

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

PERIODICAL ROOM
COPY

**JESUIT UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES:
THEIR COMMITMENT IN
A WORLD OF CHANGE**

The 1969 JEA Workshop

Vol. 32, Number 2

October 1969

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Our Contributors

The articles in this issue of the JEQ were prepared as Principal Papers for discussion at the JEA Workshop held in Denver, Colorado from August 6 to 14, 1969. Other Principal Papers of the workshop will be published in subsequent issues of the Quarterly.

FATHER JAMES M. SOMERVILLE, S.J., is the Vice Provincial for Higher Education in the New York Province.

FATHER PAUL C. REINERT, S.J., is the President of Saint Louis University and President of the Jesuit Educational Association.

FATHER CHARLES F. DONOVAN, S.J., is the Senior Vice President and Dean of the Faculties at Boston College.

DR. PAUL J. REISS is the Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs at Fordham University and Dean of the Liberal Arts College at Fordham's Lincoln Center Campus.

FATHER EDMUND G. RYAN, S.J., is the Executive Vice President at Saint Peter's College.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

Volume 32, Number 2

October 1969

CONTENTS

COMMITMENT IN A WORLD OF CHANGE

James M. Somerville, S.J. 61

THE IMPERATIVES DETERMINING THE FUTURE OF JESUIT HIGHER EDUCATION

Paul C. Reinert, S.J. 65

THE LIBERAL AIMS OF JESUIT HIGHER EDUCATION

Charles F. Donovan, S.J. 81

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION: THE JESUIT-LAY CHARACTER

Paul J. Reiss 99

JESUIT PRESENCE ON CAMPUS: TODAY AND TOMORROW

Edmund G. Ryan, S.J. 117

IMPLEMENTATION 144

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:

GERARD J. CAMPBELL, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JAMES C. CARTER, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
JOSEPH D. DEVLIN, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
JOHN W. DONOHUE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
BERNARD J. DOOLEY, S.J.	<i>Maryland 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>
FRANCIS M. O'CONNOR, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JEROME A. PETZ, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
JOHN F. SNYDER, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
JAMES M. SOMERVILLE, S.J.	<i>New York 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

Commitment in a World of Change

JAMES M. SOMERVILLE, S.J.

Those who attended the JEA Higher Education Workshop in Denver this August will be unwinding for several weeks. The last meeting of this kind was in 1962, and it might as well have been 1562—so much has changed. Aside from one day off and two short coffee breaks each day (“be back in twenty minutes or we’ll make it up during the lunch hour”), the participants put in eight and ten-hour days, trying to discern what Jesuit Higher Education in the seventies is likely to be all about.

Of the 93 delegates and observers, 5 were Provincials, 26 were Presidents and Vice-Presidents of Jesuit colleges and universities, 24 Jesuit and lay faculty members, 8 Deans, 3 Deans of Women, 4 Chaplains, 11 students (Jesuit and lay), 2 delegates from the Canadian Provinces, and an assortment of personnel from High School, Admissions, Student Relations, Medicine, and the Press. The students made uncommon good sense, thus suggesting that the younger generation is articulate and should be an integral part of all such meetings in the future.

Clearly, various Provinces are in varying stages of evolution towards the future. But there was a remarkable degree of unanimity on such things as separate incorporation, lay trustees, the social and civic orientation of liberal arts programs, the increasing importance of the campus chaplaincy and the training needed for it, responsible liturgical experimentation, better Jesuit and lay community and communication, student participation in certain aspects of decision making, etc.

Among the more encouraging signs was the conviction that Jesuit institutions are entering on a new period in which our “distinctiveness” in terms of curriculum, general consensus, and human relations must be made to stand out against the general background of confusion that has overtaken American Higher Education.

A new look at Jesuit spirituality, or what came to be called Ignatian “secular mysticism,” revealed its extraordinary adaptability. Not to be confused with the secular mystique of, for example, Harvey Cox, it is nevertheless a world-affirming humanism informed by an incarnational theology of grace, enabling the Jesuit to “see God in all things.” It is shared in varying degrees by many, possibly the majority of our lay faculty. Most of the lay participants agreed that they do subscribe to basic Jesuit spirituality, that they are for

the most part in Jesuit institutions by choice because they find or hoped to find in them a quality not easily found elsewhere, that they would favor a much closer personal association with the Society and with individual Jesuits than has been the case in the past.

On the debit side was the recognition that some Jesuits seem and act remote, that they retreat to the Jesuit residence when class is over, that they do not participate fully in academic life, in faculty discussions, luncheons, and bull sessions. An undertone picked up by the Committee on Jesuit Presence was the problem of Jesuit absence: absence from faculty offices, from student and faculty social events, from committee work, AAUP meetings, absence especially from the faculty lounge and the coffee breaks where faculty members get to know one another.

Since faculty participation, both Jesuit and lay, in academic community life differs from place to place, one cannot generalize. But students and lay faculty want to see more of all Jesuits outside the classroom. Many felt that the Jesuit residence ought to become a radiating center for community and liturgical life on a much more imaginative scale, even if this meant turning the Jesuit recreation room (or part of it) into a supplementary faculty lounge for coffee hours or expanding the community dining room (or part of it) so that it might become a regular luncheon place for lay faculty members. Back of this was the thought, expressed in the principal Consensus Paper, that if an effective campus consensus cannot be attained without the cultivation of deep personal ties of human friendship, then one of the major tasks for the next decade will be to forge the Jesuit and lay elements of the college into a true community. It is not enough to talk about the larger Jesuit family; it will only become a reality when everyone is conscious of its value and ready to make sacrifices for its attainment.

The Workshop placed strong emphasis on the importance of the student-centered curriculum and manner, lest the legitimate needs of the student be forgotten. Above all, the curriculum must be relevant and flexible, a laboratory for life, a program which reaches out into the city and the marketplace. It must begin with the students "where they are" and go on from there to create new experiences, an ongoing quest for values, an inquisitive and reflective habit of mind, fostered as much by what takes place outside the classroom as by what occurs within it. There is a great need for a wide variety of small experimental programs whose development will tax the ingenuity of those who plan them on an economy basis

and, no doubt, invite the displeasure of some department heads. But here Deans and Administrators have to act courageously to break through the formalistic prejudices of academicians whose idea of a liberal education may not extend very far beyond their conviction of the importance of their own field.

Closely allied to flexibility, the student-centered program asks of faculty members a time-consuming devotion to students with their problems, woes, and legitimate ambitions. The university cannot do without the avid researcher whose contact with students does not carry beyond the classroom and the grading system. But it is not uncommon to find that the very teachers who are most active in publication are the ones who manage to devote a great amount of time to their students. The unresolved enigma is how to account for those faculty members who, whether through shyness, self-interest, or an inability to relate to the young, neither write nor make any great effort to be available to students.

The need of the sixties was that Jesuits work to achieve parity with laymen as professional scholars and educators. For the most part this has been realized, especially among Jesuits under fifty who have had the advantage of university training. But as public institutions become larger and more impersonal, what can make the Jesuit college of the seventies distinctive (and therefore worth the higher price of admission) is a new version of the traditional *cura personalis alumnorum*, particularly where minority groups are concerned. If this means that less emphasis will be placed on research and publication, it is up to administrators and trustees to make it unmistakably clear that in the future one of the more important norms for academic promotion will be the faculty member's responsible dedication to student needs outside regular classroom hours.

So far I have made no reference to the problem of future Jesuit manpower. It was treated in several papers but the question is too complex to be handled in a few sentences. Fr. Reinert's "optimum" projection would still find the Jesuit work force at 91% of its present level ten years from now. If, during the next decade, our institutions, especially the universities, were to expand as they have over the past twenty years, the Jesuit work force would decline to well below 10% of the academic personnel, even though, absolutely speaking, the number of Jesuits had not been greatly reduced.

On the other hand, if student and faculty populations did not expand, the relative strength of Jesuit and lay faculty would remain

about the same. But even in this situation, which is unlikely, laymen will almost certainly play a much larger role in the management and administration of our larger universities. All of the Provinces will have to make important decisions regarding the concentration of manpower, weighing whether it would be better to concentrate Jesuits in the smaller colleges while maintaining an "effective" presence in the universities, or withdraw from a few of the smaller institutions and increase the concentration in the universities.

Finally, it must be recognized that today we must deal with the confused Catholic, the anonymous Catholic, the selective Catholic. As the Consensus Statement on Theology indicates, indoctrination will not do; it only serves to defeat its own purpose. Youth no longer subscribes to dogmatism or institutional protectiveness, but it likes to think that it can believe in people. Therefore, if we are to lift our students up to a sense of the divine, it will be necessary to enter through the human door, and for the foreseeable future Jesuits will have to make every effort to demonstrate that they are among those "who care." Our work is cut out for us. The mandate for all Jesuits is to exercise a personal apostolate among students and lay faculty, an apostolate of visible presence in every aspect of college and university life.

The Imperatives Determining the Future of Jesuit Higher Education

PAUL C. REINERT, S.J.

In 1963 when August A. Busch, Jr. announced the goal of \$35,000,000 for the next five years and the fact that he was assuming chief responsibility as chairman of the Leadership Council of the Saint Louis University development campaign, he said: It *can* be done; it *must* be done; it *will* be done. This is what I mean by an *imperative*—something that can be done to insure our future; something which must be done; and something that we simply must make up our minds will be done.

I should like to develop the proposition that the future of Jesuit higher education is directly dependent on our ability to carry through on at least *seven interrelated imperatives*. The vitality, in some cases, the very existence of each of our 28 institutions will depend on the degree to which we are successful in achieving these seven imperatives, not so much as a group of institutions, but as individual colleges or universities.

Three of these imperatives are being faced by non-Jesuit institutions both public and private, and we share these challenges together. The other four imperatives are unique to us as Catholic and Jesuit, and these add to and complicate the sum total of the imperatives we must meet.

In each case I shall comment briefly on: a) the nature of the imperative itself; b) the efforts that seem necessary to meet the imperative; and c) the present status of our efforts.

I. *Response to Change and Adaptation*

In common with all other institutions of higher education, Jesuit colleges and universities must adopt a style of life that is congenial to change and adaptation. This requires an internal structure of governance that gives ample opportunity at appropriate levels for all of the academic community to participate in policy formation and execution—trustees, Jesuit and lay administrators, Jesuit and lay faculty, and students.

The delegation and diffusion of authority is really in accordance with the spirit of the Society and our earliest traditions. Saint Ignatius urged, and in his own administrative practice demonstrated

that decisions should be made at the level of close contact with reality. "If you lessen the power of the man or group in charge, if you meddle in their business, power is separated from ability with most unfortunate results." In 1553 he sent Father Miguel de Torres as visitor to Portugal. He gave him broad general instructions, but no obligation of proceeding in one way or another. He did give him a large number of signed blank documents, so that de Torres could write in them whatever he judged best.

Management consultants who have looked at a good number of our institutions tell me that in many instances we really have not understood nor accepted the principle of the diffusion of authority. We older Jesuits have been brought up in a tradition where religious authority and academic responsibility were identified in the Father Rector, where the principle of obedience to a superior was transferred to our dealings with all subjects, religious and lay alike. We have not experienced nor usually have we been trained in an organizational system where there is an orderly process of gathering data, expressing opinion, engaging in debate, weighing of pros and cons from all viewpoints, arriving at tentative conclusions, testing their validity, delegating authority to some others whom we hold responsible.

One concrete evidence of a serious institutional effort to involve itself in participatory democracy within the academic community would be the existence and proper functioning of a body, composed of representatives of major segments of the academic community, working on issues of common concern. As of January, 1969, twenty-five Jesuit institutions indicated that they have a university senate (or council) with institution-wide functions. But over two-thirds of these councils (18) were established since 1964—very late in our history. The faculty is, of course, represented on all twenty-five of the university senates, the administration is represented on twenty-two of them, and the students on fifteen. In this workshop we are calling for radical, innovative change in our curriculum and the total life style of our institutions. In each school this will take place only if our policy-making structure is also radically changed.

This response to change must be genuine and sincere. The danger is that we will engage in institutional "tokenism" aimed at satisfying disquieting demands of faculty and students. Our response must spring from a sincere desire to establish a true community, involving full Jesuit-lay partnership, composed of all essential segments of the academic experience.

II. *Determination and Implementation of an Academic Priority System*

Whatever objectives or programs we determine to support in our institution, we will survive only if the financial cost of these is within our realistic potential for the future. This will demand a type of planning which has an in-built system of academic priorities determining the choices we must make.

Priorities can only be determined by reaching evaluative judgments on the part of all those most vitally involved. This means we must have an orderly process in each institution for planning the development of its future. A college without a clearly defined long range plan is in trouble even if it does not suspect it.

Institutional planning is essential. It should result in an academic blueprint which is a photograph of the planning at a particular point in time. Even as the academic plan is being printed, changes render it out of date. Hence the blueprint must constantly be studied and reworked. But the academic blueprint does set up value guidelines; it does give the institution the ability to control its own destiny. Planning must not be fragmented, but all-inclusive. There should be a plan for each department of the college or university; a plan for each school or college in the institution; a plan for the entire institution which includes: general philosophy and purposes, summary of plans for each school, fiscal projections (including the annual budget for each year of the projected period), physical needs and the campus plan, and a program for raising the necessary funds.

How effectively are our Jesuit colleges and universities carrying out the process of academic planning which inevitably requires the determination of priorities? Last year, as part of a questionnaire related to the use of cooperative programs in our Jesuit institutions, Father James Baker, S.J., asked each of our colleges and universities several background questions aimed at arriving at a general idea of the status of their academic planning. The results are only moderately encouraging. True, 88% of our institutions indicated that they have made enrollment projections for the next five years; 61% have projected their faculty needs and positions for the next five years; 73% have determined their capital and building needs for the next five years; and 70% know their financial requirements and have projected the sources of these funds. But the weakest area of planning is the most important of all, that of curriculum; in fully half of our institutions no actual projections regarding new academic

programs have been made even for the next five years.

Unless a Jesuit college or university begins its academic planning with the assumption that its resources in manpower, library materials, and money are unlimited, some system must be devised whereby current curricular offerings are placed on a priority scale of relative importance and the choice or rejection of new academic programs is determined. I submit this is the toughest question an institution faces, and for what it's worth, here is what Saint Louis University has adopted as its general policy in the matter of priorities. It is quite clear that, in the light of available resources, the University will not be able to attain high excellence in all its programs within the next five years. If all resources were assigned on a mathematical proportioned formula, all programs would be doomed to mediocrity. Hence, the University has adopted a plan of priorities which includes selective excellence and different rates of growth and development. Thus, the Department of Management Sciences has been selected as the top priority department in the School of Commerce and Finance. This program of priorities has to be combined with a planned improvement of certain areas of weakness. The Department of Theology, for example, had deteriorated and so it must be brought back to a higher level of adequacy as soon as possible. The effect of a priority rating will vary with the present condition of the department or program. A high priority rating for the English Department may entail merely maintaining it at its present level of excellence with only a very limited increase in faculty. In other cases, e.g., Biology, it may mean a considerable expansion and development.

Insofar as the effectiveness of Jesuit academic planning is concerned, it is my impression, and necessarily a superficial one, that most of our four-year *colleges* are increasingly aware of the wisdom of limiting their academic goals and are relatively committed to improving and strengthening their baccalaureate programs without ambitioning to expand into graduate and professional work. In contrast, some, maybe most of our *universities* are already overextended and are finding it extremely difficult because of long-standing commitments and because of faculty and community demands to carry out necessary curricular and program adjustments and curtailment. At the risk of acting the prophet of doom, I would predict that more than anything else the decision or lack of it regarding academic priorities will determine the long-range success or failure of Jesuit higher education.

III. *Exploitation of Every Source of Financial Support*

Every Jesuit college and university must establish or maintain a well-organized development program. None can be satisfied that its future is reasonably promising until it has in operation a program of continuing voluntary support from corporations, foundations, individuals, alumni, parents, faculty and students. Such support from multiple sources will be needed over and above the financial assistance from the Federal Government which, hopefully, will increase in the years ahead. Jesuit as well as lay staff must be trained and dedicated to this recognized and respectable area of college and university life.

Twenty years of educational fund-raising have convinced me that there are at least four essential ingredients, one or more of which is too often missing in the typical support program of our Jesuit institutions:

- a) dependence of the development program on a sound academic blueprint;
- b) continuity of effort;
- c) investment in manpower and money;
- d) the help of volunteers.

a) As I pointed out in Imperative II, each institution must have a carefully planned, widely understood and accepted set of academic goals to which are attached realistic financial projections. The fund-raising program must be a consequence and an accurate reflection of the institution's academic aspirations.

b) A program for support that operates in fits and starts due to changing institutional leadership and personnel is doomed to failure. Jesuit fund-raising has not been distinguished for its continuity of effort.

c) Again, many development programs fail because those responsible do not have sufficient faith in their vision to make the necessary investment prerequisite to successful results. There is no other way; it costs money to raise money.

d) Continuity of leadership, together with willingness to invest, still demands the invaluable advice and aid of lay volunteers. Laymen can advise and act with wisdom and power only if they are allowed to acquire an intimate knowledge of the institution for which they are working—one of the most cogent reasons for including laymen on Boards of Trustees. And the effectiveness of laymen sharing legal responsibility for an institution over those who are

merely in an advisory capacity is as different as day and night. I can testify to this from direct experience with a group of twelve laymen who served for several years as lay trustees in an advisory capacity and then became members of the official legally-responsible Board of Trustees.

This would be the appropriate place to urge every Jesuit institution to a more practical realization of the political facts of life. Not only must private colleges and universities seek support from government at the Federal level, but also at the State level—particularly in the form of State scholarship programs, tuition equalization programs, and programs whereby private institutions can contract for education, e.g., at the professional level of students who are citizens of that State. A few of our institutions, particularly Marquette University, through the leadership of Father Virgil Blum, have exercised profound influence on State legislation with very gratifying results. We must learn how to use the influence of the institution itself, as well as that of our trustees, alumni and friends, to present an effective case to the key political leadership in the State. Our earlier disdain of becoming involved in political action must be set aside if we are serious about survival.

These are the three essential tasks which we share with all other colleges and universities, especially those under private auspices. We turn now to the four that are peculiar to us as Catholic and Jesuit institutions.

IV. *The Distinctiveness of Jesuit Higher Education*

The fourth imperative is the determination and implementation of the distinctive characteristics of our type of higher education. This, of course, brings us to the key questions in this Workshop and the topics which have been vigorously discussed up to the present moment. I would not presume to add to the excellent presentations thus far.

One point which I wish to emphasize, however, is that our distinctiveness as educators in a Jesuit college or university is not to be conceived as a static quality, but like all other elements in the educational process it must be continuously evaluated and reassessed. The 1970 distinctiveness of Jesuit education is not and should not be the same as the distinctiveness of Jesuit education in 1960 or in 1900.

