this final characteristic. The man who can make a decision,

who can call the signal, and accept the responsibility for being right or wrong in his actions; this man is spotted early and immediately as a leader of men. The reason that we select, the ultimate reason for the choice of men, the so-called great men, in our space effort, is not because they are the most intelligent men in the country, or the strongest men in the country, or the healthiest men in the country, or the greatest pilots in the service. They are ultimately and finally chosen because of their ability to make a decision under extreme stress. This is the basis for our choice of our national leaders, it is hoped. We trust that this man, for whom we vote, more than any other man, will call the signals correctly and honestly as he sees fit, knowing always that there is the margin for human error.

The great challenge for the successful man today is to accept the responsibility for his own decisions, and at times to make them under extreme stress. It may be because of this stress under which the successful men in our civilization must make decisions that we have so many psychosomatic illnesses.

If a little child has not from his earliest years been trained to make decisions and accept responsibility—if the parents make all the decisions for him—he is not going to know, when he is left alone in the world at eighteen, how to make decisions or how to accept the responsibility for them. He will still want his mommy or daddy or priest with him.

If we might take just one extreme example of this: the example of the scrupulous person. This is a person who cannot make moral decisions; cannot accept the responsibility for his own moral decisions; he is a person who has not internalized his conscience. Mommy isn't there any longer to tell him what is right and what is wrong, or Father so-and-so is not there to tell him right from wrong. Yet, when we were trained to give pastoral counseling to the scrupulous person, the one thing we were trained to do was to put this person under obedience and make him do as we say. In light of modern psychology this is the most destructive (and stupid) way that could ever be conceived for handling the scrupulous person.

We counselors must take the outlook that we should not make decisions for the student, and that perhaps our greatest task is to lead the student to personal responsibility for his decisions. We should not make his decisions for him, no more than his parents should. We should bring him to think through all the

possible alternates that there might be to any course of action. If we succeed he learns ultimately to make his own decisions and accept the responsibility for being right or wrong.

To make a single clear-cut point, then, if we can take the attitude of mental health, we can include safely within it all that is precious to us, theologically, ascetically, and academically. If we could form such an attitude of mind it would make for more effective counseling of students, whether we be teacher, part-time counselor, or trained counselor. If we could spread the mental health attitude to superiors and to others who are working with us on every high school and college staff, it would make for a healthier atmosphere in which the student might mature. We ourselves must learn so much in terms of acceptance of others and right relationships. We must learn to accept the confusion of our students. We must learn to accept and be comfortable with their hostility towards us as we try to lead and teach and inspire them. Rather than being angered by this hostility and confusion, we should have enough insight and strength within ourselves to move with it and utilize it. Ultimately our greatest effort should be made in keeping our own concept of ourselves realistic. We should be in awe of the tremendous dignity of role which we exercise. This, in order that we might enter into rich relationships with the children of God who under the divine dispensation are placed within our trust.

In summary, let me point out that this outlook, this over-ruling solution to the obstacles in the way of good guidance in Jesuit institutions, whether you have realized it or not, presupposes the existence of the unconscious mind, alive, and dynamic, with psychic influence on almost every act of man, academic, spiritual, or psychological. The power of the dynamic unconscious in man, we are just starting to see and understand. If one does not accept this concept as essential to any true concept of the nature of man, as the basis for any sound theory of personality, as the ultimate rationale of all counseling, then this effort has been wasted here. One will never be able to counsel students effectively. One is caught in the obstacles that have held us back many years.

If the students are to be productive, they must have sound self concepts. If they are to be happy, they must enjoy healthy relationships. If they are to continue Christ on this earth they must be bold in their decisions. For all of this, they need and

deserve the best of counseling knowledge and effort.

Formation, then, of youth through counseling must be self motivated, self directed formation coming from the internal dynamics within the individual, which we as counselors make possible by aiding the student *to be truly free* to actualize himself.

Status of Special Studies 1966-1967

There are 573 Jesuit Priests, Scholastics and Brothers currently enrolled in special studies. This is an encouraging increase of 161 over the figures given at this time last year of those who are preparing for the educational apostolate of the Society. The increase of Scholastics in special studies (an increase of 113) is undoubtedly partially attributable to the change in the curriculum in our Philosophates which now makes it possible for Scholastics to begin special studies after two years of philosophy. For the first time Jesuit Brothers are listed among the special students; 2 from New England are studying Physics and Nursing, 2 from New Orleans are in Library Science and Nursing and 4 from Oregon are enrolled in courses in Business Administration, Computer Science, Art and Nursing.

