



2020 Vision

An Examen of Jesuit Education for the 21st Century

THINK TANK

PRESENTERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JOHN KLINE.....	5
TERRY GALLAGHER.....	9
KEVIN WILDES, S.J.	13
JOE FAHEY, S.J.....	17
TOM LAVIN	21
TOM GANNON, S.J.	25
JOYCE O'BRIEN.....	29
RON MCKINNEY, S.J.....	33
GEORGE DRANCE, S.J.....	37
JAMES GARDINER, S.A.	41
PATRICIA WITTBERG, S.C.	45
JOHN MCDARGH.....	49
SCOTT PILARZ, S.J.....	57
JOE O'KEEFE, S.J.....	63
GEOFFREY DILLON, S.J.	69
CORRINE MCGUIGAN.....	73
GORDON BENNETT, S.J.	79
BRITISH ROBINSON.....	83
MICHAEL GUERRA.....	89
KATARINA SCHUTH, O.S.F	95
ELAINE SCHUSTER.....	101
BRAD SCHAEFFER, S.J.....	105

RELATIVISM OF POVERTY

John Kline

The question that we were asked to address is to look at the kinds of changes that are going on that will shape the set of challenges or opportunities for young adults in 2020, the implications of those for education especially private and Catholic education. I am trained in Political Science. I have picked up a great deal of economics along the way so I am a political economist and I've been involved with business community for most of my professional life so I add in some applied business elements too. From that perspective I would like to share with you three different categories of trends or forces that I see active in the world that are going to shape the world for the future students.

One I would term a relativism of poverty. I don't think a political economist can start anywhere else except with the widening gap that exists within this society but in much greater disparity within the world, between the very rich and the very poor. But this I think presents some special problems for the future. Can you cope with this sort of economic disparity beyond the local and the global level at the same time without becoming relativistic about it? How do you apply the same general principles when the conditions differ so dramatically? Internationally, much of the world is being left behind. It's being marginalized. With the advent of globalization or international economic interdependence, it does present great opportunities but it's opportunities that are not being shared by all. The condition is especially difficult in terms of human infrastructure. There are ways to leap frog into, using development terms, physical infrastructure. Now you don't have to go through the laying of the telephone line; you can go directly to the wireless communication. But, how do you develop an educated population that can share in the kind of economic opportunities that are available. So that disparity gap is widening, but we also have the same kind of gaps in a different set of magnitude with a different set of standards within our own society, within this nation, within our localities. Economics has to do with scarcity. If there weren't scarcity there wouldn't be economics and the allocation of benefits and burdens. And what we're mainly allocating is time and attention in financial resources.

How do you allocate these in a world of relative poverty? Do you allocate more to the global poverty that is coming into our homes, into our lives more and more frequently, more and more easily through the kind of information and communication technologies that we have now. Do we owe more of an obligation to those who are not close to us geographically but are in dire need? Does that mean that we pay relatively less attention to those of us who are needy and geographically close but perhaps are not suffering to the same degree of magnitude as those who are more distant from us? How do you apply general principles to this? How do you deal with a preference to the poor? Who are the poor? How do you apply this in service learning with high school students? How do you apply learning projects that reach out beyond the local community and give them some experience in those areas as well as those that are close to us?

Certainly the task of discernment in how you apply more principles to complex ethical issues of our day must start with these kinds of questions. I would hesitate to get very far into the medical area, but simply looking at applying the scarcity of economics to medical advancement in societies that can afford it with all of the transplants extending life, but an economics that might mean less time and attention of resources to others in the world whose lives are cut off much shorter. Relativism of poverty.

A second topic I would term change and choice. This really has to do with the rapidity, the pace of change. I think that probably the reason I am here was because I have had the privilege of serving in an advisory group at Woodstock on global economy and culture where they're working with various Jesuit institutions around the world to survey, to try to understand the impact of globalization on cultures around the world. And it has been very enlightening to get back the stories that the institutes are sharing with us from their local perspective in countries all over the world. What has been the impact of globalization on their culture?

Many of the stories are of dislocation. Some of the stories are of opportunity, but a lot of what comes across in the stories is that the pace of change and, in particular, the way that pace is introduced in society has a different quality to it and that the key element that seems to cause people anxiety is a loss of control over the change. When change is introduced externally outside of a society and particularly when it is induced change coming from industrialized/westernized societies introduced in less developed non-western societies, often the impact of that change overwhelms the traditional social mechanisms that help the society to adapt to change. It overwhelms it with its magnitude. It overwhelms it with its force and instead of a question of "How do you change?" you feel like you are being changed. You lose this kind of control over it.

Change and choice. Well, you could say that everyone should be able to make that choice for themselves and that task is to inform them of their choices and allow them to make it. But really, in the current world that exists, how do you inform people of all the ramifications of change that may be brought into their lives. I mean you can go to (**Pa-pa-?**) New Guinea and talk about the impact of mining projects on native tribes there, but you don't have to go to that extreme to realize that well what happens in **Russia now** and you talk about introducing different capitalist methods. Do you realize what the implications are? Not just economically, not just in business terms but socially as well, politically as well. The reality is that often others make that decision for people of whether or not they are going to be changed and how they are going to be changed. And it's often the privileged who make that decision for them. Those are the many kinds of students you will be educating who will by necessity be making those kinds of choices for others.

How can you instill an understanding, perhaps even a sense of empathy, for others when those others are in such different conditions: culturally, economically, and geographically. And yet without that how can they really take on that moral responsibility of making those kinds of choices for others. Certainly this is a challenge. How can you approach it educationally? Again certainly discernment comes in, the application of moral principles. I think it affects a couple of other things that are listed in the aims of Jesuit high schools as well though. One has to do with learning, instilling a love for learning, engaging in life-long learning. That's not an option anymore; that's a necessity. Through the pace of change, life-long learning is going to be a requirement for everyone, and certainly students must be prepared for that at the earliest stage as possible.

Also a high degree of knowledge—certainly necessary but I would suggest here that it is important that knowledge not be too specialized, not be too narrow. That what, in fact, we need more of is to gain an understanding or empathy for others is an interdisciplinary perspective. You need bridgers, people who can bridge those gaps and even between the economic disciplines. Part of my frustration with my profession is the way the academic community builds up isolated fields of knowledge and jargon and specialization. When I do reviews of articles some of my caustic comments come in "This is indecipherable to anyone else outside of that field!" I remember about five years ago we created a course, Fundamentals of Advanced Technology, taught in the Foreign

Service School by a Physics professor. You must understand that many of the students who come to the Foreign Service School do so because they don't have to have a hard science requirement. But we felt that it was very important that they understand the fundamentals of advanced technology. And what did we mean by that? We meant two things: 1) an understanding of the basic dynamic forces that are driving change in various fields of science so that you get some sense for the force and impetus of this; 2) I would argue even more importantly an understanding of basic language. This Physics professor told me that his main goal in the course was to achieve a level of literacy among the students so that they could communicate with scientists. To bridge that gap you need some common bridge in language. That's what we have to do. We have to give the students the basic tools to communicate with others. In our program we teach the students finance and accounting, how to read a balance sheet. Why? - because you can't communicate with the business community if you can't read a balance sheet. You need some fundamental language and you need people with inner-disciplinary vision so they can attempt to evaluate the impact that these different changes brought on by narrow specializations and technological and social revolutions will have on the broader society and societies often very far distant from them.

And third, a grouping I would call a blurred identity in allegiance pattern. What do I mean by this? Well, politically it seems to me we are moving rapidly into an era where the nation state is losing its new monopoly on loyalty. It's often viewed as too distant and, let's face it, too ineffective compared to the past. This creates new opportunities for localities, for regions. And there is a growing bond at the sub-national level where there is a great deal of opportunity for developing some new allegiances and loyalties. There is also the possibility—thanks to technological advances—of creating these kinds of ties to a much greater extent to the individual level, citizenship level, internationally. It seems to me that this must, at the same time, be encouraged, that if there is a withdrawal from the nation state allegiance, it should not be a withdrawal inward. It must be complemented with a reaching outward beyond those national borders. I'm not meaning to suggest at all the nation state is going to disappear in the near future, but it is not going to command the kind of dominant allegiance that it has in the past.

I see a similar blur of allegiancy in identity going on in the economic and the business system. The advertisements I was getting in Washington just before coming up here were for Verizon. What is Verizon? Verizon is a merging of two former firms. This is going on all of the time. I have a very difficult time going back to my days at the National Association of Manufacturers and remembering all the companies I worked with because most of them don't exist, at least by the same name any more. And this is happening not just in terms of merging corporative entities globally as well. I sometimes give my students a pop quiz. I hand around a list of corporate names and ask for an identification of the nationality of those corporations. This is becoming extremely difficult to do. It's becoming impossible to do on a product basis. You have components coming in from all over the world into a product that the company often can't even identify the proportions. There's a blurring of these kinds of allegiances. But this also extends very importantly to the connection between the individual and their work place. There is a change in the allegiance and the loyalty to the company or the employer.

I recall not too long ago we did some programs for IBM for their international personnel group, and it was at a time before IBM really had to reorganize and lay off a lot of workers. IBM was in a sense a Japanese company. You pretty much had employment for life if you wanted it.

That's not true with virtually any company anymore. The companies merge, the companies change, the companies downsize, and they're doing it with that rapid pace that creates anxiety among people. Even in this country at a time of almost unprecedented prosperity great economy, low unemployment. People are anxious and they're anxious about this globalization concept because they're feeling that change is coming in on them, that they don't control, and they don't feel that the business place has the loyalty to them. Well, it works both ways. Individuals don't have the same loyalty to their employer that they had in the past. They are much more individualistic. They move very rapidly often from company to company.

Certainly this applies not just to corporations; it applies to many work places including your Jesuit high schools where you have a turn over of four to six years among faculty members. This creates tremendous challenges for companies, for political institutions, for high schools. And one of the key challenges is "How do you maintain and how do you transmit the value-base that makes the institution what it is, that gives it its mission and its objectives? This is a tremendous challenge for international corporations as they acquire corporations in different countries from very different business traditions. Now all of a sudden all of these employees are yours. How do you inculcate in them your business values? It comes up often in "What kind of business negotiations do you engage in?" In some cultures bribery is very well accepted. How do you transmit this? How do you deal with discrimination issues when you're having supervisors that may come from a very different tradition?

