

FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM
PLEASE RETURN TO
PRIVATE ROOM
PERIODICAL ROOM
COPY

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

SHORT-TERM EXCHANGE OF JESUIT PERSONNEL

JESUITS IN THE FINE ARTS

PREPARATION OF THE JESUIT PROFESSIONAL

ENROLLMENT STATISTICS

Volume 31, Number 3

January 1969

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Our Contributors

FATHER WALTER P. KROLIKOWSKI, S.J., is the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Loyola University in Chicago.

FATHER C. J. McNASPY, S.J., is an associate editor of *America* magazine. He was formerly dean of Loyola University (New Orleans) College of Music, has a doctorate in musicology and for many years taught history of fine arts.

FATHER JOSEPH H. FICHTER, S.J., is the Stillman Professor of Religious Sociology at Harvard Divinity School. His article is the second of three which will be published in the JEQ analyzing the data obtained through the Gerard Survey of American Jesuit Priests.

EDWARD J. BARTLEY is Chairman of the English Department at Brooklyn Preparatory High School and a lecturer on Prose Techniques at Saint Peter's College.

FATHER JOHN F. TALBOT, S.J., is the Superior of American Jesuits in Puerto Rico.

FATHER THOMAS J. CASEY, S.J., is doing graduate work in Sociology at Colorado University.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

Volume 31, Number 3

January 1969

CONTENTS

JESUITS AND THE UNIVERSITY

Walter P. Krolkowski, S.J. 131

NOTES ON JESUITS IN THE FINE ARTS

C. J. McNaspy, S.J. 143

PREPARATION OF THE JESUIT PROFESSIONAL

Joseph H. Fichter, S.J. 148

ENROLLMENT STATISTICS—1968-69 159

“AND WRITING MAKETH . . .”

Edward J. Bartley 166

A JESUIT SECULAR CAMPUS EXPERIMENT

John F. Talbot, S.J. 172

CURRICULA FOR A HUMANE EDUCATION

Thomas J. Casey, S.J. 177

SHORT-TERM EXCHANGE OF JESUIT PERSONNEL 184

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

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

A. WILLIAM CRANDELL, S.J.

Managing Editor

PAUL V. SIEGFRIED, S.J.

ADVISORY BOARD

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

JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
JAMES C. CARTER, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
JOHN W. DONOHUE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
BERNARD J. DOOLEY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JAMES E. FITZGERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
E. JOSEPH GOUGH, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
HOWARD J. GRAY, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
HERMAN J. HAUCK, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
JOHN W. KELLY, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
PAUL T. LUCEY, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
JOHN V. MURPHY, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
JEROME A. PETZ, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
JOHN F. SNYDER, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>

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

COPYRIGHT, 1969
JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Jesuits and the University

WALTER P. KROLIKOWSKI, S.J.

About a year ago, I had a conversation with a few Jesuits at Xavier University, Cincinnati, that gave me some insights into the complexities of the usual issues we discuss with each other about Jesuit universities and Jesuit life. The complexities arise, at least in part, from our attempt to talk at the same time about the nature of the university, the relation of the secular to the sacred, the role of the Jesuit, the nature of his spirituality, the relation of the Church and Christ to other institutions and other individuals. Perhaps writing about these issues separately may help bring some clarity out of this confusion. Moreover, since our stand on any one of these questions does not seem to entail necessarily our stand on another, our differences of opinion need not be global.

I

Many Jesuits are concerned that they participate in a university which is distinctively Catholic and Jesuit. I am not. What in our thinking explains this discrepancy? They see Jesuit universities as institutions where the truth is proclaimed openly and unashamedly, that truth which is excluded almost by definition from proclamation at a state university. I incline to agree to this extent: Catholics can investigate without embarrassment that ingress to truth which is properly theological. Catholics do not automatically, in keeping with the *Zeitgeist*, exclude such investigations. (On the other hand, I see Catholics falling into step with prevailing party lines. They too can be influenced by a Catholic *Zeitgeist*. How else explain the monopoly scholasticism had on our philosophical and theological faculties for the past thirty or forty years?) But I see universities beginning, if barely, to investigate seriously that phenomenon called religion; I find them willing to open departments of religion and/or theology. Inasmuch as they do this, are they not Catholic? Catholic in a special sense peculiar to a pluralistic society? For where Christ is, if not proclaimed, at least studied, there is the Catholic Church in some sense surely. Furthermore, I am optimistic about the future. If each of us, separately or together, investigates truth long enough, seriously enough, and openly enough, Christ will be in our lives and in the life of the university. I even look

forward to the day when the Catholic university will be no more, not because it has been found wanting, but rather because society at large is now willing to support and honor such institutions under its own auspices.¹ I think it is the dynamism of the Catholic university to die; the better it does the job, the sooner that day will come. The university will be free to be itself and not an organ of the Church. Therefore, I do not see that what I am saying implies any disloyalty to our own Jesuit institutions.

This idea of being superseded also comes up in discussions about the relation of the Jesuit to the layman in the Jesuit university. If Jesuits do their job well, they will raise up future generations fully capable of taking over the work of running the university and teaching in it. Again, I look forward to the day when Jesuits will no longer be needed to run and staff universities. Another mission will have been closed down because the country can now live on its own resources. I have the same hopes that lay trustees will soon be operating our universities. On the one hand, I am trying not to sound triumphal. Christ is where the truth is, where love is. He is not bound by us. On the other hand, I do not mean to be an indifferentist. Christ's Church is the indispensable organ of salvation. There is a third possibility: being a secularist. We are not to prepare others to take over our work; we are preparing them to take over, freely and in ways unknown to us, their own work of being lords of creation.²

II

I think the phrase "in ways unknown to us" is very important. I will try to discuss it from three different perspectives.

First, what is distinctive about the Jesuit?³ Does he have a peculiar and distinctive message? No. Does he bring a certain administrative apparatus to his work? No. Does he have a distinctive spirituality? No. Like a Kantian concept, he is empty of content. But he stands ready at the service of the Church. He has

1 As Chenu notes, historically the Church has been involved in education work, as it was in "organs of culture, care for the sick and the aged, reconstruction after natural disasters," as a substitute for human groups which were inadequately organized to do their proper and profane work. See M.-D. Chenu, O.P., "Consecratio Mundi," in *The Christian and the World, Readings in Theology* (N.Y.: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1965), pp. 169-170.

2 Again, Chenu reinforces what I have been saying. The task of the Church is "not to construct a 'Christian world' at her own initiative, but to Christianize the world exactly as it is being built. In a way, the Church must go out of herself; she must be *missionary*." *Ibid.*, p. 171.

3 The question, "What is distinctive about the Jesuit?" reminds me of an exchange between a female theatre-goer and Harold Pinter which was reported on by Glenna Syse in the *Chicago Sun-Times* for January 21, 1968:

no more insight into the future of the Church or of mankind than any other man. He has no plan to impose on men. But what needs doing? He will try to do it and try in a way that ties no man down to a pre-conceived plan. He helps men to be free to serve God, for he does not wish to tie down free men. He encourages them to do what they think is right, and he trusts them to do it even when it turns out that men will operate in ways unforeseen by us.⁴ This is one way the phrase "in ways unknown to us" applies.

III

There is a second. Many Jesuits are very much concerned that they do not know where the universities are going. How can they cooperate if they don't know? At the same time, they all hear about ten-year plans; so planning is going on. But these do not turn out to be plans in the usual sense of the word. What are our goals? Once we know, then we can decide how to reach them and which means are most appropriate. What, then, are the goals universities wish their students to reach? I would suggest this is the wrong question and the wrong quest. I think of a cartoon in the December 2, 1967 issue of the *New Yorker*: A man stands in his laboratory and wonders, "Now, let me see. What needs discovering?" We laugh because we know that people have problems and spend years searching for answers, never knowing where they will come out. Ordinarily, people don't start by knowing exactly what they want. University education, surely, is something rather more like this than like an engineering task, for which engineers decide which tools are necessary to get a predetermined job done. Why is it so hard to see that this kind of question, asked about a university, allows no

(Continued from page 132)

A lady wrote saying:

"I would be obliged if you would kindly explain to me the meaning of your play 'The Birthday Party.' These are the points which I do not understand:

1. "Who are the two men?"
2. "Where did Stanley come from?"
3. "Were they all supposed to be normal?"

The letter concluded: "You will appreciate that without the answers to my questions, I cannot fully understand your play."

Answered Pinter:

"Dear Madam:

"I would be obliged if you would kindly explain to me the meaning of your letter. These are the points which I do not understand:

1. "Who are you?"
2. "Where do you come from?"
3. "Are you supposed to be normal?"

The letter concluded: "You will appreciate that without the answers to my questions, I cannot fully understand your letter."

⁴ This attitude or set I am attempting to describe as distinctive of the Jesuit William H. Gass calls *presence*. "Presence is a state of concentration on another so complete it leaves you quite without defenses, altogether open; for walls face both ways, as do the bars of a cage. Inquire of the bears how it is. To erect bars is to be behind them." See William H. Gass, "The Artist and Society," *New Republic*, 159 (July 25, 1968), p. 18.

answer? Moreover, why can't we see that the means available to any university are always incommensurate to the task of educating the whole man? And, since the means are incommensurate, means-ends paradigms will not be helpful. I prefer to use the paradigm of formal and material causality. How can we make the learning environment richer so that learning can go on more productively and surely? Planning is needed, a great deal of it, but planning for better students, faculty, libraries, learning situations, not a re-examination of goals. We will not know what our students are thinking and saying but we will know we have exposed them to the best we had available. They will be good, and we will be able to trust them, even though they may end up during their lives in ways quite unknown to us.

This matter is so important I would like to discuss it at some length.

Let me state the problem initially by quoting a passage from an introduction written in 1935 by Spencer Leeson for a book written in 1880 by Professor Nettleship which describes a theory of education proposed by Plato in the 4th century B.C. Obviously, the problem, although a pressing and contemporary one, is as old as western man himself.

Here is the quotation:

There was probably never a time when more thought and care was given than it is today to working out the best methods of teaching particular subjects, and to all that concerns the organization and material equipment of the schools. But there is much dissension and confusion upon what is the supreme purpose, or the 'architectonic end', for the attainment of which all the rest exists; and it is useless, as well as illogical to consider schemes of organization and methods of instruction until we have set before ourselves a clear idea of this ultimate objective. Such and such a scheme or method is best; but best for what? passing examinations, or 'getting in', or training in citizenship, or the development of personality, or what? This primary question needs thinking out.⁵

This problem of improving means without seeing their clear defined ends exists on every stratum of today's society. Great intellectual effort is expended in improving the rational arrangement of the technical instruments of production. We can make better cars more cheaply and more quickly than we did 50 years

⁵ Spencer Lesson, "Introduction," in R. L. Nettleship, *The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1935), pp. vi-vii.

ago. We can come up with an almost infinite number of antibiotics to protect man against disease. We grow bigger and better engines of warfare.

To what effect? Improved technology leads to technical unemployment, geographic displacement of families, poverty, and alienation. Better cars kill more people than poorer cars and involve the allocation of funds for highway networks, which funds could have been used for other, possibly more human ends. Men live longer and the problems of old-age, loneliness, and hospital care are exacerbated. Planes and tanks not only kill more people more effectively but also more of the innocent non-combatants. And why are we doing all these things? Men with trained intellects work more efficiently in the realm of means and find themselves incapable of proposing, maintaining, and evaluating ends.

So it is in education. Educational planners cram more content into individual courses, increase the number of available courses, and use more and more effective means of presenting this material. Much more. But what is it all for? Where are we going?

Briefly, this is an ever recurring educational problem, which continues to trouble educators and Jesuits today. But the problem is really greater and deeper than this. Whenever educators or students propose educational aims, these aims turn out to be absolutely unattainable, or unattainable by means available to educators, or cheap and pragmatic. What educational institution in all seriousness can say that it produces the perfect Christian gentleman? Or that it develops harmoniously all of man's faculties? Or brings a human being to the point of self-fulfillment? Such ends are simply unattainable ideals. Moreover, how can a school seriously think that the means available to it—lecturing, questioning, testing—are means proportioned to such noble and overwhelming ends? Lastly, when the college and the student lower their sights and begin talking about the student becoming an engineer or a doctor or a nurse, the university becomes a means to economic or social advancement. In the roil and moil of the market, the university loses all sense of identity with itself as an institution for the transmission of knowledge and the lifelong inquiry for truth; in Hutchins' fine phrase, the university becomes a filling station.⁶

6 R. S. Peters points out that most discussions of the aims of education are wrong-headed because educators persist in thinking of aims as things extrinsic to the educational process itself. His suggestion that we distinguish between aims, which are intrinsic to the activity, and purposes or motives, which are not, is well taken. Because most Jesuits do not make the distinction, however, I have used the word *aim* in this article in the more global sense. Cf. R. S. Peters, *Ethics and Education* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1966), pp. 27-30.

The problem, as we continue to consider it, turns almost 180 degrees. We begin by seeing that we do not have clear aims. We then realize that the aims usually proposed for the university are impossible or denigrating. And this is not the end of the problem.

Even if we were to arrive at attainable aims attainable by available means and aims worthy of the university, we would still be in the position of people who have already ordered their Christmas gifts for 1975. Any hope of novelty in our lives would be denied. After many years of struggle, we would simply get what in a sense we already knew. The years of struggle would teach us nothing new. Experience would neither change or modify our aims. We would live in a condition of *stasis*. It would turn out that the very things we desire most, clear cut aims, would cause education to be noneducative. We would have placed ourselves in the platonic dilemma of having to know the answer before we could ask the question.⁷

Is there any way out of this impasse?