Nine Provinces reported an increase in the number of their special students; the other two Provinces reported a decrease of one each. The largest increases were in New York, Maryland, Missouri and New Orleans. The New York Province has more men (85) in special studies than any other American Province but they are closely followed by New England (76), Maryland (75) and Missouri (68). The ratio of special students to the total membership of the Province is highest in Maryland (8.9%), Missouri (8.8%), New York (7.6%) and New England (6.8%).

Our special students are enrolled in 119 institutions (32 foreign institutions) and in 50 different fields of study. The largest enrollments are at Fordham (54), St. Louis (44), Catholic University (26), Georgetown (24), Gregorian (21), Marquette (20), Boston College (20), Loyola, Chicago (18), Harvard (18) and University of Chicago (17).

The impact that the Loyola Workshop (August, 1962) on Theology and Philosophy has had on the number of special students enrolled in those two courses becomes quite evident by comparing the statistics for the scholastic year 1961-1962 and for 1966-1967. In 1961-1962 there were 36 special students enrolled in courses in Theology, Canon Law, Scripture, Patrology, Religious Education and Religious Studies; in 1966-1967 there are 115 special students enrolled in the same courses. In philosophy 31 special students were enrolled in 1961-1962; in 1966-1967 there are 53 enrolled.

Twenty-one special students were majoring in Counseling, Psychology or Psychiatry in 1961-1962; today there are 24 specializing in these fields.

TABLE ONE—COMPARATIVE STATISTICS, 1962-1967

	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	66-67
Full Time	309	306	365	412	573
Priests	210	220	274	314	354
Scholastics	99	86	91	98	211
Brothers	—	—	—	—	8
Ph.D.	195	185	214	211	248
Other Doctor	38	48	58	89	73
M.A.	31	24	30	51	146
M.S.	10	20	23	19	29
Other Master	4	4	7	8	16
Other Degree	15	7	7	7	10
No Degree	16	18	26	27	51

TABLE TWO—DEGREES SOUGHT, 1966-1967

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N. Eng.	N.O.	N.Y.	Ore.	Wis.	Total
Full Time	21	45	46	33	75	68	76	38	85	45	41	573
Priests	12	35	24	26	45	38	56	20	52	25	21	354
Scholastics	9	10	22	7	30	30	18	16	33	16	20	211
Brothers	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	4	—	8
Ph.D.	9	25	21	16	30	29	34	21	21	22	20	248
Other Doctor	2	8	5	9	9	1	14	0	18	2	5	73
M.A.	6	9	14	4	20	24	11	9	25	12	12	146
M.S.	2	1	1	0	5	9	2	2	1	4	2	29
Other Master	0	0	2	0	7	2	1	0	4	0	0	16
Other Degree	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	5	0	10
No Degree	2	2	3	4	4	3	13	2	16	0	2	51
New	10	20	26	11	48	46	41	26	52	24	18	322
Continuing	11	25	20	22	27	22	35	12	33	21	23	251
Total 66-67	21	45	46	33	75	68	76	38	85	45	41	573
Total 65-66	22	32	32	34	46	40	62	18	56	34	36	412
Plus or Minus	− 1	+13	+14	−1	+29	+28	+14	+20	+29	+11	+5	+161