This certainly has to be a challenge for the Jesuit high schools. How do you maintain and transmit over the years through various faculties the kind of value base because this is probably the key. The key you have to give to the students is some kind of continuance of loyalty and allegiance, allegiance to the church, allegiance to the faith, allegiance to the service of the community of learning which is much of the Jesuit tradition. It's tough when all around them the identities and allegiances are blurring. Students need some kind of stability and that stability provided very early on in their educational career would be very important it seems to me.

IMPORTANCE OF VALUES

Terry Gallagher

I found John's talk very, very interesting because it hit a number of themes that either are in my own talk or are very pertinent to it. As you know, I come at the subject as a person who has been involved in business for some forty years, thirty-four of them at Pfizer, and over those years, I have certainly seen the kinds of developments in terms of combinations of companies, acquisitions, globalization that John was talking about. It is a prime object of any large corporation that has a long history, such as a Pfizer which is now 150 years old – to have a set of values and to communicate that set of values, to build it into any company acquired so that there will be a continuing Pfizer image and Pfizer set of values. That is what we've tried to do over the years. The key, as with most things in business, is that it comes right from the top of the company – from senior management, from the board of directors on down – that they believe in and enforce a set of values. If there are violations of values, there is a sanction that takes place. Certainly, on the globalization front, we have just merged with Water-Lambert and formed the largest pharmaceutical company in the world. There have been a number of acquisitions and combinations in the pharmaceutical industry, and probably the driving force of that has been the need to expand and have a very substantial research arm today in order to have the people and the talent to develop new products coming out of all sorts of new developments. I think we see with the final identification of the human genome, there's probably going to be a whole new era of pharmaceuticals that are going to come out in the next ten to fifteen years that will be aimed at preventing disease rather than treating disease. It's a whole new world for the pharmaceutical industry. Our present chairman at Pfizer is retiring next year, and the fellow who is taking over sees that as a challenge and an opportunity for the company. Combining with Water-Lambert and having the size of a huge research arm with very talented people all of the world will be to the advantage of the company in the future.

I spend most of my career in the Pfizer legal group, but for the past ten years, I've been primarily concerned with a concept that has fairly recently become known in the business world as corporate governance. It is an area, which really tries to discern what, it is or how a company reaches its decisions and who makes those decisions and who is responsible for them. The three major elements are the management of the company, the board of directors and the shareholders. Those are the three parts we're trying to balance in what I've terms in some articles I've written as a dynamic balance. Different groups have different sets of standards depending upon what the status of the corporation's business is. In good times, the management really is the dominant force and the one that is making the decisions. As you get into trouble, the board of directors becomes the monitor of management and in ultimate problems, the shareholders make the final decisions as to what happens with the corporation's business. Because there are large shareholders of large companies such as Pfizer...early on when corporations were small and either owned by their family or owned by a small number of large shareholders, there was a great deal of communication, a great deal of influence by the various groups in the corporation and there didn't seem to be any need to articulate rules as to whose responsibility fell into which area. But as companies needed additional capital and sold shares to more and more people and developed a large shareholder base, the idea of corporate governance began to arise. There was a period of time when most of the shareholders of large corporations were small individual shareholders who did not have

very much influence over management. Management and the board of directors were pretty much free to run the business as they saw fit. For years there was a concept known as “the Wall Street walk” – that if you didn’t like the way the management was running the business, you sold your shares (took the Wall Street walk). There was some legislation in the 60’s that enabled pension funds to begin to invest in private equities and common stocks, which they had not been allowed to invest in before that. As a result of that the large pension funds in the United States, the state pension funds, the city pension funds and large international union pension funds began to acquire large amounts of stock of various companies. At one point in the 80’s Pfizer’s shareholder base was 65% owned by large institutions. Those institutions own so much of the stock that taking “the Wall Street walk” was not an effective answer if they disagreed with the way management was running the company. It would have had a depressing effect on the market, and it would have changed their whole investment portfolio by divesting themselves of a stock such as Pfizer’s. They turned to trying to influence the decisions of the company. That probably was the key to starting the modern corporate governance movement. We, at Pfizer, recognized fairly early that this was a developing trend. I was asked to set up a corporate governance department which was the first one in the United States. I took on that job and decided to reach out in a proactive manner to our large shareholders, to deal with them, to find out what they were interested in, to find out what their concerns were, and to try to deal with those as a communicator between our large shareholders and board of directors and the management of the company. We’ve done that for about ten years. It’s been useful; it’s been a way a keeping friendly relations with our large shareholders, which has not always been true of most large companies. There was a period during the 1980’s when there was a very adversarial kind of relationship between these large pension funds and corporation, and by trying to deal with them and trying to work with them, we’ve been able to avoid that kind of conflict. I’ve also worked closely over those years with religious groups that have been active through their pension funds in corporate activism. The Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility in New York has been a key focus, and I’ve worked closely with them. As a result of setting up this department on corporate governance, I think we became sort of the ethical center or the social policy center of the corporation. As a result, I’ve been called by our chairman the conscience of the corporation. Pfizer does have a set of values that includes the value of integrity which is defined as doing the right thing. On many occasions when a manager would present something to senior management or to the board, the ultimate question of whether or not we were going to adopt the project that the manager was advocating was the question, is it the right thing to do? It may be the profitable thing to do and it may be the business-expedient thing to do, but is it the right thing to do? Because of our values and tradition of having that set of values, that question was asked very frequently of the managers. I found over these past years that there are a set of young managers who grew up in an era where I think that parochial schools and public schools were not teaching values to students. They were coming into the business world with the idea that you did anything you had to do in order to make money. Over the years, I’ve tried to ask those men and women, is this the right thing to do? Put aside the fact that you’re going to get a leg up on your competition or the fact that you’re going to make some extra money for your division, is it the right thing to do? If they didn’t answer that question with my prompting, they were asked the same thing by senior management, and in many cases it was turned down.

I can cite some prominent examples of what Pfizer did over the past several years that indicate our values. We bought a company out in California called Shilee that made

artificial heart valves. The heart valves that had been on the market before these were made of pig skin and had a problem of causing blood clots. Shilee's was a mechanical heart valve that was supposed to reduce the number of blood clots, and it did significantly. But, it did have a problem in that the strut that held the butterfly valve that opened to allow the blood to go through was weak and some of them broke, and some people died. I was at the board meeting when the Pfizer board first considered what to do about the fact that they had their first report of deaths. It was a tough meeting, because this was the first project that I know of in the history of Pfizer that had killed people. We've had side effects, as most pharmaceutical companies have had, but not death. After going through a lot of discussion with our attorneys about the kinds of defenses we might raise – the fact that people didn't bring their cases soon enough, the fact that they could not prove that it was the heart valve – the board talked it out and said if our product kills somebody, we're going to pay, we're not going to contest these cases. And, we did not take any case to trial. We settled all of them. In the end it was about 300 million dollars that we paid out in settlements. I think that one was the right decision. I was pleased when they came to that decision. I think they reached that decision based on a set of values, although they had the legal defenses. The next instance is interesting. I'm sure you've heard of the product, viagra. We developed that product in England for heart problems, and it didn't work too well at increasing the blood flow in the vessels around the heart, but it worked in the reproductive area. We now had on our hands our first product that was concerned with sexual function. We had never been in that area before. At the high management level in this case, there were a number of discussions about what to do with this product. One of the things that we decided to do was talk to the major faiths about how they would view this kind of product if we put it on the market. We approached various Protestant, Jewish and Catholic faiths. We actually went over to the Vatican, and after discussing it with one of the departments in the Vatican, they said they thought this product was a positive product because it was a product that would enhance the relationship between husbands and wives where there was a sexual dysfunction problem. After the large publicity had calmed down, we think the product has fallen into place and is being used for the same purposes we intended. One of the things we decided to do, which was kind of a subtle thing, was to use in the advertising of Viagra an indication that the persons involved in using the product wore wedding rings. It was a subtle attempt on our part to say this is for married couples. A third instance has to do with a disease in the third world that causes blindness – it's an infection of the eyelid that turns in and causes blindness. That is something that is treatable with one of our products – one of our antibiotics. We had given that product away in a program that we put together with McConnell-Clark Foundation and WHO to try to eliminate trachoma, and our commitment to that was about 60 million dollars initially and it will grow. We are treating it in five different countries – four in Africa and in Vietnam. That's an overall commitment by the company. It the kind of thing we do, and it's something we've done recently with another product called diphocan which is useful for crypocochal meningitis that AIDS patients get. We've decided to give that away as well. We started out in South Africa, and we will expand to other countries in Africa if we can find the right distribution system to be sure that the product will get to the patients.

With all that background, I try to think about what it is that I might say to you folks that would be useful about education over the next 15-20 years. The first thought that comes to mind is one that, I think, everybody is aware of – that we are now a knowledge-based society, and information age, and the Internet has opened up vast sources of information. It's very evident in business that the amount of knowledge that's out there is such that we

have to operate by teams rather than as individuals. That, I think, is something that maybe very useful to educators – that the idea of educating your students to work in teams and to be judged by their accomplishment in teams is very important. In business today the team concept and the operation of teams is the typical situation. There's been no product at Pfizer that's been developed by one scientist in many, many years – it's usually a team of scientists that operate around the world, with some in England, some in Japan, some in the United States, some in France communicating with each other through the modern means of communication. I think the sum of knowledge is such today that you as educators are going to take on the role of being a facilitator of how the students reaches the knowledge they need and how they discern what is important from the knowledge that's available to them. The traditional role of the educator conveying knowledge to the student is now going to change, and the teacher has to become more of a facilitator than a conveyor of knowledge.

Globalization...John mentioned it, and that is certainly the trend. The students have to understand the effects that information flow is having upon the globalization. The decline of the nation's state certainly is something that is coming. The advent of things like the EURO, the breakdown of national boundaries in Europe, things of that sort are things that your students will have to work with and understand. There are all sorts of cultural and historic events and trends that will effect either the advancement of retardation of that development of globalization. Without that understanding, your students will not be able to operate in the business world or in the world in general.