A second point is this: although the 1962 Loyola Workshop also produced some very excellent analyses of the distinctiveness that

should characterize our educational efforts, it is important that the 1969 Workshop be much more explicit in its determination of means whereby concrete outcomes can be extended into each of our 28 institutions immediately. In this period of educational revolution, it is critically important to provide a method for follow-up and evaluation of results, particularly in this area of Jesuit distinctiveness.

I would hope that a rejuvenated or reconstituted Jesuit Educational Association might be able to serve as a mechanism for a continuing follow-up of this Workshop so that reports can be made available describing whatever outcomes can be traced to our efforts here in Denver to identify, vivify, and activate our current and future commitment. My own feeling is that we have a long way to go in reaching the desired clarity in regard to the distinctiveness of our educational mission, but, thank God, we are seriously inquiring even though we are less sure about our results and more humble in our aspirations. I am enough of an optimist to think that our educational distinctiveness can exercise a strong appeal today—in the light of the backlash suffered by huge, impersonal institutions, the reaction against over-permissiveness, and in the search for relevancy and genuine values.

Surely we should be able to present to our students and to the world the kind of institutional climate that would be a convincing antidote to Professor Levi's critical evaluation of many American universities:

“There is an obvious correlation between violent student protest and monstrous size, impersonality in human relations, student neglect, faculty self-centeredness, administrative remoteness and Olympian grandeur. At Columbia, the student body is enormous, classes are much too large, the faculty lives in Scarsdale or Queens and hardly knows the university as a place, a locale, a living environment, and Grayson Kirk, its president, spoke only to the Chairman of Consolidated Edison on whose board he sat, the President of IBM whose educational nest he feathered, and the Secretaries of State and of Defense.” (*Violence and the Universities*, Albert Levi, Washington University Professor of Humanities)

We can certainly foster a distinctiveness that will compete effectively with institutions of the kind just described. We can provide a marketable educational experience.

V. *Vital Apostolic Relationship to the Society of Jesus*

Our colleges and universities must establish or maintain a relationship to the Society of Jesus which will keep our institutions officially and in the eyes of individual Jesuits, especially our younger men, a major apostolate of the Society in the United States. There are certain conditions which would appear to be either essential or highly conducive to the establishment of such a relationship:

1) Separate incorporation of the Jesuit Community from the educational corporation of the college or university itself. Such separate incorporation provides generous benefits on both sides: it gives the Jesuit Community moral and fiscal identity and viability, and it gives the college or university the necessary independence and autonomy. These benefits will not accrue automatically, however, by the mere fact that a Jesuit Community is separately incorporated. The fact of separation must be preceded by a lengthy, carefully-planned period of orientation and education of the Jesuits and lay faculty so that the process and purposes are clearly understood and so that all involved participate in the discussion and execution of the process. Moreover, in order that the understandings achieved through this orientation period may be preserved for the long future, it is essential that the separate incorporation be bolstered by written tripartite agreements between the Society (represented by the Province), the new Jesuit Community corporation, and the educational institution.

How is the process of separate incorporation faring across the country? My impression is that progress is spotty; there is much hesitancy largely because of lack of clarity and agreement on the requirements of canon and civil law; there is also an inadequate supply of expertise in this new field to provide the analysis and guidance necessary in the varying circumstances of each case. According to information gathered by Father Crandell at the JEA Central Office, as of January, 1969, the Jesuit Community had been separately incorporated at only four (4) Jesuit institutions. Fourteen (14) others indicated that such separate incorporation was being planned for completion during 1969. No institution stated that it had definitely decided against the separate incorporation of the Jesuit Community.

I would like to commend to the attention of others the serious study which has been going on in the Chicago Province as reflected in the printed report on the Province Planning Program. In the volume entitled "Phase III—Task Force Plans" dated March 12,

1969, about 70 pages (pp. 178-246) are devoted to the question of "Autonomy and the University" with specific reference to Loyola in Chicago and Xavier in Cincinnati. While I would not agree with every position taken in this statement, it is obvious that a careful effort was made by the members of this task force, consulting with many other Jesuits and laymen, to present all the arguments for and against incorporation and all the conditions which should be guaranteed if the communities at the Province's two universities are separately incorporated. Such careful study and wide involvement can only result in wiser decisions, provided of course, that the diversity of opinion such discussions inevitably generates does not interfere with a definitive decision in the reasonably near future.

2) A second element in maintaining a vital apostolic relationship with the Society is the question of present and future availability of Jesuit manpower to enter the field of higher education in our institutions. I believe the situation in the Missouri Province is more or less typical of what we are facing throughout the country. Assuming that the current number of entering novices remains constant for the next five to ten years, the total number of Missouri Province scholastics will continue its sharp drop of the last five years and will fall from the present 210 to 111 in 1979. In the case of priests, if an average of 12.6 ordinations per year is projected; an average of 4.4 leaving the Society each year; and an average of 6.6 dying each year, one can project an average annual increase of only 1.6 priests. On this basis, the number of priests would grow slightly over the next decade, from the present 440 to 456 by 1979. Thus, by 1979 our available working manpower (except for regents) would be about the same as it is today—although Missouri Province Jesuits would be older on the average than at present. Given the likelihood of greater choice of apostolic endeavor, it would appear certain that we will be extremely fortunate if in the decade ahead we can attract the same number or only slightly fewer Jesuits into our 28 institutions than we have at the present time. This points up the importance, the absolute necessity of being able to cross province boundaries to place Jesuit manpower where it can operate most effectively.

3) But the number of Jesuits in the future is only part of the question. More important is the matter of their attitude towards higher education as an apostolic preference.

Some idea of where we stand on this question appears in the Santa Clara Survey data. In that information we find 832 college

teachers in our sample. This is about 80% of the actual number of college teachers (Jesuit Priests). If these 832 Jesuits are representative of the college teachers in general, and we have no reason to doubt that they are, we find only 364 (43.7%) who would remain teaching if given a choice; 468 of the Priests in college teaching (56.2%) want out into other work. There are 258 Jesuits in other apostolates who want to teach in college but are not, and 132 special students who desire to go into college teaching. These men, added to the 364 who would remain, give us a work force of 754 men. (91% of the size of the work force now there.)

We see from the above that there would not be a great loss of numbers if college teaching were allowed to individual choice. Yet 48% would be experienced, 34% would be from other occupations and 17.5% of the new group would be special students who have no college experience. While numbers would not change, the level of experience would drop appreciably.

Santa Clara gives us a chance to look at these different groups more closely.

- I. College Teachers in general (832)
- II. College Teachers desiring to remain (364)
- III. College Teachers who want out (468)
- IV. Jesuits of other occupations who want to be College Teachers (258)

I have taken these four groups and compared them on the basis of several criteria, e.g., the academic fields in which they were trained; their evaluation of their own training in the Society; the degrees they hold; the factors influencing their choice of an academic field; when their choice was determined; their attitude towards their Provincial; and what apostolate they had wanted to pursue when they entered.

Without boring you with the statistical comparisons, let me summarize a few interesting conclusions which I think the data justify.

As of three years ago, if Jesuit manpower in higher education were left solely to the principle of attraction, in gross numbers 91% of that total would still be available. But only 43% of this force would be people currently in college teaching. The Jesuits, not now in, who want to be in college teaching are not as qualified as those now there. Only 30% of them have a Ph.D., although 85% have Masters or better. This group of Jesuits wanting in are late starters in academic training and are critical of their course in the Society and of the unsatisfactory direction they received from their superi-

ors. On the other hand, the 57% now in who would prefer to get out of college teaching are better satisfied with their training but also quite critical of their dealings with superiors in regard to their career assignment, partly, at least, because they learned what their career work would be later in their course than the 43% who want to remain in college teaching. One-half of those who would prefer something else have Ph.D.'s, so it seems clear that factors other than adequate academic qualifications are operative in their desire to change occupations.

I fully realize the hazard of drawing definite conclusions from such data, but, omitting other observations, I believe these Jesuits are telling us how critically important it is that young Jesuits on entering be given an opportunity to evaluate their own academic potential and aptitudes, and to learn how these might fit into the needs of our colleges and universities. Then, if they and superiors agree, as early as possible, they should be set on the path towards a fairly specific career with every year in their training contributing in a meaningful way to their professional preparation.

The information from the Santa Clara survey is, of course, several years old and in these rapidly changing times may not represent the attitudes and opinions of Jesuits regarding matters referring to our colleges and universities as of August 8, 1969. It seems to me that the more recent information of this kind is generally encouraging. For example, in its published plan the New York Province indicates that its Jesuit membership has chosen higher education as one of its principal apostolates.

In the voting at the Chicago Province Congress (March 29—April 5, 1969) the following propositions were approved by a very substantial majority:

The apostolate of higher education, whether in presently existing forms or in any of the new forms proposed, should be recognized as one of the most important activities of Jesuits of the Chicago Province. (Y-48; N-10; A-3)

The Jesuit Community at both Xavier and Loyola University, as well as the various academic and non-academic departments, should take the initiative in encouraging Jesuits to work at these institutions in academic and pastoral capacities. (Y-60; N-1; A-0)

In planning a university career the individual should give priority to Jesuit universities—especially Loyola and Xavier. (Y-44; N-3; A-14)

To cite another example, the New England Province recently published its "Plan for the Future" in which it is strongly affirmed that the "ministry of higher education remains among the prime areas of Jesuit services." The future of this apostolate in the New England Province is to depend on the implementation of two principles:

- a. The principle of attraction, i.e., "that the primary responsibility for attracting Jesuit presence rests with the institution or ministry and the Jesuits who service it"; and
- b. The principle of consolidation, i.e., "that the Province's review of higher education be done with a view to consolidating our major Jesuit presence into one, or at most two, of our present three institutions of higher learning."

VI. *Relationship to the Church*

Another essential imperative is the establishment of a mutually understood and viable relationship with the structured Church—Rome, the local diocese and its Bishop. Such a relationship must, on the one hand, continue to merit understanding and support on the Church's part of our institutions as "Catholic" in a bona fide sense, yet on the other hand, truly independent of the hierarchy so that the college or university can pursue truth in every area of human knowledge, including theology, without hindrance, undue questioning, etc. It seems to me that very encouraging progress has been achieved in the effort to promote increasing awareness on all levels of Catholicism of the nature of a Catholic college or university. This effort was initiated by the Land O'Lakes statement of two years ago, produced by representatives of American and Canadian Catholic universities; followed up by the statement on the role of the Catholic university in the modern world adopted by the International Federation of Catholic Universities at its meeting in Kinshasa, Congo, last September; and then confirmed, at least implicitly, by a lengthy document recently circulated to all Catholic universities as the result of a World Congress of Catholic Universities sponsored by the Congregation on Catholic Education at the end of April of this year in Rome. The position paper and the consensus of the Congress represent a significant advance in the understanding of what a Catholic university is, both in its commitment and, at the

same time, in the autonomy which must necessarily be part of any university.

Let me quote from two of the most important points analyzed in the report: a) the essential characteristics of a Catholic university; and b) the autonomy of the Catholic university and its relationship to ecclesiastical authority:

Essential Characteristics of a Catholic University

Since the objective of the Catholic university, precisely as Catholic, is to assure in an institutional manner a Christian presence in the university world confronting the great problems of contemporary society, the following are its essential characteristics:

1. A Christian inspiration not only of individuals but of the community as well.
2. A continuing reflection in the light of Christian faith upon the growing treasure of human knowledge.
3. Fidelity to the Christian message as it comes to us through the Church.
4. An institutional commitment to the service of Christian thought and education.

All universities that realize these conditions are Catholic universities, whether canonically erected or not. The purposes of the Catholic university can be pursued by different means and modalities according to diverse situations of time and place, and taking seriously into account the different natures of the disciplines taught in the university.

The Autonomy of the Catholic University and Its Relationships to Ecclesiastical Authority

The Catholic university today must be a university in the full modern sense of the word, with a strong commitment to and concern for academic excellence. To perform its teaching and research functions effectively the Catholic university must have a true autonomy and academic freedom. Nor is this to imply that the university is beyond the law: the university has its own laws which flow from its proper nature and finality.

Although the evidence of progress is encouraging on some fronts, I hasten to warn that we may still find ourselves in a precarious position in the turbulent days ahead. The backlash from statements and actions of liberal theologians is inevitably pushing Bishops into a more conservative mood. They want to "get rid" of trouble-makers,

and have a period of peace. Cases are multiplying where procedures will be required. Each institution should have its own procedures carefully formulated and backed up with strong theological thinking. Efforts should be made, individually and by Jesuit institutions corporately, to place these procedures before the Bishop, especially if he understands the problem from our viewpoint, so that the first instance of application of these procedures will not come as a shock to the Bishop concerned.

In this area of consideration, I want to refer briefly to an incident involving Cardinal Carberry and our School of Divinity which received wide publicity. Last May the Cardinal indicated that he wanted to review with us the arrangement under which his Diocesan seminarians take their theology courses in the University's School of Divinity during their third and fourth years. While he believed that the arrangement thus far had been generally successful, there was one point in particular he wanted to discuss. (I might point out quite emphatically that the Cardinal at the start of the meeting made it quite clear that in fulfilling his own responsibilities toward his seminarians he in no way wished to interfere with the responsibilities and rights of the University to devise its own curricula and to select its own faculty). The Cardinal's main concern was that some of his seminarians were taking scripture courses from a non-Catholic professor, Dr. Keith Nickle. While the Cardinal did not question Dr. Nickle's scholarship or position on the faculty of the School of Divinity, he did hold that as a matter of his own conscience he thought it best that his seminarians not take scripture from Dr. Nickle because of the fact that he was not a Catholic. This matter was settled amicably since a Jesuit, Father Petru, also teaches scripture, and the diocesan students, of course, could enroll in his course. From the University's viewpoint, this incident represents a most significant happening. The University's autonomy in the School of Divinity in the face of ecclesiastical question was clearly and publicly stated and recognized by Church authorities.

VII. *New Relationship with the Immediate Community and General Public*

It is imperative that we either vigorously maintain our individual institutions as public-service, community-related colleges and universities, or convert them into such as rapidly as possible. Only thus can we call on the resources of the entire community: lay as well as religious, Protestant and Jewish as well as Catholic, persons from

various socio-economic levels, etc. One guarantee of total commitment to community responsibility is a Board of Trustees representing the community and sufficiently detached from the internal management to be the institution's public "conscience."

In regard to this imperative, it would seem that substantial progress can be reported. With the assistance of local legal authorities and counselling across the country our institutions have been engaged in widespread changes in their governing bodies. As of January, 1969, eleven Jesuit institutions had already included laymen on their Boards of Trustees; one was preparing to do so; only eight had no intention of establishing a mixed Board.

Another very crucial aspect of community relationship is reflected in the willingness to do our share to solve the urban crises in which all of our institutions are more or less involved.

This past May, under the auspices of the Office of Scientific and Technical Information, Cambridge, Massachusetts, the U. S. Office of Education, and the Sloan Foundation, representatives of the administration, faculty and student body of eleven urban universities were brought together with volunteer workers and civil officials. The discussions that took place in this three-day conference at Martha's Vineyard produced some ideas which I think we should all ponder in terms of our special urban obligations as Catholic and Jesuit institutions.

First of all we must examine our obligations and involvement as a *corporate* entity; e.g., the use of our investment portfolio; the local impact of our purchasing budget; our employment policy and practice; our participation in the educational uplift of the elementary and secondary schools; our availability as an information resource; our posture as an advance for the local neighborhood; our efforts at reshaping service systems for the benefit of the inner-city—law, business and medicine; the availability of our physical facilities.

Secondly, as an educational institution presumably committed to working for the solution of our country's most serious social problems, we must see to it that the total academic community—trustees, administrators, faculty and students—are concerned about our goals and the alleviation of constraints upon the achievement of these goals. Key questions in this self-examination would include:

a) Are we increasing access of disadvantaged students to our institutions, or are we letting outmoded credential systems stand in the way?

b) Are we insisting exclusively on time-honored admission tests

which are inadequate evaluations of the disadvantaged student?

c) Are we really sacrificing to offer financial aid to the disadvantaged?

d) Are we open to experimentation and new forms of teaching, or are we allowing entrenched antiquated faculty control hinder fresh approaches?

e) Are we adding to our faculty the unique kind of teacher who can relate effectively to the kind of student who is coming out of the ghetto, or are we allowing an entrenched departmentalism and the privileged position of departmental and faculty power structures to perpetuate the current licensing system?

Summary

Here, then, are the seven imperatives which in my opinion are inextricably bound to the future of Jesuit higher education. We have a future *if* we are determined to:

1. be open to administrative change and adaptation;
2. establish and carry out an academic priority system;
3. exploit every source of financial support;
4. develop and strengthen the distinctive characteristics of Jesuit education;
5. establish a vital apostolic relationship with the Society and individual Jesuits;
6. maintain a viable relationship with the organized Church; and
7. cultivate a relationship of service and involvement with the immediate community and the general public.

Admittedly, this is a frightening, formidable agenda. In honesty I must admit that my answer to the question "What is the future of Jesuit Higher Education?" depends on whether you consider our 28 colleges and universities collectively or individually. Collectively, like all private higher education, Jesuit higher education has a rather dim unpromising future pitted against the thriving, all-inclusive, highly competitive growth of public institutions everywhere. Individually, however, I am convinced that many of our 28 colleges and universities have a bright exciting future, because I am confident that in many of them there will arise Jesuit and lay leaders—trustees, administrators, faculty and students—who will accept the challenge of these seven imperatives with vigor and determination and will fight their way through to ultimate success.

The Liberal Aims of Jesuit Higher Education

CHARLES F. DONOVAN, S.J.

My theme is the liberal aims of Jesuit education. At any time since the foundation of Georgetown, up until a few years ago, this would have been a bland and comfortable topic for an address to Jesuit educators. Sure of an audience of believers, believers in liberal education and believers in Jesuit higher education, the speaker would simply embellish with his own rhetoric familiar ideas about education of the whole man in the tradition of Christian humanism, with perhaps a reverent if not too relevant reference to the *Ratio Studiorum*.

But *mirabile dictu*—at least *mirabile* to those of us hardy enough to have participated in the '48 or '56 deans' institutes—in speaking to a group of Jesuits in 1969 one cannot assume commitment to liberal education or to Jesuit involvement in it or commitment to Jesuit institutions of higher education. In 1969 one approaches the assigned topic not as expositor or eulogist but as defender and advocate.

Liberal education itself is under attack. Jesuit involvement in liberal education is questioned, and the commitment of Jesuits to institutions of higher education is being challenged. Skeptics among us ask if the liberal arts college as we have known and valued it is a viable operation. Even if it is, does the liberal arts college offer a viable vocation for a Jesuit? And finally, is there a useful future for the Jesuit college or university, as Jesuit?