TABLE THREE–MASTER FIELDS, 1966-1967

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Ore.	Wis.	Totals	
Anthropology	1 PhD	----	2 MA	----	1 MA	----	----	----	1 MA	1 PhD	2 MA	2 PhD	6 MA
	1 ND	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 ND	
Archaeology	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	
Art	----	----	1 MA	1 Cert	----	----	----	----	----	1 BA	----	1 MA	1 BA
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 Cert	
Astronomy	----	----	1 PhD	----	1 PD	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	1 PD
Biochemistry	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	
Biology	1 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	1 MS	----	1 ND	1 MS	1 PhD	1 MS	2 PhD	7 PhD	5 MS
	1 MS	1 MS	1 ND	----	1 PD	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 PD	2 ND
Business Administration	----	----	----	----	1 MBA	----	1 PhD	----	----	1 BA	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 MBA
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 BA	
Chemistry	----	1 ND	1 ND	1 PD	1 MS	----	1 PhD	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 MS	----	4 PhD	4 MS
	----	----	----	----	1 PD	----	1 MS	1 BS	1 MS	----	----	1 BS	3 PD
	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 PD	----	----	----	----	2 ND	
Communication Arts	----	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	2 PhD	----	2 PhD	----	1 PhD	6 PhD	1 MA
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 MA	----	
Computer Science	----	----	----	----	1 M	----	----	----	----	1 BS	----	1 M	1 BS
Counseling	----	----	----	----	2 M	----	1 MA	----	----	1 MA	----	2 M	1 MS
	----	----	----	----	1 MS	----	----	----	----	----	----	2 MA	
Drama	----	----	1 PhD	----	1 MA	----	----	1 PhD	----	----	----	2 PhD	1 MA
Economics	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	2 PhD	3 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	----	----	----	1 PhD	12 PhD	5 MA
	----	----	----	----	----	3 MA	1 MA	----	----	----	1 MA	----	
Education	----	2 PhD	2 PhD	----	1 MA	3 PhD	1 PhD	----	1 PhD	1 PhD	----	10 PhD	7 MA
	----	----	2 M Ed	----	----	4 MA	----	----	1 MA	----	1 MA	2 M Ed	1 MST
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 MST	----	----	----	
Engineering	----	----	----	----	----	----	2 PhD	----	----	----	1 MS	2 PhD	1 MS
English	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	3 PhD	6 MA	4 PhD	4 PhD	4 PhD	4 MA	2 PhD	3 PhD	24 PhD	32 MA
	1 MA	----	2 MA	3 MA	----	5 MA	5 MA	1 MA	2 ND	3 MA	2 MA	2 ND	
Fine Arts	----	----	----	----	----	----	2 PhD	1 MA	1 MFA	----	----	2 PhD	1 MA
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 MFA	
Geology	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 ND	----	----	----	1 MS	1 MS	1 ND
Geophysics	----	----	----	----	----	1 MS	----	----	----	----	----	1 MS	
History	1 PhD	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	4 PhD	2 PhD	3 PhD	8 PhD	3 PhD	4 PhD	2 PhD	31 PhD	24 MA
	2 MA	2 MA	1 MA	----	4 MA	5 MA	----	----	5 MA	4 MA	1 MA	1 DesL	1 ND
	----	1 DesL	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 ND	----	----	----	
Industrial Management	----	----	----	1 PhD	1 MA	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	1 MA
Industrial Relations	----	----	----	----	1 M	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 M	
Languages	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Arabic	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	2 ND
	----	----	----	----	----	----	2 ND	----	----	----	----	----	
Classics	1 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	3 PhD	----	1 PhD	----	3 MA	1 PhD	1 PhD	10 PhD	8 MA
	1 MA	----	----	----	1 MA	1 MA	----	----	2 ND	----	2 MA	1 MAOxon	2 ND
	----	----	----	----	1 MAOxon	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	
French	----	----	1 MA	1 MA	1 MA	----	----	----	1 MA	----	----	4 MA	----
German	1 PhD	----	----	----	1 PhD	1 PhD	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	4 PhD	2 MA
	----	----	----	----	1 MA	----	----	----	1 MA	----	----	----	