Demographics is another things that's going to be an important influence over the next 15-20 years. In the United States the Baby Boom generation will retire and there will be fewer productive workers supporting a larger base of retirees. You'll have the inverted pyramid. The falling birth rate in the developed world, in Europe especially (both eastern and western Europe) means that your population will continue to age, and you'll have the problem of providing security for the elderly under government or private schemes that were developed at a time when there was an increasing population and an increasing number of people to support the elderly. In 15-20 years your students will be faced with that inverted pyramid and how to cope with that kind of problem. The more education your students receive, the better off they're going to be.

I think the vitality of the Catholic Church is going to be in the third world. I think we've lost Europe – certainly such bastions of faith as Italy and France. A reunification with the Orthodox Church is coming. I think we've started on it. I think the present pope has helped to start that dialogue, and I think we're going to reach that. I can see over the next 15-20 years substantial progress in reunifying the western church with the Orthodox Church. That, combined with a vital third world church that has reached maturity, will make the 15-20 years from now an era of wonderful Christianity that reaches around the world. That's my optimistic view. I could go on to discuss things like the pharmaceutical industry and the genome, but I think that's Kevin's area, so we'll let that go.

TECHNOLOGY CREATES CHOICES

Kevin Wildes, S.J.

My particular area of expertise is bioethics. The good thing is that bioethics is an interdisciplinary field, and so it allows me to sort of roam all over the place intellectually and in my writing and research. I do come at this as someone who is working in an area of applied ethics, but also someone who is a philosopher with a background in theology. There is a great intermixing of a lot of these issues along the way. I'm going to do what philosophers both love and hate to do – I'm going to talk in some really grand, broad brush strokes today.

I think one way to characterize the modern age as distinguishable from the ages that preceded it is that the intellectual paradigm of the modern age has been science. In very many ways, I think science has defined the world from 1500 and beyond. So that even theology wants to be, in the twentieth century, scientific in the way it proceeds. The central science that has defined, in many ways, the last century was physics. And, I'm not saying that physics will not continue to be crucially important. But, I would argue that the sciences that will be most central to this century (or at least the beginning of this century) are the life sciences. If you look at genetics and the genome – in July we had the announcement that they've done the first draft of mapping the human genome – we can see that this is an important first step in what I think will be a radical redoing of the way we understand medicine and health care. Furthermore, I think it will have a radical effect on the way we understand human life period. But, it's only a piece of it all. There have been other things that have been glimmering out there over the past 5 to 10 years. There is a development of an area called "regenerative medicine" which has been a lot of the work around stem cells and the work in cloning to help people regenerate parts of the body that have become dysfunctional through a better understanding of cell life. I think we're going to see a real increase in terms of life span. People talk very easily, casually and uncritically about how people are living longer. You have to parse that out more carefully. The average life expectancy has increased but largely because we've done much better at lowering infant mortality rates and deaths in the first year of life. If you live past the first five years of life, at the beginning of the 20th century, chances were that you were going to live to be about 70 years old. It's just a lot of people didn't, so the average life expectancy was much lower. Now we're at a point with the life sciences where that life span will increase, and, perhaps quite dramatically. I know some scientists who talk very optimistically about a life span of 150 years as being more the norm than the exception. There are a number of implications for us as a society as well as what it means for us educationally. Simply, all that we learn from the life sciences, creates choice. It's not that suddenly in the 60's and 70's that ethics became a problem for medicine. Medicine has always struggled with questions of ethics. But, the field began to explode precisely because for the first time in its history, medicine is actually able to do things for people. For most of its history, medicine probably did more harm than good – we bled, purged, blistered and everything. Now, we're in an era where, in fact, we can give people choices. Those choices are going to radically increase. Stop and think about what's happened in the last thirty years. That will pale by what will happen in the future. Very few people in the United States simply die. People die because we make a choice to stop doing something. Now we're asking the question, can people ask for the choice to actively do something to end their life. Choices become crucial to how we understand death. People have all kinds of choices about reproduction. In this genetic era, the

notion of choice will continue to expand exponentially. Technology creates choices. Technology, at least in terms of health care, also creates another set of issues, i.e., because health care requires an enormous infrastructure to support it and deliver it, it also raises lots of questions about what are the ethics of public policy in all of this. What is the appropriate or inappropriate role of government in all of this. That comes at a time of diminishment of the nation's state. Even the rhetoric of the Democratic Party has been changed to a smaller version of government, a government that is less intrusive. That, of course, creates lots of issues about how you create public policy. In the quote you read this morning, Peggy talks about public, moral debate. The health care as an icon raises fundamental questions about what that means in a society that is truly pluralistic and multicultural. I always hesitate to use those words, because I think they're overused. I think these trends raise fundamental questions about something that's very difficult for American to come to terms with, and that is the notion of limits. Technology creates choices and new possibilities. Everybody wants to have some of the possibilities. But, we can't do everything for everyone. Part of the reason that we're struggling with issues of managed care today is because for a long time in health care we pretended as if you could do everything for everybody, and so we wound up spending more money on health care than on any other segment of the American economy. One of the reasons is that we kept dumping more and more resources into it. Then we got to the questions, can we and should we. Limits and living with limits is a fundamentally difficult issue for Americans. Last evening at the democratic convention they had a tribute to Jimmy Carter. I think one of Jimmy Carter's fundamental problems is that he told American you had to live with limits. This is the national where anybody can grow up to be anything. You can be president of the United States...it's the land of limitless expansion. We're going to have to make choices about where we put things and how we use things. The other thing about health care is that it raises very fundamental questions about the fact that ultimately, even if we do live to be 150 years old, sooner or later we die. And, American culture hates to talk about death – it is the ultimate limit that we don't like to talk about...so we don't. We hid death in all kinds of ways, shapes and forms.

Where do these trends take us for education? Sometimes the obvious is the most important to get a handle on. People in the future must have a literacy in science, because are going to have to understand the kinds of choices they're going to be facing just in the reproduction of their own families in the not too distant future. While education struggles with interdisciplinary studies, scientists don't...they're already doing it. Biochemistry, molecular biology...these are scientists from a variety of different fields who are working together. Getting departments or schools to work together is a difficult thing. But, the sciences are doing it. We need to educate men and women who can come to terms with interdisciplinary studies. Obvious but worth mentioning explicitly to me is the broad question of ethics. We are at fundamental crossroads about ethics. Not only do we have disagreements about how we think about ethics, but we have disagreements over basic concepts like responsibility and what that means and choice and what that means. I think medicine has not helped us all that much in this area, because we are more and more medicalizing what used to be treated as questions of social and individual responsibility. All these developments (health care, medicine and sciences) raise really fundamental questions about how we are to die. It seems to me that when all is said and done, underneath the choices we will make are visions about human flourishing and human well-being. Just to give one example. People in the genetics areas or policy makers frequently use a lot of distinctions that they think sound great, but when you press them hard, they don't necessarily make a lot of sense. People will say,

we should do genetic intervention that is therapeutic, we should not do genetic intervention that is enhancement. I think that's bogus, because they say it as if somewhere there is a place that you could find where the list of therapy is versus where the list of enhancement is. Underneath those things are questions about human flourishing and well-being. I can actually see pretty well. Are my glasses therapy or are they enhancement? A lot of what medicine does is enhancement. Underneath those kinds of distinctions are fundamental questions about human flourishing. And, that's where I do think the Jesuit Christian tradition of humanism and education has something very important to bring to the table at two different levels at the same time. One is for our own students and the other is for the public discourse and debate. Any community that has some notion about death and the meaning of life and death and resurrection has something to say to the world around it. Dan Callahan is a well-known person in bioethics and talks about the fact that Americans don't really have a good image about what a good death is like...and, we don't. That is why on any given day we have literally thousands of people who are dying who are having technological interventions all over the place keeping them alive. Because we don't have a set of images or stories about what a good death is about. That is part of what I would call the tradition of humanism in the sense that somehow the death tells you something about what the life is about. A shift for us is that for a long time in the west there was a common culture, whether it was enforced by the state or not, and now that common culture has gone. Hence, the popularity of terms like post-modernity, etc. I think it's important to recognize that you cannot assume that people who live right next store to us share common values and culture the way they did when I was growing up. For education that means we have to answer questions about how we educate young men and women into a community particularly when there are problems within the community. I told a story last night about Captain Cook when he landed in Hawaii and he met the Polynesians and he was scandalized that men and women frequently lived together without benefit of clergy. But, at the same time they would not eat at the same together. When Cook asked the Polynesians about it, they didn't know and couldn't explain it to him – all they knew was that it was taboo. They were people who had lost touch (for a variety of historical and other reasons) with their own tradition. I think we run a lot of that risk already. People use terms like religious literacy and that means more than what the Pope says about a particular topic – a sense of the tradition and its rootedness. Alister McIntyre talks about people becoming “rootless cosmopolitans” in contemporary American, and I think that's a real risk for us. The thing is, we have a wonderful tradition which is rich and diverse and has a lot to say about the kinds of questions that will be before us. In order to be alive, the tradition needs to be transmitted and translated and it needs to be alive and developed.

PERSPECTIVES ON JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS OF THE FUTURE

Joe Fahey, S.J.

I bring three different perspectives: (1) an alumnus of a Jesuit high school; (2) as a trustee of three, and (3) as a president of my high school alma mater. I also, I believe, bring the perspective of a person from the university ranks. For sixteen years, I was chief academic officer either at Holy Cross College or Boston College where I oversaw admissions and I oversaw faculty hiring – those issues will come up in my comments. And, I'm now a teacher – I started teaching in 1968 economics at Holy Cross College, and now I'm back to teaching at least on a part time level. Finally, I bring the perspective of a trained economist.

Before I get to the questions that were in Joe's letter, I would like to just report briefly on a lunch I had with three other Jesuits the other day. Somebody mentioned the Kairos retreats which is so popular at Jesuit high schools and is now has become popular at some of our colleges and universities, saying that it was the Jesuit high school graduates who really were responsible for the fact the Boston College has the Kairos retreat. They were pushing for it and pushing for it. But, then people started talking about the characteristics of Jesuit high school graduates – you can tell who they are fairly quickly, certainly by the end of a course even if they don't mention it. And, these were the characteristics. First, they do have a good knowledge of their religious background. Secondly, they are committed to service. Third, they have a certain self-confidence – I think that comes with the fact that they had Jesuits in their high school years, and they are much more comfortable with them in the classroom. And, fourth, they have sense of community which students from other high schools do not seem to have – certainly, not the public high schools. If you ask people who is coming to your college, for example, Boston College, they know the other BC High students or the other St. Ignatius students who are coming to BC. And, if you ask them who from your high school is here, they know them, they can tell you who they are and where they are living in the residence halls.