I am awed but honored to be the first spokesman for the defense—awed because of the suddenly massive dimensions of the challenge; honored because of personal devotion to Jesuit traditions in education and belief in their value today. While I am an ardent proponent of our historic vocation as educators, there is no intention of presenting here a statement of faith in the ways, the structure, or even the style of Jesuit liberal education as we have known it. The world has changed, higher education has changed, the Society of Jesus has changed; and new educational strategies must be devised to fit new situations. In all candor it must be said that the new day is forcing us at last to come to grips with root inadequacies in our education which we have too long ignored, some of which will be mentioned later.

We do not lack Jeremiahs announcing the doom of liberal educa-

tion. Jacques Barzun, for example, says: "The liberal arts tradition is dead or dying. We may keep talking about the liberal ideas at Commencement but the Commencement platform is their last and only refuge . . . the trend seems to me so clear that to object would be like trying to sweep back the ocean. It would be foolish to repine or try to prolong a tradition which has run its course."

The college is caught in the now celebrated squeeze between high school and graduate school. Responsible observers predict, too optimistically I think, that improved secondary schools will soon assume the burden of liberal education. On the other hand, the ravaging of liberal education by graduate and professional schools and by illiberally educated, graduate school-oriented college faculties is a scandal. Jencks and Riesman rightly characterize as an academic revolution the imperialism that has been established in higher education by academic specialists in graduate schools. The professionalization of liberal arts colleges is attributable to the professionalization of faculties at least as much as to the career ambitions of students and their families. Indeed, students have begun to rebel. It is students, not faculty members, who are pressing for curriculum reform as evidenced by "free universities," *ad hoc* courses and the like.

I think that most of us Jesuits, despite the considerable extent to which we have sold out to professionalism in our liberal arts colleges, in our hearts subscribe to the traditional philosophy of liberal education. Most of us embrace without reservation ideas expressed by Cardinal Newman on the subject over a century ago. Liberal education aims, he says, at a certain enlargement or illumination of mind, intellectual culture, which can be called philosophy. It is a competence that gives the student an analytic, distributive, harmonious power, a connected view of old and new, past and present, of far and near, with insight into the influence of each on the other.

I think that most Jesuits would pledge allegiance to Newman's declaration of liberal education when he says it is: ". . . the education which gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them and a force in urging them. It teaches him to see things as they are, to go right to the point, to disentangle a skein of thought, to detect what is sophistical and to discard what is irrelevant. It shows him how to accommodate himself to others, how to throw himself into their state of mind, how to bring before

them his own, how to influence them, how to come to an understanding with them . . . He has the repose of a mind which lives in itself, while it lives in the world, and which has resources for its happiness at home when it cannot go abroad."

I think we instinctively are with Maritain when he says that the main purpose of liberal education is to help a youth attain his full formation or his completeness as a man, that is, as an intelligent, wondering, imagining, affective human being.

I think we respond favorably to Robert Hutchins' thesis that the aim of liberal education is to draw out the common human nature in students and to expose them to man's common intellectual heritage, or at least to give them a common body of ideas, knowledge, and principles as a basis for judgment and communication.

I believe we are in sympathy with the position of the Harvard Redbook, *General Education in a Free Society*, when it defines liberal education operationally as enabling students to do four things: to think effectively, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgments, and to discriminate among values.

I think most Jesuits would applaud the statement of Professor Daniel Bell of Columbia: "The university cannot remake a world (though in upholding standards it plays some part in such attempts). It cannot even remake men. But it can liberate young people by making them aware of the forces that impel them from within and constrict them from without. It is in this sense, the creation of self-consciousness in relation to tradition, that the task of education is metaphysics, metasociology, metapsychology, and in exploring the nature of its own communication, metaphilosophy and metalanguage. This, in itself, is the enduring rationale of liberal education and the function of the college years."

While we would perhaps embrace no one of these statements as embodying our philosophy of liberal education, still each speaks to us of ideals we believe in: an education that is not merely professional or specialist; an education that occurs at a time in students' lives when they have sufficient maturity for reflecting, reasoning, assessing and judging; an education that civilizes, that helps youth rely on reason and contemplation rather than instinct and prejudice; an education that unlocks for the student doors of fabulous chambers of art, wisdom, and science. These are some of the values we see in liberal education and we think the product of such education

is thereby capable of being a fuller and more competent human being.

Perhaps some will object that this humanistic ideal, while attractive and noble in terms of mundane values, hardly deserves the dedication of religious and priestly vocations. I shall argue in a moment that it is a Christian humanism we espouse, but after Vatican II we should be slow to belittle even secular humanism. Cardinal Newman's gentleman is the secular saint and, though unbaptized, he is closer to Christianity than the secular savage. Even a non-religious liberal education has humanizing qualities, propaedeutic to religion, that merit not only our admiration but our labors. To liberate men from ignorance, provincialism, superficiality, crudity, illogic, and visceral thinking is a social service of a high order, as high as administering to the sick, aiding the needy, or defending the civil liberties of the oppressed. The mission of inducting youth into a style of life that prizes due process wherever it is due, that accents flexibility of thought and attitude, yet has anchoring values and perspectives against floods of change, and that promotes social concern and responsibility, is a calling that does honor to priest as well as to scholar.

But this conference is not concerned with liberal education *manqué*. To us religious perspectives and views are an intrinsic part of liberal education and, while I do not wish to intrude upon themes that will be treated more directly by others at this meeting, I cannot speak of the liberal aims of Jesuit education without mentioning religion. When someone charged that the church-related college has become a quasi-religious institution, Lloyd Averill of Kalamazoo College rejoined that failure to take religious questions seriously will turn any liberal arts college into a quasi-educational institution. We agree. We believe that a liberal education without religion is imperfect, and it is precisely our awareness of the crucial importance of liberal education in shaping men and society that inspires us to provide centers around this country where liberal education in its completeness can operate.

John Courtney Murray called Christian humanism a precarious synthesis, the bringing together, in tension and harmony, of the Word and the world. As he said, the civilization of intelligence is a humanistic and scientific process, while the understanding of Christian faith is a religious and supernatural one. But though the processes are distinct, they should be related, since they go on in the same mind and soul. The Catholic college provides Christian stu-

dents an opportunity to meet human wisdom and faith in encounter. It provides all students the chance to consider every question—universal or personal, cosmic or trivial—in the light of the hypothesis, for skeptics, or of the conviction, for believers, that God exists and is the Designer and End of man's existence. And what a difference that hypothesis or that conviction makes in a life or in an education.

Happily the era of angelism in the philosophy of Catholic higher education has passed. For a while we were scrambling to prove ourselves purely intellectual in educational objectives because we thought a more comprehensive aim would jeopardize our standing with American prestige universities. But now you can be academically respectable and talk about values. To a large extent we have our young people and their concern for moral issues to thank for this. It is once again being accepted, as President Dickey of Dartmouth pointed out a few years ago in the *Atlantic Monthly*, that human competence must be balanced with human conscience and that an education which gives people competence without any concern or any guidelines about the use of that competence is mis-education.

So we have reason to be devoted to liberal education as a high vocation and even more reason to be committed to Catholic liberal education. Does this mean that all is well with our Jesuit institutions and we simply should have business as usual? Far from it. It has been said, perhaps too facilely, that Christianity hasn't failed, it has never been tried. I think something similar could be said of liberal education in Jesuit colleges, at least as they have existed for the past quarter century. The corporate educational traditions and spirit of the Society have often been a substitute for individualized or institutionalized philosophies of education developed by Jesuits working together on a faculty. We decry compartmentalization of disciplines, yet when Jesuits comprised the dominant part of the faculty, there was little evidence of interplay between theology and the social sciences, between the literary and the philosophical or theological treatments or human problems. We rather accepted than formulated and enucleated the objectives of our colleges, departments, and courses. And when more and more laymen joined us on our faculties, there was no socializing agency to induct them into the ethos and dynamism of Jesuit education, because we Jesuits had played the part of passive recipients rather than molders and controllers of that ethos and dynamism. As an aside, may I say that it is

good for us that younger Jesuits find such somewhat inert tradition-acceptance intolerable.

Therefore one of the first and radical things our colleges must do is create genuine faculty communities. Students are part of a wider community, to be sure, and I shall mention that presently. But above all we are in desperate need of faculty communities, groups of college teachers and scholars who share a common excitement about liberal education, a common belief in the importance of the interplay between Christian and human wisdom, and who translate this excitement and belief into cooperative and continuing efforts to make these ideals a reality. I am not so naive as to think all faculty members will ever become part of such a community. The isolated scholar and the inveterate specialist have neither heart nor time for transcendent college or student matters. We will always have our scholar-craftsmen who faithfully polish the stone of modern algebra or macro-economics, or Roman history, not caring or comprehending that the varied stones of the curriculum are supposed to form for the student a mosaic of meaning and beauty. They do their academic thing convinced that to consider their colleagues' academic things and their possible relatedness would be a betrayal of their primary duty. But hopefully a solid nucleus of the faculty, perhaps not even a majority but an energizing minority, will see and care about and try to shape the mosaic, will join similarly sensitive colleagues and work together with zeal and pride as Christian liberal educators.

I am convinced that the awkwardness Jesuits have felt in working with our lay colleagues is due to the fact that we haven't worked with each other. Of course we have worked with each other temporarily and geographically. We have been co-workers—and indeed, friends and companions—rather than colleagues. We have been a family but not a professional team. We have not sat down together month after month and year after year, restating and reshaping liberal education for this age, this region, and this institution. We have not worried and worked and brain-stormed together in season and out to see how and where Christian values and wisdom can most effectively illuminate learning. Though we have had the best motives and unparalleled opportunities for doing so, I submit that we Jesuits have never become faculty communities.

Given this professional disparateness or non-unity of the Jesuit faculty, it is not surprising that when more and more laymen, Catholic and non-Catholic, joined us, we found them alien and somehow

threatening. To be sure, we presented to them a surface unity; we lived together and shared a special allegiance to a Jesuit institution. But we did not have already existing on our campus a vital faculty community into whose ferment and vision the laymen could be drawn. This has been a tragic defect in American Jesuit higher education, I believe. But there is no use in weeping over it now. The moment has passed when Jesuits could band together in a uniquely Jesuit team to give substance to a dream of Christian liberal education. What once would have been a fraternal would now be a divisive enterprise. This should be said with emphasis and clarity: Let us be done with nostalgic regrets for the passing of the all-Jesuit faculty. In the first place, only a romanticist could believe that our all-Jesuit faculties usually formed themselves into the kind of professional academic communities here proposed. Secondly, the job we have undertaken is far more significant and worthy of the Society's efforts than any collegiate effort Jesuits could mount by themselves. But third and most important, Vatican II has mandated collegial and cooperative effort of layman and cleric in the work of the Church. The presence of laymen on the faculty, therefore, is not an expedient or a compromise; it is a boon which enhances and multiplies the effectiveness of our work.

We are in a new era of Jesuit higher education, the era of lay-Jesuit partnership. In our personal lives fellow Jesuits may have special places of affection and respect. But in our colleges and universities Jesuits and lay faculty members are all equal colleagues. And so we must now set about building with laymen and Jesuits the faculty communities we failed to develop among Jesuits alone. Superficially the task would now seem harder. It would seem easier to create a community out of a group of men sharing common traditions and aspirations and a common life-commitment. But the fact that we failed to do so might indicate that Jesuit tradition rested too heavily or was unquestioned where Jesuits only were concerned. Perhaps the advent of laymen with differing perspectives and a healthy skepticism will help shake us out of routine thinking or indeed out of the unthinking acceptance of what has become routine. At any rate Jesuits and laymen with similar concerns for Christian liberal learning or even for liberal learning with religious perspectives should now unite to talk and argue and enthuse and labor together trying to incarnate their vision of liberal education. The first order of business in Jesuit colleges is to encourage and facilitate faculty communities.

We have an opportunity to create something distinctive and deserving of national note, namely, groups of faculty members on our campuses who first of all really care about broad-gauged, non-specialized education—Jesuits and non-Jesuits, Catholics and non-Catholics, Christians and non-Christians, who are deeply concerned about comprehensive human learning and the insights religion and theology can contribute to education; groups that not only care but work, through committee meetings, study, conferences, and retreats, to translate their beliefs into courses, programs and institutional atmosphere.

So unique is this opportunity and so basic is this need that I would say there is neither future nor salvation for Jesuit higher education except through the committed, generous, and imaginative cooperation of Jesuit and lay faculty members in groups of believers—believers in liberal education, believers in Christian education—who together form creative and leavening faculty communities.

If the establishment of faculty communities is the first order of business for Jesuit higher education, the appropriate involvement of students is the second. I am not speaking of political involvement here or thinking of the student body as a political force to be accommodated, appeased or outwitted. I am talking about the student, with his needs, expectations, anxieties and hopes, as a major focus of liberal education.

Recent studies of late adolescence and of college students such as those of Freedman and Sanford show the need for the integration of the cognitive and non-cognitive development of young people. Many students come to college more anxious about and aware of their needs in the non-cognitive than in the cognitive area, and for this reason professors and academic administrators do not engage their interest or loyalty as do, for instance, counselors or activity advisors. For such students the classroom is an unreal world where the teacher's interests dominate; the real world is the cafeteria, the dorm, the college activity where the student's interests are paramount. In recent years members of our student affairs staffs have become far more knowledgeable about student drives, hang-ups, and aspirations than have the teaching faculty, and some professors resent the growth of what they call the student personnel empire. This is really a silly quarrel because obviously there is a wide range of student needs outside of the classroom and beyond formal academic structures that deserve the skilled attention of people other than teachers. Here the faculty themselves have sold

out and yielded an empire in treating the classroom as a laboratory that deals only with intellects, having no responsibility for emotional, social, personality, and other aspects of student development.

Many of you are familiar with the meaty little report prepared for the Hazen Foundation by a committee headed by Joseph Kauffman entitled *The Student in Higher Education*. It is a document that urges a new structuring of the academic program around the student with whatever ambitions, insecurities, ideals or gropings he may exhibit at various stages of his college years. This is not a plea for putting counselors in classrooms or substituting personal adjustment for scholarship. It is not anti-intellectual. It suggests that academic learning can be better assured if the meaning, the relatedness (I guess I have to say it), the relevance to the student of what is being taught is illuminated by the professor. It also suggests that in their teaching faculty members have an obligation to help students learn about themselves as well as about a subject.

The matter is stated by the Kauffman committee thus: "The committee does not take issue with the traditional emphasis of higher education on intellectual development, but it finds most definitions of 'intellectual' and most understandings of how it is to be developed far too narrow. To split 'intellectual' from 'other' development seems highly analytic, for in practice when dealing with an individual it becomes virtually impossible to separate intellectual from moral and emotional growth. Or put more precisely, a radical split between the intellectual capacities and the human qualities in an individual would itself be a symptom of a failure of development, which it is hoped, education—in the broad sense—would help to resolve. Similarly, the distinction between 'intellectual development in the classroom' and 'social development in extra curricular activities' seems exceedingly simple. The development of intelligence should occur both because intellectual activities are interesting and exciting in their own right *and* because intellect at its best informs life. Thus that form of intellectual development which has no visible impact on the individual's life, his values, feelings, goals, and deeds, is relatively sterile and undesirable."

The student revolt is on. Accompanying the turmoil on our campuses across the country, which has often been associated with issues unconnected with things academic, is a mounting discontent with the formal academic experience itself—with its alleged inflexibility, arbitrariness, routineness and irrelevance. This discontent

is exhibited by the establishment of at least forty experimental colleges or "free" universities from New Hampshire to California, with curricula designed, organized, advertised, conducted, and largely taught by students, offering courses immediately responsive to student interests and not using or needing the familiar academic sanctions to insure attendance or application. I am not suggesting student rebellion as a criterion for curriculum reform nor would I propose that a liberal education would result if a faculty started and stayed with student interests. Some may see in the "curricular relevance" insisted on by college students today an analogue of the "felt needs" of progressive education. Progressive education boasted of its student-centered philosophy, and I am surely emphasizing the focal role of the college student in liberal education. At its worst progressive education was tyrannized by student interests and I hope no one will now urge such a style of education at the college level. The difference in the liberal education here advocated is that the relevance of a course is either based on the values and interests the student brings to a class or on interests and perspectives communicated to the student during the course. It is not therefore that the student's education is to be circumscribed by his personal world view but that his world view can be modified to include values and concerns and interests to which he was previously indifferent. The enlargement and sophistication of one's view of relevance is itself a major goal of liberal education.

At any rate the student revolt dramatizes two basic defects of current liberal education: The first is the neglect of the student's physical presence, his relegation to a position of second or third importance on the college scene, after research and publication and graduate students and perhaps community service; and the second is the neglect of the student's psychological needs, treating him in his academic activity as a disembodied intellect.

What I am suggesting is that our faculty communities, mentioned earlier, dedicated to the reform and revitalization of liberal education, are going to have to keep the supposed beneficiaries of liberal education in the very center of their planning. It is time for us to become sensitive to the subjective process of liberal education and not focus solely on its objective content. As scholars we know the content, or a segment of it, and by manipulating the segments we think we build or restructure a curriculum. But as teachers our first concern should be the inner chemistry of the student, for if he is unready or unconcerned there will be no catalysis. The simple

fact is we have far more scholars than teachers, and if we are to regenerate liberal education, we will have to work strenuously to transform and upgrade teaching. Good teaching means communicating—not merely speaking or presenting but communicating—a curriculum. And liberal educators concerned and enthusiastic about good teaching will modify and mold a curriculum so that it is not merely presentable but, in a very radical sense, acceptable to students. The kind of curriculum reform here proposed will be much more exhausting in time and energy than the kind of credit snipping and course swapping we have done in the past. The student should not only be part of our curriculum plan; he should be, at appropriate times and places, one of the planners. He has declared himself eager and is, I think, qualified to help. The student is no longer willing to accept, as one sociologist puts it, the role of tenant in intellectual structures erected for his temporary occupancy by the faculty and administration of the university.

Several studies of private and, more specifically, church-related colleges and universities complain that these institutions have not taken advantage of their unique freedom to innovate. The Danforth Commission report edited by Pattillo and Mackenzie in 1966 made this central criticism: "In order to make the most of their assets and overcome their weaknesses the church-affiliated colleges and universities, in our judgment, need to take a more experimental approach to their work. Private institutions have more freedom to experiment than public institutions, but they are not taking full advantage of this opportunity. The church institutions must become problem-oriented rather than merely imitative of the educational patterns laid down by others. It is not only that they imitate but that they imitate in ways that ill serve their purposes. Let us strive for distinctive programs which will point to better educational theory and practice. To become experimental and distinctive in the best sense requires wise administrators and committed faculties more than it requires money and prestige."

I think most of us would say Amen to this criticism as it touches Jesuit institutions.