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N.E.	N.O.	N.Y.	Ore.	Wis.	Totals	
Islamic	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	
Semitic	----	1 PhD	1 ND	----	----	----	4 PhD	----	1 PhD	----	----	6 PhD	1 ND
Spanish	----	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	----	2 MA	1 MA	1 PhD	----	2 PhD	4 MA
	----	----	----	----	----	1 MA	----	----	1 ND	----	----	1 ND	
Law	----	----	1 JD	----	----	----	----	1 LL.B	----	----	----	1 LL.B	1 JD
Library Science	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 ND	----	----	----	1 ND	
Linguistics	----	----	2 MA	1 ND	1 MA	----	1 PhD	----	2 PhD	----	----	3 PhD	3 MA
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 ND	
Literature, Comparative	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	
Mathematics	2 MA	1 PhD	1 MA	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	1 PD	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 MS	1 PhD	9 PhD	1 PD
	----	----	----	----	1 MS	4 MS	1 MA	1 MS	1 MST	----	1 ND	4 MA	7 MS
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 MST	1 ND
Medicine	1 MD	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 MD	
Music	----	----	1 PhD	----	----	----	----	1 PD	1 MA	1 PhD	----	2 PhD	1 PD
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 MA	
Nursing	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 Dip	1 RN	----	1 RN	----	2 RN	1 Dip
Philosophy	2 PhD	6 PhD	1 PhD	3 PhD	3 PhD	2 MA	1 PD	3 PhD	1 D'Univ	2 PhD	3 PhD	27 PhD	17 MA
	----	5 MA	2 MA	----	2 MA	----	3 PhD	----	1 D Ph	2 MA	----	1 PD	1 STD
	----	----	----	----	1 STD	----	2 MA	----	1 PhD	1 PhL	----	1 D'Univ	1 PhL
	----	----	----	----	----	----	2 ND	----	2 MA	----	----	1 D Ph	4 ND
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2 ND	----	----	----	
Physics	1 MS	----	2 PhD	1 PhD	4 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 MS	1 PhD	13 PhD	8 MS
	----	----	----	----	1 MS	4 MS	1 MS	1 BS	1 MA	----	----	1 MA	1 BS
	----	----	----	----	1 PD	----	1 ND	----	1 ND	----	----	2 ND	1 PD
Political Science	----	2 PhD	1 PhD	2 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	----	1 MA	1 PhD	2 PhD	----	11 PhD	2 MA
	----	----	----	----	----	1 MA	----	----	----	----	----	----	
Psychiatry	----	1 PhD	----	----	----	----	1 Cert	----	----	----	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 Cert
Psychology	----	1 MA	2 PhD	----	1 PhD	2 PhD	1 PhD	2 PhD	2 MA	1 PhD	1 MA	9 PhD	5 MA
	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 MA	----	2 ND	----	----	2 ND	
Reading	----	----	----	----	1 M	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 M	
Religious Education	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	4 PhD	----	----	----	----	----	5 PhD	
Religious Studies	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	
Scripture	----	----	----	----	----	2 SSL	----	----	1 SSD	----	----	1 SSD	2 SSL
	----	----	----	----	----	1 ND	----	----	1 D Ph	----	----	1 D Ph	1 ND
Sociology	----	3 PhD	1 PhD	----	----	1 PhD	2 PhD	----	2 PhD	1 PhD	1 PhD	11 PhD	8 MA
	----	1 MA	2 MA	----	----	1 MA	----	----	2 MA	2 MA	----	1 MS	1 ND
	----	----	1 MS	----	----	----	----	----	1 ND	----	----	----	
Speech	----	1 PhD	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 MA	1 PhD	1 MA
Speech Therapy	----	----	1 PhD	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 PhD	
Theology	1 STD	1 PhD	2 PhD	9 STD	4 Doct	6 PhD	1 PhD	4 MA	1 PhD	5 PhD	1 PhD	20 PhD	55 STD
	1 ND	5 STD	4 STD	1 ND	3 PhD	1 STD	14 STD	----	10 STD	2 STD	5 STD	1 D'ScR	1 ThD
	----	1 Cert	----	----	4 STD	1 MA	1 MTh	----	1 ThD	----	1 ND	2 D Ph	4 Doct
	----	2 SSL-STD	----	----	----	2 ND	2 ND	----	1 D'ScR	----	----	5 MA	2 MTh
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2 D Ph	----	----	1 Cert	11 ND
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1 MTh	----	----	2 SSL-STD	
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	4 ND	----	----	----	

TABLE FOUR—SCHOOLS

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N. Eng.	N.O.	N.Y.	Ore.	Wis.	Total
Al Hikma*	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	---	---	---	2
American Class. Acad.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
American Psychiatry	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Andover-Newton	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Arizona	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	---	3
Baltimore City	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Biblical (Rome)*	---	---	---	---	---	3	---	---	1	---	---	4
Boston College	---	---	3	1	3	1	7	---	---	4	1	20
Boston University	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	---	1	---	3
Brandeis	---	---	---	---	---	---	4	2	---	---	---	6
Bristol*	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Brown	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	1	1	2	---	6
Buffalo	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2
California (Berk)	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	1	1	5
California (L.A.)	---	2	---	---	2	1	---	---	---	1	---	6
Cambridge*	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1	3
Case	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Catholic University	2	---	---	---	8	3	5	1	5	---	2	26
Chicago	---	4	4	1	2	1	2	---	2	1	---	17
Cincinnati	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
City U of New York	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	---	2
Clark	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Colorado	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Columbia	2	---	1	1	---	---	3	---	3	---	---	10
Cornell	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1
Corpus-Christi*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
DePaul	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Duke	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Fairfield	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Florence*	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Fordham	4	4	6	2	9	1	6	2	17	3	---	54
Frankfurt*	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1	2
Freiburg*	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	2
Georgetown	---	5	3	2	6	---	3	1	3	---	1	24
Gonzaga	---	5	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	9	---	14
Gregorian*	1	---	3	2	4	---	2	---	6	2	1	21
Harvard	2	---	1	2	2	1	6	---	3	---	1	18
Hebrew U.	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Heythrop*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Holy Cross	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Howard	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Illinois	---	---	1	---	---	3	---	---	---	---	---	4
Illinois Tech	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Indiana	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	2
Innsbruck*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Instit. Cathol.*	1	1	1	---	1	---	1	---	1	---	2	8
Instit. of Living	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
Instituto Madrid*	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	1
Johns Hopkins	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	2	3	---	---	6
Kansas U.	---	---	---	---	---	3	1	---	---	---	1	5
London*	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1	---	---	2
Louisiana State	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	3	---	---	---	3
Louvain*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	2
Loyola (Chi)	---	1	4	4	5	2	---	1	---	---	1	18
Loyola (N.O.)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	1
Lumen Vitae*	---	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2
Madrid*	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	1
Mainz*	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	1
Marquette	---	---	---	2	3	4	---	1	1	3	6	20