Now, to one of the questions that Joe posed: the challenges for young adults in the year 2020. Let me begin in 1966, Daniel Patrick Moynahan, outgoing senator from New York published a book on the black family. It caused a furor, because he said that so many of the black youngsters were growing up with families headed by single mothers, and that this was hurting the development of the children. There was a discussion as to whether or not he could have put it a different way, but the general consensus was that there was a concern back in 1966 on the number of children born to a unwed mother among the African American community. In 1996, thirty years later, the number of white children born to an unwed mother was equal to what it had been among the African American community in 1966 – over 25%. So, whatever problems existed for the black families of 1966 are existing for the white families in 1996. The African American incidence of children born to unwed mothers was over 50% in the inner cities. For all groups it's about two thirds. In the United States, in 1996 the number of children born to an unwed mother was 36%. For the children whose families were on welfare, 66%. Obviously, I think this has meaning for society and it has meaning for high schools. The incidence of certain problems for children born and raised by a single parent is alarming relative to children born and raised with two parents. It is 4-8 times the incidence of drug addiction,

of crime, of high school drop out, of illiteracy, and for a young girl born to an unwed mother for herself becoming a teenage mother. Even when adjusted for income and ethnic background differences, the incidences were quite higher. What does this mean for young adults? Well, I think in the high schools we are dealing with a number of people whose parents have separated or are separated. But, you haven't been dealing with the numbers which are coming of children who really were not raised by more than one parent. I don't have the answer to what is the solution to these problems, but I think that it's a serious issue. It's a serious issue for society. One of the issues we discussed in the course I taught this past spring at Boston College, called Economics and Values, was whether or not there was an increase in equality of opportunity in the United States over the past thirty year. And, you could make strong arguments for an increase in opportunity – the increased opportunities for women, for people of color, the anti discrimination laws, the fact that the internationalization of the economy (businesses just can't discriminate the way they might have done before). But, one interesting belief or position developed in the class, and that is that while for the vast majority of the population, there is greater equality of opportunity and more opportunities (say for the top 80 to 85% of society), for the bottom 15-20%, there's perhaps less equality of opportunity. And, the case was stated as follows: Thirty or forty years ago a person growing up in great poverty at least had an opportunity for an adequate education in the public schools. A person, however, growing up in the inner cities today does not have that opportunity for a good education. Maybe he has the opportunity, maybe there is some opportunity. But, it is much more difficulty for a student to get a good education in the public schools, especially in the cities. I should just say in the cities. The urban public schools are in a very bad situation. This comes as no surprise. But, when you consider that the person 30-40 years ago could at least get a good education, then could go on to college. Secondly, the people who were growing up 30-40 ago were growing up in a two-parent family. And, today that is not the case, especially in the cities, and that's where most of our high schools are. So, that is a real problem for society. The students in my class were asked – we have inequality of income, and any economy has to have some inequality of income in order to make the economy efficient – why do we have inequality of income? Is the inequality of income that we have and to the extent that we have it based more on the fact that we have Ameritocracy or is based on what is called “family status” (it depends on what family you were born into)? And, the class actually split right down the middle. But, the people who said it was family status and not Ameritocracy, said that once you get to college, it's basically Ameritocracy and in applying to college it's whatever the criteria – how you did in high school, what your grades were, what your extracurricular activities were – and once you get out of college, you job will depend on a great extent to how you did, and then there are opportunities in business. But, what they were saying was, “how many students have the opportunities that we have to go to Boston College?” So, they themselves were raising the question as to whether or not we really have increased equality of opportunity, and to the extent that we don't have equality of opportunity, at least half of them believed that it was because of family status in the U.S.

What are the implications for our schools? I don't have much to say on that. I raised the issue as one who did deal with a lot of mothers who I call heroic – people who are trying to give their kids a good education, a good upbringing and trying to get their kids through BC High. I do believe that because of these problems, people in the high schools will have to give more one on one attention to students, and I speak as one who believes that the faculty and staff at BC High do do that, and I'm sure it's done a Jesuit high schools.

I'm going to mention later on that I really think that one of the things that high schools will have to consider is reducing the teaching load for a number of reasons, and this is one of them – the backgrounds of the students who will be coming to our high schools. We will need to reduce the standard class load from five to four. I say I don't have a heck of a lot to say about the ramifications of these developments are, because at BC High, we did not have a high number of students of color. We worked at it – we went from 4% in 1985 to about 11% in 1999. But, as I looked at the JSEA statistics, New England, especially, was among the lowest. I'm always impressed by St. Ignatius of Chicago or the California schools, and it might be worth looking at, as to how they are dealing with the types of problems I have mentioned. And, I also would give an aside. As one who I think was interested in increasing the number of students of color, I was particularly disappointed in the fact that we had very limited success in increasing the number of Hispanic students at BC High, because I believe the largest ethnic group in the Catholic Church in twenty or thirty years is going to be the Hispanics. And, as a school, BC High which is always taking the sons of Catholic immigrants – the Irish, the Italians, the Poles, the French – and really did an excellent job of educating them for leadership positions in society. I believe there is great potential there, but a potential that was not being reached.

Something about the future in the schools. And, because I'm an economist, I will have to talk about finances. I think there will be fewer private schools in the U.S. in twenty years. I don't think there will be fewer Jesuit schools. But, I think it will be harder for the Jesuit schools to continue to educate people of limited means. And, the reason I say that is this. By design, high schools do not have a significant productivity increase. In other words, the largest cost center is the faculty. And, by design, we have committed to not increasing the size of the faculty. And, therefore, you don't have a productivity increase. Productivity increases are very important in keeping down the costs and prices in business. For example, if businesses and private schools are increasing their costs by 4%, but business has a 2% increase in productivity, business can keep steady state by increasing its prices by 2% a year. The private schools, in order to keep steady state, has to increase its tuition by 4%. You do that disparity over 40 years, the cost of business or the economy as a whole has doubled. The cost of tuition has quadrupled. And, therefore, the share of people's income that is going to go to education, whether private or public, is going to double in 35 years. Whether or not people are willing to commit to that is a real question. I think the Jesuit schools will survive, but it will be more difficult to continue to expand the opportunities to people with limited means.

What are the solutions? Fundraising. Jesuit high schools do extremely well in fundraising...much better than the colleges as a percentage of their total income. At BC High, for example, in a non-capital campaign year we raised a higher percentage of our budget than Boston College does in a capital campaign. And, BC High was not among the top five or six Jesuit schools in fundraising. There is great potential there, and there is great loyalty among the alumni. And, we hope that perhaps some type of voucher system will come. I really do think that you have to go to four courses, because from Monday morning to Friday afternoon, the teacher is just overwhelmed teaching five 45 minutes sections, preparing classes, preparing exams, correcting papers, etc. to the extent that the schools can go to four course and it can be done rather economically, I think it is an essential.

Joe said JSEA is thirty years old, and thirty years ago the schools were not all in good shape. Now, you are in good shape. And, so the challenge now is really to preserve, I think in many ways – not exclusively. I was appointed president of BC High in 1987, and I went to my first JSEA meeting in Georgetown that summer...just finishing up at BC. I heard in those two or three days more about the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola from Jesuits and non-Jesuits than I did in my eighteen years of experience at Boston College and Holy Cross. I was tremendously impressed. So, I say, keep up what you're doing. And, I say this as one who was in charge of hiring at Holy Cross in the '70's. Like other Catholic schools, we wanted to show that we were as good as the secular universities and colleges throughout the country. And, we weren't concerned about hiring people who shared our values. In the '80's that changed, and in the '90's it accelerated. But, the fact of the matter is that a lot of damage was done in the sense that the faculties themselves have a lot to say about who is going to be hired. Not just do the teaching, but determine who their colleagues are. My experience at BC High is that people were there because it was a Jesuit school. That's important to be maintained. You have that strength. Your challenge will be not to lose it – don't take it for granted, because the colleges dropped the ball back in the '70's.

FUTURE OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS

Tom Lavin

As I struggle as a parent with young people, I think that the main challenge that is facing us is really trying to maintain a Catholic identity. We have the ethical challenges in the broader culture – I like to call it the MTV culture, the pabulum culture. Multiculturalism is a good thing, but it definitely has a side that is a challenge and to a certain extent dangerous, because if all values are equally good, then no values are important, and people need a sense of identity. They need to value what they bring to the dialogue, and that requires a certain amount of factual knowledge but also ownership of those values and that sense of identity. It was all pretty easy when people lived in ethnic neighborhoods and went to parish schools to have that sense of identity of the group that you belong to. To steal another phrase from Senator Moynahan, “in the melting pot it’s a lot harder to have a sense of identity.” Let’s face it, as Catholics we are really leaning into the wind of the popular culture in many ways. As I said before, the big epiphany I had with regard to making sure that we raised these issues of bioethics in our families and in our schools, issues of family balancing beliefs with tolerance. Pretty tough to deal with that with high school kids. I made the comment – I have five children and I would say, statistically, that two or three of my children will marry someone who is not a Catholic. Or maybe a lapsed Catholic or a Muslim or an atheist. What does that mean for my grandchildren? It comes down to the personal level. So, this sense of identity I think is the biggest challenge we have because we can teach Chemistry or Physics as well as a Horace Mann or Styvesant or Boston Latin, but that’s maybe half the mission. What’s distinctive about us is values and identity.

I think that some of the other dimensions of this is reconciling science with faith. I think, generally, we are headed for a period where science is king. People need to know that we may have finished the first draft of the human genome, but I think God finished the final version a long, long time ago. And, people need to understand that and the limits of science. You can’t start making them aware of these kinds of issues and problems too early. So, that absolutely is something that has to make its way into the curriculum. I will leave it to the educators. Maybe you can’t take a quarter of the class to deal with these issues in AP Biology class, but you can deal with them in Theology class, or you can have a day of reflection where you poll some of these disparate items in the curriculum together and maybe put a bright yellow line under them in a school assembly. Maybe it’s a great break after finals or in second semester of senior year when it’s hard to catch people’s attention about anything once they’ve gotten into college. I think that’s a challenge.