I have already suggested two changes that would represent revolutionary and exciting innovations, namely, the establishment in our institutions of faculty communities, teams of enlightened zealots, dedicated to the revitalizing of liberal education and the infusion into liberal education of Christian wisdom; and secondly

the inclusion of the student, not as a mind only but as a person, as an active agent in both the planning and the process of liberal education. These two reforms, honestly and thoroughly executed, will rejuvenate any one of our institutions and make it a national model.

But there are many less dramatic yet still significant innovations which might help reestablish the integrity and terminal value of liberal education. Since this is the era of attacking the establishment, perhaps one establishment we should shake is the academic department. Departments are a logical and efficient mechanism. They serve admirably in the intense and professionalized area of undergraduate majors and in graduate programs, but departments are notoriously inward in viewpoint, inflexible, imperious, and indifferent to the global concept of the college's role and operation. For these reasons, but mostly because of their professionalization, departments as presently operating can no longer be entrusted with that part of the college experience that offers liberal arts courses to the non-specialist. This is sometimes called general education or the core of common curriculum. This important segment of undergraduate education needs protection from departmental tyranny or unconcern. It needs governance and management of its own, separate from the departments. It needs a faculty, not doled out to it on a left-over basis, but assigned to it as an honor as members of the liberal arts faculty with only incidental departmental affiliation. Thus all faculty members would belong as usual to appropriate departments in which they would teach courses for undergraduate majors and graduate courses. Some of these department members would be singled out and assigned to the liberal arts faculty, which would be responsible for developing, shaping, and teaching the common liberal arts curriculum. The faculty and the curriculum would be headed by a powerful committee comprised of some of the brightest people from the faculty community mentioned above and from students, led by the dean of liberal arts. This would give the dean a creative role in influencing liberal education which he can hardly exercise at present as an outsider to departmental decision-making.

There is no reason why the liberal arts curriculum should be limited to traditional categories—courses in English, history, philosophy, theology, etc., although these presumably will endure. Imaginative members of the liberal arts faculty, probably from different disciplines and perhaps with an assist from students, might build courses around large issues such as violence, civil dis-

obedience, imperialism, or work. Theologians might appear more impressive to students contributing a theological dimension to such discussions than in presenting a formal course of their own. Interdisciplinary courses in theology and literature, in psychology and communications, are already being offered and such cooperative ventures would be promoted under the suggested arrangement for liberal education.

I would propose a salary differential in favor of a faculty member invited by the committee on liberal education to teach in that curriculum, a differential which would cease when association with the liberal arts faculty ceased. This would be a realistic way of reasserting the central importance of liberal education and an effective device for assuring the prestige of liberal arts teaching.

Another establishment we might invade is the inviolable classroom where the college teacher hides his deeds. The non-evaluation of professional performance in this career or its assessment by rumor or by absence of complaint and riot is an objectively ridiculous situation, and we could shake up the academic world by instituting visitation and evaluation of classes by peers as well as evaluation of teaching by students. I am thinking of this procedure as being generated and promoted by the liberal arts faculty for its own courses. But once the practice was established at that level, the absurdity of non-evaluation at any level would become evident.

Another worthy experiment would be to get our liberal arts faculties working together on a national level for the re-creation of the liberal arts curriculum and the revitalization of liberal arts teaching. At present we sponsor national meetings of administrators, liberal arts deans, business officers, student affairs officers, and so on. A summer workshop of two weeks' duration with three to five faculty representatives from each of our colleges could bring together one hundred or more people who represent the potential nucleus of the faculty community for each institution. The workshop could deal not only with suggested ways of reordering and refreshing the curriculum but also with strategies for continuing such discussions, involving larger numbers of our liberal arts faculties, on a regional level. Perhaps in the new dispensation of lay-clerical management our Jesuit college faculties can establish a national identity and, more important, can call upon a nationwide pool of talent and ideas and generate creative cooperation of a kind that has not up to now existed among our twenty-eight liberal arts colleges.

In his recent book, *Reforming American Education*, Alvin Eurich urges the establishment by every college and university of a program for research and development in the art and science of teaching, and he wonders what higher education would be like if for ten or twenty years one half of one per cent of all instructional budgets were devoted to such an enterprise. By a very rough estimate I calculate one half of one per cent of the instructional budget of our twenty-eight institutions as about two million dollars a year. Can you imagine where our Jesuit colleges would be relative to the rest of American liberal arts colleges if we had been putting this kind of muscle into the improvement of instruction and curriculum, especially on a coordinated national level.

Perhaps one day a scholar at the Cambridge Center for Social Studies will explain the anomaly of the almost total lack of mutual support, interchange, and cooperative effort among our colleges for one hundred years. Our colleges and faculties have accepted and indeed defended an independence, a go-it-alone exclusiveness that are characteristic of American institutions of higher education generally, particularly those under private auspices. We have not taken an even minimum advantage of our unique potential for corporate action. This is a sad fact of American Jesuit education, a fact that we have the chance to modify by having the courage and largeness of view to break out of our separate cocoons of parochialism and establish a national identity with national cooperation. Another speaker will address himself to the question of the uniqueness of Jesuit higher education. It seems very likely that our new faculties, with the percentage of laymen rising, will come to a realization and appreciation of a uniqueness in Jesuit education far more readily by being in contact with lay and Jesuit scholars at a network of the twenty-eight institutions than by simply confining their thoughts on higher education to the ambit of a single campus. It is time that the Jesuit Educational Association became an honored association of the faculties, lay and Jesuit, of our colleges and universities, instead of an association of Jesuit educators or, even more narrowly, of Jesuit administrators.

When a network of twenty-eight Jesuit colleges is mentioned, I realize that not all Jesuits, at this moment in our history, react with pride and support. There are some who feel we should be committed to no institution and others who believe we cannot effectively maintain and develop so many colleges. It is not my role to speak of the viability of particular institutions, and I make no brief for

twenty-eight colleges or thirty-five or fifteen. I do make a brief, however, for corporate Jesuit effort at Jesuit institutions. The kind of Christian liberal education and the faculty communities of Christian liberal scholars advocated above are possible only in institutions where numbers of Jesuits and like-minded laymen work together and influence and shape the curriculum and the learning style of the college. When a John Courtney Murray was at Yale it could be said that there was at Yale a Jesuit educator. It could not be said that there was Jesuit education at Yale, and this would have been true had there been three or five Courtney Murrays there. Would anyone argue that five distinguished Jesuit scholars, even if they spent an academic lifetime at an institution such as Yale, could radically influence the whole curriculum and academic ways of the college? This is not, of course, to deprecate the value of work that can be done by individual Jesuits as professors in secular academic settings. But we must distinguish between the impact of a course and the impact of an education. Education results from the combined influence of a faculty, a curriculum, a college community, and an institution's traditions and living ideals. Jesuits cannot be part of such an educational thrust except where they combine their efforts with others in a setting that by statute and spirit is supportive of the ideals of Jesuit education.

The young people are suspicious of institutions and contemptuous of systems. One can sympathize with their sense of personal identity that rejects submersion in a mindless system, although it is hard to see why the prospect of being swallowed up in a neutral secular system is less threatening to some than the same prospect at a Jesuit college. Obviously we must make our colleges exciting places for faculty members, places where each person feels involved and influential. The faculty communities mentioned above could be the natural matrices for the self-expression and self-fulfillment of scholars as educators. Unless we maintain corporate Jesuit effort in Jesuit institutions then we should rename the JEA the Jesuit Educators' Association, because Jesuit education will be a thing of the past. As I indicated earlier, as scholars Jesuit and lay members of the faculty have identical standing and identical missions. But of course the Jesuit, as priest and religious, does have another, exemplary and pastoral, mission. It need not take much or any of his time. He is by profession a man of God, and if he takes this profession seriously, then he is, to put it popularly, a resident saint. This second vocation is no substitute for scholarship but, when it is

lived genuinely, it obviously enriches the academic community and enhances the influence of the scholar-priest.

I have mentioned the faculty, students, and the curriculum as component parts of a liberal education. Someone could include the same components and be describing a cloistered academy cut off from the stresses and urgencies of the real world. But a genuine liberal education, particularly a value-oriented liberal education, cannot be aloof from the movements and the problems of society beyond the campus. It is true that Jacques Barzun has recently challenged the role of universities as service stations and first aid dispensers to society. Here we are not considering the full scope of the university's resources and personnel, including professional faculties and research institutes. We are limiting ourselves to the liberal arts portion of higher education, but even in the light of this narrower focus I would take a stand in opposition to Barzun's recommended isolation of college from community. A liberally educated person will not live his life in a library, laboratory, museum, or study. He will live in a society with specific perplexities, problems, and hopes. As the curriculum unfolds for the student the story of man's environmental, social, and spiritual experience, it surely should not neglect but should pragmatically culminate in a consideration of man's contemporary experience. And as the college urges civic responsibility and social concern, it should facilitate and support the involvement of students in activities hopefully leading to the solution or alleviation of human needs. Apart from the many extra-curricular opportunities for such involvement, the sensitive faculty community will find appropriate ways to integrate service and social action with the curriculum and to reinforce campus learning by such activity. The liberal arts college is not an ivory tower, nor is a liberal arts education one that liberates from social responsibility. Rather it commits students and faculty members alike to thoughtful concern and action for the promotion of social well-being.

Our liberal ideals are the ideals of Christian humanism, and these ideals are shared in large measure, and perhaps in some instances totally, by other Christian denominations. It would be not only an ecumenical gesture, it would be a bold move for mutual support were one or several of our colleges to merge with a Protestant college, which could be either an existing college that would move to the Jesuit campus or a college created for this ecumenical merger. The Protestant denominations have written

some of the most stirring and impressive pages in the history of American higher education. Many of the finest liberal arts colleges in the country are now or once were sponsored by one of the other Christian communities. There is a tradition of high spiritual purpose combined with academic excellence in a good number of Protestant colleges that would complement and strengthen our own purposes and traditions. In such a merger most liberal arts courses would be open to all students without distinction, but since there would be no intention of blurring the differences between denominational commitments, separate courses would be available in theology and separate liturgical services would be conducted. At a time when religion is a waning force in society and when, as a consequence, religiously oriented colleges may seem to be in a weakened position, it would be a dramatic affirmation of the relevance of religion for the life of the mind to have two great Christian denominations which historically stood apart from each other join in the conduct of a Christian college. If there is any arena of activity where ecumenical cooperation could develop meaningfully on a large scale and with significant mutual benefits, it would seem to be in the area of higher education.

When the American Council on Education asked nearly a quarter of a million of last year's college freshmen to indicate what seemed to them important objectives of a college education, by an overwhelming margin nearly 90 per cent of them chose as the principal aim the development of a philosophy of life. Today's students are looking for what we believe we have to give. For the liberal ideals of our education can be called a philosophy as Newman used the word when he called the enlargement or illumination of the mind resulting from liberal studies, philosophy. To have substantial acquaintance with the human Odyssey and understanding of the products of man's soul in art and science and letters, not only to know but to know how to know more, to be able to detect fallacy and follow reason, to come to detest smallness of mind and heart, to identify one's self and one's responsibilities in society, and to see how self and society and all things are positioned vis-à-vis Almighty God and His will and love—this is the stuff of our liberal education and this adds up to a rich and steadying philosophy of life. There is no question but that such a philosophy is limp and incomplete without the religious dimension.

I conclude, therefore, first that a vocation that transmits or fosters this kind of world view or philosophy to thousands of young men

and women is worthy of the dedicated efforts of any person, lay or cleric. I conclude secondly that such a philosophy can be cultivated in its fullness only in a religiously-sponsored institution where the entire resources of the college abet the effort. And thirdly I conclude that the liberal ideals of Jesuit higher education can be realized only where significant numbers of Jesuits work with lay colleagues in Jesuit institutions to build appropriate curricula and help shape a desirable college life style.

Faculty and Administration: The Jesuit-Lay Character

PAUL J. REISS

The Jesuit and lay character of the faculty and administration of institutions founded by Jesuits has a significance which can be analyzed and evaluated only within the context of changes taking place in higher education generally. There are a number of current changes within higher education which are relevant to an understanding of our subject; we could not handle here even the major ones. However, I believe two major trends are of particular importance: the first constitutes a change in values and the second a change in forms of social organization.

Higher education in this country is affected by changes in the values and ideologies of American society. One complex of values concerns the meaning of human activity in relationship to ends or goals. I would propose that in this area there has been a trend from religious values to values of secular rationality. This trend has gone to such a point now that a countertrend has been set in motion; secular rationality is now giving way to an emerging commitment to humanistic values. As related to higher education this process could be described as a change in values from religiousness to secularism to commitment.

Higher education is also affected by changes in the modes of social organization. The manner in which individuals and groups relate to each other and organize their interrelationships changes from one period of time to another. I would propose that in this area there has been a trend in the society from an organizational pattern which stressed ascribed hierarchical patterns to one which emphasizes specialized professional roles and bureaucratic organization. This trend has also been pushed to such a point that a contrary trend is in effect. Bureaucracy is now giving way to a search for solidarity in community-type relationships. As related to higher education these changes in organizational mode could be described as a trend from paternalism to bureaucratic professionalism to community.

In this paper I would like to explore the implications of the two trends for higher education which I have just described and then focus our discussion on the significance of these trends for the

Jesuit-lay character of administration and faculty in institutions founded by Jesuits.

FROM RELIGIOUSNESS TO SECULARITY

It is clear that religious thought and values do not permeate today's society and culture in the manner characteristic of previous eras. Secularization for our purposes can be viewed as the process through which religious values and thought are separated from various areas of human activity including education. Secularization does not mean that people are less religious but only that religions and other areas of human activity are differentiated from each other.

The requirements of a pluralistic society have demanded the separation of religion and higher education in the case of public institutions. This same process has affected private colleges and universities as well. Church-sponsored private colleges and universities which were founded with the express purpose of integrating religious and educational ideals and purposes have gradually become more secular. This has clearly been the case with many institutions which were founded under Protestant auspices but which have now become completely secular. Others retain religious orientations to varying degrees and have some minimal relationship to religious organizations.

Until recently, however, all colleges founded under Catholic auspices have maintained a distinct Catholic character. This Catholic religious character has been manifested in the ownership and control of the college or university and in its faculty, student body, curricula, and in the general culture of the campus. During the past ten to fifteen years, however, as we all know, major changes have been taking place in the specifically religious character of Catholic institutions of higher education. In general these changes have served to emphasize the character of these institutions as educational institutions and have de-emphasized their character as religious institutions.

It is clear that an increasing proportion of the faculty at Jesuit and other Catholic institutions do not perceive their role or purpose in religious terms. With religious vocations declining and college enrollments increasing, the proportion of religious on the faculty has been declining. There are many departments in Catholic colleges where there is now not a single priest or religious. Laymen are now heavily represented on the philosophy and theology facul-

ties. In addition, there are increasing numbers of non-Catholics on the faculty in all areas. I do not mean to imply that laymen or non-Catholics cannot be religiously oriented, but religious orientation or commitment appears to be a consideration of decreasing importance in the selection of faculty and in the manner in which they carry out their duties.

Changes in the curricula are also very extensive, with the consequence that differences between Catholic and non-Catholic colleges have been greatly reduced and in many respects eliminated. It has long since been recognized that the natural sciences and mathematics are secular subjects which should not have specifically religious perspectives injected. This has more recently been accepted for literature and the social sciences where the market for specifically Catholic texts in English literature, history, sociology or psychology has about disappeared. Philosophy students are reading the same books as philosophy students at secular colleges. In theology the accepted position appears to be that the subject should be approached as an intellectual discipline, not as an effort to increase religious fervor, practice or commitment. One could conclude that at the present time the curricula at Catholic colleges differ from those of secular colleges only in somewhat more extensive offerings in Catholic theology and perhaps a greater emphasis on theology and philosophy among the requirements. In a few years even these differences may be gone.

While the students at Catholic colleges and universities are still largely Catholic, the trend is definitely toward a more pluralistic student body, a trend which is being actively fostered on many campuses. Catholic colleges are recruiting in public high schools and making determined efforts to enroll minority group students regardless of religious background or interest. On the campus the religious practices of the students are viewed as a private matter, not as a business of the college or of its regulations. Even the symbols of a religious character, such as public prayer, clerical garb and statuary, are much subdued.

The administration and control of the Catholic institutions of higher education have retained a religious appearance in some instances well after the institution has become relatively secularized in other respects. Jesuit administrators and trustees are presiding over institutions which are largely secular in character. Even here, however, we are seeing transformation at the very highest level of ownership and control; Catholic institutions are appointing lay, and

in many cases non-Catholic, members to the boards of trustees and to top administrative posts.

Thus it is that Catholic colleges and universities have followed the path of other church-founded colleges and universities in moving to a more secular character. In few cases has the over-all trend been by design; it is more often the result of a genuine desire to achieve academic goals. The process is certainly not complete, although the direction is clear. It is most difficult to point to the characteristics which will actually differentiate Catholic and Jesuit colleges and universities from others in the years to come.

FROM SECULARISM TO COMMITMENT

The trend in values toward those of secular rationality seems to have run its course in higher education. Even on those campuses which have become the most completely secular, where rationality and intellectualism have long been dominant values, there is a renewed search for meaning, for objectives and goals, and a new willingness to become committed to certain ideals. To many, secular rationality and intellectualism now appear to be empty. Research and the advancement of knowledge are not enough. It is the students, particularly, who are telling us that they do not find enough meaning in the pursuit of intellectual and career goals. Some faculty are beginning to express more concern about their relationships to and impact upon their students. Both faculty and students express their interest in the quality of their lives and the lives of others in the society. From the Peace Corps to the free university to the presidential campaign there is a desire on the part of many to commit themselves to the achievement of social and political goals which are in accordance with their ideals.

As we know full well the attention of faculty and students has been turned toward their colleges and universities. For them the structuring of the institution to achieve the secular and rational goals of academic excellence—research and the advancement of knowledge—is inadequate. The conflicts which these value changes and differences have produced are well known. They represent, I believe, at least in part, a conflict between the established values of rationalism and secularism and the developing search for and commitment to humanistic and social ideals.

Let me illustrate this trend from religiousness to secularity to commitment from my own field of sociology. There was a time, not too many years ago, when a sociology course at a Catholic college

would include in a discussion of interracial relations a consideration of the teachings of the Church on the subject. This was done in order that findings of social science would be related to the religious values and perspectives of student and teacher. As the curriculum, faculty, and students became more oriented to secular academic values, however, the consideration of religious perspectives usually fade away. A course on the social encyclicals, for example, became inappropriate in a sociology program. The sociology professor and his textbook would both take the position that the course should describe and analyze interracial relations in a scientific manner prescinding from any consideration of personal or social ideals, except where such ideals were themselves the subject of scientific scrutiny. The course certainly did not promote forms of social action. In the attainment of scientific objectivity, motivation to action was irrelevant. The sociology course at Catholic and non-Catholic colleges was identical.