* Non-United States Schools

	Buf.	Cal.	Chi.	Det.	Mary.	Mo.	N. Eng.	N.O.	N.Y.	Ore.	Wis.	Total
Maryland	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Massachusetts	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
M.I.T.	----	----	1	----	1	----	1	----	----	----	----	3
McGill*	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
Michigan	----	2	1	1	----	----	1	----	1	1	----	7
Michigan State	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Minnesota	----	1	----	----	1	1	----	----	----	----	1	4
Missouri	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	1
Montreal*	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Munich*	----	1	----	----	1	----	1	----	----	----	----	3
Munster*	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	2
New Mexico	----	1	1	----	----	1	----	1	----	----	----	4
New York U	----	2	----	----	1	----	1	----	4	1	----	9
Nijmegen*	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
North Carolina	----	1	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	2	5
Northwestern	1	1	1	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	2	6
Ohio State	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Oratory-London*	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	1
Oriental*	----	----	----	----	----	----	2	----	----	----	----	2
Ottawa*	1	----	----	3	----	1	----	----	----	1	----	6
Oxford*	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	1	2
Paris*	----	1	----	1	1	2	----	----	----	----	----	5
Peabody Institute	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1
Pennsylvania	----	1	----	1	3	2	1	1	----	----	1	10
Pittsburgh	----	----	----	----	1	----	1	----	----	----	----	2
Princeton	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	1
Private Study	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	3	----	----	3
Puerto Rico	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	1
Rochester	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	2
Rome*	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	2
St. Eliz.-Covington	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
St. Louis	----	----	1	----	3	28	----	1	1	1	9	44
San Francisco	----	2	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	3
Scranton	1	----	----	----	2	----	----	----	----	----	----	3
Seattle	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2	----	2
Sorbonne*	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	1
Southern California	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	1	----	----	2
Spring Hill	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	3	----	----	----	4
Stanford	----	1	----	----	----	2	----	----	3	2	1	9
Strasbourg*	----	----	----	----	2	----	1	----	1	----	----	4
SVD (London)*	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	1
Syracuse	2	----	----	----	1	----	----	1	----	----	----	4
Tennessee	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1
Texas	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	2	1	----	----	4
Toronto*	----	----	----	1	----	----	3	----	----	----	----	4
Trier*	----	----	----	----	1	----	1	----	2	----	----	4
Tubingen*	----	1	----	----	----	----	2	----	2	----	----	5
Tufts	----	----	----	----	----	----	2	----	----	----	----	2
Tulane	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	1	----	2
Union Theological	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	1
Vanderbilt	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	2
Washington	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	1	----	3	1	6
Washington State	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	----	1
Wayne	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	1
Western Reserve	----	----	1	1	----	----	1	1	----	----	----	4
Wisconsin	----	----	1	1	1	----	----	----	----	2	----	5
Woodstock	----	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	1	----	----	2
Xavier	----	----	2	----	2	----	----	----	----	----	----	4
Yale	----	1	1	----	1	2	2	1	----	----	1	9
Yeshiva	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1

* Non-United States Schools

Interdisciplinary Social Sciences in Secondary Schools: A New Approach

R. Emmett Curran, S.J. and Joseph M. Kakalec, S.J.

Background

The purpose of this paper is to describe an experimental program towards teaching the social sciences in our high schools. This program is the outgrowth of a realization that many of our high school graduates had little or no meaningful knowledge of the society in which they lived, and little commitment toward that society. This realization was confirmed by reports and information coming back to us from college officials on the poor background of students. To take some steps to overcome these deficiences, we set up a program which would hopefully analyze American history as fully as possible. This we attempted to do by approaching American history through interdisciplinary dimensions. Too often the historian is incapable of presenting the multi-faceted dynamics of any given era of our society. To expect him to be deeply perceptive in economics, sociology, and political science is unrealistic.