I think there is. Let me begin by quoting a contemporary French philosopher, Maurice Merleau-Ponty:

He [the philosopher] says . . . that the world is going on, that we do not have to judge its future by what has happened in the past, that the idea of a destiny in things is not an idea but a dizziness, that our relations with nature are not fixed once and for all, that no one can know what freedom may be able to do, nor imagine what our customs and human relations would be in a civilization no longer haunted by competition and necessity. He does not place his hope in any destiny, even a favorable one, but in some-

⁷ Abraham Kaplan, from a different perspective, wishes to offer a theory of decision-making that departs from the view which equates rationality with the deductive *mos geometricus*. He writes:

Our usual reconstructions [which purport to give an account of the process of decision-making after the fact], I am afraid, beg the question of the range of their applicability by tacitly identifying rationality with what is self-conscious, deliberate, calculated, and controlled. But it is perfectly rational not to be *perfectly* rational. Reason itself sets limits on itself, not to make room for a Kantian faith, but less metaphysically, simply to allow for the values in other modalities of experience. The computers may yet make Spinozists of us all, identifying freedom with the determination of action by the recognition of deductive necessities. But spontaneity is also a value, and unplanned pleasures may be more gratifying even than unearned increments. The florist who ensures us against forgetting thereby destroys the meaning of remembering. Overarching plans, whether for scientific advance or for economic development, are in their very nature insensitive to what can be achieved by *unorganized* effort; the anxious hostess trying to decide how to make the party go would be more rational if she left her guests alone—with the food and drink, I must add. More generally, the calculation of an optimal strategy has its own costs not represented in the payoff matrix on which the calculation is based. It may be more rational to take political and judicial errors as they come than to adopt procedures recommending themselves as more “efficient.” There is much wisdom in the characterization of democracy—was it Mark Twain?—as sailing on a raft: Your feet are always wet, but the thing doesn’t sink.

See Abraham Kaplan, “Some Limitations on Rationality,” in *Nomos VII. Rational Decision*. Edited by Carl J. Friedrich (New York: Atherton Press, 1967), pp. 62-63.

thing belonging to us which is precisely not a destiny—in the contingency of our history.⁸

This quotation embodies what I believe to be a viable alternate way. In the first place, “the world is going on.” The world is not something we can leave today and come back to tomorrow and get back on where we had gotten off. Things really change. Process is a reality. In such a world, the fixed, unalterable aim defies the very movement of reality.

“We do not have to judge its [the world’s] future by what has happened in the past.” Life is not completely determined. The future is not simply an extrapolation from the past. Our past failures do not ineluctably eventuate in a future of failure. Not only do things change, but they are free to change.

“The idea of a destiny in things is not an idea but a dizziness.” Any person who believes that the man is in the sperm and the oak is in the seed cannot help but experience vertigo. In such a world the actuality of the world is coterminus with its potentiality. The future exists in the past. Opposed to this is the view of a changing, free, and emerging world.

“Our relations with nature are not fixed once and for all.” The question is: who is master? Does the world dictate our responses? Are we the servants of nature? Or are we masters of creation and creators ourselves? If we are masters, we look out on a world that is changing, free, emerging, and under our direction and control.

“No one can know what freedom will be able to do.” This is the crux of the matter. If we act in response to the world as it is and as we are, we do not know what will happen. The category of the new overrides all other categories. And this should be our hope and our joy. It enables us to look forward to a real transformation of our worlds and of ourselves. It enables us to look forward to tomorrow because we do not know what tomorrow will bring. Our grasp will exceed our reach.

“No one can imagine what our customs and human relations would be in a civilization no longer haunted by competition and necessity.” Such precisely is our dream, and it is a dream that goes beyond the complacencies and securities of clear aims.

What, then, am I saying? Am I throwing out the world idea of

⁸ Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *In Praise of Philosophy* (Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1963), pp. 43-44.

aims? No, I am not. But I am suggesting that we resist to the death the idea of fixed and stable ends which are completely clear to us before we start down the road to reach them.

I am suggesting that there is an inter-action between the present quality of our experience and the aims we have set hypothetically for ourselves. I am suggesting that we trust our experience.⁹ In the light of it, we ought to be ready to modify our actions and, in exactly the same spirit, modify or even reject our dearest held aims and ideals. I do not think a pre-arranged future ought to govern us. As God has no past or future but only a present, so we, too, ought to live as much as any creature can in the present.

I am fearful that we are so concerned about predictability that we will be satisfied with an impoverished but well controlled future. Our present, which is all we have, should never be sacrificed to the mere hope of a future good nor should we be willing to do mean and meaningless and routine things, all of which we hate, for some chimera that we hope to possess in a mythological future. In sum, I sing in praise of richness and experience and trust of oneself and each other. I sing in praise of freedom and the unsafe and the unpredictable and the new. I do not praise the mechanical. I praise the truly human.

IV

Finally, the phrase "in ways unknown to us" occurs in and fits a third context of discussion. Tensions arise between the Society of Jesus' commitment to the individual and her commitment to an institution. Typical quote, if mythical: "I would like to let you teach, Father, but there is a hole to be filled at Bobola University in administration." For a Superior, in today's world, to have to make the choice is not to acknowledge an inevitable tension but to court disaster. I would maintain that this course of action is disastrous because it presumes the decision is one, on the operational level, to be made by the superior. It fails to regard the relation of one decision-maker, the superior, with another decision-maker, the subject. It also ignores the fact that the decision is not an isolated one but one in a sequence, in which the relationship

⁹ We should be able to trust our experience as long as we put no ideological filter between ourselves and the things we experience. Using a different metaphor, a staff writer for the *New Yorker* wrote about Camus on January 6, 1960: "He [Camus] felt the world as close as water on his skin, and never grew the scales appropriate to a Big Fish. He was without insulation—the antithesis of the detached Stranger with whom his names will eternally be associated."

built between persons may turn out to be much more important, even in a mundane context, than the filling of a slot.¹⁰

Jesuit institutions have their own way of fostering immortality. As long as they have a worthwhile if marginal function to perform, they will survive, by using the resources, willing resources, of the Society or by going outside of it for faculty, administrators, or cash. Universities are strong and stable enough to endure. Individual talents and training are much more fragile, in constant need of tilling, pruning and dunging. I say, let the individual—he has had long years of training; he is a man of prayer—make known to Superiors his desires, whether they involve work in a Jesuit institution or outside it, and let him be allowed to pursue his desires.¹¹

What will be the profile of the Province in ten years' time? Who knows? But men will be happy. The Spirit will be free to act outside of institutional structures as well as within them. The future will be truly future, not simply a prolongation of the past. I can imagine no more paradoxical or frightening image than that of a troop of horses, impatient, stomping, whinnying, eager to be off, on whom are mounted, rooted to the ground, enamored of stability, unable to move, the light cavalry of Christ. No need to worry about our institutions. They will survive; they will flourish, manned by men, Jesuit and lay, who desire to serve other men through these instrumentalities. Ah, but how Jesuit will they be? As Jesuit as the people who desire to man the stations desire them

¹⁰ Charles E. Lindblom has a number of wise things to say on this matter. I hope I will be pardoned for quoting at length some of his other observations:

Faced with a problem in evaluation that exceeds his capacities, a would-be rational decision-maker can go in either of two ways: He can, like Major, the horse in Orwell's *Animal Farm*, resolve to work harder. Or he can try to develop strategies that adapt to his difficulties and make the most of his capacities by respecting limits on rationality. In its conventional endorsement of clarification of values when they will nevertheless remain obscure, of systematic canvassing of alternative means, when alternatives are countless, and of exhaustive tracing of consequences, when consequences go on forever, conventional decision theory displays the mentality of Orwell's horse.

Some obvious strategic adaptations are these, especially interesting because they violate the canons of most contemporary theory of rational choice: In collective decision-making, do not try to clarify values if the parties concerned can agree on policies, as they often can, despite their disagreement on values. Or: Neglect those consequences of possible decisions for which there exist watchdogs elsewhere in the society who will probably attend to the neglect: Or: Cut off the analysis of consequences at any point at which you yourself can probably at a next stop in a sequence of decisions attend to them if unfavorable.

Cf Charles E. Lindblom, "Some Limitations on Rationality: A Comment," in *Nomos VII. Rational Decision*. Edited by Carl J. Friedrich (New York: Atherton Press, 1967), pp. 227-228.

¹¹ In a way, I am echoing Bertalanffy's polemic against "the mystical belief in the group, team, committee." He continues: "Of course, the group or team has an important role in science, particularly modern science with its high degree of specialization and complicated techniques. Roughly speaking, teamwork will be productive and indeed indispensable wherever elaboration of a given project, discovery, or idea is concerned. The group or team will never, however, replace the individual in inaugurating new developments. There is, I believe, no example in the history of science where a new breakthrough, an essentially novel discovery or theory, was the work of a group. The idea that brainstorming in a bull session will result in new revelations has no factual background." Ludwig von Bertalanffy, "The World of Science and the World of Value," *Teachers College Record*, 65 (March, 1964), 503-504.

to be. Jesuits will act in ways unknown to us; universities will act in ways unknown to us as we stand in the here and now. And I see both of these as great goods, greatly to be desired, certainly not events to be feared because they cannot be specified in advance.

V

Two more points, both of which can be briefly dealt with. We fall, in our discussions, into the fallacy of being content only with the best. We see our schools less highly rated than others. We become discontented. We talk of amalgamating our forces so that, with all Jesuits or all midwestern Jesuits conjoined, we can have a university the equal of x or y. Two comments. Put all the American Jesuits together and we still could not equal Harvard or Berkeley. So we are simply dreaming. But, more than that, we are discontented for the wrong reason. Let us be discontented that our universities are not as good as they could be for a variety of real and corrigible reasons, but the dream of the best university as the only university with the right to exist is utopian in that it ignores the needs of countless students for a university education. Simply put, there can only be one best university; and it is the case that in America today we need at least two to three thousand colleges and universities. There is still place for excellent institutions, though they fail to equal "the best."

Let me try to say this another way. Pauline Kael, in her movie review column in the *New Yorker* for January 13, 1968, is discussing under the impact of big business methods the narrowing range of movies after an early period of experimentation. Not only did the range of techniques and subject matters narrow but critics began to search for justifications for this narrowing.

They began to ask what cinema 'really' was, as if ideal cinema were some pre-existent entity that had to be discovered; like Platonists turned archeologists, they tried to unearth the true essence of cinema. Instead of celebrating the multiplicity of things that movies can do better or more easily than the other arts, and in new ways and combinations, they looked for the true nature of cinema in what cinema can do that the other arts can't—in artistic apartheid. Some decided on 'montage,' others on 'purely visual imagery' . . . They wanted to prove that cinema was a real art, like the other arts, when the whole world instinctively preferred it because it was a bastard, cross-fertilized super-art.

Jesuits hankering after the best university have succumbed, or so I believe, to the same Platonic temptation.

VI

Finally, I would like to describe the secularism I espouse and set it off against an otherworldly view I find unproductive. First of all, in today's world with today's people, I find the rewards of heaven and the pains of hell motives that do not move. Perhaps people are wrong in not being moved, but perhaps in ignoring these motives they are wiser and more Christian than we think. Is there a heaven? Is there a hell? Of course I am not denying their reality; I am denying their power as motives for action. But there is another heaven and another hell which are powerful motives: the union with Christ in the here and now, which St. Thomas calls an *inchoatio gloriae*, and the loneliness of a self-created universe for the person God created for life in society and for friendship with his fellows in a common universe. Secondly, because Christ was incarnated in flesh, his flesh becomes revelatory. Similarly but not identically, the world incarnates all values, because it is the creation of the Lord and a sacrament revelatory of God. Now this secularism is not identical with paganism. It quite obviously depends on Christianity. It is, however, a secularism. The here and now is the central and all embracing category. We don't have to wait on the eschaton for our lives to have value, nor for heaven either. Today is infinitely precious and good and is the only good we possess. Am I denying an eschaton? No; that unknowable day will come, but I am much more interested in the quality of the eschaton permeating today, the irrevocable challenge to be met or failed today. Do I deny the transcendence of God or of man's spirit? No; but I am much more interested in using the potentialities of the world and man under God to help the world and men transcend their present in an unknowable but surely breath-taking tomorrow by what we can do together today.

* * * * *

These are, I submit, some of the issues that are strangely mixed together whenever Jesuits get together to discuss their present and their future. Only by making these distinctions, perhaps in ways other than I have made them, can they move the discussion from an emotivist to a cognitive plane. The issues are too thrilling and

the prospects too inviting for fear of the future to hypnotize us and freeze us in our tracks. Only in the freedom of uninhibited discussion, where we truly respect and trust each other, and in the freedom of conjoined activity, no matter how great the physical separation of one from another Jesuit, will we be able to find again and maintain our identity with Jesuit pioneers like Xavier and have the confidence to meet the Lord Jesus as he comes to us, unpredictably but gloriously, from the future.

Notes on Jesuits in the Fine Arts

C. J. McNASPY, S.J.

Jesuits professionally committed to the fine arts—not such a rare breed at the present time as a generation ago—felt a sense of release on reading Decree #30 of the last General Congregation, “Cultivating the Arts in the Society.” True, no province in our assistancy had been altogether Boeotian with regard to the literary arts, and some few could claim creative dramatists and even an occasional specialist in film or communications, not to mention a poet or other. Such boasts, however, were always made discreetly, as though the whole thing were not quite decent.

That such a dim state was more typical of the “New” than of the “Old” Society is a matter Father Thomas D. Culley (N.O.) and I have been concluding, after hundreds of hours spent over tens of thousands of *Monumenta* pages, and we hope to make our point in a monograph before too long. In any case, hardly a province in the entire Society today can point with honest pride to its artists in the same way that it can point to its scientists and other research scholars.

So it was that Decree #30, modest and tentative as it was, burst as a surprise on all: pleasant to many, a bit bewildering to others. Shortly before the Congregation, Father William F. Lynch (N.Y.) suggested to me that we invite the Jesuits involved in art and stationed within striking distance of New York to meet informally, with a view to discussing common problems and providing some mutual help. Several such gatherings took place—at Fairfield University, on Fordham’s Lincoln Center campus, at Shrub Oak and at the LaFarge Institute (*America* residence).

We were all happy to discover how widespread interest was, and all of us felt bolstered up when the Congregation passed Decree #30, especially its final sentence: “In addition, mutual communication is recommended among members of the Society who are engaged in artistic activity.” While our artists’ group has no formal organization, Father Vincent MacDonnell (N.E.), now doing graduate work in drama (address: St. Paul’s College, Catholic U., Washington, D.C.), has done a good deal of hard secretarial coordinating work behind the scenes, helping to keep the group going.

Meantime, I was asked to do a paper on Jesuits in art for the

Santa Clara Conference (published in the proceedings, Vol. 2, Part I, pp. 113-123). Subsequently, the director of the Survey of American Jesuits asked me to prepare a somewhat fuller treatment for Phase 2 of the survey, and this has appeared in the brochure published by the committee. *Woodstock Letters* had previously requested an article on the same topic. Instead, I secured statements from half a dozen Jesuit professional artists (painters and sculptors), which appeared with my brief introduction in the Fall, 1966 issue.