One of the things that impacts the Jesuit schools in maintaining Catholic identity, we need to figure out how we’re going to create and maintain and transition from a clergy-driven Church to a lay-driven Church. We would all be thrilled if the number of vocations tripled overnight, but I don’t think we can count on it. It’s a problem, but it’s also an opportunity. It might be worthwhile for the JSEA to focus a symposium on “passing the torch” (even though this has a sort of finality that I don’t like). We need to think about what happens with the next generation. It’s pretty easy for the people who grew up with lots of Jesuits and actually know what a scholastic is to maybe carry on some of the work in the near term. If you don’t have Jesuits on the faculties, you need people who went to Jesuit high schools and colleges to come in and join the faculty as lay

people. Colleges got away from that in the '80's to their detriment. I don't know if that can continue. It's hard to attract people into the teaching profession with what teachers are paid and the burden we put on them to solve problems of the greater society. I think that's a challenge that we need to get the next generation ready for – maintaining the institutions and organization of the Church. Institutions are the glue that keep people together and keep communities moving forward and ensure our progress.

We talked a lot about being lifelong learners, about being literate in technology, and about dealing with globalization. I book I'm reading is "Doing Well and Doing Good". That should be our advertising slogan for what we want to accomplish with our graduates. The doing well part of it is going to involve a certain amount of literacy with regard to technology and knowing how to learn. It is also going to need to make people aware of the broader world. I was very heartened to see that Fordham Prep is working on an exchange program now with a Jesuit school, Colegio San Ignacio Basque in Chili, and also a Jesuit school in Italy. The Jesuits went global in the 16th century, so it's been a global organization for many, many years, and I think that would be a terrific aspect of the Jesuit network of schools. My daughters went to Sacred Heart schools, and they really worked their network, which isn't nearly as powerful or extensive as the Jesuit network of schools, very well. Whether it's e-mailing girls at other Sacred Heart schools or exchange programs, it's a way to see a number of things – to make our children aware of the world we live in and how it's coming closer together as well as to understand what Catholic means in Catholic Church, because this is a very good story and should be emphasized.

I want to talk about multiculturalism. One of my good buddies from business school is a graduate of the Loyola school in India and his son is going there now. They came to visit a month ago. It's there, it's a resource. We ought to figure out how to mobilize it early, and let these young people know that they belong to something very special with a long history and tradition and a global reach. It will stand them in good stead and it will stand the institutions and organizations in very good stead.

In terms of implications....

I think we need to teach "metaskills". What we really want to teach is communications. You can't write well unless you're thinking well – unless you can muster an argument and reason from the general to the specific, to deduct, to puts facts together for an argument, to refute another argument. They need these skills, but they also need values. When I grew up, we always used to hear stories about the martyrs and defending the faith. We have to defend the faith now, except we do it at suburban cocktail parties when people denigrate values that we hold dear without even thinking about it. I think there is a lot of truth to the fact that the only bashing that is PC these days is Catholic bashing, whether it's articles about education in the New York Times or chatter at suburban cocktail parties. We need to give people the skills to carry an argument. We also need to give them the courage to carry an argument. Being a full-blooded Irishman from Brooklyn, I enjoy arguments. I'm not sure everyone enjoys them as much as I do, but people have to be willing to speak up, because that's where these issues are settled. You can't just believe in things, you have to get out front with it and advertise it.

We talked about exposing scientific issues in moral context. One of the best examples out of my own education...I took a course in business school on production and operations management, and it dealt a lot with factories and manufacturing processes and

when you have testing. And, the last class to sum everything up, we had a case on health exams. What's that got to do with production, we thought. Well, the questions was, "was it worth putting in a screen test for this disease or that disease – how many do you catch, how many people die?" And, production issues, quality control issues, and all the stuff you would use in an assembly line to make computers applied to people's health. And, it hit me like a baseball bat, because you never think and talk about the examples you use and applying them. I think we need to bring those types of issues to the forefront and personalize them in dealing with science.

The second question dealt with values, and I've now had six years on the Fordham Prep board and a parent for a total of six years at the Prep, and I try to be as involved as I can at Xavier and understand what's going on there. I think we're doing pretty well on the values side, but I think there are a couple of things we need to do with regard to ensuring the continuity of the Jesuit schools. I think from a financial perspective, if the Jesuit schools can survive another 15-20 years, they will be in good shape, because a sufficient number of the baby boomers will have passed away...I do think that if you look at annual giving, there is a real sense of indebtedness. The Jesuits have done their job well and their alumni have participated pretty well in the U.S. economy. People are working on endowments, and I really do believe that if we can get to a certain point, we'll be okay in that regard. As someone who pays all these tuitions, I have to tell you where I stand on the voucher issue. I think it's absolutely ridiculous, and it may be able to provide some near term relief, but...

The way this is going to have to work going forward is that the alumni of the Jesuit schools are going to have to pick up part of the load here and carry it with their checkbook, with their time, and with their children. I think that the seed for that can be planted a little bit more explicitly. I think more time could be devoted to the history of the Society, its commitment to education, working the global network, a sense of belonging in a larger sense...a centuries old global tradition of education. One of the problems is high schools today, particularly with young men (I don't see it quite as much with young women) is it is very hard, much harder than it was in my day, to create a culture of scholarship. The immigrant work ethic, the desire to get ahead isn't there, particularly among many of the students, particularly the students of middle class parents. Their heroes are rap stars and Puff Daddy, and it's very hard to value learning in that kind of a context. I think we need to find ways to create that culture of scholarship in the schools without it being a battle about haircuts, jackets and ties, etc. I think many of our boys who graduate are academically ready for college, but they're not ready from a personal maturity standpoint. I'd love to see the Jesuit volunteer corps create a program for high school graduates, maybe even between junior and senior year, where young men could take a year off and build houses in Guatemala or whatever type of service work might be appropriate. I think it would be great for their awareness. I think it would be great for their language skills and be great any way you could measure it. I think they need. I think boys today really seem to lack maturity, focus and purpose. And, this might be a way of helping them to get there. I also think we need to continue to try and create a context for young men to value their religious life. One of the things I think is terrific about our schools is that we have all these great role model, whether it be the Jesuits themselves, faculty members, parent-oriented liturgies where it's comfortable, it's normal, it's the right thing for men to be intimately involved with religion. That's not true generally in the society.

THE CULTURE OF JESUIT EDUCATION IN 20 YEARS

Tom Gannon, S.J.

What is the culture we're going to be dealing with in twenty years and the impacts on that culture of all sorts of other changes? We're talking about communications becoming faster and more immediate. We're talking about space and time, both expanding and shrinking, simultaneously. We're talking about increased mobility of a scope we haven't seen before...job changes, travel, and all the rest of it. The downside of this Joe Fahey talked a little bit about in terms of family structure...I don't see any evidence that we're going to see a decrease in single parents or a decrease in the divorce rate. In fact, the divorce rate is likely to go up given the stress of the advanced technological society and the mobility that we're facing, which means we'll have students with more problems (and serious problems). I was at a play not too long ago in Chicago at the Steppenwolf Theatre, written by a British playwright, Patrick Marber. The title is "Closer". Marber's subjects are two interchanging couples vainly and incessantly looking for love in the '90's in London. And, there's a line in this play that I think is rather striking. Their battle cry and their theme song is expressed by the oldest member of the quartet, a chap by the name of Larry whose a hulking, macho dermatologist who cries out while being teased in a strip club, "what do you have to do to get a bit of intimacy around here?" The line just struck me – the search for intimacy in a rapidly changing society. And, the line that comes later in the play, I think in the most clever scene – a ferociously off color mating game of make believe played on the Internet and then projected on the large screen on the stage- and the line is, "we live as we dream...alone." I think that's the world we're going to have – part of it, at least...the part we're going to be struggling with in light of the technological change. We're at the cusp of a revolution which perhaps will not be as, in my judgment, broad as the Industrial Revolution when you think of all the changes that came in, in terms of travel and communications, telephone, electronics. It's a revolution that builds on the past but is going to change our life, not only dramatically but very quickly. That is, after all, one of the problems with the third world countries, isn't it? That they have to adjust to the change with a speed that we didn't have to. We had a hundred years to adjust to the effects of the Industrial Revolution. Nobody has that time anymore. And, it's that pace of change which, seems to me, which is sort of dramatic.

So, our students are going to need communication skills and interpersonal relation skills. It seems to me that has to be added to the profile that we got in the questions. Discernment is going to be the key skill that young adults are going to need so that they don't isolate or burn out and can live with unbelievable stress in the face of all the technological stimuli. They'll need to have tools for decision making so that they can sort out the sources of information, judge the values of the larger society that are bombarding them. They have to know how to think. They have to realize the real world. It may not be MTV, but this is reality and the more reality they submerge themselves into the more human they become and the more adept they are at understanding themselves. The whole point of science literacy is to help people understand their own experiences and communicate. The whole goal of literature literacy, if you want, is to understand their own experiences. And, that real world has got to be appropriated if they're going to

deal with this world that we don't know what is going to be. We're talking about a world where we're educating the students of our present students. We're talking about a school which will probably have none of the faculty there who are there now. We're also talking about a school which very likely will have no Jesuits. I'll come back to that in a minute. You talk about 2020...that's what I see is the reality out there. We've got ten years to deal with that which is coming in twenty. I do believe firmly that discernment skills and the Ignatian Pedagogy have to continue to hallmark our schools – not the academic qualities which they can receive anywhere else. But, I think that discernment has got to be fleshed out and the pedagogy has got to be fleshed out more that it is if we're going to deal with this. It is no longer sufficient to talk about the Ignatian Pedagogy in terms of experience, reflection and action. That's not bad for openers. But, we've got to get further than that. Otherwise, we're going to be condemned to what I call in my own field, among social action people, social analysis by anecdote. People have to be able to deal with much more broad levels of information and understand on much more broad levels.