Moreover, we believed the student could be better prepared for his future education by presenting him the opportunities for synthesizing, thinking creatively, working in a seminar atmosphere, and familiarizing himself with the inductive, behavioral method of the social sciences. The course would also serve as an introduction to the other social sciences not normally taught in high school. In short, we wanted to develop a new method of teaching in this field, one which would convey to the student both the complexity of our evolving society and the difficulty of meeting challenges in contemporary society.

Setting up the Program

Since this program was experimental, we wanted to select our students very carefully. The criterion was not primarily intellectual ability or past achievement, although both factors were important. (With one exception, all participants had a B+ average or better). Of equal importance was the student's interest in social sciences, his willingness to carry the demanding work-load, and his readiness to experiment along with us. Moreover we

wanted to keep the group workably small to eliminate as many variables as possible. We finally invited twelve students, eight of whom accepted.

Since Loyola High of Baltimore, where this program was initiated, is relatively close to Woodstock College, a large number of qualified and experienced teachers was available. Staffing the program were five Jesuit theologians, two with Ph. Ds and three with Masters' degrees. The fields included were history, political science, economics, sociology, and cultural anthropology. In addition, there were guest lecturers in art and jurisprudence.

Again, due to the experimental nature of the program, the team recognized the absolute necessity for cooperation and coordination among the respective disciplines. Several preliminary meetings were held to discuss the nature of the program, its historical approach, and the necessity for continual dialogue among team members during the coming year. In these first meetings a tentative format and program was set up to be modified as needs and reflection required.

The Program

The general program operated within the framework of an advanced placement history course. The course itself was a broad selective survey, based on continuing problems and trends within American society rather than a strict chronological presentation. This part of the program began with six weeks of summer work at the end of the students' junior year. Sessions were held for an hour-and-a-half three afternoons a week. During this time a basic introduction to history and its place among the social sciences was given and the whole period of colonial history—up until 1784—was covered. The main purpose for this early start was to provide historical background for the other social sciences to work within once the fall semester began. During the regular year, the history teacher had two hours of class per week. This time was split between lecture periods and seminar discussions or occasional reports. A basic textbook (Thomas Bailey's *The American Pageant*) was used with 150-200 pages of additional readings every week. Also every third week a three-to-five page paper was due.

We might point out here that American history was broken down into four periods: 1) Early beginnings to the Revolution, 2) The Revolution to the Civil War, 3) Reconstruction to 1898, 4) 1898 to the present.

The purpose of this division was to allow the other social sciences to orientate their matter and organize it for the classroom. More importantly, it provided a basic co-ordination for presenting the matter of the particular period. The general plan adopted by the social sciences (political science, economics, etc.) consisted mainly of following three patterns. First, each discipline tried to give the student certain fundamental concepts (e.g., the different types of economic systems, the meaning of society and groups in the American context, the nature of government and the functioning of political parties). Secondly, we wished to stress the more important developments of each respective discipline during the given period (e.g., in political science the evolution of American Constitutionalism during the Federalist Period). Thirdly, we particularly wanted to underscore how developments within the various fields were interrelated with the whole American milieu (e.g., the effects of immigration upon political parties, the influence of economic factors upon the American Constitution). The above factors, it was hoped, would enable the student to make the proper applications for periods not treated.

Each instructor taught about three hours every month in his discipline. Each required certain basic readings for any given period. On the average one paper was required for each discipline during the semester. On occasions the team would meet prior to a cycle and discuss the planning for a period. This close co-ordination and pre-class discussion allowed us to eliminate as much as possible an isolated, centrifugal approach which would only serve to hopelessly confuse the students.

Results

On the whole the teachers and students involved found this experimental program a promising success. In particular, we might note that the student did get a clearer and broader vision of American history and society. This was indicated in an evaluative questionnaire at the end of the year. By and large the students responded very favorably to the course, worked diligently, and were genuinely interested. This was manifested by the caliber of the work which the students showed in their papers, tests, and reports. One student wrote back from college that this course was the best single preparation he had received in high school.