My purpose here is to alert American Jesuits to two important papers recently presented to *Survey-France* by two of the Society's leading artists, Fathers André Bouler and Joseph Tézé. Both are well known in French professional circles, and they hold forth full-time in an attic studio at 35 Rue de Sèvres, Paris 6. In this country they are known among artists for their chapel at *America* residence and for the articles dealing with this chapel in *Liturgical Arts* for November, 1966.

Father Bouler's article is very ingenious indeed. He suggests quite simply that as an important supplement to Decree #30, we reread the previous decree, "Scholarly Work and Research," and change the terms, wherever they appear, "scholarly activity" and "scientific research," into "artistic work" and "creation." (Rather than reprint his article, may I suggest that the reader take out his copy of the Decrees and do as Father Bouler urges?) This is not, it need hardly be said, to depreciate scholarly or scientific work, but only to suggest that artistic, creative work should be placed on a par with it.

Father Tézé's article is not so easy to present. It is titled "Esthetics and Theology," and starts with a word of praise for Decree #30, while indicating that the Decree marks only a minimal beginning and cannot be taken as an ideal. For, as Tézé puts it, "art touches man and especially religious man too closely" to be treated as a mere form of persuasion or propaganda, however well intentioned. It is a paradox, as Bouler mentions, that the only way for art to be "persuasive" is for it to be "disinterested," not ulterior, not phoney; the artist can only do art, not "artistic" propaganda. Now back to Tézé, whose line of argument I shall paraphrase here, and to which I warmly subscribe in almost every detail.

In our time especially, when conceptual thought and logical formalism are so pervasive, artistic activity keeps alive in civilization a current of symbolic thought which men cannot do without. The sociologist Lévy-Bruhl notes that "the need for participation

is surely more imperative and more intense in our society than the need for knowing or conforming to logical demands. It is a deep need. It comes from far." But artistic activity is one of those rare activities that satisfy this fundamental need for participation. And this is so because of its symbolic bearing.

In this symbolic bearing one tries to reach, not so much the structure of things, as their profound substance—the thing itself grasped alive and whole. By this sense of the concrete and of totality, artistic activity though centered more on existence than on knowledge, emerges into a deeper and more essential truth than does science. For, as Heidegger says, "poetic creation is more true than the methodical exploration of the being."

In this symbolic bearing, too, consciousness can circulate freely at every level of reality: sensible-sense, universal-particular, subject-object, necessity-freedom, unconscious-transconscious-conscious, appearance-being. It is a powerful factor of centration and integration.

"In poetry," to quote Heidegger again, "man is concentrated on the depth of his human reality." The artist is a "being of total accomplishment," says André Breton.

In our technological and dehumanizing civilization, art becomes more necessary than ever to keep a spiritual equilibrium. Teilhard puts it this way: "The more the world is rationalized and mechanized, the more it needs poets as saviors and the ferment of its personality." And more than 30 years ago, Van der Leeuw made this prophetic statement: "Secularized man reduces everything to the state of an object, even his own ego. Everything becomes a thing, including man himself. He dominates everything until the moment when he sacrifices himself. The supreme glory of secularized man is to be able to realize, modestly, that he himself is only a cog in the universe. He assigns everything to its place, himself included. He is thoroughly man, and hence he loses precisely his character of man, to become a technical object, a fraction of the idea." The impasse of secularized man invites one to go on to religious man.

It is disconcerting that Decree #30 says nothing of the relations between art and religion, except for a very general affirmation that art contributes to the "building up of the kingdom of God."

I think that the link between art and religion is far more direct and internal. Here I shall insist on two points: on the transcendence of art, and this all the more because in our time we find very serious and subtle analyses that tend to deny this transcendence.

Such analyses may be psychological or psychoanalytical, historical, iconographic, sociological, Marxist, neopositivistic—all reducing art to something less than it is, to a symptom or a sign of something else, society or an archetype or what-not.

Thus we find works of art reduced, in their forms and significant structure, while beauty itself is neglected—its irreducible aspect, its untouchable resplendence. Yet, how can one speak of the work of art at all if he neglects the overwhelming experience of beauty? The work of art, precisely as beautiful, cannot be dissolved into mere fact, nor into an object of desire, nor into some dominant law. In a word, it is transcendent—“a sensible radiance, and a correspondence with heaven” (Baudelaire’s phrases). It is a metaphysical datum, a “wharf toward the infinite, an exercise of going beyond reality” (Souriau), a “runway” (Jaspers). Berdiaev puts it this way: “The creative act is always a transcendence, a departure beyond the frontiers of reality, a free vista beyond necessity.”

In a general way, art endows the sensible not only with fullness of meaning, but with a “radiation” such that it is summoned from another world, approaches a transfigured world, where our divisions and imperfections will be overcome. It is significant that in our time of desacralization, artists—even atheistic artists—continue to believe in the “sacred.” But if this notion of the sacred is indeterminate or ambiguous, it needs to be stressed at a time when it tends to disappear. We find here a contact between the Christian religion and pagan ones.

My next point (says Tézé) is this: the link between esthetics and theology. This link is also internal. Too often Christians conceive of art as only the illustration of revealed truths. However, revelation has esthetic aspects over and above mere illustration. Esthetic reason, as Urs von Balthasar remarks, is as necessary to theological reflection as are theoretical reason and practical reason. A theology without esthetics is not only bloodless; it can never go beyond a sort of extrinsicism.

A work of art cannot be objectively grasped except within a subjectivity that accords with it. Esthetics here gives us the criterion of the highest truth—one that does not separate the object from the subject, as science does, but keeps them united. This truth is that of theology. For example, we must not oppose subjective faith to Revelation (as often happens today), or the witness of the disciples to the Word of God, the Jesus of faith to the Jesus of history.

The esthetic process is one of incarnation. In a work of art, the

content of the form is not behind or beyond it, but in it. Sense is totally immanent in the sensible, as the soul in the body. This immanence has a certain transcendence about it. Paradoxically, in beauty what is manifested in its very manifestation is what is not manifested. For, as Rodin says, "beauty is what is not seen." In the same way, Christ does not send us to a mysterious depth: He is His manifestation ("He who sees me sees the Father"). And He reveals this manifestation by hiding it. A theology without esthetics always tends to bypass the sensible signs of the Incarnation, the humanity of Christ, and having grasped their abstract meaning, tends to neglect them. Esthetics helps us to possess the Infinite in the finite figure: "the torrent of the universe in an inch of matter," as Cézanne put it. So it is that we cannot go to the All, the Absolute, God, without going through the humanity of Christ.

In the work of art, the sensible appears and keeps itself in appearance. It does not disappear in favor of abstract meaning. This involves a purification and a certain death, or transposition. Thus, the esthetic process is a process of transfiguration. Just so, too, the economy of the Son does not yield to the economy of the Spirit (this against Hegel and Merleau-Ponty). Christ does not disappear. He rises in His flesh and the Spirit remains joined to this flesh. If there were no resurrection of the body, the gnostics would be right and so would all the forms of idealism in which the sensible must disappear to become Spirit. In this way, the resurrection of the body proves artists and poets right in a definitive way.

So it is that artistic activity must not be considered as a mere means, but as a long-term investment. It requires a man more wholly even than does scientific activity; it must be developed as much as scientific activity if we wish to maintain the equilibrium of man; it contributes greatly, especially at our epoch of specialization, to awaken and maintain the religious sense, and, for us Christians, to perceive Revelation in its fullness. Not only should the Jesuit artist (as Decree #30 says) "learn how to integrate artistic activity into the context of priestly and religious life," but the Jesuit philosopher and the theologian should integrate esthetic truth into their thought.

Preparation of the Jesuit Professional

JOSEPH H. FICHTER, S.J.

Preparation of the Jesuit Professional

The ministry has always been included among the learned professions in Western society, and the professional is the person whose "necessary preliminary training is intellectual in character, involving knowledge and to some extent learning, as distinguished from mere skill."¹ The tasks he performs require technical competence and specialized knowledge, so that the professional is the "man who knows." American Jesuits generally, whether or not they live up to their reputation, are often reputed as learned men. This is especially true of those who have gained eminence in some particular field of research, writing or lecturing. From this point of view, the "ideal" Jesuit is one who performs well because he has been well-trained and prepared for the task to which he has been assigned.

In discussing the "formation of Jesuits," the delegates to the thirty-first Congregation made it fully clear that the future priests of the Order should have the best possible professional training.² The subsequent conference at Santa Clara on the total development of the Jesuit priest specified not only spiritual formation but also professional training. We are then at a point in time when we are expected to build on, and improve, the traditional concept of the Jesuit professional. Also at this point in time we are fortunate in having available the findings of the Gerard survey of American Jesuit priests, conducted in 1967.³

Training or Experience?

One of the key questions of the survey (Q. 11) asked the Jesuit

1 Studies of the professions generally have been proliferating, and some have paid attention to the Church professional. See Joseph H. Fichter, *Religion as an Occupation* (University of Notre Dame Press, 1961) ch. 7, "Religion as a Career," also, among others, Kenneth S. Lynn, ed., *The Professions in America* (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1965) ch. 5, "The Clergy in the United States" by James Gustafson; and James D. Glasse, *Profession: Minister* (Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1968).

2 The *Documents of the Thirty-First Congregation* (Woodstock, 1967) contains a long section on "The Apostolate," pp. 70-106, but the materials more relevant to the present analysis are "On Studies," pp. 30-35.

3 The data are available only in the form of 212 statistical tables that constitute the first volume of the Proceedings of the Santa Clara Conference on the Total Development of the Jesuit Priest.

priests how well they felt prepared for their current main occupation. Three-quarters of them replied that they consider themselves "well-prepared," equally divided between those who got their preparation by previous training (38%) and those who were prepared only through experience (38.2%). The remainder who answered the question said either that they were "somewhat prepared" (19.9%) or that they were "poorly prepared" (3.9%).⁴ A finding of this kind arouses the analyst's curiosity and suggests some exploratory hypotheses.

Do those who feel that they are well prepared by training refer mainly to their specialized graduate or professional academic study? Only a small handful (42 men) of all priest respondents to this survey said that they have no academic degree.⁵ We did not ask about the strictly ecclesiastical degrees, Ph.L. and Th.L., which seem to have relatively low academic status in the American system. The academic degrees are earned then "outside" the regular course of Jesuit training in what are called "special studies." Approximately one-quarter of these priests (23%) have earned the doctoral degree. In the first Table presented here the data indicate their estimate of their preparation according to the highest academic degree obtained.⁶

The statistics in Table 2.1 show quite clearly that the men who think they are well prepared for the present occupation, and who have the lowest academic degree, attribute their preparation mainly to experience (58%), while those with the highest degrees attribute it to training (63%) or to special studies. The term, training, then seems to have a particular connotation of the kind of preparation that has not been provided in the regular internal educational scheme of the Jesuit course of studies. It appears from this that some other term, like formation, is more appropriate to the general training, both intellectual and spiritual, given within the Jesuit curriculum.⁷

4 These percentages were recalculated by omitting the "no answers" from Table 10, p. 11 of the Gerard Report. The total respondents then number 3,475 priests. We could have sharpened our present analysis by subtracting also 904 men who said their main current occupation is "studies," or "other" or did not answer question 10 in Table 9, p. 10 of the Gerard Report.

5 A survey of lower-echelon diocesan priests disclosed that fourteen percent have no academic degree while four percent hold the doctorate. See Joseph H. Fichter, *America's Forgotten Priests* (New York, Harper and Row, 1968) p. 96.

6 In this and all other tabulations the "no answers" were subtracted and the statistics recalculated. See Gerard Report, Table 121, p. 125.

7 The Congregation dealt with the "formation of Jesuits" under a general heading in the *Documents*, 11. 13-38, but discussed the spiritual and academic aspects separately.

Table 2.1 Extent of preparation for main occupation, by categories of highest academic degree earned

	Bachelor or less	Have or will get Master's	Have or will get doctorate
Well prepared by training	13%	28%	63%
Well prepared only by experience	58	46	18
Somewhat prepared	22	22	17
Poorly prepared	7	4	2
	(439)	(1822)	(1164)

Is there a connection between the age of the respondent and the academic degree he has earned? If so, does this tend to confuse our generalizations when we ask whether the data indicate a change over time? In other words, is there now more professional and graduate training among Jesuits than there used to be? Are the younger men more likely than the older men to have been trained professionally? Evidence from other studies of the American clergy provides an affirmative answer, at least in so far as this can be measured by higher academic degrees and specialized professional studies. It is unquestionably true that with each ordination class, particularly since the Second Vatican Council, larger proportions of Jesuit priests are engaging in such specialized studies.⁸

If the age of the respondent makes this difference, the following Table ought to show younger men better prepared than older men for their life's work. Yet the comparative statistics demonstrate that the men under forty years of age are more than twice as likely (37%) as the oldest men (16%) to say that they are only "somewhat" or "poorly" prepared for their current occupation. Part of the explanation of this difference seems to lie in the fact that the main current "occupation" of many of the younger priests is "studies" and that they still consider themselves in the process of preparation.

Table 2.2 Extent of preparation for main occupation of Jesuit priests, by three age categories

	Under 40 years	40-54 years	55 years and over
Well prepared by training	44%	40%	32%
Well prepared only by experience	19	37	52
Somewhat prepared	32	19	13
Poorly Prepared	5	4	3
	(740)	(1549)	(1180)

⁸ Aside from the Decree on Priestly Formation there are other official documents of the Holy See dealing with this matter. See Walter Abbott, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York, Guild Press, 1966) p. 456, footnote 65.

While it is true that Jesuit priests are ordinarily still "in training" in their early thirties, the significance of added years is seen in Table 2.2, where the older men are much more likely (52%) than the younger men (19%) to reply that they are well prepared "only by experience." Whatever other inference we may draw from the age comparisons in Table 2.2, we may safely assume that at the present time among American Jesuits the older priests attribute their preparation more to experience than to specialized training, and that the reverse is true for the younger priests. There should not be any ambiguity in the wording of the question in the survey since the term "only by experience" is meant to exclude formal and academic training pointed at the specific current occupation.

Who Gets Professional Training?