Secondly, you've got increasing diversity of the student body. I don't like the word multiculturalism at all. I dislike it almost as intensely as I dislike the term quality time. I'm too arrogant to think that any time that I give anybody is not quality time. And, I don't like multiculturalism, because it assumes a stasis in the culture. In other words, that the African Americans or the Hispanics or the Asians that we will meet at a future time will look like the Asians or the African Americans or the Hispanics we are encountering today. There's no indication that that will be the case. Certainly from the studies we've done in the Heartland Center about Hispanics in Indiana, they look a lot like Anglos. They don't look like Hispanics in L.A. They don't look like Hispanics in New York or Miami. But, 60% of them are intermarried with Anglos regardless of gender. Four fifths of them claim they are excellent at English. 85% of them are native born. 45-50% were born in Indiana. The mobility is increasing, and they're moving out of the ethnic neighborhoods – the Hispanic neighborhoods – into the suburbs. The educational level is slowly increasing. The income is increasing. The assimilation is increasing. And, you're going to have a Lady of Guadalupe novena in West Indiana where we have a lot of Hispanics, and you're going to have the kids there, so you're going to have to run two tracks – Spanish and English – because the teenagers don't want to come to a Spanish novena, and the older people don't want to come to an English novena. I'm just saying that the Hispanic young people twenty years from now are not going to look like many Hispanics do today. The Asians are not and the African Americans are not either, especially those that are upwardly mobile. We're not talking about Jesuit education for the underclass unless you're trying to run a school like in Detroit. We maybe should be doing that, but that's not what we're talking about. We're talking about middle class kids, and that African American middle class is going to look much different. That's why I don't like multiculturalism, because it kind of assumes that that culture is static. When you look at the Census Bureau projections, you can make a pretty good prediction, although we all know that any demographic change can be turned around in 9 months. So, population projections are risky, because they depend on the birth rate and fertility business. We know that, if these projections are correct, that by 2020 the 13-age population will increase by 7%. There's a little bit of an echo effect by the Baby Boomers. Hispanics by contrast will increase by 69% across the country...Asians by 72%. So that our student pool is going to be much more Hispanic and much more Asian. The African American population is not expected to increase that much, maybe 5% by 2020. And, there are also some indications from religious researchers that the Catholic

population is growing fastest compared to other denominations while higher Catholic fertility rates, especially in the western states will have an affect as well. That isn't much different than what's happening in the total population, but it does give us some idea of what that student pool is going to be in twenty years. The increasing participation of the work force is going to also continue to change the family structure, and the high divorce rate and the single-family situation is going to continue.

A third comment I want to make has to do with what John referred to as the relativism of poverty and the continuing growing income – what we have to call an income gulf, not just a gap. That is very likely going to continue unless we have something drastic happen to try to curtail that politically in this country, but it's much more difficult to curtail it internationally. This is going to put pressure on us, it seems to me, to sharpen the need for an awareness among our students of the suffering poor in our midst and in the midst of the world. All of this is going to deepen the need for people understanding the communal dimensions of their faith - the fact that we are born into a fabric of relationships, that our humanity ties us to others, that the prophets indicate that those ties will be the very test by which our holiness is judged. That's what we mean by solidarity, and the challenge to have that more deeply engrained in our students is critical. At the same time we need more research on that whole business of “what effect are these outreach programs having?” I haven't been able to find any type of systematic evaluation of them. I remember years ago that Joe Fickter tried to do this, and he didn't find any favorable trends in socialization in the schools because of these outreach programs. I think we need some research on that so we have a better idea of what's working and what isn't if we're going to plan for the future. While I think this whole area in theory and concept is wonderful, I think we need to know more of what's happening as a result of them.

I want to come back to Tom's point, because I think the biggest challenge facing us is on the religious, Catholic, and Jesuit side. It strikes me very interestingly that the questions under #3 are phrased in such a way that they don't convey to me, at least, that anybody's overly anxious about Jesuit identity. I'm not criticizing that...it's just an observation that the questions under #3 convey to me that the high schools feel pretty good about their identity after working so hard on it for the past two to three decades. Being a member of the board at Loyola Academy and being familiar with some of our other places, I think there is a lot to be proud of in what we've accomplished in the last two decades. I simply say that we've got a hell of a long way to go. And, to say anything less than that is not honest...at least not in terms of the challenges we're facing. In the larger culture, there's no indication to me that practical atheism will not continue to erode the culture's religious foundations – at least among the elite in the culture. The fundamentalist backlash is not going to win out, but the result of that is simply going mean at least an increase in agnosticism, if not practical atheism. In the Catholic Church, we're going to have a combination of shrinking clergy and rising Catholic numbers. That's the other side of this. Catholic population is going to continue to get bigger, and the clergy is going to continue to get lower. We're going to have a continued decentralization and laitization of our work in the society, and that's going to accelerate the need for competent lay leadership in the Church. The Jesuit high school has to face that issue about what it wants to do about preparing lay leadership in the Church, because the Catholic culture will not only continue to erode, in twenty years in will have disappeared. A sad but fatal facet of contemporary Catholicism is massive ignorance. I know some of the people from Jesuit education know their religion, but I'm talking about the Catholic

culture at large. Too many of our educated Catholics, including priests, lack a sense of Catholic tradition. They have no sense of the Catholic imagination – the incarnational and sacramental nature. I don't mean rule; I don't mean sexual ethics; I mean the fundamental imagination that holds us together, that keeps us coming back week after week – the Eucharist, the real presence, the whole ball of wax. We don't go back for sermons; we don't go back for music; we don't go back for circuses; we go back because there is something that holds us together, and we've got to understand what that is. We're losing that battle. The results are tangible. A generation of Catholic high school and university graduates know St. Augustine only as a born again Catholic who foisted on us a hellish doctrine of original sin and a pessimistic view of sex and marriage. Who sneer at the mention of Medieval as if the Middle Ages were darker than our own. Who could care less about a papal pronouncement much less peruse it. I've been a Jesuit 46 years; I've been a priest over 33 years, and over those years, to be perfectly honest, I've watched our rich, Catholic tradition pass slowly but surely into museums or, at best, into the hands of appreciative Protestant sisters and brothers. And, that's to my mind where we are now. I'm not encouraged by the next twenty years in this regard. It seems to me this is a tremendous challenge for our high schools, because all of this is going to hit at a time when we're not going to have any Jesuits there – at best, we may have a few. We have to decide what we want to do now to prepare for that future. I don't think we have a lot of time. I'd give more attention to resources I needed to give to faculty – not orientation but faculty formation in these values. Because the torch is going to be passed and it's going to be in their hands and there may be a few of us who are going to help to do that. But, it's going to be theirs. If we can't carry this identity forward, there's no reason for us to continue to exist. That's why the challenge that is in the JSEA Preamble about this is still very real.

My last very brief comment is that if the Provincials continue to go the way they have gone, then we can't look for any leadership from them – not on the national scene. They haven't begun to recognize in thirty years the conclusion that we drew in the 1970's in the Jesuit sociological assistancy that they are leaders of the Jesuit assistancy across the United States, and that the assistancy is one social reality. They have never realized or grasped that in thirty years, and I am not optimistic about the next twenty that we can actually see that the Jesuit high schools should be a national apostolate – that the Provinces can't handle it any more alone. This should be a national apostolate – nationally directed with some strategy behind it. Who is going to open the high school that we need to have opened in Atlanta? Who is going to open any other school that we need to have in the South where the Catholics are moving. The New Orleans Province? I'm sorry, they don't have the resources to do it. I mean if you're going to start thinking nationally as a Jesuit high school ministry, where do we need them? Well, we certainly need something in the South. Who is going to do that? That's a great challenge along with the identity question.

JESUIT EDUCATION

Joyce O'Brien

I thought it might be helpful to explain my background before coming to Prep (or Jesuit education) as a parent. I am the product of Catholic education. I am the mother of 3 boys who attended public schools through elementary and middle school. I was PTA President in a Montgomery Co. school district known for high academic standards and fairly aggressive parental input. I mention this to tell you that when we chose to move our Sons to a Catholic school, I arrived at a Jesuit high school pretty much as a blank slate. I knew the reputation to be a fine one, but I had no inside experience.

The ideals and goals of Jesuit education described in question #3 are obviously desirable, but I wonder if other fine schools wouldn't identify similar objectives. Who isn't for respect, intellectual challenges, etc.? While most people in this room have a clear idea of what Jesuit education is all about, I'm not sure that the consumer really knows exactly what it is. Many parents get warm and fuzzy when reminiscing about their experiences with a Jesuit high-school, but I suggest there needs to be a clearer commitment to just what it is that makes a Jesuit high-school unique from its competition, Catholic or secular. And this goal involves following through to make sure the institution delivers the goods.

I have had the good fortune to participate in a Kairos retreat. This was fabulous -- everything I had heard raved about was true. I saw the students, leaders, and faculty at their best in striving to connect with each other to a common goal. Each person was made to feel important, valued for his ups and downs, and part of a thriving community. This was special to me, and an example of the heights that can be accomplished. There was a spirit in that gathering that was unforgettable.

It seems to me that the greatest challenge is to ensure that those ideals professed to identify Jesuit education become the engines that drive daily performance. We need to look outside our community of Jesuit education to see how our schools compare with others. What are we doing that is better, the same, or worse than our academic peer group? I think it is easy to fall back on a comfort level with tradition, an assumption that Jesuit education is the best. I suggest keeping a keen eye on the universe beyond Jesuit resources.

In my case, coming from the world of public schools, I was aware of the strengths and weaknesses of another system. Often public schools are disparaged as valueless wastelands, but that's not really fair, I have witnessed tremendous dedication and respect for other in that system.

So--what were my observations upon entering the Jesuit world? Frankly, in our particular situation, the academics of the first two years were a step backward. (I am confident that has improved.) What did impress me greatly were the faculty - parent conferences. I felt most of the teachers had a good sense of the strengths and weaknesses of each student as well as a commitment to the mission of the school.

I continue to think the faculty's performance is a major determinant of a school's

accomplishments. So many of the teachers are committed and competent. However, I became dismayed at the staying power of those teachers I felt were incompetent. When I was named to the Academic Committee of the Board of Trustees, I arrived with an agenda of finding out why certain teachers survived. One of the answers given was that it was a “social justice” issue -- Mr. X had been there forever, where would he go, etc. I questioned how the balance of “social justice” for the student body was valued. I thought that the administration was not being accountable for the product it had promised the student.