In the Advanced Placement History Examination, of the six

students who took the test, three received 4's (Honor Grade), two received 3's (Good), and one a 2 (Credit). This represented a substantially higher mean score than the national mean, and also was much higher than the mean achieved by the students in the previous year who had taken only a strict A.P. history approach. All six students received placement in their respective colleges, representing Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Loyola (Baltimore), Notre Dame, Washington, and Wesleyan.

Looking Toward the Future

While generally satisfied with the results, certain difficulties were evident upon our final reflection. First of all, in order for such a program to work most effectively, a minimal four-hour week seems in order to allow for more lecture and discussion time. The students were unanimous in wanting more classes! Secondly, despite our efforts to co-ordinate, the initial undertaking revealed (in the students' evaluation and in our own) that more co-ordination is necessary. This is not insuperable, but some controlling structure should be set up. For instance, bi-monthly meetings would seem a necessary step in this direction. In interdisciplinary team-teaching, there is simply no alternative to close co-operation and co-ordination. For example, in the reading program we found that no reading assignment can be isolated within one discipline. Clinton Rossiter's *Political Parties* can be used from a historical, political, and sociological approach. Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle* provides much revelatory material for the historian, the sociologist, and the cultural anthropologist.

The students enjoyed studying American history through the use of a novel such as Sinclair's *The Jungle,* or John Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath.* However, it would be better if these could be read within the scope of the English course. This again would require co-operation between the English and history teachers.

One of the great requirements of the course is a very adequate library with a sufficient number of multiple copies of "core" books. We were fortunate in two respects. To begin with, Loyola High School, in addition to having a superior library, was very generous in meeting our needs. Secondly, Loyola College was also helpful by contributing funds for the purchase of books. The building of a special library is no major obstacle since federal and state funds, among others, are becoming increasingly avail-

able for such quality programs. Also it might be pointed out that practically all the books used were paperbacks.

In recent years there has been a growing awareness of the need for a more comprehensive program in the social sciences. As Father Edward Sponga, S.J. emphasized in his keynote address to the delegates of the 1966 JEA Workshop at Los Angeles:

> Can we honestly say that we are educating a man to live in this modern world, if he knows the modern mathematics and the use of the supine, but is unaware and unconcerned about the economic and social and truly human problems of his city, nation and world? Is such a graduate ever likely to have any true influence as a Christian?[1]

At the present time our schools cannot hope to accommodate the demands of each and every social science. Consequently some initial compromise has to be reached. We believe this experimental program is a step in this direction. By integrating the basic social sciences within an historical framework, the net result is not only an exciting teaching and learning experience, but also strenthens the social dimensions of our curriculum. In these days of searching curriculum re-evaluation, we feel that such a program deserves serious consideration.

---

1 *The Christian School: A New View* (Washington, D.C., Jesuit Educational Association, 1966), xiii.

News From The Field

New Board of Trustees at Saint Louis University

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY became the first major Catholic university to give laymen and clergy combined legal responsibility for institutional policy and operations when on January 21, 1967, Father Paul Reinert, S.J., President, announced that the University had reconstituted its board of trustees so as to include eighteen laymen and ten Jesuits on the board which owns and controls the University.

The eighteen laymen on the board will include nationally known business, professional and civic leaders of various faiths. At least two will be outstanding educators from other universities, and four will be alumni of the University. Of the ten Jesuit members of the new board, five will come from the University and the other five will be from other Jesuit institutions or organizations. Under the by-laws governing the new board of trustees, the president of the University must be a Jesuit. The by-laws also require a two-thirds majority vote in policy-making decisions, thus requiring at least one Jesuit vote for arriving at such decisions.

Four two-day meetings of the board will be held annually. Monthly meetings will be held by an executive committee consisting of the chairman, the University president, two trustees elected from among the Jesuit administrators of the University and three lay trustees elected from lay board members. The board of trustees is self-perpetuating. It has the power to appoint the president of the University and elect its own chairman from among the lay members of the board. The chairman and board members will serve four-year terms and be eligible for re-election to two additional terms. The restructuring of the board will not require any change in the University charter. The charter does not specify any particular number of trustees, nor that they must be Jesuits.

In citing reasons for the change in the board, Father Reinert said:

"The trustees view this move as a means of better achieving the long-held fundamental objectives of the University, not as a step towards changing those objectives.