If good preparation by training refers mainly to graduate and professional studies at the higher academic levels one would expect that those Jesuits whose main occupation is teaching would be well prepared by training and that those who are not engaged in teaching would be well prepared by experience. The following Table tends to bear out this hypothesis, but raises a question about the preparation of administrators for their tasks.

Table 2.3 Extent of preparation for main occupation by Jesuit priests who are in teaching, administration and parish work

	Teaching	Adminis- tration	Parish work
Well prepared by training	57%	15%	15%
Well prepared only by experience	24	57	62
Somewhat prepared	17	21	18
Poorly prepared	2	7	5
	(1517)	(700)	(354)

It is in the administrative occupation of Jesuits (second column in Table 2.3) that the lack of advanced training shows up. It is a well known fact in the American Church, both in the dioceses and in the religious orders, that the officials, managers, administrators, get comparatively little technical and professional training for their tasks.⁹ Table 2.3 shows that almost three out of ten (28%) of the

⁹ Administrative appointments seem to have low priority among the occupational preferences of Jesuit priests. A comparison of the Tables 9 and 132 in the Gerard Report, pp. 10 and 137, shows that 707 men are in administration but only 277 prefer it; on the other hand, 358 are in parish work but 571 prefer it.

Jesuit administrators feel that they are only "somewhat" or "poorly" prepared for their main occupation, and that only a small proportion (15%) are ready to say that they are well prepared by previous training. The Gerard Report (Table 11) lists three categories of administration (high school, college and "other") with hardly any statistical difference among them on the extent of preparation.

Approximately the same lack of previous training is found among the Jesuits whose main occupation is in the parishes. The Fathers of the Congregation said that "men skilled in pastoral work should also be trained with special studies. This will enable them to promote the proper arrangement of our ministries and their adaptation to modern times and special circumstances." What seems to have happened, at least up to now, is that the parish priests had to be content with on-the-job training after they had received their assignment to parochial work. Under this arrangement, it is understandable why more than six out of ten of them (62%) say that they have been well prepared for their current tasks "only by experience."

The Gerard Report (Table 11) reveals that the priests who are teaching at the college and graduate levels, and in the Jesuit seminaries, include a much larger proportion who are prepared by previous training than do those who teach at the high school level.¹⁰ The proposed ideal seems to be that the former should have the doctorate and the latter at least the master's degree. The thirty-first General Congregation did not make this distinction between secondary and higher strata of education but did recommend that those destined to teach in major seminaries should take special studies and "obtain the appropriate academic degrees, especially ecclesiastical ones, and be well prepared for teaching." Those who are destined for scientific research and for teaching in the positive sciences should also have special training so that the Society has men "with doctoral degrees who become truly eminent in their fields."¹¹

These ambitious recommendations are probably now widely in effect in the American provinces. Let us see, however, how the professional preparation varies among the various academic fields represented by the respondents to the survey.

10 Among those who are teaching Jesuit Scholastics sixty-eight percent say they are well prepared by previous training, compared with only forty-three percent of those teaching high school boys. See Table 11, p. 12.

11 *Documents of the Congregation*, pp. 33f.

Table 2.4 Academic fields of main occupation of Jesuit priests and extent of their preparation

	By training	By ex- perience	Somewhat prepared	Poorly prepared	N
Theology	43%	26	29	2	(471)
English	49%	33	15	3	(184)
Philosophy	51%	25	21	3	(288)
History	52%	22	21	5	(149)
Foreign Languages	53%	33	12	2	(256)
Physical science, math	55%	25	18	2	(316)
Social science	63%	20	15	2	(311)

It is probably one of the unexpected findings of the Gerard survey that three out of ten (31%) of the Jesuit theologians feel that they are only "somewhat" or "poorly" prepared for their main occupation. They also represent the smallest proportion (43%) who say that they are well prepared by training. The implication here is that more than half of the theologians had no graduate studies beyond those obtained as seminarians in the Jesuit major scholasticate and that this was not considered by them really adequate for the work they are currently performing.¹² Table 2.4 shows that the men in the area of "liberal arts," for which Jesuit and Catholic education has stood so firmly over the centuries, enjoy varying degrees of professional training.

At the other end of the scale are the physical scientists, and particularly the social scientists, for whom relatively few courses are provided in the Jesuit scholasticate and who have obviously gone elsewhere for their graduate and professional training. There have always been some prominent mathematicians and physical scientists in the Society. The social sciences represent a more recent specialization among Jesuits and this is probably because they have come to relatively late recognition and maturity among the learned professions.

Factors of Professionalization

A close scrutiny of the findings of the Gerard survey provides some clues to the important question why some Jesuit priests are better prepared than others for their main occupation, why some are professionally trained and others are not. The three clues we have found indicate that the professionals are the "self-starters"

¹² One of the explanations may be that many of the priests who teach religion at the high school level include themselves as theologians.

who begin early in their field of specialization and whose personal preferences are taken into consideration by Jesuit superiors. Let us look at the comparative data that support this description.

One of the questions in the survey (Q. 43) asked "what *most* influenced you to be interested in the field of work in which you are now specializing?" The survey questionnaire provided a choice among eight specific answers, and the Report (Table 102) gives the percentage distribution of responses. For purposes of clarification we here collapse these responses into three categories.¹³ The first group (37%) attributes the main influences to the respondent himself, either before or after entering the Society. The second and largest group (54%) attributes it to assignment or encouragement by superiors. The third group (9%) says it was the example or counsel of a fellow Jesuit that led him into his specialized field of work.

Table 2.5 Extent of preparation for current occupation according to main influence for entering this specialization

	Self-starters	Jesuit Superior	Other Jesuits
Well prepared by training	50%	31%	47%
Well prepared only by experience	26	46	33
Somewhat prepared	21	19	18
Poorly prepared	3	4	2
	(1098)	(1642)	(276)

We were curious to know whether there is any relationship between the extent of preparation a man has for his occupation and the main influence through which he selected his field of professional specialization. In other words, are the "self-starters" more likely, or less likely, than those who were influenced by superiors, to be better prepared and trained for their current occupation? While the distribution of responses in Table 2.5 shows a clear difference between the self-starters, of whom half say they are well prepared by previous training, and those who were influenced by superiors, of whom less than half (46%) say that they are well prepared only by experience, the reasons for this difference are not completely clear.

Our hypothesis is that the self-starter, the person with initiative concerning the kind of work he wants to do as a Jesuit, is probably also the one who knows early in his life what that occupation will

¹³ The percentages in Table 102, p. 106, include those who did not answer as well as those who indicated some "other" influence. These were omitted from our calculations.

be. The decision, of course, is not solely the choice of the individual because that decision must keep in mind "both the needs of the apostolate and the talents and preference of the scholastics."¹⁴ The Gerard survey asked the question, "when did you first learn that you would be engaged in the principal occupation you are currently doing?" (Q. 44) The alternative responses were divided into eight time periods, from the novitiate to some years after tertianship. In Table 2.6 we have collapsed these into three periods: before, during, and after the theologate.

The totals at the bottom of the columns in Table 2.6 show that only one out of five (19%) of our respondents knew before entering the theologate what their life's work would be, while the great majority (65%) of them did not learn this until after they had finished their theological studies. What is clearly evident from the comparative statistics is that the earlier a man knew what his occupational specialization would be the more likely he would be to have professional training for it. Six out of ten of them report that they are well prepared by training, while only three out of ten (31%) of those who got their work assignment after theology could make this claim.

Table 2.6 Extent of preparation for current occupation according to time when this specialization was decided upon

	Before theology	During theology	After theology
Well prepared by training	60%	56%	31%
Well prepared only by experience	25	19	44
Somewhat prepared	13	23	21
Poorly prepared	2	2	4
	(587)	(483)	(2022)

The last General Congregation recommended that "those who are to have special studies should be chosen carefully and in good time." This may have been voted in recognition of the fact that in most cases the decision had not hitherto been made "in good time." The data of this survey show that the practice has been far from the ideal of early choice even though it would be unrealistic to suggest that every Jesuit will know precisely while he is still a seminarian what his main future occupation will be in the Order.¹⁵ The combined thrust of the Tables 2.5 and 2.6 is that he will be

¹⁴ *Documents of the Congregation*, p. 33.

¹⁵ Some Jesuits seem to find their main occupation rather late in life. About three out of ten say that they got this main task "some years after tertianship," which probably means around the age of forty years. See Gerard Report, Table 109, p. 113.

well prepared by training if he himself takes the initiative and if the final decision is made before he begins the study of theology.

While the initial impetus and attraction to specialized work may come from the individual Jesuit at a relatively early period, the actual decision to pursue the specialization rests also on other factors. There are "slots" to be filled, the apostolate of the Society is varied, and the ultimate appointment to an occupation comes from the religious superiors. The ideal appointment would be one in which the Provincial sends a man where he is needed and at the same time satisfies the individual's occupational preference. One of the survey questions (Q. 45) brought up this matter of personal preference and enquired: "to what extent did superiors consider your personal preference in deciding about the specific work you are doing?"

Table 2.7 Extent to which superiors considered personal preferences for current occupation by degrees of preparation

	By training	By experience	Somewhat prepared	Poorly prepared
Much consideration	67%	29%	48%	29%
More or less	15	22	22	20
Little consideration	18	39	30	51
	(1307)	(1298)	(683)	(132)

Two-thirds (67%) of the men who were well prepared by training report "very much" or "quite a bit" in answer to this question.¹⁶ On the other hand, half (51%) of those who feel that they are poorly prepared for their current occupation answered "hardly at all" or "not at all." It is probably that those who are well trained in a special work are more clear on their preferences, or that their preferences are more clearly recognized by superiors, than is the case with others. In general, according to the survey data, the majority of American Jesuit priests "feel most inclined today" to some occupation other than the one in which they are currently engaged.¹⁷ This seems a disturbing fact that merits further investigation.

Satisfaction with Jesuit Curriculum

During their period of preparation for the work of the Jesuit Order some men live a "double" educational life. They follow the regular Jesuit course of studies prescribed for all priests in the

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, Table 115, p. 119.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Table 9, p. 10 and Table 132, p. 137.

Society, and they also take a course of "special studies," sometimes simultaneously and more often consecutively. By and large, it is the specialized professionals, those who are well prepared by previous training, who have led this "double life." This experience allows them to make a comparison between the preparation they received within the Jesuit curriculum and that which they obtained outside of it.

A pertinent final hypothesis is the suggestion that the specially trained may have a different estimation of the regular Jesuit course of studies than the estimation held by those who did not have special studies. To sharpen the contrast let us compare the two categories of respondents as related to their estimate of preparation for their present occupation: those who are the best prepared and those who are the least prepared. At first blush, this may seem to be begging the question, but it is not. The survey asked them (QQ. 36-41): "to what extent do you feel that your own training in the Jesuit course of studies (excluding any special studies) helped you to do the following things?"¹⁸

Since the question prescind from specialized professional training and focuses *only* on the Jesuit curriculum it seems fair to ask it of all the Jesuit priests. A man may feel that he is only poorly prepared for his specific current work but at the same time feel that many other desirable results have accrued to him from the regular Jesuit course of studies.

Table 2.8 Percentage comparison of the well trained and the poorly prepared who felt that they were helped "very much" or "quite a bit" by the Jesuit course of studies on the following items

	Well-trained	Poorly prepared
To lead an intellectual life	76	51
To lead a holy life	69	53
To have a happy, self-fulfilling life	68	41
Be effective in current work	63	7
To deal with lay people	45	19
Be aware of crucial modern problems	36	17

The most relevant conclusion to be drawn from the comparative statistics of Table 2.8 is that the priests who were best trained by special studies outside the Jesuit curriculum have a fairly high opinion of the effectiveness of the regular Jesuit course of studies.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Table 90, p. 93.

The fear is unfounded that these specially trained men would be negatively critical of the preparatory studies provided by the Society for all its future priests. As a tentative generalization, one may say that the positive appreciation for the authentic "core" of the Jesuit system of studies will increase in proportion to the increase in the number of Jesuit priests who receive specialized professional training.

In conclusion we may here summarize some of the findings and interpretations of the data of the Gerard survey concerning the occupational preparation of American Jesuit priests. While the large majority (76%) consider themselves well prepared for their current occupation, those who are prepared by special studies, or previous training, have higher academic degrees and are younger than the others. Teachers are best prepared by special studies while administrators and parish priests are best prepared by on-the-job experience. The social scientists have the most professional training while the theologians have the least.

The professionally trained men, as differing from those who are well prepared by experience and those who do not consider themselves well prepared, exhibit three characteristics: (a) they generated their own enthusiasm for their specialized work; (b) they started early, knowing before ordination what they were going to do; (c) their personal preferences were given high consideration by superiors. The data also disclose the encouraging fact that the well trained professionals also have the highest regard for the normal course of Jesuit studies.

Corrigenda:

In the first part of Father Fichter's article, *JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY*, October, 1968

- p. 95, line 2—67% should be 69%
- p. 99, line 16—39% should be 30%
- p. 99, line 18—226 should be 222

Enrollment Statistics

SCHOLASTIC YEAR 1968-1969

According to statistics sent to the central office of the JEA by the registrars of Jesuit high schools, colleges, universities, and houses of formation, the total enrollment at these institutions at the beginning of the fall term 1968 amounted to 190,109 students. This figure is 595 less than the totals reported last year, 1967-1968. However, since the enrollment totals for this year do not include tertianships and minor seminaries which reported enrollments of 317 students last year, the current decline is reduced to 278 students.

Colleges and Universities

Total enrollment in the colleges and universities is 150,884 which is 479 less than last year (-0.3%). Adjusting these figures to take account of the fact that 2,820 students were lost as a result of the closing of non-credit courses at the University of Detroit, the medical school at Marquette and the phasing out of dental schools at Saint Louis and Loyola, New Orleans, the rest of the enrollment figures indicate a gain of 2,341 students.

Increases were noted in full-time enrollment totals (+1,152), part-time totals (+288), arts and sciences—day division (+1,553), graduate schools (+1,544) and summer graduate enrollment (+1,701). The most significant decreases were in commerce, evening division ($-1,578$), extension, low tuition and non-credit courses ($-1,919$), and undergraduate summer schools ($-1,433$).