Now, however, secular rationality is losing its primacy. Commitment to social ideals in interracial relations is an increasingly relevant aspect of such a sociology course. The establishment of an interracial community center or of a black studies program in the institution could well become a sociology class project. Changes in students' values are seen as a legitimate objective of the course. In this the Catholic and the non-Catholic institution do not differ from each other, but both now are moving away from the almost exclusive attention to secular rationality, a position which the non-Catholic college has been at for some time and which the Catholic institution has more recently reached. The turn-around in the process of religiousness to secularism to commitment is, therefore, more sharp in the case of the Catholic college or university. In some instances, however, the Catholic institution is still attempting to achieve the models and ideals of the secular university which the secular university itself is beginning to reject.

The changes of which I speak certainly do not constitute a return to a religious orientation and a reaffirmation of religious values in higher education. They do, however, constitute a vastly different context than secularism and rationality for the consideration of religious perspectives in higher education.

FROM ASCRIPTIVE PATERNALISM TO BUREAUCRACY

In addition to the changes in values which I have discussed above, there has been a change in the organizational forms of

higher education. The first phase of these changes is associated with the increasing size, complexity, specialization, and bureaucratization of higher education. At a time when colleges were of relatively small size, and the numerous fields of specialization were not yet developed, the roles of faculty, students, and administrators in a college were ascribed to them on the basis of traditional norms. Even at the time my father graduated from college it was not necessary to specialize with a particular major and he was taught by no more than a dozen faculty members who were also his counselors, dormitory proctors, athletic coaches, activity moderators, and parental substitutes. It was clear that faculty and administration were not fully differentiated from each other. Those in authority were more like parents than they were bureaucratic officials and academic specialists. This situation was true at colleges and universities regardless of religious orientation.

As we know, this has all changed. As with industrial, political, and religious organization, so also in educational organization have new forms of organization been introduced. The conditions which have brought about this change are clear: increasing size of faculty and student body, increasing specialization of roles and differentiation of functions, increasing complexity, increasing mobility of faculty and administrators, and decreasing commitments on the part of individuals to particular institutions. These conditions, wherever they occur, constitute the prescription for bureaucratic development; the college or university is no exception. Individuals relate to one another in terms of their specific roles, not as persons. Knowledge, academic excellence, research, budgets, and individual careers are all furthered in the process; bureaucratic organization does produce efficiency. Interpersonal relationships and groups, however, become difficult to maintain and gradually fade away.

In this development of the multiversity and bureaucratic college organization, the administrator becomes a bureaucrat, not a parental substitute. The faculty not only become more specialized within their particular disciplines but also become specialized professionals as teachers and researchers. Orientation to the discipline or profession replaces orientation to the institution. As with all professionals, they must be careful not to get too involved with their clients and their problems. Administration is then not a faculty role but is left increasingly to the administrators. The office of student affairs handles student problems—not the academician. Of course, there are areas of faculty control which are developed. As Parsons

and Platt have indicated in recent research, the more differentiated and complex the institution, the less does administrative paternalism remain. There is a diffusion of power throughout the institution to individuals in their specialized roles.

In this process of bureaucratic organization and diffusion of power, the Catholic institutions have in general been behind the secular colleges and universities. Typically, in Jesuit and other Catholic institutions, greater power and control have been retained by the administrators. The faculty also are not quite as mobile, having somewhat greater institutional loyalty. The full development of a bureaucratic organization has been retarded by the fact that many members of the faculty and administration are joined together in a religious community. But while the Catholic institutions are somewhat less advanced in the process, the developments are along the same direction. Colleges can become very much like business firms with their executives, employees, and customers who have little to do with each other except in their specified relationships while on the job.

FROM BUREAUCRATIC PROFESSIONALISM TO COMMUNITY

We are in a period of reaction to the multiversity, to bureaucratic professionalism, although the reaction has not set in uniformly. It is no coincidence that the computer has been the object of attack in several student demonstrations. It is the computer which enables the university to handle the student not as a person but as a number; it is the computer which can establish average faculty salary increases and pay them out without administrators having to talk with individual faculty. Again it is the students who have set the pace in their concern for the effects of anonymity and bureaucracy. While they have fought paternalism at colleges and universities and have largely been successful, they are now concerned with one of the consequences of their victory—the withdrawal of concern on the part of the institution for the individual student and his problems.

Students, as we know, are seeking greater involvement in their colleges, faculty frequently are as well. Former bureaucrats, professionals, and clients are developing more concern with the system in which they are enmeshed and with their relationships to others in the system. Even the democratic process seems inadequate; it too is impersonal.

In many instances this seeking for involvement takes the form of a search for community—a group where the members experience a common purpose and feelings of attachment and solidarity to each other and to the group. We see the term community used for institutions—the college community, the university community. Most institutions, however, are too large for the term to be really meaningful except in some symbolic sense. For this reason we notice many efforts to establish subcommunities within the college or university. Students would prefer to live in an apartment with several friends than in a large dormitory; the seminar is highly prized over the large lecture course; and groups of faculty and students seek the establishment of subcolleges within the larger institution. Faculty, students, and administrators are brought together in committees and councils to relate all members of the “community” to each other.

The community which is sought today is both voluntaristic and non-hierarchical. It certainly is not a return to ascribed paternalism. On the other hand, it is a recognition of the fact that while there is efficiency in bureaucratic organization, there are definite human costs as well. Here again, as in the changes in values, the Catholic colleges and universities find themselves trying to catch up with other institutions in bureaucratic organization and professionalism at the same time that these other institutions are now more fully realizing the defects of these developments.

THE JESUIT-LAY CHARACTER

These changes in values and in forms of social organization have particular significance for the Jesuit-lay character of faculty and administration at Jesuit-founded institutions. The Jesuit-lay character is not only associated with changes which have occurred in the past, but must be accommodated to these trends as they unfold in the future.

*The Jesuit-Lay Faculty**

It is well known that the proportion of Jesuits among the faculty and in the administration has been declining for some time. The actual dimensions of this situation are not so well known. As the colleges and universities have increased in size, the number of faculty substantially increased. During the same period, however,

*I am indebted to Rev. A. William Crandell, S.J., at the Jesuit Educational Association, for the raw data from which the statistics in this paper are derived.

the number of Jesuit faculty and administrators has remained about the same. In 1958 Jesuit colleges and universities had 4,175 full-time faculty. This increased to 6,943 in 1968. At the same time, the number of Jesuit faculty remained the same (1,146 versus 1,135). The resulting decrease in the proportion of Jesuits among the faculty is apparent in Table 1. If the trend continues, ten years from now Jesuits would constitute only about five per cent of the total faculty.

TABLE 1

JESUIT PROPORTION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY

1948	1958	1963	1968	(1973)	(1978)
31.1%	27.5%	22.0%	16.3%	(10.0%)	(5.0%)

While the general trend of a decreasing proportion of Jesuits on the faculty is true for each of the Jesuit institutions, the situation varies from campus to campus. There is a range among the institutions in the Jesuit proportion of the faculty from five per cent to 32 per cent; eight institutions have less than 15 per cent; eleven have from 16 to 25 per cent; and 9 have from 26 to 32 per cent. In general, the proportion of Jesuits is highest at the smaller colleges and lowest at the larger universities, especially those with several professional schools.

During the past ten years, then, there has been a 40 per cent drop in the proportion of Jesuits on the faculty. This trend is so great that it constitutes a substantial change in the character of the faculty; it is not merely a shift or alteration of percentages. The Jesuit-lay character of the faculty is significantly different from what it was ten years ago, and the trend gives every indication of continuing. The meaning of this change has not been realized by many involved in Jesuit higher education.

Receiving a Jesuit education has never implied that all one's instructors must be Jesuits, but it certainly has implied that a substantial proportion would be. Now we must frankly admit that students at Jesuit-founded institutions are being taught by Jesuits for only a very minor proportion of their courses, that in a given semester most students will have no Jesuit instructor, and that some students will graduate without ever having a Jesuit as a professor. This is true not only in medical and engineering schools but also in liberal arts colleges. We continue to speak of students receiving a "Jesuit education". If this concept remains valid, it must be be-

cause its implementation does not depend upon students being taught by Jesuits.

The basic facts tell us that for the most part students are not being taught by Jesuits now and are even less likely to be so in the future. Sooner or later reality will catch up to the image or stereotype of a Jesuit education. We should more correctly now speak of our lay faculties which include a few Jesuits.

We have been speaking primarily of the Jesuit portion of the Jesuit-lay composition of the faculty. With respect to the lay faculty, little need be said since their roles have become virtually identical to faculty roles on any American college campus. That is not to say that there are no religiously committed lay faculty. There are such faculty on both secular and Catholic college faculties. It does mean that lay faculty at Jesuit institutions are recruited according to the same norms as at other colleges and that the institution has the same set of expectations for their performance as teachers and scholars.

With the Jesuit-founded institutions maintaining an image as "Catholic," naturally they have attracted Catholic lay faculty. This appears to be more by accident than by conscious design. In fact, a non-Catholic professor being recruited for the college will usually be assured that his faith or lack thereof will not present an obstacle to his appointment, nor to his being able to carry out his scholarly work and teaching. So long as he is not a militant atheist or anti-Catholic (and that eliminates only a few, since most would not be interested in an appointment at a Catholic college anyway), he will find no difficulty in this respect in joining the faculty. The main reason for this is, of course, that professional academic norms are applied, not religious norms. The present faculties, Jesuit and lay alike, would insist, I am sure, that faculty appointments, promotions, salaries, and other faculty status matters be decided on the relevant academic, not religious, standards.

It has been argued that the number of Jesuits on a faculty is of little consequence, that the type of role that a Jesuit plays on the faculty and his influence on students and other faculty is the important consideration. Here again I am afraid that we may not be facing reality. Even if we assume that the Jesuit faculty are on the average much more influential than the non-Jesuit faculty, they must exert their influence in the situation wherein 84 per cent of the students' teachers are not Jesuits.

The assumption itself, however, must seriously be questioned.

Among the faculty that I have known, the one who in my estimation has had the greatest influence on students and fellow faculty alike is a Jesuit—and the influence has been entirely in a positive and Christian direction. On the other hand, Jesuits predominate among those faculty I have known whose influence, to the extent it has existed, has been of a directly opposite, negative type. There is doubt today about the impact which any faculty have on the values, life styles and commitments of their students. We know that some faculty have an impact but that many do not. While Jesuit or lay faculty in any discipline may exert an influence on students, I would have to conclude that Jesuit faculty on the whole do not exert an impact which is significantly different, either in degree or in type, from that of lay faculty. Whether they should is another question. I only maintain that there is little or no evidence to support an assertion that the Jesuit faculty actually do exert a different influence on students or colleagues than do lay faculty.

One of the reasons that Jesuit and lay faculty are similar in their influence is that their roles have become increasingly similar. To the full credit of the Jesuits, they have increasingly insisted that Jesuit faculty members meet the same standards as other faculty, that they be appointed, promoted, dismissed, or retired according to the same norms as other faculty, and that their teaching load, working conditions, and other aspects of their status be the same as for lay faculty. Of course, this has not been completely implemented, but the effort appears to be strongly in that direction. The situation could be summed up in the observation that Jesuit faculty have become professionalized along with lay faculty. This has meant the acquisition of graduate degrees and the development of research interests and publications. The Jesuits in their roles on the faculties have largely adopted secular faculty roles. Many have performed in an excellent manner in these roles but not in a distinctively Jesuit manner. The Jesuit appears to students and faculty to be first and foremost a scholar, scientist, teacher, or colleague.

It is argued that Jesuits, in fulfilling roles on the faculty, prove that there is no conflict between religion and science or that religiously committed people can still achieve academic excellence. One might question whether the point still needs to be continually proven and even if it does, that it constitutes a sufficient justification for a distinctive Jesuit faculty role.

The trends toward secularism and toward bureaucratic professionalism have thus brought about a situation wherein there is only a small proportion of Jesuits among the faculty; the lay faculty acts according to the usual professional academic norms; and many of the Jesuits on the faculty fulfill primarily professional roles which are similar to those on the lay faculty. It is in the context of the more recent changes toward commitment and toward community, however, that future Jesuit faculty roles should be viewed. Jesuits and laymen will be able to have the greatest impact upon students if they are in positions where they can guide value commitments and can work toward the creation of attitudes of community. The role of chaplain, counselor, dormitory resident, or discussion group leader is particularly important in these respects. These roles have the advantage of bringing Jesuits into more personal relationships with students. While it is certainly possible for faculty to establish such personal relationships, the experience of American higher education has shown that the professional norms and expectations applied to faculty do not encourage it.

The Jesuit-Lay Administration

The trend to smaller proportions of Jesuits on the faculties of the Jesuit-founded institutions is matched by a similar trend among administrators—and for the same reasons. While the number of full-time administrators increased from 674 to 1,177 with the growth of the colleges and universities, the number of Jesuit administrators remained about the same (300 versus 312). The resulting decrease in the proportion of administrators who are Jesuits is presented in Table 2. A continuation of this trend would leave only about 15 per cent of the administrators being Jesuit by 1978.

TABLE 2
PROPORTION JESUIT AMONG
FULL-TIME ADMINISTRATORS

1958	1963	1968	(1973)	(1978)
44.8%	34.7%	26.7%	(20.0%)	(15.0%)

As with faculty, there is a variation from campus to campus in the proportion of administrators who are Jesuits: for three institutions it is below 15 per cent; six have 16 to 25 per cent; two have 26 to 35 per cent; nine have 36 to 50 per cent; and seven have over 50 per cent. The smaller institutions, as expected, have the higher proportion of Jesuits. It is clear, however, that the proportion of

Jesuits among the administrators varies from institution to institution much more than does the proportion on the faculty. While the range on the faculty is only from five per cent to 32 per cent, the range in the administration is from seven per cent to 100 per cent. It is obviously possible with limited Jesuit manpower to maintain a higher proportion of administrators than faculty, especially in smaller institutions.

With a 50 per cent reduction in the proportion of Jesuits in administration, we also have a substantially different situation than was the case in 1958. Again stereotypes and images have not yet caught up with reality, as is evidenced by the letters still received by lay administrators which are addressed "Dear Father." Gradually the images are changing, however, so that there is no longer the expectation that a director, dean, or vice president at a Jesuit-founded institution will necessarily be a Jesuit. At this time only the position of president has been reserved without exception for a Jesuit.

The decreasing proportion of Jesuits among administrators is clearly related to the trend from religiousness to secularity in colleges and universities. The first positions which were occupied by laymen were those which were most clearly defined as secular, e.g., comptroller, dean of an engineering or business school, and so forth. Gradually, however, in keeping with the changing character of the institutions themselves, other administrative positions were viewed more as positions for academic administrative specialists than as positions for religious.

The increase in lay administrators has also been related to the increasing bureaucratization and professionalism in educational administration. One of the main reasons the Jesuits have not had the manpower to fill these positions is because the positions have increasingly called for a specialized technical competence. Having managed the business affairs of a Jesuit community is no longer a sufficient qualification for becoming a dean of a business school, nor is successful performance as a superior of a Jesuit community sufficient to qualify one to be a dean of a faculty. It is a principle of bureaucratic ideology that specific capabilities are assigned as requirements for each position.

It should not be concluded that Jesuits never have the technical competence and qualifications for administrative positions in higher education. Many do. It is difficult, however, to find an increasing number of administrators with specialized qualifications among a

relatively stable number of Jesuits. A college or university presidency today, for example, requires a person of uncommon abilities and experience. Few persons can handle the position adequately, let alone well. Can the necessary new presidents for the twenty-eight colleges and universities be restricted in the future to those who have joined the Jesuit order? Institutions have already had to go outside of the Province to find the right person. The colleges and universities can only suffer as educational institutions if the choice of the top administrator is restricted to a relatively small number of eligibles.

It should also be pointed out that Jesuits who are appointed to administrative positions tend to fulfill their roles in a professional and bureaucratic manner similar to that of lay faculty. While the Jesuit administrator may symbolize a religious presence, it is not clear that he actually carries out his duties in a manner different from comparably qualified lay administrators.

This brings us to the selection process through which administrators are appointed in higher education. Increasingly, this process has become rooted in academic professionalism rather than hierarchical paternalism. Accepted academic procedure in American universities generally requires nomination or at least approval of a department chairman, for example, by the faculty of the department. If the department faculty seek as chairman the person most qualified among them for the position, and if only one or two members on the average in a ten-faculty department are Jesuits, the chances are one or two in ten that the chairman will be a Jesuit. Ten years from now the chances will be less than one in ten. While it has happened in the past, Jesuit administrators will not be able to insist that being a Jesuit is a relevant factor in the choice of any department chairman. Professionalism has already advanced too far for that. Not only is clerical status deemed to be irrelevant, if not a hindrance, but college administrations simply do not have the freedom to appoint chairmen against the wishes of the faculty concerned—and the faculty are primarily lay.

The same academic appointment process is being increasingly applied to other administrative positions. Not only faculty but now students are demanding to be at least consulted on administrative appointments, even that of the president. In some instances it has moved past consultation to approval. While institutions may still technically have the right to appoint administrators without such approval, the climate of opinion demands it, and the success of the

appointee in his position may well depend upon it.

The more recent shift from bureaucratic professionalism to community as the norm for organization also makes it less likely that Jesuits will be appointed to administrative positions. The administrator must now not only be professionally competent, but also express the sentiment and objectives of the college community. This is one of the motivations for student participation in the selection of administrators. With a lay student body searching for a community symbol, and a largely lay faculty insisting on professional competence, a candidate is not likely to appear more qualified because he is a Jesuit.

Thus it is that professionalism and a seeking for community do not permit the likelihood, let alone the guarantee, that Jesuits will occupy even the portion of administrative positions that they now hold. There is a tendency which is a vestigial survival of hierarchical paternalism to believe that Jesuits should respond to the fact of their being a smaller portion of the faculty by seeking to control and influence the institution by retaining administrative positions. This view represents a failure to understand the nature of academic institutions today and the values of the society which are relevant to them.

Operative authority does not simply derive from higher administrative positions or from boards of trustees. Both the development of bureaucratic professionalism and a sense of community oppose such a view. The authority of academic administrators today must be legitimated both by a demonstration of professional competence and by an approval of the community. If these conditions are not met, the authority will not be recognized by those over whom it is to be exercised. In many subtle ways, such as a withdrawal of effective cooperation, or good faculty leaving for other colleges and universities, or students becoming apathetic or hostile, the authority will be undermined. Of course, we must also contend today with overt and even aggressive manifestations of the lack of legitimacy for such authority in the minds of those to be governed. Neither the status of a Jesuit, nor that of professor or Ph.D. is sufficient basis for authority. It must be won.

There are other problems in attempting to maintain a Jesuit character in an institution by holding on to administrative positions when the faculty and student body are lay. In the first place, it would be necessary to develop a class of Jesuit administrators trained for such positions and carefully inserted into the positions.