As a parent, I represent the consumer side of Jesuit education, and I strongly advocate seeing issues from the point of view of a student with 4 years invested in a high school. It has been my observation that the time frame of identifying a problem area, working with, and then fixing it is simply too long. I don't think it is just for a student to be penalized while an incompetent teacher is being given remedial training. Too often I have been told that teacher X was being worked with, things looked better, etc. But, meanwhile, time is passing, classes are graduating. I think avoidance or delay in addressing a problem is very costly to a school's reputation.

I think it is crucial for the administration to be on top of the faculty. This can be difficult when some teachers have become institutions themselves, and may think they are above the law. I think professional development must be a non-stop effort, with the administration so keenly aware of all that is going on in the world of education that it is constantly expanding its frame of reference. It strikes me that stagnant teaching can only survive if the administration is not paying attention. The administration must be held accountable for ensuring a valid educational environment.

I served on the Academic Committee for 6 years. The first meetings I attended were relatively non-productive. I thought discussions were “soft” and often met with defensiveness. However, as my colleagues and I honed in on specific issues, our questions got tougher, and responses improved. This committee proved to be a vehicle for input by those of us who thought the academic program needed improvement, and we valued the openness of our Headmaster to our suggestions. I would recommend that each administration have some means of absorbing constructive input. No one wants parents to run the school, but I do believe the parent as consumer should be listened to -- there may be a valid point being made.

I think a possible danger in evaluating Jesuit education within its own universe is a certain “smugness.” There can be an assumed superiority. “If we've put our kids in a good Jesuit school, we've done our best.” I have found that the most “gung-ho” parents often are not that discerning. They accept the academics that are presented to them. They may be more passionate about coaching performance. Frankly, even on the Board of Trustees, I have seen financial wisdom, sports expertise, and a tremendous commitment to the school, but often a lack of knowledge of what is going on in the classroom. There is such a nod to the value of “tradition” that present performance may not be tightly evaluated. That same sense of tradition that provides wonderful community adhesion can also cloud discernment of current performance.

When I was Co-chair of the Parents Board, I was somewhat surprised by an insular attitude. For instance, during discussions concerning teen-age behavior problems there was an attitude that others were wrong, and “we” were right. Other schools were

considered the source of the “bad guys.” I found this attitude very naive. I have heard an anti-semitic remark from a fellow Trustee. I think we must work very hard to rid our community of insularity and self-satisfaction, for it becomes even more distasteful in our increasingly multi-cultural world.

Jesuit education is blessed with a strong and valuable tradition. But it is not a good substitute for critical self-examination. I think that the key to a strong future is not only to operate in an environment of Jesuit ideals, but to demand a daily accountability to them.

I would like to see the same accountability demanded of the students. I’d like to see a student project in some way what he hopes to accomplish during high school. Then, after a certain time has passed, he would state what he thinks he has achieved --beyond grades and athletic performances. I believe that a student has a responsibility to contribute to his educational environment. The tuition check opens the door, but the student must be an active part of his high school career, rather than a mere recipient of its benefits.

CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE OF JESUIT EDUCATION

Ron McKinney, S.J.

If the science of complexity has taught us anything, I think it's that the world is made up of interconnected elements. That means that learning has to be a process of making connections, of helping our students make connections. We give a lot of lip service to lifelong learning – that's what we should be about, teaching them not so much content but how to learn so that they can continue after they got out of our four years in high school and college. And, yet, I think that means that we've got to start learning how to be creative in helping them learn how to make connections. The key is that we have to get our students to be far more active and independent learners. I get the *crème da la crème* from a lot of our Jesuit high schools, but for the most part it's the passivity of our students. Trying to get them to take charge of their own learning...they're dependent upon their professors – too much so. I remember after doing a doctorate in Philosophy and then going on to four years of Theology. I don't think they liked me much, because I was one to want to do it myself, learn it my own way. But, they wanted me to fit into the system. I think that's a metaphor for the way we're responsible for the passivity of our students. We don't really want them to be able to do without us. We've got to really start training faculty that will encourage more active learning. If we can do that, then our students are going to be more what they're not now – leaders. If I'm looking for RA's for our freshman dorm that I can think about hiring the following year, and I go down the list of fifty kids, there might be two or three, if I'm lucky, that I would think, wow, they really stand out as leaders instead of just passive followers. I hope that's just characteristic of Scranton students, but I have the suspicion it's not. The president I'm going to be voting for in November, Martin Sheen...he said, very accurately (talking to his daughter's friends in the last episode of the *West Wing*), "your generation is noted for it's apathy and passivity." I think he's right on, but I think we're responsible for that. In what ways could we improve? I think one of the biggest things is interdisciplinary learning. The way our faculty are trained and evaluated is all in a departmentally based structure. If we can get interdisciplinary courses in the curriculum on the high school or college level, it's difficult because everyone is turf conscious. They want their courses. And, if you have interdisciplinary courses at all, it's a course in which this person from this discipline comes in and talks at them, and then this other professor comes in. The professors themselves are not doing the interdisciplinary type of integration in their own work that should be the model for our students. So, why should our students make connections between different classes? We never ask them, "what are you doing in Theology," "what are you doing in Science?," "what are you doing in math?" "Do you see the connection with what we're doing here in Philosophy?" That division is the fundamental problem we have. And, I don't see it changing radically. I mean you have biochemistry that the chemistry department runs. Then you have chemical biology that the biology department runs. And, you wonder what's the difference. The way we train people and the way we reward them...I remember being asked at a tenure hearing, "well, Ron this is very interesting – the stuff you've done – but you're writing about Eudora Welty, you're writing about this novelist in England, you're writing about entropy over here, you're writing about Theological stuff over here. Aren't you a bit of a dilatant? We have to finally reward people for doing interdisciplinary stuff. Until we do that, things aren't going to change. But, the structure has to change as well. I tried to

challenge my program once at my school...let's maybe throw everything out and do it from an interdisciplinary angle. Well, my God! My suggestion is that the one Jesuit skill or thing that we've lost that we ought to get back to is revival of Jesuit Casuistry. This is a skill our students in Jesuit high schools and colleges need. What is that exactly? Well, 1988 Albert Johnson and Steven Tuleman wrote a book called "The Abuse of Casuistry." It was about the decline, since the Jesuits got lambasted by Pascal for corrupting Machiavellian-wise, the world. What they said was, no...we've got to revive this because the current way of educating on values is by taking an abstract theory or principle and try to apply it in some absolute way. Rome was very good on their absolute principles, and they don't see that the problem is there can't be absolutes if you're going to attend to the circumstances and the differences of each particular situation. What casuistry does by the examination of cases is it says, we all have experiences of successful resolutions of issues – call them paradigms – but what we need to do in this situation is make an analogy between the proper paradigm that can give us some illumination. We're doing analogical, deductive axiomatic reasoning. We're trying to look at the similarities and differences of cases. That is what is going to make connections between people. For example, someone was doing some work on fetal tissue use, and trying to figure out the ethics involved. He said he thought it was like the just war paradigm. The point of casuistry is to make those connections so that we can see situations in entirely new ways. Some people accuse casuists of being dependent totally upon past precedents, like law – you're always looking at past cases to govern the present. I think we know that every time you take a look at a precedent to apply to a present case, you are changing the precedent and what it means in the process of application, just as you are changing the present in list of the past. I was surprised that George was working on reviving this long dead Spanish 17th century dramatist. And, I think he realized in doing it, though, that the production he made of Calderon, changed Calderon just as much as it changes us by trying to look at paradigms from the past. So, I think that casuistry is a way of linking the polarization that's going on in the Church today between conservatives and liberals. We need to look at the classics of the past and situations of the past to appeal to. But, we need to appropriate them in a very creative way that changes them as we are changed by the classic situations. An example of this for secondary education: when I was growing up as a young Jesuit, you had scholastics in the high schools – young guys that made a remarkable impact and difference. In the days of Ralph, they probably had twenty or thirty Jesuit scholastics at any one time. The impact that made because of their age, enthusiasm...perhaps they were inexperienced, but as teachers they made up for it in what they were doing. We don't have that, and we never will have that any more. What can we do to see that as a paradigm, and creatively recreate it in some way? I think St. Joe's Prep has alumni service corps. They go back to St. Joe's Prep after graduation from college to, in effect, be regents for a year or two – they teach and do all the moderating of activities that older folks don't have the energy for. They are the new scholastics – or can be. It seems to me that other schools around the assistancy should use that paradigm and appropriate it in a way that is particular to your school and your history and your situation. Don't try to imitate it slavishly but make creative adaptations. So, that's one way you can think casuistically. The problem with being a casuist, of course, is that if you're clever enough, you can probably justify anything you want, and that was the accusation. But, I think you have to remember that the Jesuits were casuists because they were working in the penitential or confessional, and they had all the scrupulous people coming to them with guilt-ridden things. And, the Jesuits were trying to get them to see that – in fact, our theory of probablism in casuistry was the roots of the reasonable doubt theory in the criminal law practice – if there's a

reasonable doubt as to whether you should really be fasting for an hour before communion, then maybe you should give yourself the benefit of the doubt and release yourself. There's a compassion there. Rome doesn't want to go that route, of course, because they're afraid if we're compassionate, if we practice casuistry, and start seeing new ways of looking at new obligations and start making nuanced views about "this is alright here but not alright there", we're going to lose all of our morality. And, I don't think it follows that way. And, that's why I think that if we can train our students to exercise that prudential judgment of knowing how to take the goodness of the past, then we can do something good.