Fifteen colleges and universities reported increases in their grand total enrollment and seventeen in full-time enrollment. The largest increases in grand total enrollment were reported by Loyola, Chicago (+927), Saint Peter's (+543), Loyola, Los Angeles (+551), and Santa Clara (+425). Significant decreases were noted at Detroit ($-2,217$), Marquette (-640), and Fordham (-505). All of these losses are explained, in great part, by special factors—at Detroit, by the discontinuance of non-credit courses; at Marquette, by the closing of the medical school; and at Fordham, by a failure to report on certain divisions on which reports were made last year.

In the past, freshman enrollment figures included both full-time and part-time students. This year the figures have been adjusted to represent only full-time freshmen. For purposes of comparison, the adjustment was made in the freshman enrollment figures for

both the current and the past year. The adjustment is fairly accurate but may differ slightly from an exact count which is not available to us.

The adjusted figures indicate that freshman enrollment has increased by 426 students or 1.2%. Rather heavy losses were reported by several of our largest institutions, but the favorable total resulted from a very large increase at Loyola, Chicago (+515), by the addition of co-education at Regis (+191), and by sizeable increases at Loyola, Los Angeles (+119), Saint Joseph's (+112) and Boston College (+108). Nine other colleges reported increases varying from 92 to 14. Fourteen colleges declined in freshman enrollment, five of them by more than 100 students; the others indicated varying decreases from 74 to 4.

Comparatively, Loyola of Chicago leads all other Jesuit colleges and universities in the following major categories: Grand Total Enrollment (15,035), Full-Time Enrollment (8,192), Part-Time Enrollment (5,147), Freshman Enrollment (2,056), Liberal Arts College Enrollment, both Day (4,403) and Evening (2,698), and in Undergraduate Summer Enrollment (5,103). Saint Louis University has the largest Graduate Enrollment both in the regular session (3,177) and in the summer school (2,757).

In Grand Total Enrollments the five largest universities are the following: 1) Loyola of Chicago (15,035); 2) Marquette (12,264); 3) Saint Louis (11,358); 4) Fordham (10,757); 5) Boston College (9,972).

Considering only Full-Time Enrollments the same five institutions rank in a slightly different order: 1) Loyola of Chicago (8,192); 2) Boston College (8,181); 3) Marquette (7,917); 4) Saint Louis (7,442); 5) Fordham (7,362).

The five largest Jesuit liberal arts colleges, day division, are: 1) Loyola of Chicago (4,403); 2) Fordham (3,826); 3) Marquette (3,810); 4) Saint Louis (3,212); 5) John Carroll (3,021).

In breaking down the enrollment into various categories, the category of social work has been omitted from the tables this year. Students enrolled in schools of social work have been included in graduate school enrollments. The category of "Miscellaneous" includes the following: Aerodynamics, Architecture, Commercial Certificates, Dental Assistants, Dental Hygiene, Foreign Service, Journalism, Language and Linguistics, Medical Technology, Music, Physical Therapy, Sister Formation, Speech, Teaching Certificates and Post Graduate Courses.

High Schools

Twenty-four Jesuit high schools reported increased enrollments; in twenty-nine the number of students decreased, and in two it remained the same. Most of these variations involved only slight changes which are usually the result of attempts to maintain a constant enrollment figure. The number of freshmen and sophomores decreased by 303 while the number of juniors and seniors increased by 823. The largest increases were reported by the four newest Jesuit high schools, two of which are enrolling senior classes for the first time this year, while the other two still do not have a full complement of students. These four are: De Smet Jesuit High School of Saint Louis (+205), Walsh Jesuit High School of Cuyahoga Falls (+177), Saint John's High School of Toledo (+157) and Bishop Connolly High of Fall River (+87). The grand total increase in enrollments in Jesuit high schools for 1968-69 amounts to 484 students or 1.3%.

The category of "Specials" listed in the enrollment table refers almost exclusively to students who are in the upper elementary grades which are taught in a few of our high schools.

The seven largest Jesuit high schools in the United States each enroll more than 1,000 students. They are: 1) Loyola Academy at Wilmette, Illinois (1,644); 2) Boston College High School (1,284); 3) Saint Xavier High School at Cincinnati (1,229); 4) Saint Ignatius High School at Cleveland (1,170); 5) Saint Ignatius High School at Chicago (1,095); 6) Saint Ignatius High School at San Francisco (1,066); and 7) Bellarmine College Preparatory at San Jose (1,019).

Houses of Studies

Because of the changes that have been made in the Jesuit course of studies, it is almost impossible to draw conclusions from the change in enrollments at our scholasticates. Enrollments have decreased by 283 in our Theologates, combined Philosophates and juniorates, and Novitiates.

Summary

28 Colleges and Universities	150,884
55 High Schools	37,811
22 Houses of Formation	1,414
105	190,109

Jesuit Educational Association

High School Enrollment 1968-1969

TABLE ONE

	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors	Specials	Totals 1968-69	Totals 1967-68	Increase or Decrease
Bellarmino College Preparatory (San Jose).....	275	285	251	208	0	1,019	999	+ 20
Bellarmino Preparatory School (Tacoma).....	123	127	110	106	0	466	497	- 31
Bishop Connolly High (Fall River).....	109	93	93	0	0	295	208	+ 87
Bishop's Latin School (Pittsburgh).....	27	37	22	30	0	116	119	- 3
Boston College High School.....	350	313	314	307	0	1,284	1,308	- 24
Brebeuf Preparatory School (Indianapolis).....	189	199	171	142	0	701	683	+ 18
Brooklyn Preparatory School.....	252	276	231	221	0	980	989	- 9
Brophy College Prep School (Phoenix).....	177	140	135	121	0	573	546	+ 27
Campion Jesuit High School.....	172	139	138	114	0	563	574	- 11
Canisius High School.....	209	207	226	208	0	850	924	- 74
Chaplain Kapaun Memorial High (Wichita).....	119	127	121	122	0	489	497	- 8
Cheverus High School (Portland, Me.).....	101	108	99	88	0	396	396	...
Colegio San Ignacio (Puerto Rico).....	129	138	128	105	233	733	783	- 50
Cranwell School (Lenox, Mass.).....	59	58	66	62	2	247	244	+ 3
Creighton Preparatory School.....	259	226	221	221	1	928	898	+ 30
DeSmet Jesuit High School (Saint Louis).....	247	213	0	0	0	460	245	+ 215
Fairfield College Preparatory School.....	213	182	204	203	0	802	790	+ 12
Fordham Preparatory School.....	201	176	185	232	0	794	827	- 33
Georgetown Preparatory School.....	82	91	82	73	0	328	321	+ 7
Gonzaga High School (D.C.).....	183	182	174	158	0	697	746	- 49
Gonzaga Preparatory School (Spokane).....	201	180	181	182	0	744	779	- 35
Jesuit High School (Dallas).....	148	134	123	115	0	520	541	- 21
Jesuit High School (El Paso).....	133	107	77	67	0	384	385	- 1
Jesuit High School (New Orleans).....	221	215	177	197	103	913	943	- 30
Jesuit High School (Portland).....	160	155	105	112	0	532	512	+ 20
Jesuit High School (Sacramento).....	168	130	126	96	0	520	464	+ 56
Jesuit High School (Shreveport).....	79	61	64	60	0	264	331	- 67
Jesuit High School (Tampa).....	124	150	122	108	0	504	519	- 15
Loyola Academy (Wilmette, Ill.).....	486	437	384	337	0	1,644	1,657	- 13
Loyola High School (L.A.).....	251	249	216	224	0	940	955	- 15
Loyola High School (Missoula).....	27	36	32	33	0	128	140	- 12
Loyola High School (Towson, Md.).....	209	182	148	160	0	699	670	+ 29
Loyola School (N. Y.).....	43	52	37	45	0	177	186	- 9
Marquette University High School.....	270	246	226	210	0	952	972	- 20
McQuaid Jesuit High School (Rochester).....	223	188	192	158	56	817	805	+ 12
Regis High School (Denver).....	111	127	152	181	0	571	562	+ 9
Regis High School (N. Y.).....	159	152	146	135	0	592	605	- 13
Rockhurst High School.....	205	213	190	187	0	795	805	- 10
St. Ignatius High School (Chicago).....	313	261	265	256	0	1,095	1,044	+ 51
St. Ignatius High School (Cleveland).....	354	277	261	278	0	1,170	1,107	+ 63
St. Ignatius High School (San Francisco).....	287	279	264	236	0	1,066	1,068	- 2
St. John's High School (Toledo).....	225	192	184	204	0	805	648	+ 157
St. Joseph's Preparatory School.....	282	206	213	171	0	872	823	+ 49
St. Louis University High School.....	223	223	212	221	0	879	865	+ 14
St. Peter's Preparatory School (Jersey City).....	259	222	241	221	0	943	999	- 56
St. Xavier High School (Cincinnati).....	320	307	306	296	0	1,229	1,258	- 29
Scranton Preparatory School.....	139	133	122	93	0	487	487	...
Seattle Preparatory School.....	154	136	145	113	0	548	529	+ 19
Strake Jesuit College Preparatory (Houston).....	101	87	92	91	2	373	390	- 17
University of Detroit High School.....	285	205	249	239	0	978	976	+ 2
Walsh Jesuit High School (Cuyahoga Falls, O.).....	185	164	188	147	0	684	507	+ 177
Xavier High School (Concord).....	120	106	92	82	1	401	410	- 9
Xavier High School (N. Y.).....	257	230	232	224	0	943	967	- 24
Colegio San Jose (Peru).....	80	72	59	60	53	324	299	+ 25
Colegio San Mateo (Chile).....	55	36	23	13	470	597	525	+ 72
Totals 1968-69.....	10,333	9,467	8,817	8,273	921	37,811		
Totals 1967-68.....	10,458	9,645	8,513	7,754	957		37,327	
Increase or Decrease.....	-125	-178	+304	+519	- 36	+484		+ 484

College and University Enrollment, 1968-1969

	Liberal Arts		Commerce		Education	Engineering	Nursing	Pharmacy	Dentistry	Law		Medicine	Graduate	Miscellaneous	Full Time Totals	Part Time Totals	Full and Part Time Totals	Extension Low Tuition Non-Credit	Grand Total	Summer School	
	Day	Evening	Day	Evening						Day	Evening									Graduate	Undergrad
Boston College.....	2,390	604	1,806	314	1,256	...	591	520	2,355	136	8,181	1,791	9,972	...	9,972	1,784	2,194
Canisius College.....	1,544	455	511	474	42	...	91	702	...	2,628	1,191	3,819	5	3,824	750	516
Creighton University.....	2,304	32	468	192	150	138	...	239	302	...	354	...	3,599	580	4,179	...	4,179	525	477
Fairfield University.....	1,676	1,211	...	1,729	1,158	2,887	...	2,887	344	1,010
Fordham University.....	3,826	663	1,006	206	1,086	167	...	447	312	...	2,482	...	7,362	2,833	10,195	562	10,757	2,090	1,882
Georgetown University.....	1,662	...	516	352	274	763	490	438	1,510	1,725	6,537	1,193	7,730	...	7,730	3,694	789
Gonzaga University.....	1,643	...	289	154	149	...	69	194	2,278	369	2,647	5	2,652	613	102
Holy Cross College.....	2,365	8	...	2,299	74	2,373	...	2,373
John Carroll University.....	3,031	...	275	784	212	2,842	1,460	4,302	193	4,495	1,467	677
Le Moyne College.....	1,633	1,590	43	1,633	72	1,705	524	...
Loyola College (Baltimore).....	872	1,345	728	...	1,053	1,892	2,945	16	2,961	670	743
Loyola University (Chicago).....	4,403	2,698	774	400	400	216	154	379	3,112	803	8,192	5,147	13,339	1,696	15,035	5,103	2,444
Loyola University (Los Angeles).....	1,045	...	273	95	443	307	...	424	...	2,088	680	2,768	247	3,015	944	392
Loyola University (New Orleans).....	1,317	1,203	504	169	523	628	200	2,669	1,875	4,544	...	4,544	1,326	311
Marquette University.....	3,810	722	875	570	...	470	404	282	1,376	1,025	7,917	2,884	10,801	1,463	12,264	2,686	1,235
Regis College.....	663	111	125	35	55	200	986	203	1,189	...	1,189	272	...
Rockhurst College.....	660	...	331	1,323	935	1,379	2,314	...	2,314
St. Joseph's College.....	1,867	535	...	1,618	733	256	1,730	2,506	4,233	6,739	54	6,793	2,566	65
St. Louis University.....	3,212	337	720	376	...	163	554	193	116	463	3,177	753	7,442	2,966	10,408	950	11,358	2,527	2,757
St. Peter's College.....	1,820	537	539	1,230	590	2,603	2,113	4,716	124	4,840	1,657	...
Seattle University.....	1,531	...	400	...	482	...	210	508	369	2,831	841	3,672	...	3,672	1,167	340
Spring Hill College.....	1,186	935	251	1,186	...	1,186	767	...
University of Detroit.....	2,531	694	885	1,302	...	326	183	120	...	1,441	355	5,381	3,499	8,880	...	8,880	2,079	1,440
University of San Francisco.....	2,009	776	470	542	351	210	129	...	872	738	4,057	2,040	6,097	276	6,373	3,166	499
University of Santa Clara.....	2,012	...	658	184	76	...	2,136	...	3,549	1,812	5,361	498	5,859	373	1,126
University of Scranton.....	964	323	382	268	279	...	29	664	...	1,662	1,301	2,963	...	2,963	1,073	574
Wheeling College.....	813	795	18	813	216	1,029	242	57
Xavier University.....	1,479	528	705	417	2,866	8	2,726	3,277	6,003	32	6,035	1,447	2,030
Totals 1968-1969.....	54,268	11,563	12,512	8,675	3,878	3,505	3,358	305	2,072	4,203	1,853	1,582	27,663	9,038	97,372	47,103	144,475	6,409	150,884	39,856	21,660
Totals 1967-1968.....	52,715	11,923	12,347	10,253	3,544	3,628	3,150	376	2,158	4,351	1,666	1,937	26,119	8,591	96,220	46,815	143,035	8,328	151,363	41,289	19,959
Increase or Decrease.....	+ 1,553	- 360	+ 165	- 1,578	+ 334	- 123	+ 208	- 71	- 86	- 148	+ 187	- 355	+ 1,544	+ 447	+ 1,152	+ 288	+ 1,440	- 1,919	- 479	- 1,433	+ 1,701
Percent.....	+ 2.9%	- 3.0%	+ 1.3%	- 15.4%	+ 9.4%	- 3.4%	+ 6.6%	- 18.9%	- 4.0%	- 3.4%	+ 11.2%	- 18.3%	+ 5.9%	+ 5.2%	+ 1.2%	+ 0.6%	+ 1.0%	- 23.0%	- 0.3%	- 3.5%	+ 8.5%