Jesuits would become known as college administrators and would devote themselves to this. Such a process would undoubtedly create antagonisms between administrators and faculty, since most administrators would not come from the faculty or have faculty support. Even if it were managed with the greatest skill, there is nothing which would be better designed to increase anti-clericalism than to attempt to maintain a Jesuit administration for a predominantly lay faculty and student body. There is enough hostility toward administrative authority without it becoming associated with the Jesuit order. It is fundamentally a very dangerous situation in today's society to find an institution where, for example, the student body has almost no Jesuits, where the faculty contains only 10 to 20 per cent Jesuits, but where the administration, however, is 50 per cent Jesuit and the board of trustees 100 per cent Jesuit.

CONCLUSION

This review of the Jesuit-lay character of the institutions founded by Jesuits has focused on the empirical reality of the situation within the context of the values and organizational forms of society and of higher education. It has been done in the conviction that any idea concerning the nature and future of Jesuit colleges and universities must come to terms with this reality, if it is to be implemented. While it is important to assert the characteristics which should imbue a Jesuit institution and the manner in which a Jesuit witness and a lay witness should be manifested, it is also important to recognize the probable divergence between the "should" and the "is" and the real possibilities, or lack thereof, of bringing the reality into accord with the desired.

I would like to conclude by summarizing the major points of the situation as I see it, and then presenting what I would see as some realistic alternatives.

The colleges and universities founded by Jesuits are and will increasingly be characterized by:

1. A predominantly lay faculty. This is presently the situation and will increasingly become so from every indication presently available. We should more correctly speak not of a Jesuit-lay faculty but of a faculty which includes some Jesuits. Jesuit status is no longer the norm against which other faculty can be referred to as lay.
2. A predominantly lay administration. This is now the situation except at the highest administrative level, but is likely to be-

come the case even there in the years to come. Again, the proper characterization is of an administration on which some may be Jesuits.

3. Autonomous ownership. If being a Jesuit institution means being owned and operated by Jesuits or by the Jesuit order, and this is what it has meant in the past, the meaning is not really true now and will be less valid in the future. Although in most instances Jesuits technically and legally "own" the institutions, they do not own them in a social sense. The colleges and universities which Jesuits founded have now become the possession of the faculty, student body, administrators, alumni, and others who form the college community, together with the board of trustees. If the Jesuits for some reason decided to close down their colleges and universities, they could not do it in most instances—the real owners would prevent them from doing so. If the Jesuits decided to abandon them, the owners would in most instances, I am sure, still continue them as colleges and universities. Real ownership in this sense cannot be assured through control of a board of trustees as has been demonstrated on several secular campuses this spring.

Given this situation, what model for the Jesuit-founded colleges and universities is valid for the future? First of all, the Jesuits could decide to select a few of the small colleges which would continue on the model of past decades. With a marshalling of manpower and resources, three or four colleges could have a substantial portion of Jesuits on the faculty and given this, Jesuits could probably hold most administrative positions. The image of a Jesuit institution and Jesuit education could then be maintained as well as the real ownership of the college. This is a viable alternative which ought to be seriously considered. With such a plan the values and characteristics of Jesuit higher education would have an opportunity of being developed, maintained, and tested in a few places.

There is another model, however, which most institutions will, I am convinced, gradually adopt and which all will adopt unless the first plan is implemented. In this model, the colleges and universities will continue the process of becoming institutions in which the faculty and administration, as well as the students, are predominantly lay. The Jesuits will participate in the life of the institution not as corporate owners and operators but as individual faculty members, administrators, and students fulfilling their vocations as

priests as well as scholars, teachers, and academic administrators. In other words, there would be a Jesuit presence, witness, and influence dependent upon the number and character of the Jesuits present. This Jesuit presence would in no way be guaranteed; it could not be. Such a college or university could hardly be called a "Jesuit" college or university; it may not be called a "Catholic" college or university, although individual Jesuits and other Catholics, clerical and lay, would participate in the institution. It would be known as an established, and hopefully excellent, college or university which was founded by Jesuits.

This model is, I believe, inevitable given present indications. It should not, however, be viewed by Jesuits as a failure. To have given birth and to have raised such fine institutions is a great accomplishment for the Jesuits. The child has grown now and begins to assume independence from the parents. Attempting to keep the child tied to the apron strings will only serve to prejudice the relationship of the parents to the grown child in the future.

Let me conclude by mentioning that I am not in favor of this second model over the first. I was educated in a college and a university operated as Jesuit institutions. They were excellent institutions; I would wish that at least some might continue. However, as a sociologist looking at the real world, I do not see how the first model can any longer remain valid. Attempting to use such a model for all the Jesuit colleges and universities must meet with eventual failure.

Jesuits, however, have been known for their adaptability. They can thus adopt the second model and work effectively within the institutions which are patterned on such a model and which would be viable as American colleges and universities. I hope to see in the future several excellent autonomous colleges and universities, founded by Jesuits and in which individual Jesuits, in accordance with their capabilities and interests, continue to participate.

Jesuit Presence on Campus: Today and Tomorrow

EDMUND G. RYAN, S.J.

I. Introduction

Philosophical immediacy usually defies definition. But "presence" falls within the category of the philosophically immediate. Most people feel so familiar with the term that attempts at further analysis run the risk of discovering nothing new. A paper on "Jesuit Presence on Campus: Today and Tomorrow" faces similar difficulties. The title evokes the memory of Father Smith, S.J., or Mister Jones, S.J., or Brother Brown, S.J., teaching class or administering Spring Hill College. But the world-wide educational tradition shared by Jesuits and the laity also qualifies under that title.

This paper treats of Jesuit presence *first* as a tradition in education, and *second* as the personal and corporate sharing of that tradition. The *first section* of the paper after a narration of the rise of the Jesuit educational tradition and a description of other American educational traditions etched against the background of contemporary student revolt examines the Jesuit college in the United States today and in the future as a witness and interpreter of the Jesuit educational tradition. The *second section* analyzes the various modes of individual and corporate Jesuit presence on Jesuit college campuses in the United States. The individual modes include individual members of the Society of Jesus and individual persons who are not Jesuits; corporate presence discusses the Jesuit college as a corporation and as a college and the Jesuit community residing on campus.

The Denver Jesuit Educational Association Workshop meets to set guidelines and play the role of prophet for the American Jesuit colleges in the seventies and later. Jesuit institutions mirror an educational tradition; persons in clerical black garb and collars and ties interpret and alter that tradition. The guidelines and prophecy of the Workshop call for a full treatment of "Jesuit Presence on Campus."

II. Tradition in Education

A. Tradition Today

To search for a tradition in education amid the 1969 clamor for relevant courses, for "turned on" professors, for non-structured colleges and universities runs counter to every popular campus move-

ment. Strident choruses shout "action now," "power now," "changes now." Devotees of the "now" cut all roots with the past; they hate history. But who can define "now" without some reference to the past?

Jesuit presence in the Jesuit colleges of the 1970s evokes a glance at the past as the necessary link—as the bridge—to the future. The bridge spans a tradition. The tradition runs parallel with the history of the Jesuits—the Society of Jesus—reaching from 1540 or even earlier in Saint Ignatius's personal history to the LEM moon capsule. The first Jesuit college at Messina opened in 1547 and the Jesuit Educational Association's Workshop on American Jesuit Liberal Arts Colleges in 1969 fits under that same umbrella.

This educational tradition shares the key operational principle given to the Jesuit order by Ignatius: adapt to times, places and persons; always remain flexible. The small Jesuit "colegio" in Italy in 1547 and the Jesuit multiversity in the United States in 1969 rightfully pose as genuine representatives of that tradition. Adaptation explains the closer similarity of the Jesuits' first college at Messina in 1547 to Vittorino da Feltre's school at Florence than to an American Jesuit high school such as Fordham Prep in 1969. The same principle predicts that Saint Louis University today in curriculum and organization appears more like the University of Missouri than the Jesuit Universidad del Salvador in Argentina.

Logic dictates however that in 1969 some link binds the Universidad del Salvador and Saint Louis University and excludes the University of Missouri. This paper bypasses the debate regarding the maintenance by a Jesuit college or university of a legal link with the Society of Jesus. The document, *Final Report on Meeting on Jesuit Institutions of Higher Education* (Rome: International Center for Jesuit Education, 1968, pp. ii, 60), well summarizes the opposed positions. My personal opinion favors a view that a tradition works out a definite value system and a characteristic style of operation. Participants of the tradition subscribe to the philosophy and style of the tradition. Covenants neither create nor preserve a tradition; only persons accept and live a tradition. Flesh and blood not paper and pen continue or kill a tradition.

Creation of Jesuit Educational Tradition

The Jesuit educational tradition encompasses a special view of what Jager entitled the *paideia*, "the process by which older persons in a society transmit to the young their total way of thinking, living,

working to create a life adequately human in the contemporary circumstances." The Jesuit view always focused on an evolving Judaeo-Christian outlook on life. In fact, many commentators on Jesuit education claimed to discover more about Jesuit education in the *Spiritual Exercises* of Saint Ignatius Loyola than in the famous *Ratio Studiorum* or in the fourth part of the Jesuit *Constitutions* which treats of education. The *Exercises* open a panorama: Ignatius' vision of a God-centered universe, of man created and loved by God, deprived of special gifts but not depraved—or made less a man—fallen but redeemed, of man serving the Church and his neighbor. Definite views regarding man's origin, his freedom, his weakness, his destiny they catalogue. These positions set Ignatius and his educational theory within a definite world view.

The Jesuit *paideia* extends beyond the secular humanism of the Renaissance or of the present day. Throughout its view the religious dimension pervades. But the view also operates within Jesuit formal education. The educational practices of the sixteenth century Jesuits fused the classical, rhetorical education in the lower classes with natural science, philosophy and theology in the upper classes. The faculties of law, medicine and theology offered traditional university studies. These studies in Jesuit colleges and universities of the sixteenth century pointed students toward success in life and a commitment to service of the Church.

In the rapid proliferation of Jesuit institutions in the sixteenth century in Europe and in India, certain unique features emerged as hallmarks of Jesuit schools. Jesuit education fostered close relationships between teachers and students (the *personalis cura alumno-rum* of the *Ratio*); schools received encouragement to adapt curriculum and organization to times, places and persons; an intellectually based Christian outlook on life gave unity to the entire institution. These characteristics gave distinctness to Jesuit schools wherever they were established.

Four and a quarter centuries refined and sharpened the Jesuit educational tradition. Jesuit colleges and universities in 1969 fly the flags of Japan, Chile, Zambia, France, Biafra, Australia, and the United States. All of these schools share a Jesuit tradition; that tradition encourages a marvelous flexibility. In accordance with that principle, Saint Louis University in its curriculum and organization parallels the University of Missouri rather than the Jesuit universities in the Argentine. But the spirit unites the Jesuit universities in Argentina and Saint Louis and excludes the University

of Missouri. True to that tradition, Jesuit colleges in the United States today follow the pattern of American liberal arts colleges in most areas of comparison such as curriculum, credentials of faculty, ages of students, student services, and will continue to do so in the future. Yet American Jesuit colleges do feel strong ties to Jesuit colleges around the world.

B. American Pluralism in Education

1. Educational tradition

In the spirit of American pluralism, many educational traditions flourish in the United States. The traditions represent different viewpoints. But their approach to a hotly debated topic, values, sharpens their differences. In the United States today, the search for values and the questioning of value systems occupy many hours of an educator's day. Society thrusts upon the school, college, or university a key role in the transmission of values to the young. The Jesuit educational tradition draws its value system from the revelation in the Old and New Testaments and from reflection on the revelation. Institutions within the tradition share a Judaeo-Christian outlook on life, but other traditions based on other approaches to values claim many adherents in the United States. An examination of those traditions highlight by contrast the special characteristics of Jesuit education.

2. Toleration and/or secular humanism

The American campus usually pictures itself as an academic community, but community implies a unity of purpose and some agreement on values. To hold that the common purpose—the search for truth—unites faculty, students, and administrators really misses the point. The secular humanist confines his search for truth to the categories of space and time; a Christian humanist widens the categories to include the transcendent within his search. State institutions, by statute, defer choice of any value system but encourage the creation and pursuit of all systems. On a state campus, consequently, multiple starting points exist in the pursuit of truth. On campuses dedicated to secular humanism or to toleration of all value systems, the search for truth does not unite, but rather divides the members of the academic community.

Recent discussions and articles reveal that many state and private secular institutions of higher learning in the United States now experience a need to investigate the religious dimension of existence.

Can the institutions committed to no value system or to secular humanism investigate the religious dimension? Institutions with no value system really demand that all members of their academic community accept toleration of all systems or non-commitment as a value system. In search for truth within those institutions, the search takes first place. On principle they defer decision and commitment on such basic issues as the nature of man, his destiny, his values, his rights and duties. Choice usually follows the search for truth. But institutions, which foster all value systems and prefer none, defer choice. Choice ruins the institutional stance of neutrality regarding value systems. While deferring choice, the institutions proclaim support for disinterested scholarship which pledges objectivity and protects neutrality.

Institutions dedicated to secular humanism as a value system block themselves *a priori* from searching for the religious dimension in man's history. By definition the institution limits its search for truth to the categories of space and time. Thus the institution factors out the transcendent from its search. The possibility of man's non-secular or post-secular existence falls outside the ken of rational discussion. It is nonsense. But persons within that academic community realize that many significant events in man's history, both in the East and in the West, fall within the religious dimension.

Pressures built up on American campuses during the 1960s. Some attributed the campus unrest to the generation gap or to Vietnam or to the affluent society, but many published analyses of Berkeley and Columbia singled out the dissolution of consensus regarding the institution's commitment to a value system as the chief cause of campus turmoil. Whether an institution can choose a value system is a moot point. Certainly without a functional consensus of the faculty, administrators, and students who form the academic community, no institution can sustain its commitment to a value system.

3. *Students challenge values*

In the 1950s American campuses stood for detached scholarship and winked at youthful exuberances. Student newspapers crusaded for beer on campus and parietals; "disruption on campus" meant panty raids and snake dances. The 1960s changed all that. During the last few years students on American campuses turned "serious." Moral issues pushed parietals and beer off the campus editorial page. Students demanded that the institution and the faculty abandon objectivity and ivory tower scholarship and take a stand on moral issues. "Disruption"—a tactic borrowed from the civil

rights movement—closed campuses unwilling or unable to make moral choices.

The anger of college students against the “establishment” or the “over-thirty generation” centers on moral choices. Vietnam, napalm, the draft, the industrial-military complex, the population “explosion,” poverty, underdeveloped nations, the use of military force in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, starvation in Biafra, the use of police, and civil rights touch a moral chord. Activist students charge their elders with avoidance of moral choices on these burning issues. The students have singled out for special attacks the campuses which advocated intellectual detachment. Students have indicted those institutions, their administrators, and faculty for using objectivity or toleration as a pretext for postponing moral decisions. Activist students labelled this institutional stance a “cop out” or a failure to face up to the responsibilities of human life.

The students exposed a raw nerve in academe. Ideas have consequences. The consequences frequently lead to moral choices and even impinge on the religious dimension of man's life. In the world of 1969, Americans cannot take an ostrich view of national or institutional policies and actions. The policies touch human lives throughout the world. Activist students have threatened the functional consensus present in some academic communities or American campuses.

4. *American Jesuit educational tradition: the Jesuit college*

How do American Jesuit colleges today respond to the contemporary challenge of students? And how will they respond in the seventies? With its declared value system the Jesuit college provides a shared starting point in the search for truth for the academic community. The Christian outlook on life assumes definite positions regarding man and his destiny. The academic community on a Jesuit campus should foster a functional consensus with the context of the institution's commitment. The person entering the community freely chooses the value system provided by the context of the Jesuit college.

The value system operates within the context of the Jesuit educational tradition. Its characteristics should appeal to serious students in the United States today. Should not the tradition in Jesuit education of close student-faculty relationships create a beneficial educational milieu in an era castigated by American youth for dehumanizing and depersonalizing higher education? The restless

quest of students for moral choices should find a response on the Jesuit campus. The Jesuit college in the United States should strive for a synthesis of the Christian outlook on life with the evolving American culture. This synthesis should include moral choices and the religious dimension of man's life. Finally, the adaptation of curriculum to contemporary, local needs should challenge the American Jesuit college to broaden its treatment of culture by the inclusion of non-Western cultures. Adaptation should extend also to the very purpose of liberal education. In the seventies and beyond, the purpose of a Jesuit liberal arts college in the United States should widen from the present promise of educating a person in the culture of the Western world as a Western man to the education of a student in the culture of the world as an international man. True to the Jesuit educational tradition, the Jesuit college in the United States can have a vibrant future.

What does this educational tradition mean to a student entering Holy Cross or any American Jesuit college? Does the tradition live or is it the product of the rhetoric of admissions bulletins or speeches during freshman orientation? The student attending a Jesuit college expects to receive quality academic education, but also chooses to investigate the Catholic faith as a philosophy of life or a value system.

Baptized Catholics constitute the majority of persons enrolled as undergraduates in American Jesuit colleges. Home life introduced them to the Catholic tradition; by free choice the young men and women pursue higher education within the same tradition. These students carry with them definite resonances from their upbringing in the Catholic faith. A view of Catholicism not experienced by the faculty, staff, and alumni was open to our present and future students during their formative years. Formerly the Catholic Church stood out as a rock bristling with strength and certitude. To present and future undergraduates, the post-Vatican II Church looms as a storm-tossed barque and not as the symbol of certitude. In the midst of the doubts and confusion normally associated with adolescence, the Church today compounds rather than calms confusion.

In its role in transmitting culture the Jesuit campus should aid Catholic students to live with the present turmoil in the Catholic Church. The Church has changed more in the last six years than in the previous six hundred or even sixteen hundred years. New modes of liturgy and clerical garb; new attitudes regarding other Christian

churches; new views on freedom, warfare, dissent, the priesthood of the laity, sin, and on technology, present the Church through a kaleidoscope. But are not these changes in the *aggiornamento*, the response of the Catholic Church to new moral and historical situations? They symbolize hope and spring from the vitality of faith.

Does the Jesuit campus pay more than lip service to the Catholic tradition? Within the curriculum theology claims a pride of place as an academic discipline. Undergraduates learn the essential facts and ideals of the Christian faith. The diploma from a Jesuit college proclaims at least this minimal understanding: the ability to discuss theology intelligently. Other academic disciplines also set minimal standards. The key to the cultivation of this understanding lies in a faculty academically qualified and dedicated to value the Catholic tradition of Christianity. They teach the creed, code and cult of the Catholic Church and relate their subject to its meaning for a person alive in the space age.