"The action is based primarily on recognition by the current

trustees that the educational goals of the University can best be served by:

"Placing legal responsibility in a board composed of leaders from various fields of American society so that it will truly represent the various interests and needs of the University's many constituencies: alumni, the business and professional community, the Catholic Church, and the general public; primarily, we are educating lay people for a lay society, and our board should reflect this;

"Giving laymen a clear-cut opportunity to participate in university life at the policy-making level, in line with the general movement within the Catholic Church, as expressed by Vatican II, to give laymen a greater role;

"Separating the general, overall policy-making function from the internal administration of the University;

"Enabling the University to strengthen and broaden its influence and support."

Father Reinert added that the University is moving carefully in the transition, realizing that the move will have important implications for other Catholic institutions of higher education and perhaps also for many of the other church-related colleges and universities in the United States.

"We feel that this pioneering pattern of governance for a church-related institution establishes a middle position between the traditional arrangement in which all or almost all of the legal trustees are members of the religious order responsible for the institution and, on the other hand, the pattern common to private non-denominational institutions whose boards of trustees are composed totally of laymen."

In approving the restructuring of the board, Very Reverend Father General wrote Father Reinert:

"I am very happy with the proposed greater collaboration of laymen in the direction of the University. I pray that St. Louis University will continue to give the leadership in the field of higher education that so many have come to expect."

Father General also referred to the decree on education which was approved last October by the Thirty-First General Congregation. In this decree, "close collaboration with the laity" in Jesuit education is recommended and "the advisability of establishing boards of trustees composed both of Jesuit and laymen" is recommended for investigation.

In a letter to Father Reinert His Eminence, Joseph Cardinal Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis wrote:

"My congratulations to you and those who are working with you on the project for the enlargement of the board of trustees. It is a fine plan which will mean much for the university and the whole community it serves.

"Be assured of my enthusiasm and wholehearted support and approval of this proposal to enlarge your board and to involve laymen in direction and policy-making responsibilities of the University. It is very much in keeping with the spirit of the Vatican Council II."

Daniel L. Schlafly, a member and former president of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, replaces Father Reinert as chairman of the board of trustees. Father Reinert continues as president. He has served the University in that position since 1949.

Mr. Schlafly, 54, has served as a member of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis since 1953, and was president of the board for three terms. He is a charter member of the Higher Education Coordinating Council of Metropolitan St. Louis.

He received the St. Louis Award in 1960 "for his effective service in the public interest as a member of the St. Louis Board of Education, for his conscientious efforts to improve the quality of education in the City of St. Louis, and for the image of civic service he has projected."

A native St. Louisan, Mr. Schlafly graduated from St. Louis University High School in 1928. He received a bachelor of arts degree from Georgetown University in 1933. In 1962, he received a distinguished alumnus award from Georgetown.

In World War II, he served four years with the U. S. Army in the South Pacific and earned the rank of lieutenant colonel.

In 1962, he was named a Knight of Malta, one of the highest papal honors a Catholic layman can receive. He received the "Big Brother of the Year" Award in 1961, and the brotherhood award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in 1965.

Mr. Schlafly is president of Arkansas Beverage Company and has varied banking interests. He is the father of three children.

In accepting the Chairmanship of the Board, he said:

"This is a high honor and I am very privileged to be offered the chairmanship of the University's board of trustees.

"I have thought long and hard about saying "yes" to Father

Reinert because of the many challenges and responsibilities involved and because I recognize that what we do here will have long-range effects on many other church-related institutions of higher learning.

"My acceptance was based on my belief that a board of this type is the best way to achieve the fundamental objectives of the University. This is not in any way a step toward changing those objectives, but a better way of achieving them.

"This move places the broad policy-making decisions where they should be—in a board truly representative of the many areas of society that the University serves—not only the students and faculty, but the total community, local, national and international.

"While the board will not and should not be involved with the day-to-day administration of the University, it will nevertheless have the final authority over the University's long-range policies.

"In accepting this position, I was persuaded by a strong personal conviction that this move by the University is very much in the spirit of Vatican II, in involving the laity on highly responsible levels throughout the Church.

"Like everyone else, I am greatly impressed by the steps St. Louis University has taken to achieve educational excellence and a ranking among the nation's top fifty universities. I am convinced that the newly reconstituted board of trustees will accelerate this progress."

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Index to Volume XXIX

June 1966 to March 1967