TABLE TWO

Jesuit Educational Association

Composite College Statistics, 1967-1968, 1968-1969

TABLE THREE	Grand Total		Increase Decrease		Freshman Enrollment		Increase Decrease	
	1968-69	1967-68	Numerical	Percentage	1968-69	1967-68	Numerical	Percentage
Boston College.....	9,972	9,729	+ 243	+ 2.5	1,757	1,649*	+ 108	+ 6.5
Canisius College.....	3,824	3,703	+ 121	+ 3.3	717	754*	- 37	- 4.9
Creighton University.....	4,179	4,114	+ 65	+ 1.6	723	827	- 104	-12.6
Fairfield University.....	2,887	2,738	+ 149	+ 5.4	429	503	- 74	-14.7
Fordham University.....	10,757	11,262	- 505	- 4.5	1,480	1,427	+ 53	+ 3.7
Georgetown University.....	7,730	7,480	+ 250	+ 3.3	1,044	1,030*	+ 14	+ 1.4
Gonzaga University.....	2,652	2,692	- 40	- 1.5	782	690	+ 92	+13.3
Holy Cross College.....	2,373	2,353	+ 20	+ 0.8	609	612	- 3	- 0.5
John Carroll University.....	4,495	4,604	- 109	- 2.4	890	946*	- 56	- 5.9
Le Moyne College.....	1,705	1,618	+ 87	+ 5.4	418	358	+ 60	+16.8
Loyola College (Baltimore).....	2,961	2,978	- 17	- 0.6	272	219*	+ 53	+24.2
Loyola University (Chicago).....	15,035	14,108	+ 927	+ 6.6	2,056	1,541*	+ 515	+33.4
Loyola University (Los Angeles)...	3,015	2,464	+ 551	+22.4	466	347	+ 119	+34.2
Loyola University (New Orleans)...	4,544	4,334	+ 210	+ 4.8	540	498	+ 42	+ 8.4
Marquette University.....	12,264	12,904	- 640	- 5.0	1,588	1,704	- 116	- 6.8
Regis College.....	1,189	993	+ 196	+19.8	383	192*	+ 191	+99.4
Rockhurst College.....	2,314	2,490	- 176	- 7.1	227	289	- 62	-21.4
St. Joseph's College.....	6,793	6,992	- 199	- 2.8	654	542*	+ 112	+21.0
St. Louis University.....	11,358	11,501	- 143	- 1.2	1,321	1,449*	- 128	- 8.8
St. Peter's College.....	4,840	4,297	+ 543	+ 1.3	737	670*	+ 67	+10.0
Seattle University.....	3,672	3,851	- 179	- 4.6	658	786	- 128	-16.3
Spring Hill College.....	1,186	1,236	- 50	- 4.0	248	289	- 41	-14.2
University of Detroit.....	8,880	11,097	-2,217	-20.0	1,175	1,139*	+ 36	+ 3.2
University of San Francisco.....	6,373	6,496	- 123	- 1.9	818	886*	- 68	- 7.7
University of Santa Clara.....	5,859	5,434	+ 425	+ 7.8	815	854	- 39	- 4.6
University of Scranton.....	2,963	3,081	- 118	- 3.8	421	403	+ 18	+ 4.5
Wheeling College.....	1,029	819	+ 210	+25.6	224	228	- 4	- 1.8
Xavier University.....	6,035	5,995	+ 40	+ 0.7	474	668*	- 194	-29.0
Totals.....	150,884	151,363	- 479	- 0.3	21,926	21,500	+ 426	+ 2.0

* Adjusted 1967-1968 figures

Jesuit Educational Association

Jesuit Houses of Studies Enrollment 1968-1969

TABLE FOUR	1969				Totals 1968-69	Totals 1967-68	Increase Decrease
	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year			
THEOLOGATES							
Alma.....	22	20	23	25	90	106	- 16
North Aurora.....	27	25	25	20	97	101	- 4
St. Louis.....	21	28	29	33	111	132	- 21
Weston.....	21	17	22	21	81	72	+ 9
Woodstock.....	58	45	41	44	188	193	- 5
Totals.....	149	135	140	143	567	604	- 37
COLLEGE PROGRAM							
Detroit, Univ. of.....	10	6	16	18	- 2
Florissant.....	13	8	21	24	- 3
Los Angeles, Loyola U.....	8	18	26	48	- 22
Milford, Xavier U.....	12	7	19	25	- 6
New Orleans, Loyola U.....	3	2	2	..	7	0	+ 7
North Aurora.....	19	20	39	56	- 17
St. Bonifacius.....	11	18	29	37	- 8
Shadowbrook.....	0	14	- 14
St. Louis, Fusz.....	1	1	50	43	95	112	- 17
Shrub Oak.....	..	29	23	44	96	135	- 39
Spokane.....	3	9	32	39	83	106	- 23
Spring Hill.....	4	5	17	9	35	64	- 29
Weston.....	..	26	23	31	80	81	- 1
Totals.....	65	129	166	186	546	720	-174
NOVITIATES							
Clarkston.....	8	12	20	37	- 17
Florissant.....	9	11	20	31	- 11
Grand Coteau.....	13	13	26	29	- 3
Milford.....	9	13	22	38	- 16
Poughkeepsie.....	17	24	41	50	- 9
Santa Barbara.....	30	13	43	36	+ 7
St. Bonifacius.....	14	15	29	36	- 7
Shadowbrook.....	29	19	48	45	+ 3
Sheridan.....	7	16	23	31	- 8
Wernersville.....	13	16	29	40	- 11
Totals.....	149	152	301	373	- 72
GRAND TOTALS.....	363	416	306	329	1,414	1,697	-283

“And Writing Maketh . . .”

EDWARD J. BARTLEY

What precisely does writing maketh? I think this depends pretty much on which side of the desk one happens to be sitting. For the student who works at it, the reward is exactness. He has Francis Bacon's word for it. So much for the student at this point. For the conscientious high school English teacher who attempts to teach it, writing primarily maketh waves. If he seriously sets out to teach it *in depth*, he is in for a year of frustration, acknowledging ultimately that it simply cannot be taught in the time allotted, regardless of what the syllabus and the handbook state.

Even a cursory check of writing among students—at any educational level—would reveal that it is one critical area in which they are woefully inept. The reasons for this weakness are obvious, even at the beginning. They do comparatively little writing and what they actually do produce gets marked superficially. If the elementary school teacher is still entrenched in the old system of teaching several subjects to one group, it is impossible to devote much time to writing, especially when the classroom is literally bursting with anywhere from 45 to 70 students. If he or she teaches only English to several classes, then we are discussing some 150 to 200 or more students. Need more be said?

And so the students come to our high schools and we put approximately 35 of them into one class, give one English teacher four such classes, and tell him, among other things, “Teach them to write!” The “other things” include fiction, non-fiction, poetry, drama, grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. And anyone who thinks that writing is simply grammar, spelling, and vocabulary has already missed the point. The English teacher can scarcely look to the other departments for help. It is a rare creature in another discipline who assists beyond the occasional circling of misspellings, if that. *Content* is too often the only criterion here and the inadequacy of the presentation itself is passed over with, “I knew what he meant.”

Everyone in English in our high schools (and at the administrative level) is aware of the problem, but . . . well, maybe if no one talks about it, it will go away like a bad dream. It doesn't and the frustration continues. Even beyond high school. Many colleges

make a half-hearted effort to cope with it by installing a mandatory freshman course in rhetoric and composition. But here, too, the classes are overcrowded and are usually given to inexperienced teachers, who are frequently too busy working on their own advanced degrees to do the course justice.

To examine the situation in our own high schools is to see more clearly why the writing problem remains unchanged. Each English teacher has, in his four classes, a total of about 130-150 students. If he is fortunate, he has only two preparations, although three is more common. Like any other teacher he has tests and quizzes to prepare and mark, and like any other good teacher he has to read books and magazine articles pertinent to his field. But he carries two crushing burdens in addition to these. He must read and be prepared to teach novels, short stories, essays, dramas, and a host of reviews. (Students also expect him to be able to discuss, or at least comment intelligently upon, recent films, plays, and television productions.) And *then* there are the compositions—the dusty arena where each student tries to express himself.

At the start of the fall semester, the English teacher, usually returning from his summer job or assignment, schedules compositions as often as possible—perhaps one a week or one every other week. But this means approximately 140 papers each time. The mission is really impossible. Something must go . . . and it is invariably the compositions.

No one yet has given me the answer. “Give one a week, but only mark every fifth one,” some say. I can’t do that; it isn’t honest. I feel the obligation to mark what I assign. Perhaps for some this system works, but I doubt its effectiveness from the students’ point of view. This method perpetuates errors simply because no one catches them. Consequently they become more deeply rooted. Still worse, it lends credence to the students’ cynical conviction that “No one reads this stuff anyway!” So they start to play the odds—and win four out of five times. Or is it more accurate to say they lose four out of five times?

“Give them a lot of short compositions, one side or so,” comes another cry. Not a bad idea at the lower levels, first and second year, but one that fares poorly higher up. It allows no room for the development of theme or the expansion of ideas. It is stifling.

“Try this! Try that!” I’ve tried both *this* and *that*, and a few others as well. None that I know of currently being used at the high school level works well. If the student is to improve notice-

ably, his writing requires intensive marking and commentary on a regular basis. At present this is not practicable. Time, as always, is the enemy. Two years ago another teacher advised me to give 500-700 word compositions every other week and to mark them intensively. "Okay," I said, "but do we agree that 10 to 20 minutes per theme is reasonable for intensive marking?" (This would include editing, suggested re-write, marginal comments, and the like.) He agreed. The trap was sprung. "Where," I asked, "do I find 25 to 50 hours every two weeks?"

I am wary of those who tell me that they assign lengthy compositions on a regular basis and find time to mark them carefully—making marginal suggestions and such. I have seen these "carefully marked" themes and they were frauds. The red marks usually indicated misspellings or pulsating grammatical errors that Huck Finn's father would have spotted; the marginalia consisted of an occasional "AWKWARD!" or "POORLY ORGANIZED!" with no hint of how to make it otherwise. The papers were generally clumsy, overworded, haphazardly developed, sophomoric, and dull—with inconsistencies and contradictions in the argument.

An *intensified* writing course in which both the teacher and the student can see the individual weaknesses and correct them and one in which the results are obvious and immediate seems far more desirable to me than the present "catch-as-catch-can" approach. Generally, most of our students write well enough on short themes—and what weaknesses they have do not manifest themselves. However, themes of some length tax their powers of organization and analysis to a considerable degree and their writing breaks down. This is largely because we never get around to this type of writing in practice. True, individual teachers may require analytical criticism of some literary work covered during the term, but too often this results in the teacher's either not reading it at all, or his merely skimming it for what it said with little regard for how it is said.

In short, the writing problem is serious, and nothing is done about it. It is so frustrating that many teachers give it little of their time, preferring to discuss literature and life with students, who, when finally given the opportunity, experience enormous difficulty in articulating their own thoughts and feelings on the same subjects.

But simply indicating that the situation exists is superfluous. It scarcely ranks as a revelation of monumental proportions. There isn't an English teacher in the Jesuit system who is unaware of it.

And so, for better or worse, I propose a partial solution.

"If I had just a handful of students to teach, I really think I could accomplish something with their writing." Most English teachers have heard this. More to the point, most English teachers have said it. It is axiomatic: the smaller the classes, the more individual and intense the instruction. This is especially true of writing.

But supposing it could be done. Supposing it was possible to teach an intensified course to, say, ten students—what then? Such a writing program is presently in effect in Saint Peter's College and, with a few modifications, it could be adapted to the high school level.

In the belief that something could be done about student writing, Saint Peter's has made its program mandatory for all freshmen. The course differs from the ordinary college writing course. The classes are small (rigidly limited to 10-12 students) and the instructors are all professional writers who teach only one class apiece. The class meets once a week for two hours for one trimester (approximately ten weeks).

I know of no sizable school—at any level—that has solved the writing dilemma, nor do I know of any that has developed as realistic an approach as that of Saint Peter's. The results there have been edifying. No Shakespeares emerge but the level of expression improves considerably, even after so short a segment. Writers who were good when they began the course find receptive professionals to read their work, criticize it, and encourage them. Weaker writers benefit from the favorable teacher/student ratio, from the constant writing and re-writing under such critical competence, and from the general intensiveness of the program.

Intensive is the key word. My proposal is to tailor the Saint Peter's plan to suit the Jesuit high schools. No Jesuit high school can hope to match the professionals on the Saint Peter's staff, but otherwise the adaptation could be accomplished. Under ideal conditions it could last more than ten weeks and could be limited to 8-10 students per class.

More specifically, the proposal is this: that we set aside one class period per week in third year as a writing/reading period. I think it should be one of the five regular weekly English periods, rather than an additional one. The important thing is that the writing segment is designed *solely for writing*. No other aspect of English is to intrude and siphon off the time. There is no particular

need for all third year classes to have this period simultaneously. It is preferable, in fact, that they do not, since this might create a shortage of classrooms.

Two-thirds of the year would have a *reading period* during which they would read from books on the third year reading list—no exceptions. It is *not* to be a study period. It would be supervised by a teacher from some department *other than the English department*.

The other third of the year would take the intensified writing course. The students would break down into groups of 8-10 and be assigned to an English teacher. The writing period for these students would be held in a separate classroom. (Actually the group is so small that almost any available activity room would suffice.)

Every member of the English department would teach this writing course. Most of our schools have a third year numbering somewhere from 150 to 250 students and an English department numbering about 7 to 12 teachers. At any rate, the ratio seldom exceeds 30 to one, and breaking this into thirds, the ratio drops to 10 to one (or better).

The period would be spent briefly discussing the more common errors, writing a short exercise in class, and assigning a more comprehensive theme to be done at home. During the writing exercise the teacher would speak individually for a few minutes with each student. His individual critique would be based primarily on the more lengthy theme that was handed in the previous week and which he returns to the student at this time along with his own notations and suggestions. Each student would maintain a folder of his own work and this folder would be filed with the English department at the conclusion of the course.