The theology department on a Jesuit campus through frequent personal contact enters into dialogue with other departments. Dialogue promotes the synthesis of an intellectually based Christian outlook on life with the evolving contemporary American culture. In the course of the dialogue, as the Land O' Lakes statement on the Catholic university reveals, theology enriches itself and, by bringing insights to bear upon the problems of modern culture, stimulates the internal development of the other disciplines. Although universities with a variety of professional schools offer a wider forum, the Jesuit college encourages and reaps profits from the dialogue.

Theology does not stand alone in the elaboration of a Christian philosophy of life. All value-laden subjects comment on the meaning of experience. The humanities and the social and behavioral sciences delve deeply into values. In research and lectures in these disciplines, the Jesuit campus invites professors to utilize or at least respect Christianity as a value system shedding light on the data of their disciplines.

In seeking new faculty members and administrators, American Jesuit colleges consciously profess a desire to find persons dedicated to the Catholic outlook on life. The declaration does not lock the doors to Protestants, Jews, Buddhists, atheists or agnostics. In addition to its dedication to academic freedom, the Jesuit campus heeds the contemporary call of the Catholic Church in the name of

ecumenism and religious freedom to encourage religious pluralism in the composition of faculty, administration, and the student body. In the past most persons on Jesuit campuses were Catholics. The campus milieu attracted persons sympathetic to the Catholic tradition to enter this type of academic community.

As a community, the Jesuit college enjoys a social existence and an organizational form. The Land O' Lakes statement catches the spirit of the campus in its description of the Catholic university. But the Catholic Jesuit college promises comparable climate.

Within the university community the student should be able not simply to study theology and Christianity, but should find himself in a social situation in which he can express his Christianity in a variety of ways and live it experientially and experimentally. The students and faculty can explore together new forms of Christian living, of Christian witness, and of Christian service.

The students will be able to participate in and contribute to a variety of liturgical functions, at best, creatively contemporary and experimental. They will find the meaning of the sacraments for themselves by joining theoretical understanding to the lived experience of them. Thus the students will find and indeed create extraordinary opportunities for a full, meaningful liturgical and sacramental life.

The students will individually and in small groups carry on a warm personal dialogue with themselves and with faculty, both priests and laymen.

The students will experiment further in Christian service by undertaking activities embodying the Christian interest in all human problems: inner-city social action, personal aid to the educationally disadvantaged, and so forth.

Thus will arise within the Catholic university a self-developing and self-deepening society of students and faculty in which the consequences of Christian truth are taken seriously in person-to-person relationships, where the importance of religious commitment is accepted and constantly witnessed to, and where the students can learn by personal experience to consecrate their talent and learning to worthy social purposes. All of this will display itself on the Catholic campus as a distinctive style of living, a perceptible quality in the university's life.

The total organization should reflect this same Christian spirit. The social organization should be such as to emphasize the university's concern for persons as individuals and for appropriate

participation by all members of the community of learners in university decisions. University decisions and administrative actions should be appropriately guided by Christian ideas and ideals and should eminently display the respect and concern for persons. ["Idea of a True University: Land O' Lakes Statement"]

The social context of the Jesuit campus touches the lives of the students by the silent carrying out of the aims of the college, the over-all spirit, outlook, and hope of the educational community to which they belong.

III. SUMMARY

The Jesuit educational tradition stretches over four and a quarter centuries. Within its history Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States play a significant role: American Jesuit institutions foster close faculty-student relationships, adaptation of curriculum and organization to contemporary needs, and presentation of an intellectually based Christian outlook on life. In the United States today, the Jesuit educational tradition offers significant advantages. The commitment of a college to a definite philosophy of life grounds a functional consensus for the academic community; a view of life seen by all beckons every person within the college in pursuit of truth. An avowed Catholic outlook prompts students, faculty, and administrators—perhaps the institution itself—to enrich data with consistent meaning and to risk making moral choices. The social existence of the college reflects a shared purpose and shared agreement on the reason for dealing with individuals as persons. Since the Jesuit tradition incorporates the flexibility needed for the promotion of progress, the American Jesuit college welcomes changes in technology, the Catholic Church and nations. Jesuit colleges today reach with confidence for the world of the twenty-first century.

IV. JESUIT PRESENCE: PERSONAL AND CORPORATE

The first part of the paper treated Jesuit presence as a vibrant tradition. But tradition results from ideas, ideals, decisions, and actions of persons. Persons create, interpret, and alter tradition. Jesuit education claims no exception to the process. The tradition parallels four and a quarter centuries of history. In the United States, Jesuit tradition claims more years of history than the nation.

The term "Jesuit presence," as it applies to higher education in the United States, admits of predication either individually or cor-

porately. In its individual use, "Jesuit presence" means either a member of the Society of Jesus or any person who accepts and operates within the Jesuit educational tradition.

The term "Jesuit presence," in its corporate sense, means either the educational institution or the Jesuit religious community housed on the campus. The second part of this paper analyzes "Jesuit presence" in its individual and corporate sense.

A. Individual Jesuit Presence

1. Members of the Society of Jesus

The individual Jesuit lives as witness to the Jesuit tradition. From his education and training the Jesuit draws his ideals, values, a life style produced by four and a quarter centuries of vibrant and evolving tradition. The tradition includes identity as a Catholic serving the Church within the Jesuit order. Less clarity regarding the meaning of Catholicism and the mission of the order exists in the minds of American Jesuits today than ten years ago, but the spirit of adaptation within the Jesuit tradition holds out hope for a brighter future and a challenge to initiate innovative projects and not to await change.

On a Jesuit campus the Jesuits by their presence give visibility to the Jesuit tradition. Jesuits participate in the work of the college according to their personal talents and insights and according to their individual, personal fulfillment. Their abilities vary. Talents fit individuals for teaching, administration, research, counseling; the individual Jesuit best shares in the life of the academic community by the fullest utilization of his particular talents. Personal fulfillment usually accompanies full use of personal talent and temperament.

By utilizing his talents to the fullest the Jesuit influences other members of the campus academic community. The influence is personal and individual. Students, faculty, administrators, and staff note his carrying out of a Christian vocation with highly professional skill. The Christian vocation calls for all the "people of God" to consider witnessing to Christ as their prime work. For a Jesuit, the witnessing to Christ and competent fulfillment of a profession as teacher, administrator, etc., form two facets of a single vocation—the Jesuit educator. Some Jesuits view the personal and individual influence as more effective and important than any corporate Jesuit influence, but even advocates of that view do not deny that at a Jesuit college the influence of a person signing "S.J." after his name

extends beyond the individual; a collective influence of the Jesuits as a community, a corporate witnessing to Christ, also is possible.

On a college campus personal contact with one's peers and especially with students offers the most powerful area of presence and witness. "Presence" and "witness," as social terms, call upon "persons" to respond in a deep, meaningful interpersonal context. College students crave and cultivate this response. Their ages—between seventeen and twenty-two—cover late adolescence which fills them with doubts and fears. In groping for their own identity, late adolescents challenge the values of adults in a fashion today known as testing the commitments of the "above-thirty generation." Open, friendly, flexible adults win a quick and warm response from students who challenge their elders.

On Catholic campuses recent, quick, and bewildering changes in the Church compound the adolescent crisis for Catholic students. The presence at a Jesuit college of an alert, competent Jesuit as a person committed to Christian witness evokes in students immediate response and deep confidence. Adolescents admittedly quick to admire sincerity and to reject the false or "phony" must frequently adopt a philosophy of life by judging the life style of persons committed to a proposed philosophy. An approachable Jesuit interested in students and gifted with the ability to dialogue and interact personally in the classroom, in his office, in the dormitories or dining hall, presents living witness to a Christian philosophy of life. His influence on students is constant and long-lasting.

The Jesuit educator should have the training and degrees requisite for the job and present in his peers. As a witness to the Jesuit tradition his competency should serve the Church and should aid the dialogue on campus in forming the synthesis of an intellectually based Christian outlook on life with contemporary American culture. In the process of dialogue, and in the development and practice of competency, the Jesuit should witness also to academic freedom. On a Jesuit campus academic freedom should be cherished not only as part of the tradition of American higher education as freedom to teach and to learn, but also as part of the Christian tradition of service which Paul advises takes place "in freedom and in truth." In dealing with his peers in the academic community the Jesuit should utilize his competency and move with the personal ease felt by colleagues.

The value-laden subjects—the humanities, especially philosophy and theology, and the social sciences—delve into meaning and re-

flect the personal philosophy of life of the professor. Jesuits take special interest in disciplines which offer a forum for sharing personal values. Today's students most quickly adopt the outlook on life of professors who blend competence with humaneness. The traditional Jesuit *personalis cura alumnorum* prompts the Jesuit teacher to live as he teaches and to make his contacts with students inside and outside the classroom reflective of Christian personalism.

On campus ample opportunities for the exercise of the ministerial priesthood by celebrating the liturgy, preaching and distributing the sacraments confront the Jesuit priest. The ministerial priesthood focuses on the central act of cultic expression by the Christian community. A Jesuit teacher, administrator, or counselor as Jesuit educator at Mass consecrates and mediates as priest all teachers, administrators and counselors. Liturgy can be the central act expressing the community on Jesuit campus. The present climate of liturgical experimentation presents the college with a challenge to contribute to the modernization of the Church by the creation of intelligent, cooperative and relevant forms of liturgy. The forms created by the college usually are carried to home parishes by the members of the academic community who created and participated in them.

Some Jesuits express uneasiness over the possible role or identity conflict facing a Jesuit priest-teacher or priest-administrator. They claim a fundamental tension and even opposition between the Jesuit as priest and the Jesuit as chemist, etc. My own guidelines for solving the problem suggest that the problem first be stated properly. Jesuits too frequently pose the problem as a generic one, but a generic problem applies to every member of the genus. Some Jesuit priest-teachers experience no role conflict or opposition; for them the problem does not exist. The hyphenated priest problem is really a personal and not a generic problem or a problem necessarily shared by every Jesuit priest. But the personal problem does involve a Jesuit's functioning within a profession—as Jesuit educator.

Recent studies reveal that other professions also suffer similar tensions. For some married surgeons professional life presents a conflict with family life; for others no conflict arises. The conflict applies to some married surgeons and therefore is not a generic problem. In the last few years debates have raged in Church circles regarding the meaning of the priesthood. In France a movement arose to encourage priests to put on overalls and go into the plants as factory workers or to live in the slums as social workers.

While proposed originally as a means to reach the worker and the poor, today proponents of the experiment claim every priest must have some additional *metier* or profession or job or role. In this way a priest mediates and consecrates that *metier*. Not surprisingly, this opinion finds more adherents among the diocesan priests than among religious priests such as Jesuits, whose *metier* caused the hyphenated priest debates of the 1950s.

On the Jesuit college campus, the individual Jesuit daily witnesses to the Jesuit educational tradition. Through his competency and concern, a Jesuit's peers and students view the Church and the Jesuit tradition adapting to the modern world.

2. *Other persons sharing the Jesuit educational tradition*

During Saint Ignatius's lifetime persons other than Jesuits found employment in Jesuit colleges and universities as disciplinarians, professors of medicine and law, and as beadles in classes of languages, arts, and theology. Most were laymen. No evidence pointed to the presence of non-Jesuits in the faculties of languages, arts, and theology. In those days Paul III was Pope and the Council was Trent. But history showed non-Jesuits formed part of the Jesuit educational tradition from its origin.

In the days of Vatican Council II and Pope Paul VI, the worldwide Jesuit educational tradition continues to thrive. True to its tradition, collaboration with non-Jesuits also thrives. The Church in Vatican Council II urged all the "people of God" to cooperate in apostolic efforts, including education. The Society of Jesus, at the Thirty-First General Congregation held in Rome in 1965 and 1966, in its decree "On Education" seconded the Council's suggestion: "According to the mind of the Second Vatican Council, a close collaboration with the laity is recommended. On the one hand we can give them help in their formation by schools, and other suitable works, and by our friendly dealing with them and the testimony of our life. On the other hand, let Jesuits consider the importance for the Society itself of such collaboration with lay people, *who will always be the natural interpreters for us of the modern world*, and so will always give us effective help in this apostolate. Therefore, we should consider handing over to them the roles they are prepared to assume in the work of education, whether these be in teaching, in academic and business administration, or even on the board of directors." [*Documents of the Thirty-First General Congregation* (Woodstock: College Press), p. 95. Emphasis supplied.]

The italicized words in the document introduce a very new emphasis into the Jesuit tradition. To the Jesuit delegates charged with bringing the Jesuit order in line with the *aggiornamento* of the Second Vatican Council, the laity offer the valid interpretation of the modern world. In the Jesuit educational tradition in the United States, the laity play a vital role in synthesizing the Christian outlook on life with contemporary American culture. In fact, the laity are the primary interpreters of the culture. The American Jesuit college today throws its doors open wider to invite the laity, as interpreters of modern culture, into Jesuit classrooms, administrative offices, and places on the board of governance.

This view of the last Jesuit General Congregation pulses with the vitality of the Jesuit tradition. Responsive to the changes in the Church and to the shortage of vocations to the Jesuits, the delegates mapped out a realistic direction for Jesuit schools. The decree points a definite direction for Jesuits in the United States. Vatican Council II urged religious orders to invite the laity to participate in their apostolic endeavors. In American Jesuit works the sponsorship of colleges and universities stands out as a primary work. At the same time that Jesuit novitiates received fewer and fewer candidates for the Jesuit order, Jesuit colleges exploded in a building boom and expanded enrollments. Future plans for American colleges, sponsored by the Jesuits, definitely and realistically call for greater involvement of non-Jesuits especially the laity, in Jesuit colleges.

But to continue as a Jesuit college the persons directing, teaching, and administering the institution presumably know the Jesuit educational tradition. In the recruitment of teachers and administrators, first consideration belongs to persons interested in the continuation of a church-related college dedicated to a Christian philosophy of life. Alumni of Jesuit high schools, colleges, and graduate schools live the tradition. Usually they readapt quickly to a Jesuit campus. Many Protestants and Jews share a desire to belong to an academic community which professes a definite value system. Some persons without any faith commitment do seek positions at institutions with a known faith commitment. To fuse all persons into an academic community on the Jesuit campus, orientation of new faculty and administrators into the aims and objectives of Jesuit education becomes a key to the vitality and advancement of the community.

In the academic community on the Jesuit campus, members of

the Society of Jesus live the Jesuit tradition. Social and professional contact with their lay peers produces mutual benefits. Lay administrators and teachers through these relationships come to know the Jesuit tradition better; the Jesuits through these contacts learn the constant adaptation of Jesuit educational tradition to the new needs of the modern world. Within the academic community departments, faculty senates and faculty committees exercise a great deal of internal control over education policy. To reflect a desire to continue the Jesuit educational tradition, the faculty members and administrators—lay and Jesuit—on these bodies should by their decisions show knowledge of and respect for the tradition operative in their academic community. Cooperative adaptation of policies, curriculum, and practice advances Jesuit educational tradition in the American Jesuit college.

B. Corporate Jesuit Presence

1. The corporation

Persons call Seattle University or Le Moyne College "Jesuit" in the legal corporate sense to the extent that its charter and/or its board of trustees accept for the institution the Jesuit educational tradition. Jesuit institutions in the United States differ from their counterparts in Europe, in South America, and on the other continents in their legal origin and, consequently, in their legal responsibility. In countries other than the United States some wealthy person—noble, prelate, businessman—or the Church or the municipality invited the Jesuits to staff a college or institution; the invitation usually included a provision for a voice for the founder in the institution's operation. In the United States, private persons through voluntary association sought the charter from the state or federal government to establish a school and to grant degrees. These persons received a charter to empower them and their successors on the self-perpetuating board of trustees to control the institution subject only to the body which granted the charter.

The twenty-eight Jesuit institutions in the United States today remain subject to their boards of trustees. The usual pattern followed in chartering the institutions, such as Saint Peter's and Santa Clara, found only Jesuits as the original incorporators and the first board of trustees. Some institutions presently Jesuit, such as Saint Louis and Fordham, included no Jesuits among the original group which petitioned the state for a charter. But the boards, after inviting the Jesuits to staff the institution, elected Jesuits to the boards;

Jesuits through subsequent elections gained all board seats. Until the last few years, the boards of trustees at American Jesuit colleges and universities exercised very little authority over the institutions. They voted on granting degrees and empowering the president and treasurer to make loans and contracts and to open bank accounts. But the internal Jesuit government—the local Provincial and Roman superiors—performed the supervisory functions traditionally carried out by boards of trustees in American higher education.

Today the boards of trustees of the twenty-eight Jesuit colleges and universities govern their institutions without reference to the Provincial or to Rome. Some Jesuit superiors and many individual Jesuits raise worried questions about the newly established, complete autonomy of Jesuit institutions of higher education in the United States. Does institutional freedom from supervision by Jesuit superiors mark the first step toward “secularization” of the college? Will the college throw off all church-relatedness and slip away from dedication to Christian ideals and the Jesuit educational tradition? Other Jesuits feared higher superiors had surrendered to pressures and abdicated their authority. In September 1967 Saint Louis University dramatically announced the change of its board from exclusive Jesuit membership to a mixed board with a majority of laymen and a minority of Jesuits. The cries from anguished Jesuits rose throughout the American Assistancy.

Actually, Saint Louis University and subsequently other Jesuit institutions merely followed Jesuit tradition. The Thirty-First General Congregation of the Society of Jesus, held in Rome in 1965 and 1966, declared in the twenty-eighth decree, “On Education”:

“It will also be advantageous to consider whether it would not be helpful to establish in some of our institutions of higher education a board of trustees which is composed partly of Jesuits and partly of lay people; the responsibility both of ownership and of direction shall pertain to this board.” [*Documents of the Thirty-First General Congregation* (Woodstock: College Press, 1967), p. 95.]

Changes in the board need not augur denial or abandonment of the basic aims and outlooks of the institution. The new trustees still receive the charge or the “trust” given to the original incorporators or trustees and passed on to their successors. The Jesuit college professes a purpose: the education of students within a special tradition. Trustees oversee and guide the college within the Jesuit tradition. Judicious selection of trustees suggests seeking out persons

who have an educational bent and profess knowledge and loyalty to the Jesuit educational tradition. Their loyalty and actions as board members insure the continued presence of an educational institution within the Jesuit tradition.

By-laws of the board of trustees and statutes of the institution usually spell out the traditions and goals of the college more specifically than charters of incorporation. To aid trustees of Jesuit institutions in their duty of perpetuating the aims of Jesuit education, the key documents of each institution should spell out the nature of the Jesuit educational tradition. Many colleges utilize a few days of orientation for new board members; Jesuit colleges in the orientation of new board members should highlight the Jesuit educational tradition and treat of the more specific characteristics of the individual college, such as Loyola. In Jesuit institutions members of the Society of Jesus should remain on the board and, as living members and primary interpreters of the Jesuit tradition, should share their views with other board members. Since flexibility and adaptation are part of the Jesuit tradition, Jesuits should lead in seeking and approving changes as new needs face the college. The board should function to keep the college alive and adaptive to the needs of the nation, the Church, the students, the community. The board members share an imposing trust.