Two recommendations at this point. First, the writing teacher should give a mark for all this and submit it to the regular English teacher who will incorporate it into the student's English grade. Second, those students who are known to be weak writers should be assigned to the first group taking the course. This would make it possible to have the genuinely dismal cases repeat it at least once. For this reason the first group should number slightly more than one-third.

Why third year? For a number of reasons. John Milton felt that it was a mistake to force young people to write at length before they had anything to say or any desire to say it. After ten years of teaching first and second year students, I find it difficult to dis-

agree with him. The students in the lower years have relatively little to say and virtually no desire to say it. These years should concern themselves with eliminating as many mechanical and technical errors as possible. They should focus on short, imaginative exercises to help them overcome the inertia that attends their introduction to writing. The third year students do have something to say and usually a great desire to be heard. And from a practical point of view we must remember that in their fourth year they will be doing considerable writing—college applications, writing samples, advanced placement tests (in some cases), and a variety of other essays. Since much of this will be early in fourth year, the writing course must be completed prior to that year.

Each group would take the writing course for one-third of the school year. Then it would be rotated back into the reading segment of the year and another third of junior year would begin. So intensified a program with so few students and only one class per week would allow time for detailed criticism. For a change we could explain why we wrote “UNCLEAR!” And time to demonstrate how to make less awkward that phrase we bracketed and scribbled “CLUMSY!” after.

The plan poses problems, to be sure, but none that are insoluble. I do not think that the scheduling of classes would present any great obstacle for the administration. English teachers involved in third year would have their normal teaching load reduced up to four periods per week if the reading/writing period were made one of the five regular English periods. So the real burden would actually fall upon English teachers who had no regular third year classes—and these men would only pick up one period per week. This is not too much to ask, particularly if they can see *they are accomplishing something with the students' writing*.

Writing is not easy. It never will be. But it is one of the more important aspects of a Jesuit education and one which students at a Jesuit school have every right to expect. The present tide of inarticulation is not going to abate on its own. If we are to stem it at all, we had better experiment with something different from what we are currently using. This program may not be the answer but perhaps it is a step in that direction.

A Jesuit Secular Campus Experiment

JOHN F. TALBOT, S.J.

In recent meetings on the selection and revision of Jesuit ministries, younger Jesuits especially have expressed increasing interest in the apostolate of the secular campus. For example, the Morristown, N.J. meeting of 80 superiors and delegates of the New York Province urged "that the results of the survey regarding Jesuit work at non-Jesuit institutions of higher learning be made readily available", and "that the Provincial undertake experiments toward the utilization of Jesuit academic units on non-Jesuit campuses". The reasons for this heightened interest are evident: the 1,000,000 Catholics on secular campuses; the whole chain-reaction of secularity in the Church; disenchantment or dissatisfaction with our own Jesuit institutions; greater research and teaching opportunities; pressure from Ordinaries to join the Paulists and Dominicans in a greater commitment to the secular campus.

The Morristown report recommended that all experiments "should be subjected to constant, careful evaluation by the persons involved and by the Province. The results should be published and should serve as the basis for the Province's future commitment of Jesuits to this work". For the past six years, just such an experiment has been going on at the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras. Its Latin setting and other atypical factors may limit the applicability of its evaluation, but we feel that the history of its evolution and its actual structure can prove instructive for similar experiments.

The Río Piedras campus of the University of Puerto Rico is central to the Island and its development. Its 20,000 present enrollment is 40% of the university population; by 1975, it may reach 35,000 students in a total Island population of 3,000,000. Apart from mere numbers, the standards of admissions at Río Piedras, the quality of its faculty, the range of departments, its annual budget of \$25,000,000, all combine to make it the premier educational center of Puerto Rico. It is, moreover, the traditional scene of student "happenings", far more than the universities of the more provincial cities of Mayaguez and Ponce.

The Archdiocese of San Juan, to its credit, has had a lengthy history of "presence" at the Río Piedras campus. Well before the

establishment of a Catholic University in Ponce in 1948, the Archdiocese had built and maintained a sizeable student residence directly in front of the campus. A *Centro Universitario Católico*, at the service of the university community, has existed since 1927; a succession of dedicated part-time chaplains, secular and religious, broke real ground in creating a spirit of Christian community.

Jesuit involvement in the secular campus apostolate in Puerto Rico is personified in a 61-year "young" Spaniard, Antonio González Quevedo. One of three Jesuit pioneers in Puerto Rico in this century, he arrived in 1945 to establish a mountain retreat house; almost immediately he began to dream of duplicating, in Río Piedras, the famed professional-student Sodality of Havana's Fr. Rey de Castro. His dreams had to wait on the construction of the retreat house, then a temporary teaching assignment in the newly-founded Catholic University. Come 1954, Fr. Quevedo was a high school counsellor in Río Piedras, and began to dedicate all his spare time to the *Centro Universitario Católico*, then without the services of a regular chaplain. Another paraministry! By 1959, his religious superiors finally released him for fulltime duties at the *Centro*, and his life's dream began to materialize. A very successful television series publicized the work of the *Centro* and won him financial support of many friends. During these early years, he helped form or, better, allowed to form themselves a whole generation of talented young university students. Several are now religious and priests; many more went on to professional schools, are now U.P.R. professors and personnel who continue passionately devoted to the *Centro*. Moreover, the inspiration of the *Centro* in the late '50s and early '60s was not Fr. Quevedo, but a young charismatic layman, Charlie Rodríguez. A self-made liturgist and spiritual counsellor, he died of cancer in the summer of 1963.

Puerto Rico passed to the jurisdiction of the New York Province in July, 1959. Shortly thereafter, Fr. Quevedo began to share his enthusiastic dreams with Fr. John McGinty, Provincial. In the fall of 1961, Fr. McGinty signed an agreement with Archbishop James P. Davis of San Juan, to commit more Jesuit personnel to an expanded apostolate of the *Centro Universitario Católico* and at the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras. There was to be added to Fr. Quevedo's pastoral and counselling ministry a strong academic thrust on campus, involving professors in key departments, and philosophical and theological formation programs in the *Centro*.

The team of priests began to function in 1962. It included professors of history and economics; a psychologist-counsellor; a young Cuban disciple of Fr. Rey de Castro; and Fr. Quevedo. Interprovincial cooperation was significant: there were two Americans, two Spaniards, and one Cuban. Two years later, a third professor joined the group. One of the professors had considerable success in research, and became a member of the Social Sciences Research Center and an Island government consultant. Another professor has faculty tenure, and is involved in different committees organizing curriculum changes and interdepartmental coordination in the Social Sciences faculty. All, in varying degrees, participate in the counselling and pastoral services of the *Centro*, housed since 1964 in a Butler building on a site one block removed from the main U.P.R. entrance. The building can easily accommodate 200 persons for Mass or lectures, includes three counselling offices, and has some study and recreational facilities for students. Erected in an emergency and leaving much to be desired in the way of facilities, it will soon give way, we hope, to a more permanent *Centro*.

Six years have seen a turnover of personnel and some definite changes of emphasis. The original conception projected as many as five counsellors and five fulltime professors by 1968, a figure never realized and probably not realizable. In the 1967-68 academic year there were two fulltime professors; this coming year there will be but one. The dropoff is related in part to the Province's personnel problems, in part to the difficulty of obtaining qualified personnel who can also speak Spanish fluently. Two other priests continue in the pastoral line; the priest psychologist has returned from a year's sabbatical study of group dynamics and hopes to apply the results to work with Catholic Action groups in and around the campus. Two young Puerto Ricans supply the new dimension: they are working with student movements characterized by commitment, penetration, and change in university structures. One has even been labeled the "leftist" priest. They are also exerting leadership in the coordination of student and youth movements in the Archdiocese. More recently, a sister of a Puerto Rican religious congregation has joined the staff of the *Centro*; in the process of getting a Master's in Social Work at the U.P.R., she has spent her spare hours in counselling coeds in the *Centro*.

Post-conciliar reflection has modified other aspects of service.

At a given moment there was an over-emphasis on sacramentalism: periodic Masses, communion outside of Mass at stated intervals or for the asking, a tendency to count heads. That phase is over, thank God! The main emphasis now is to create Christian community; that faculty and students feel the *Centro* is theirs, the liturgy is theirs, the initiative is theirs. Actually, the liturgy has grown into something alive, distinctive, collegiate: Masses-in-the-round, spontaneous dialogue homilies, formal homilies by faculty and students, penance services, instrument liturgies, adapted lyrics, etc. There is freedom in suggesting and initiating experimentation, in close coordination with the archdiocesan liturgy commission. The recurring message of professors' homilies has been that the liturgy terminates on campus in the apostolic action of the committed Christian working within the university structures. Dialogue has come a long way, too, from the days when some professors had recourse to Provincial or Archbishop over autocratic direction of the *Centro*. Faculty, husbands and wives, have dined with the Jesuit community to discuss the future of the *Centro*; we have held several public hearings on the identity and purpose of the *Centro* and the U.P.R. Catholic community. We are in the initial phases of a formal "parish" council. Many have asked why, in fact, we have never petitioned the Archbishop to make the *Centro* a non-geographical, functional parish; our answer and conviction has been, and still is, that we are trying to create the reality of Christian community before baptizing it with the name "parish". It is on the way: one respected professor, of long acquaintance with the U.P.R. and the *Centro*, feels that a definitive breakthrough is imminent, that the Catholic community is reaching a sense of identity and unity.

A litany of triumphs? I hope I haven't given that impression. There have been ups-and-downs, disappointments, failures. Finances are always touch and go. Stable income is the professors' salaries; the rest of the team lives off them, the donations of friends and university personnel, and the ceaseless fund-raising of Fr. Quevedo. The students evidently contribute very little. The *Centro* has been an itinerant institution for much of its career, and now the U.P.R. is threatening to expropriate its present ideal site, to construct a university city. The expropriation, however, may be a blessing in disguise. The threat has helped to unify the community and cause it to reflect on itself: what does the *Centro* pretend to be? is a building necessary to crystallize community?

should we concentrate on Catholic Action cells on campus independently of any visible structure? The expropriation may also give us a good shove along the road of Ecumenism. Puerto Rico is hardly pluralistic with its estimated 95% Catholic population, and Catholics just don't feel the minority need for ecumenical cooperation. A secondary site for the *Centro* lies squarely between Methodist and Episcopal centers, and plans for a new center are in the direction of a *koinonia* house. Recently, the joint action of chaplains of the three denominations elicited the promise of the U.P.R. administration to furnish common counselling facilities within the campus student union building.

If liturgy, dialogue, and ecumenism are up, adult catechetics and formation in the faith are down. Daily, well-prepared homilies on the *lectio continua* over two years have done incalculable good, not to mention Scripture groups, discussions on Christian commitment, and some social orientation. But serious, persevering catechesis on an adult level has been woefully deficient, especially, e.g. to university students arriving fresh from the emotional impact of a *Cursillo* or *Jornada*. Fr. Quevedo himself used the Exercises for years as an instrument of conversion and formation; the younger Jesuits employ any and every method, *Cursillos de Cristiandad*, *Jornadas*, *Cursillos de Capacitación Social*, to confront youth with the Christian message. Still, some solid, doctrinal followup is needed, and we are looking for the way to furnish it.

This has been more a narrative than an evaluation. Yet the mere telling, we hope, may serve to communicate the conviction of the *Centro* Jesuits that the experiment is eminently worthwhile, and merits being continued and even expanded. Expanded, because a generous estimate is that we contact, counsel, teach, or know less than 10% of the 20,000 student body at Río Piedras; expanded, because the professional aspect of the group is down to a low of one professor. The future has some challenging and exciting possibilities: close ecumenical collaboration or even an ecumenical center; a center in the midst of a university city of five thousand students; possibilities of on-campus counselling, or even a department of theology; a combination residence-center, to take away another barrier to identification with the university community. Such are the themes of our discussions in the *Centro*, and our own biweekly reflection in the small, closely-united Jesuit community of six or seven.

Curricula for a Humane Education

THOMAS J. CASEY, S.J.

While it would be difficult to get much consensus on what constitutes an ideal curriculum for the college of today, there does seem to be consensus on one thing relative to the curriculum. Practically everyone seems to feel that the traditional college curriculum, particularly at the undergraduate level, has been inadequate and is therefore much in need of reform. The traditional curriculum may be credited with imparting disciplines and skills which allow students to fulfill adequately job and career roles in our society. But in the area of true human development, in liberating the capacity for humane and social living which satisfies man's craving for self-fulfillment because an individual recognizes that he is living fully, traditional curricula are considered to be a failure. Student apathy and alienation witness to this failure and increasingly students themselves are calling attention formally to it.¹ As for the faculty, there is evidence of a willingness to recognize the validity of the charges and responses made by students and a formal calling for something to be done about the situation.²

One type of response to this call for change and experimentation in the curriculum was made at Regis College in Denver last year. A full account of this program which involved superior senior students and chosen faculty members from a variety of disciplines has been given in an article written for *Liberal Education* by Harry Klocker, S.J., the Dean of the College.³ Admittedly the program was small and it needs to be observed in action for some time yet before any final and complete evaluation can be made, but initial evidence and the responses from participants certainly indicate that it is at least a step in the right direction if not a great leap forward.

The basic motivation for starting this new program for selected seniors was the feeling that, while a basic liberal arts college, such as Regis is, provides exposure to liberalizing and humane subjects, it did not guarantee that there was real depth of learning being correlated with the exposure. In particular, it was felt that the

1 Peggy Kraus, "Berkeley Revisited: Where Social Scientists Fail," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 47, No. 8 (April 1966), pp. 421-423.

2 Joseph Katz and Nevitt Sanford, "The Curriculum in the Perspective of the Theory of Personality Development" in Nevitt Sanford (ed.), *The American College* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962), pp. 443-444.

3 Harry R. Klocker, S.J., "Integrating Liberal Education," *Liberal Education*, Vol. 53, No. 3 (Oct. 1967), pp. 385-391.

desired integration of the various disciplines among themselves and the consequent relevancy of such an integration for living a full and humane life was not being achieved as adequately as it should or might be. A group of concerned faculty members, therefore, desired to provide at least some of the seniors with an opportunity for a seminar approach, allowing for faculty and student give and take, to the disciplines they had already studied. This seminar would attempt formally to integrate the various disciplines among themselves and to the basic problem of living an integrated and meaningful life in modern society.