2. *The college*

The twenty-eight charters of American Jesuit colleges spell out the purpose of the institutions—"to provide higher education." Education on their campuses follows a tradition. In the United States today colleges within the Jesuit educational tradition enjoy a definite advantage: Jesuit colleges share a purpose and a respect for persons. American Jesuit colleges share a philosophy of life—Christianity as a value system. This value system sets a context for true academic community. It is academic because the Jesuit educational tradition openly avows a commitment to Christ, the Word made flesh, who is Truth and who responds to the primary goal of an academic community—the search for truth. It is a community because the Jesuit educational tradition fosters close relationships among all the persons within the college as the consequence of the Christian truth, "Love one another, as I have loved you."

As academic communities, Jesuit colleges in the United States engage in formal education. But faculty and students do share a world view which fosters a functional consensus. Curriculum con-

struction in any college involves a series of value judgments; those judgments at a Jesuit college reflect the world view or philosophy of the institution. American Jesuit colleges express a concern for ultimates in drawing up their curriculum. The curriculum, heavily weighted with value-laden subjects, invites students to seek "meaning" in the discipline and in their own lives.

How does the Jesuit campus respond to the student quest for freedom especially regarding their publications and desire to invite speakers to campus? In a day of quick communication via television, satellite, telephone, jet, high-speed trains and cars, students today see the world unfold before them. In an era witnessing the removal of the screen of legal censorship from books, movies, magazines, and newspapers, every social and political opinion, every norm of morality and form of license bombard American youth. The campus cannot become a fortress or a ghetto. The communications revolution buries that possibility. The Catholic Church does offer the Jesuit campus advice on the new freedom in Vatican Council II's "Declaration on Religious Freedom":

"Many pressures are brought to bear upon men of our day, to the point where the danger arises lest they lose the possibility of acting on their own judgment. On the other hand, not a few can be found who seem inclined to use the name of freedom as the pretext for refusing to submit to authority and for making light of the duty of obedience.

"Therefore, this Vatican Synod urges everyone, especially those who are charged with the task of educating others, to do their utmost to form men who will respect the moral order and be obedient to lawful authority. Let them form men too who will be lovers of true freedom—men, in other words, who will come to decisions on their own judgment and in the light of truth, govern their activities with a sense of responsibility, and strive after what is true and right, willing always to join with others in cooperative effort." [*The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: America Press, 1966), p. 687.]

In a day of instant communication this declaration does give advice on how to treat student freedom regarding their publications and their desire to invite "controversial" speakers to the campus. The Christian outlook on life—the value system of the campus—offers norms for personal morality and for judgment. A code of student conduct drawn up by students with the cooperation of the other parts of the academic community should give guidelines. But the students rightfully claim freedom to put the code into practice.

Responsibility needs testing also. But the academic community of a Jesuit campus provides a better context for experiment and quick correction than does adult life. Most experiments in publication will issue in good taste. Violations of good taste should bring corrective action by the community of students, faculty, and administrators.

Within the context of Christian maturity and academic freedom the Jesuit campus provides a forum for all speakers; all varieties of opinion receive a hearing. In 1969, and in the future, provision of a platform does not necessarily mean agreement with a speaker's views by the college. The maturity of students and the certitude of a Christian philosophy of life allow students to judge the truth of a speaker's words and make up their own minds on even the most provocative message. The campus should so encourage dialogue on all issues that dissent without rancor exists within a Jesuit academic community as a mark of its respect and love for persons. The context of community also explains why every person on the Jesuit campus agrees on the rules of civilized and reasonable conduct necessary to give an airing to differing ideas and opposed speakers. The gamut of responsible freedom should have full play at Jesuit colleges.

The Jesuit college today also grapples with the pressing problems of the times. The faith commitment of the institution and of the faculty, students, and administrators proclaims definite views regarding man, his dignity, his rights and obligations. Civil rights, education of the culturally deprived, poverty, peace, hunger, and other local, national, and international problems evoke Christian concern and moral choice on the Jesuit campus. True to its context as an academic community, the response includes intellectual examination of the problem and judgment of possible solutions. If the campus can contribute actively to easing the problem (e.g., education of the culturally deprived), the college facilities and resources and the entire academic community should close ranks and work in unity for the proposed solution.

The response of Jesuit colleges to modern problems springs from the Christian tradition of service manifested in Christ's life "Who came to serve and not to be served." Within the function of service, Jesuit colleges differ from their state and secular counterparts. Jesuit and Catholic colleges stand in a special relationship to the Catholic Church, as state colleges to the state, and secular colleges to special constituencies. In the United States, Jesuit colleges

pledge loyalty to an intellectually based Christian outlook on life, but for this world view to survive and remain relevant to Americans calls for constant confrontation with the contemporary American culture. The Jesuit college best serves the Church by the promotion of intellectual dialogue on the campus between theology and other disciplines; the dialogue provides a stimulus and an arena for the Church "to do its thinking." Campus dialogue may lead to a new synthesis between Christianity and American culture. The Jesuit college, as a Christian academic community with a faith dimension, also serves the Church in its central act—the pursuit of truth.

The Jesuit colleges of the sixteenth century aimed to share "inherited wisdom" with their students. True to the Jesuit educational tradition of adaptation, the Jesuit college in the 1970s will place more stress on the functional purpose of education. Recent studies point out that American colleges today and in the future should aim at aiding graduates to function within national and international society. Jesuit colleges should respond to the challenge. More international studies will enter the curriculum. The learning process of the future will also incorporate more direct experience. The Jesuit college of the future will adapt to meet the new needs of the Church and of the world.

3. *The Jesuit religious community on campus*

On Jesuit college campuses in the United States, the Jesuit religious community maintains its own residence. The Thirty-First General Congregation, in speaking of Jesuit community life, declared:

"And so community in the Society of Jesus takes its origin from the will of the Father joining us into one, and is constituted by the active personal striving of all members to fulfill the divine will, with the Holy Spirit impelling and guiding us individually through responsible obedience to a life which is apostolic in many ways. It is a community of men who are called by Christ to live with Christ, to be conformed to Christ, to fulfill the work of Christ in themselves and among men. This is the foundation and aim of community life in the Society of Jesus."

Thus in the American Jesuit college a faith community grows up inside the campus of the academic community. Individual students, faculty members, administrators, and staff experience the tensions bedeviling persons on earth as men reach for the moon. Local, national, and international problems grow to crisis stage with each

passing day. To meet the pressures with equanimity, persons expect the quiet of a private home to provide peace, companionship, understanding, full acceptance, and true communication on rich and personal levels. The Jesuit community, as the home of the Jesuits on a college campus, should offer a rich and rewarding home life for Jesuits.

Does Jesuit community life in an era of pluralism of views give witness to the possibility of men with diverse opinions living in peace and harmony? Do Jesuits exhibit care for one another and the easy association felt by friends? A negative response to the questions blunts the vitality of Jesuit presence on the campus and to many throws into doubt the relevance of faith and the promised new climate in the Church. An affirmative reply strengthens the individual and corporate witness of Jesuits on campus.

The corporate presence of the Jesuit community opens the possibility for lived witness to the gospels. The climate of the era craves community but divides over an operative principle to make community effective. The presence of men united by religious convictions and Christian love in an effort to serve others at a college by teaching, counseling, administering, etc., suggests to students forming or testing a philosophy of life the viability of Christianity as a guide for life. On a college campus a group of men, celibates by choice, yet living a rich, deeply personal and satisfying human life witnesses excellently to the vitality and richness of the Christian message, the possibility of sublimation and the incompleteness of pansexualism. The practice of transferring the contributed services of the Jesuit community to the college through a quiet book transaction misses an excellent opportunity for the Jesuit community to call public attention to its corporate poverty. A suggested annual ceremony picturing the Jesuit superior of the community handing a check to the President of the college provides an occasion to point out Jesuit corporate poverty and the commitment of the Jesuit community to service of the particular college.

The commitment of the Jesuit community to Christian principles should be manifestly operative on the campus. Persons in the academic community should look to the Jesuit community as the symbol and incarnation of authentic Christian life. Within the context of an academic community, individual Jesuits should feel free to invite other members of the academic community to dine with them, to take part in the liturgy of the Jesuit community, and to meet with Jesuits in relaxed social situations. The creation and con-

tinuation of a "fortress concept" whereby Jesuits "retire" to their own residence and shun involvement in campus life destroys the effectiveness of Jesuit witness.

Separate incorporation of the Jesuit community promises many dividends. Legal separation calls the attention of the entire academic community to the motivation for the presence of members of the Society of Jesus on the campus; Jesuits sponsor colleges to perform service based on Christian love. Service does not imply ownership of the institution. Under the new arrangement regarding boards of trustees, the Jesuits visibly separated sponsorship from ownership. Separate incorporation of the Jesuit community beckons as the next logical step. In the past did confusion between ownership and service blur and even blunt the mission of the Jesuits to the particular college? Actions and decisions proper to owners or masters, but performed by persons pledged to service, certainly destroy a service role. Separate incorporation highlights the service role of the Jesuits and challenges individual Jesuits to work even harder regarding their corporate and personal apostolate of service to the academic community. Removal of the ownership feature also gives to the Jesuit community a mobility and healthy independence very much in accordance with the purpose and ideals of the Society of Jesus.

The Jesuit community on campus gives witness to the faith commitment of the Society of Jesus and individual Jesuits. At a college this corporate witness silently carries out a special role in the Catholic Church in the world of today and tomorrow.

V. CONCLUSION

"Jesuit presence" admits of many meanings. The first connotation of the term evokes a memory of the Jesuit educational tradition forged over more than 425 years. The tradition produced at least three characteristics: adaptation of curriculum and organization to times, places, and persons; presentation of an intellectually based Christian outlook on life; and cultivation of close, personal relationships between faculty and students. In the United States, the commitment of Jesuit colleges to Christianity as a value system operative within a functional consensus of the academic community differentiates the Jesuit campus from those dedicated to neutrality or to secular humanism.

Will these characteristics denote Jesuit colleges as unique, as distinguishable from every other type of American college? Cer-

tainly not. Jesuit colleges in the United States for the next thirty years will follow the curriculum pattern of American liberal arts colleges and will share the faith commitment and deep personalism of church-related, and especially of Catholic, colleges. As colleges in the United States, their personnel and organizational patterns will continue to reflect the American historical, educational, and religious climate. But lack of uniqueness does not deny a distinctness to American Jesuit colleges. The characteristics of the Jesuit educational tradition provide a distinctness: a unity of purpose and a style of life. The distinctness of Jesuit colleges fosters consensus on fundamental issues and offers a value system to the academic community. In this way distinctness marks off Jesuit colleges from public and non-sectarian institutions.

The academic community present on a Jesuit campus in its search for truth shares a commitment to Christianity. The commitment prompts faculty and students to look for meaning and to probe for values and the moral dimension in academic disciplines. On the Jesuit campus, theology should take the lead in initiating dialogue with other disciplines with the hope that the interchange will produce mutual benefits—not only a new synthesis of American culture and a Christian outlook on life, but also new depths of meaning and internal development in individual disciplines.

The milieu of Jesuit colleges as academic communities should respond to the needs of today's and tomorrow's students. Baptismal water flowing over their infant heads incorporated most of the students into the Catholic Church many years before they reached a college campus. Jesuit colleges should aid these students to adapt with the Church in transition by questioning and deepening the understanding of Catholicism and Christianity as a value system. This value system issues in moral choices and structures meaning in consistent patterns. Contemporary Catholicism also does not confine itself to theory but moves out to aid in the solution of pressing modern problems. Students on a Jesuit campus should experience this concern.

The key to the continuation of the Jesuit educational tradition lies in the hands of the faculty and administration. Their dedication to the tradition and its flexibility will shape Jesuit colleges for the remainder of the century. Functional consensus on the validity of Catholicism as a value system will continue Jesuit colleges as "Catholic"; they will remain "Jesuit" as long as faculty and administrators derive inspiration from the Jesuit educational tradition.

“Jesuit presence” connotes not merely a tradition; tradition springs from the ideals, decisions, and actions of persons corporately and individually. Individually, “Jesuit presence” looks to witnesses to the tradition within and outside the Jesuit order. Corporately, “Jesuit presence” includes the corporation, the college, and the Jesuit religious community as creating and adapting the Jesuit tradition.

Mention of “Jesuit presence” immediately calls to mind the image of a Jesuit priest, brother, or scholastic. The individual Jesuit lives as a personal witness to the Jesuit educational tradition. Training and studies equip the Jesuit to interpret the tradition according to his personal talents and temperament. His witness or presence combines utilization of his talents and consequent personal fulfillment in his role as teacher, counselor, and administrator. As a person convinced of the Jesuit ideal of *personalis cura alumnorum*, the individual Jesuit—as open, friendly, and personable in dealing with other members of the academic community—testifies to the vitality of the Christian philosophy of life. In fostering interdisciplinary dialogue and in teaching value-laden subjects, the Jesuit serves the Church and helps create a new Christian synthesis. Jesuit campuses should also provide an opportunity for the Jesuit priest to exercise his ministerial priesthood and thus witness to Christ’s mediatorship of all truth.

Within the Jesuit educational tradition, from its earliest days, persons who were not Jesuits always played a vital part. During the last thirty years of the twentieth century, the laity will increase its role in Jesuit education. Vatican Council II and the Thirty-First Jesuit General Congregation pointed the way. The Catholic Church encouraged religious orders in the execution of their sponsored work to work closely with the laity; the Jesuit General Congregation called the laity the natural interpreters of the modern world. These guidelines show the responsiveness of the Church and the Jesuit order to modern needs and developments. Jesuit colleges in the service of the Church in the United States will synthesize a Christian outlook on life with evolving American culture. Since the laity will interpret the culture, recruitment of lay faculty and administrators for Jesuit colleges should concentrate on persons interested in the continuation of Church-related colleges and in the evolution of a Christian philosophy of life.

In the legal corporate sense, “Jesuit presence” applies to the corporation chartered by the state or federal government as a col-

lege. The board of trustees, as a board, legally controls and runs the college in the fulfillment of its purpose: to provide higher education. The trustees remain pledged to continue the purpose and ideals of the original incorporators and their successors. To remain "Jesuit," an American college must at least continue within the Jesuit educational tradition. The by-laws of the board should spell out in general terms the direction and nature of that tradition. Responsive to their own needs and to the suggestions of the Thirty-First General Congregation, boards of trustees of Jesuit colleges in the United States have shifted recently from exclusive Jesuit membership to a mixed board with lay and Jesuit trustees. The lay and Jesuit trustees should know the Jesuit educational tradition and foster its continuation and adaptation in their college.

The Jesuit college has a splendid opportunity to encourage true community. Its tradition respects persons and fosters the closest relationship of persons, a true love. Within that milieu also flourishes a toleration of opposing views because of the respect for persons professing the opinions. The personalist orientation of the campus leads to a concern for ultimates and value judgments in the construction of curriculum. The value judgments utilize the Christian outlook on life as the basis for positions regarding man and his relations with the world. The Jesuit college should grapple with contemporary problems and express its Christian concern through thought and action. In its service orientation, the Jesuit college includes service to the Church through dialogue productive of a new synthesis and liturgy attuned to the times. In the next thirty years the American Jesuit college in its own evolution will give wider attention to international studies and challenge students by more direct experiences. In this way the Jesuit college will give witness to a vibrant tradition.

On the Jesuit campus the Jesuit religious community witnesses to the contemporaneity of the Jesuit tradition. Amid the tensions of the modern world, Jesuit community life should offer individual Jesuits a rich and rewarding home life. On a college campus a religious community motivated by deep Christian love can prove the vitality of the gospel by living the evangelical counsels and simultaneously enjoying a rich and deeply personal human life. Separate incorporation of the Jesuit religious community or legal separation from the college grants the Jesuits a mobility consonant with the purpose of the Society of Jesus and a greater clarity between Jesuit ownership and Jesuit sponsorship of institutions. The

Jesuit religious community resides on campus to serve the academic community; separate incorporation highlights the service motivation.

Jesuit presence will flourish on college campuses in the United States as long as the Jesuit educational tradition adapts to the new needs of this country and of the Catholic Church. A Christian philosophy of life will perdure as long as young persons, witnessing men and women living the value system, respond personally to the understood moral choices of the day. The Jesuit college will move forward into the twenty-first century provided persons, as trustees, faculty, administrators, and students pledged to a religiously-grounded value system live according to it, and win adherents to its continuation. Individual Jesuit effectiveness, dedication, and hard work will combine with trends in the Catholic Church to chart the future of the Jesuit order in the United States and around the world. The future belongs to the optimist; the pessimist has no hope. Jesuit educational tradition reaches optimistically for the twenty-first century.

Implementation

(A resolution adopted unanimously by the participants in the 1969 JEA Workshop)

Jesuit workshops, institutes and summer meetings have usually had a remarkable effect on the individuals participating in them. These participants have gone home with new ideas, renewed enthusiasm and a great feeling of accomplishment.

The resulting publications have usually been widely distributed but, after an initial reading by a limited number of Jesuits or interested laymen, have been put on shelves or in files and largely forgotten. For a time there may be a spotty flurry of interest and some sporadic follow-up efforts but very soon the workshop becomes part of the past and seems to have no continuing influence.

The success of a workshop lies largely in the generation of ideas through dialogue and discussion based on well prepared papers and presentations. To achieve a continuing effect, it seems necessary to extend this dialogue and discussion to every Jesuit campus according to some continuing and cumulatively effective plan.

Hence, it is recommended:

1. That copies of all principal papers, proceedings of the workshop, consensus papers, committee reports and recommendations be sent to every Jesuit College and University in the United States;
2. That these materials be reproduced in sufficient numbers by each institution to make them available for study and discussion by all segments of the University community;
3. That the Presidents of all Jesuit Colleges and Universities be urged to initiate as soon as possible a continuing dialogue and occasional formal discussions in which students, faculty, staff and administrators participate and through which an attempt will be made to arrive at a consensus applying the recommendations of the workshop documents to the local situation. Adequate means for implementing the campus consensus should be foreseen and provided;
4. That regional meetings within each Jesuit Province also be encouraged;
5. That periodic reports on the ideas, statements, recommendations, positive action, etc. resulting from these meetings be

sent to the JEA Washington Office to be duplicated and distributed to all other Jesuit Colleges and Universities for their information and stimulation;

6. That the JEA Washington Office continue to encourage and stimulate such local and regional dialogues and meetings;
7. That the Jesuit Educational Quarterly and occasional JEA Bulletins publish articles inspired by the workshop, report on concrete developments and specific programs and release annually a synoptic of the previous year's activities related to the workshop;
8. That each JEA conference include on its program for next year (1969-1970) a topic from the workshop that is related to its specific goals;
9. That the next workshop on this basic subject grow out of and specifically relate to the on-going reflection and discussion recommended above.