The heart of the program centered around bringing a half-dozen to a dozen faculty members together with about twenty-five seniors of marked academic attainment for a seminar session one afternoon a week. The starting point for explanations, integrations and discussions was found in the mutual reading of six important and current books from the humanistic and social science areas. The formal part of the program consisted of the participating faculty members giving a brief description of their respective disciplines and the current problems in them, while students paired up to give reports on the books chosen for communal reading. To force the students out of their areas of specialization and to broaden their perspectives they were made to report on a book which was from an area unfamiliar to them. The students were also required to present a paper at the end of the seminar which treated an interdisciplinary problem that had become particularly meaningful to them as a result of the seminar discussions. These discussions had constituted the real instrument of learning and development which was achieved through the senior interdisciplinary seminar.

At the conclusion of the seminar the reactions of both participating faculty and students in this experimental curriculum program were formally solicited and obtained. On the part of faculty, it was agreed that the basic and formal purpose of the experiment was achieved. They were confident that the students had grown in an awareness of the problems connected with the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge and that these problems and interrelationships had become a matter of personal concern and interest to them. The professors felt that they themselves had grown with their students in this awareness and concern. They were particularly impressed with the developments they recognized as having taken place in disciplines other than their own since their undergraduate days. Admittedly, to the problems raised in the seminar sessions no real

answers were hit upon. There was, too, a feeling that the seminar had ambitioned to cover too broad an area, but these entries on the debit side hardly dampened a quite positive reaction on the part of faculty to the new program or their conviction that it was worthwhile.

The reaction of the participating students was also positive. They expressed their appreciation for this opportunity to grow in an awareness of and appreciation for disciplines to which they had been able to give little or no time in the course of their college undergraduate program. They were impressed particularly with the realization they attained that no scientific or departmental problem can be divorced from human considerations and repercussions. Philosophic and theologic concerns had a way of intruding themselves in every application of scientific findings for human improvement or management. They too felt that an excessive quantity of matter had been attempted and they would have preferred to be graded on a mere pass-fail basis. But the opportunity to be at least for a short period of their college career members of a real community of scholars jointly pursuing and exchanging insights and understandings was considered to be more than adequate compensation for whatever inadequacies they might have to report.

The program at Regis is but one of a number of similar programs which have been attempted in an effort to overcome what Dressel calls the essentially juvenile character of much of undergraduate education and which has resulted in his judgment primarily from a proliferation of courses and specialties.⁴ Perhaps the one which bears most resemblance to the Regis program is that initiated at Bowdoin College in Brunswick, Maine. This liberal arts college started its program exclusively for seniors also, though in this case for all of them and concomitantly with new housing for them. It calls for a seminar in each of the senior semesters instead of merely the final one, and it relied upon personnel and resource persons from outside the college as well as from within the faculty itself. But otherwise there are quite strong similarities in aims and methods between the programs of the two colleges, particularly in stressing that seniors introduce themselves to unfamiliar areas of study. Initial reaction to the program at Bowdoin also seems quite positive on the part of both faculty and participating seniors.⁵

A somewhat different approach to realizing some of the same

⁴ Paul L. Dressel, "Curriculum and Instruction," *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 38, No. 7 (Oct. 1967), pp. 393-396.

⁵ James S. Coles, "The Bowdoin College Senior Program," *School & Society*, Vol. 94, No. 2276 (April 2, 1966), pp. 182-183.

aims and meeting the same needs the Regis and Bowdoin programs address themselves to has been attempted at the University of California at Berkeley and Union College in New York. However, in these cases a start was made with the beginning rather than with the end of the college career. At Berkeley in 1964 five faculty members from different departments got the administration's approval and backing to start the Experimental Collegiate Program. This program was designed for one hundred fifty entering freshmen, equally divided between men and women, and it represented a rather radical modification of the traditional curriculum for freshmen and sophomores. The new curriculum centered around a theme or "problem-centered" approach to the study of those areas usually covered by more traditionally organized curricula. The heart of the program was found in the extensive reading demanded of the students in selected historical eras and frequent discussion among faculty and students as a result of mutual participation in an orderly series of lectures, seminars, papers and consultation. In addition the students were still required to take one regular course from the ordinary undergraduate curriculum for freshmen and sophomore students during each of the four semesters they were enrolled in the Experimental Collegiate Program. This requirement helped to prepare for upper division courses and specialization later on, since the main purpose of the new program was to show the interrelation of knowledge and to enable the students to maintain their enthusiasm for collegiate studies by seeing their relevancy to real life problems of humane living.⁶

The program at Union College in New York, the second oldest college in the state, manifests a still more radical approach to curriculum reform. This reform of curriculum embraces all four years and involves the abolishment of the so-called "distribution requirements" for general education. Electives are introduced early and only sixty percent rather than eighty percent of the student's time is given to the area of majors and minors. Introductory survey courses are dropped for the most part and credits are computed for courses rather than by credit hour. The whole emphasis is upon models of inquiry in studying problems or cases which arise within and among various disciplines. Quality of understanding and perception is sought rather than quantity of information. In their final year of college the seniors are required to take a round of common courses which hopefully will help them attain a final integration of

⁶ "Experiment at Berkeley," *NEA Journal*, Vol. 56, No. 1 (Jan. 1967) pp. 21-22; 78.

the disciplines they have seen in the curriculum, and in which they have become involved and well versed since they have followed their interest and concerns in a way the old curriculum did not allow.⁷

As can be seen from the cases briefly reviewed, there is experimentation with curricula going on within the liberal arts colleges and the undergraduate programs of universities. The range of experimentation is also considerable, from the modest introduction of a seminar at Regis to the revision of the whole four year's program at Union College. In Logan Wilson's judgment the piecemeal approach of Regis College in adding a course without discarding any other curriculum offerings is probably the more typical approach to the revision of curriculum found on most campuses which still tend to be conservative.⁸ But the program at Union College and to some degree the experiment at Berkeley does show that at least some of the institutions of higher education are ready for the radical experimentation and change that many feel is needed. What all these experiments with curricula seem to indicate is that we are still looking for means to achieve the aims which Hutchins proposed for general education and, more particularly, the basic faculties he would like to see dominant on a university campus and which would constitute a genuine community of scholars.⁹

At this stage in the development of experimental curricula it is too early for anything like a complete and final evaluation. It is even too early to judge whether the initial enthusiastic reports in favor of the changes introduced are anything more than a manifestation of the Hawthorne effect. When it comes to assessing the value of any new procedure in learning, as Bugelski warns, it is only after novelty and the consciousness of being a part of a unique and experimental group have worn off that we can really begin to judge whether the new program represents an improved learning technique. The achievements of the new program may represent nothing more than the results of improved motivation and an appreciative response to the attention and importance which is attached presumably to one who is chosen to participate in a new scientific program.¹⁰

7 "Curriculum Revision at Union College," *School & Society*, Vol. 94, No. 2278 (Summer 1966), pp. 261-262.

8 Logan Wilson, "Current Changes in Education," *North Central Association Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Spring 1965), pp. 314-315.

9 Robert M. Hutchins, *The Higher Learning in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, paperbound, 1962). Hutchins devotes chapters three and four to the problems associated with achieving these aims.

10 B. R. Bugelski, *The Psychology of Learning Applied to Teaching* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964), pp. 232-233.

All four of these new programs are agreed on the need to give undergraduate college students a more integrated general education which stresses depth of learning rather than mere factual breadth. Two have concentrated on the seniors for their enrichment efforts and the other two have begun primarily with freshmen and sophomores. Yet neither pair would want to defend too strongly the approach they have taken as the best. They are all aware of the weaknesses of both approaches. There is no doubt that seniors have a better background for a program which attempts an integration of knowledge. But the enthusiasm-dampening effects of a traditional and uninspiring curriculum during their earlier years of college may have created a spirit of apathy that successfully resists any attempt to fire them again with a thirst for knowledge and a belief in its intrinsic worth.

On the other hand, if you start with the freshmen and allow them to follow their own interests through a relatively unstructured curriculum, they may indeed maintain their enthusiasm and liking for the college experience. But there is evidence that they may find they simply do not have sufficient background, experience and maturity to use profitably the freedom that is given to them in creating their own learning experiences. It is instructive to note that one-fifth of those who entered the Experimental Collegiate Program at Berkeley dropped out of the program at the end of the first year and went into the regular college program. In the same program, the faculty had to admit also that the study house which was provided for frequent collaboration and confrontation of faculty and students was little used. It became a flourishing intellectual center for relatively few students in the program.

But if the question of where to begin and how to begin with the students in a formal attempt to integrate their knowledge and thus attain depth of perception remains largely unresolved on the basis of present evidence, we can be more confident in assessing the value of the program for the faculty. Participating faculty members have recounted their pleasant surprise at the appreciation the seminars and team-teaching programs have given them of the related disciplines of their confreres on the faculty. Kranzberg would contend that this is one of our current great needs if faculty members are to make students aware of the impact of science and technology on their lives.¹¹ These faculty members experienced a humanizing

¹¹ Melvin Kranzberg, "The Liberal Curriculum in a Scientific and Technological Age," in Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (eds.), *The College and the Student* (Wash., D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966), pp. 177-184.

and humility-engendering effect from the competencies demonstrated by other participating faculty members, as well as from the occasionally frank criticisms and disagreements on how they were handling their own disciplines. Exposing their professional competencies to a jury of peers, they found, called for more soul searching and self-examination than did an appearance before a group of young and immature undergraduates. The faculty found also that they became much more interested in how other faculty members taught students, since they considered the students as individuals for whom they had a personal concern and whom they wished to see benefitted. Seemingly some of the faculty indifference toward students and the tendency to consider them as just so many registration statistics had been modified markedly if not totally overcome.

Perhaps the best advice we can take at present is to follow McConnell and recognize that we simply know too little about curricula and learning situations for individuals or groups of individuals to do other than keep the curriculum flexible and encourage reasonable research and experimentation.¹² The experiments performed so far are encouraging and may receive approbation as at least a step in the right direction. As long as we are aware that in a social body as well as in the human body, unexpected side effects occur with the introduction of new structural and functional elements which may be good or bad, and we plan to handle them intelligently, then we may continue to approve and support current efforts to update the curriculum.

12 T. R. McConnell, *A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962), pp. 179ff.

Short-Term Exchange of Jesuit Personnel

The central office of the JEA has received the following communication from the Fathers Provincial through Father John V. O'Connor, S.J., Executive Secretary of the Conference of Major Superiors of Jesuits. It is published here in the hope that it will come to the attention of all interested parties.

“Under date of March 12, 1968, the JEA Board of Governors informed the Administrators and Faculty of Jesuit Colleges and Universities that they looked with favor on any efforts to establish new types of interprovincial and interinstitutional cooperation. They suggested that one way in which this might be promoted was by short-term exchange of Jesuit personnel and that these exchanges need not be confined to institutions within the same Province or even the same geographic region.

“In their most recent meeting the JEA Board of Governors unanimously endorsed the proposal that this exchange of Jesuit personnel be extended not only to Jesuit institutions in the United States but also to overseas apostolates which are less developed.”

(Excerpt from Minutes of the Provincials' Meeting, October 3-7, 1968, North Aurora, Illinois.)

The document, approved by the Fathers Provincial, which spells out the details of short-term exchanges of Jesuit personnel reads as follows:

“In its 47th Decree, the 31st General Congregation urged us to open and complete cooperation between the Society's members, whatever their professions, as a growing requisite for effective apostolic action today.

“The various recommendations of this decree are being implemented by the Fathers Provincial and have resulted thus far in some extensive restructuring of province relationships in order to enhance the possibility of cooperation among a larger, more widely dispersed group of Jesuit institutions. A case in point is the restructuring of the relationship between the New York and the Buffalo provinces.

“In line with the trend which is so essential in this day of shifting and divergent apostolates and of limited manpower and financial resources, the Board of Governors wishes to call to

the attention of all engaged in the Jesuit higher education apostolate the fact that they look with favor on any efforts to establish new types of interprovincial and interinstitutional cooperation, and the enlargement of any such types of cooperation already in existence.

“Following are some suggested types of cooperation which might enhance the professional competence of the individual Jesuit faculty members or administrators as well as redound to the benefit of the institutions participating.

“1) Jesuit faculty members, particularly those who have been teaching in one of our colleges or universities for a lengthy period of time, should be encouraged to arrange for a semester, a year, or a summer session of teaching at another Jesuit institution. Such an arrangement might be made by the Jesuit himself or by his administrative superior. In such cases, the institution to which the Jesuit would go should expect to remunerate his services in the same fashion as it would a visiting lay lecturer.

“2) In cases where two institutions could profit from an exchange of two Jesuit faculty members in the same or different academic fields, every effort should be made to encourage such exchanges. In fact, exchanges of this type might not necessarily involve two Jesuits, but a Jesuit and a lay faculty member, each on leave from his respective institution.

“3) There might be cases where a Jesuit faculty member could be assigned to another Jesuit college or university in order to spend a year or a semester solely in writing or research with no teaching assignments.

“4) Similar opportunities for and exchanges of administrators should also be explored. Jesuit Deans and Vice Presidents as well as Assistant Deans, Deans of Men and so forth could profit immensely from a change of institutional environment, especially if they have been serving in the same administrative position for a lengthy period. Such an exchange might also carry with it the aspect of an apprentice program where an Assistant Dean in a larger institution is available to go to a smaller institution on a leave of absence to be replaced by an inexperienced Jesuit who is being trained for an administrative position.

“In all such cases, these exchanges need not be confined to institutions within the same province or even the same geographic

region. Once the details of such exchanges or leaves of absence have been worked out tentatively between the authorities of the two institutions involved, it can be assumed that Provincial approval will normally be forthcoming."

Extension of This Document and Approval to Jesuits in High School Teaching or Administration

On December 23, 1968, in response to a request that had been submitted earlier, the Board of Governors, through Very Reverend Gerald R. Sheahan, S.J., Provincial of Missouri and Chairman of the Subcommittee of Provincials for JEA Affairs, extended the provisions of the document cited above and its approval by the Board to Jesuits who are assigned to our high schools. The exchange involved may be between two Jesuit high schools or between a Jesuit high school and a Jesuit college.