We were talking last night about death and the experiences in our schools that death really enriched our students. When they had to face failure, it enriched our students – instead of just looking at success. I think what's going on here is that we have a tension between two ideals. One, we want to show our students how to affirm the world and the culture they're in...to look for the good. Not just if you go to another culture and see what's good there, but in your own culture; to value to and not to always put in down. On the other hand, we're also trying to train them to be counter-cultural – to be critical of that. I don't think we're succeeding in creating students on the college or secondary level that can do that creative tension – that both/and thing. Because, what end up happening is, we get people who come through our schools and they are either world affirming in the sense that they say, yeah I'm going to be a stock broker...they see the goodness of the American way and have an openness to it, but they have been co-opted by it. Although they give to their biggest charity, but they don't make any changes in the system. They've been bought over, and we have given them the skills to do that and to succeed well. On the other hand, those that actually listen to the other message of counter-culturalism...we've make them into cynics who no longer believe in politics, who no longer believe in the business world. And, instead of trying to get in and changing the business world or the world of politics, they say, no, I want to go into the non-profit section, or say "I want to be in business...this is too painful for me to have to do the reflection and criticism that I know I'll do, and I can't live this tension. This is sad when they want to opt out of the guilt they're feeling. I don't think many can feel that tension, to do that both/and approach to life, because we're not providing the models for them. In our teaching that we give them, we're either cynical liberals and can't understand why they don't trash all these Republicans or we are showing them that we are living the good life style and they want that too. We need to start living that tension better. It's not enough for us to provide experiences of success; our students have to learn how to fail. Education should be looked at as not only enchantment but also as disillusionment – a process where we are constantly teaching them that their dreams are only partially accurate and that they need to learn to give up on them progressively. But, we must be careful in this. If you rob them of the dreams too early on, if they lose that romance too early on, that's just as bad as not having any critical sense at all. To me, the casuistic mindset I'm arguing for is a mindset that's trying to live in the world of tradition and in the world of innovation and to constantly live in the center. If we can't create that of our student body, we're not doing our jobs.

THE IMPACT OF ST. IGNATIUS AND THE ARTS ON THE FUTURE OF JESUIT EDUCATION

George Drance, S.J.

I'm honored to be here and part of this group. It's very encouraging that you've asked for a perspective of someone who is in the arts. I just want to frame that by saying that artists have usually been used in the past for either comic relief or getting people really mad. I hope that I do a little bit of both. I don't know how much I will be able to do.

The first thing that I wanted to say about the question...I kind of react to words and that's what people in theatre do all the time – they find a word and they dig and they mine everything they can out of that word so that hopefully more than one facet will come out. Question #2 about, based on my area of knowledge, interest and expertise, what will be the greatest challenges or opportunities in the year 2020. I just feel absolutely inadequate to do that. In a sense, what I think we should be doing, or what an artist would say we should be doing, is not preparing for something that is foreseen and possible as one of the million outcomes, but to encourage a process to prepare the students for what is unforeseen. I think the arts as a practical discipline help a student to do that. When we talk about challenges, they seem to be quantitative rather than qualitative. I would hope that we in Jesuit schools would be more interested in giving a process rather than in filling up a bag of tricks which then could be opened up and either applied or not applied to any given situation. Now, that's not to say that we don't need that bag of tricks. We certainly do, and I think that that is very important for us in terms of the gospel message "being as clever as serpents." But, we also have to realize that we must not neglect being as innocent as doves. That is going to be a matter of process. In order to realize what's out there, to somehow meet it with training and preparation, we also have to be able to assess it and move toward compassion. All of this is a process of personal integration which has come through loud and clear in the students reactions. For us, we have the greatest gift in the *Spiritual Exercises*. The *Spiritual Exercises* are intensely practical, and I was struck by reading the student replies about different approaches...some of them were very thoughtful, very clear, very specific, and in other schools I just got the sense that they were repeating "buzz" words. In a certain way, it seemed as if we treated Ignatian education as if we were just preparing them for another test on which all of these "buzz" words would be included, and if you used the right words, then you got the right score. I would say that we have to delve into and embody the fact that the *Exercises* are very practical and experiential. Reading from the Principle and Foundation this morning in our prayer kind of as the starting point gets to the questions, "why are we on this earth?", "why did God make us?" and "what is our life for?" This is a starting point, and then going into the *Exercises* in one sense as a "how to" (practically) and in another sense as kind of an accompaniment (spiritually). Practically, some of the gems that are in the *Exercises*: #22: ...let it be presupposed that any Christian will more inclined to support a brother or sister's proposition than to attack it. And, if one finds that he/she cannot support it, to ask how they meant. Then, if they meant it badly, to do everything in your power to go about and bring them to a right way of doing that. That is, step by step, very, very practical. If we could not only embody that in our own lives, but teach that as a method, I think we'd all be in a lot better shape.

We've talked about decision-making and how students make decisions. The rules for discernment in the *Exercises* again are intensely practical. If they're coupled with an ongoing examination of conscience, students are allowed to build a process by which they not only assess what has been done, but they acquire an agility for making a decision in the moment, because they are used to doing that process in and out. Another gem – it took me ten years of being a Jesuit to realize that this was actually a practical thing – was the “Third Mode of Humility.” I always thought it was this great inspirational, Don Quixote, up there, yes, I'm going to take on all of the ills and I'm going to love it. But, what I realized was that the “Third Mode of Humility” didn't come out of some ideal that Ignatius was striving for. It came out of his own experience of failure. And, we're talking about failure a lot and how do we prepare students for failure. I think talking about the “Third Mode of Humility” is an excellent way of doing that. By saying that because we are Christian, because we are following Christ, Christ, who was crucified, we will fail in the eyes of the world. We will be failures in the eyes of the world. But, that's a wrong way of looking at things. I guess what the “Third Mode of Humility” has done for me is when I see that I am neglected, misunderstood; I don't think it's my fault anymore. And that's, I think, where young people today are trapped – if they fail, they think it's their fault, rather than possibly a process in a context. When I fail, I either make excuses for my failure, or I kind of totally discount the things that made me fail and throw them out of the window. However, what the “Third Mode of Humility” teaches us is that we recognize it and then we pass through it and we don't really have to let everyone know what's going on inside of us. We don't have to come out and scream and cry and “rage against the night.” What we do is we actually live within that and see the resurrection on the other side of it, see Christ silent throughout his own passion knowing that some way, some how God is going to make clear to us what is happening and what is redemptive in this suffering, what is happening and what is redemptive in this failure. What do we find in the *Exercises* that are accompanying emotionally? You have the “Contemplation on the Incarnation” in which a personal God has a discussion about how much God is in love with the human race and how much God is going to do for the human race. You have the “application of the senses” which theatre people love because that's what we do all the time, and a way in which we can put ourselves in a scene of Scripture in contemplation. Taking that and flipping it around, if I can put myself in a scene of Scripture and contemplate myself as active in there, then that trains me later on for watching myself in real life situations. In contemplating what is the narrative that is going on around me rather than being swept up in the panic of the moment... Brecht, as a theatre theoretician, talks about this as “du fremdem's effect”, which, I think the best translation of that is the “othering of the self” of watching myself as being intensely in something but watching myself as being “other” that what is going on at the same time. So the *Exercises* as a framework for these values and really seeing them not just as nice words but as really practical guidelines and intensely flexible.

Two very practical things about education based on my reflections as teacher are: If we can teach students how to think logically in an illogical world, we're preparing them for anything; and, if we can teach them to write effectively, we will teach them to think logically. I'm really amazed at how few colleges and universities have still kept the freshman requirement for a logic class. I, personally, as a freshman in college found very few classes as empowering as that particular class. I could listen to arguments, realize I was getting swept up in an argument, and then say, wait a minute, this is an illogical form that is appealing to my emotions rather than to my reason. In a sense what we have done

in trying to be affirming of the individuals is we affirm blanketly without giving the tools to discriminate. In our desire to be non-judgmental, we have robbed ourselves of the capacity of making judgments, which is something we need to do. We really need to be discriminating – but then not let my judgment be the final word, but to allow new input consistently. A practical thing for us as Catholic educators – very often religious education has become really kind of warm and fuzzy and nothing more than sitting around in a circle and saying how we feel about things. A lot of times adolescents have no idea how they feel about things, so they simply repeat what other adolescents say and sound good and sort of perpetuate something. Now, that being a context of “this is religious experience”, when I get into the world where Time magazine and cable television have blown the lid off of historical critical method, but have done it in a way that attacks the faith rather goes toward understanding. A student will then feel, “this is what they’ve been keeping from me, and here is the truth that those people have been trying to deny.” Whereas, if we can acknowledge historical critical method and say that if we stick with it...and the last shock to my faith has happened, then I will go through that and continually find what is essential to my faith. That’s what I think we need to do as educators is continually affirm the fact of seeing a process all the way through to the end and not abandoning it mid-stream.

Here’s my plea now. I don’t know how many of you in your schools have arts education or arts curriculum. I think it’s really essential for several things - in terms of imagination and inspiration in particular. We talk about the need for creative thinkers, but we distance ourselves from the arts, which are a means of forming imagination. We say all students have imaginations; they just have to use it. Well, how have those imaginations been formed? They’ve been formed by video games, by movies, by fashion, by MTV, by forces that are out there. What arts and what the classics can do is they can provide other forces which are equally as compelling, equally tangible and equally practical. It’s away of using the Ignatian principle of *adjure contra*, of going against something, of realizing that there are these forces around here that are trying to usurp my imagination, that are trying to make me a good consumer, and how do I go with that or go against it once I realize what’s out there. Given the experience of people who have done that before in the arts – they have grappled with questions not only in the stories that they tell in their art but also in the process of making art. I’d just like to give you a little bit of weirdness about what we’ve done at Columbia. One of the things we do is called sazuki training, and that’s not, kind of like “violin by ear training” – what it is is a movement system based on the work of a Japanese theatre director, Tadashi Sazuki. It’s a movement training system which is aimed at putting the actor’s body in crisis. So, a concrete example of that: they play this music that lasts 3 minutes and say that your pelvis must remain at the exact same height off the floor while you’re stomping in rhythm with the music bringing your knees as high as possible, hiding the fact that your breathing is going ten million miles an hour, and then at the very last point of the music after having stomped around the floor with all your force into the ground, then collapse on the floor on the last note of music and then take the whole next 3 minutes to stand and walk to the edge of the stage arriving at the end perfectly at the end of the music while hiding the fact that you’re going like (huff, puff, huff, puff). It’s to put the body in crisis. It’s a visceral experience, a real tangible experience of seeing what a crisis is. Crisis from the Greek, meaning judgment. We sometimes look at crisis and say that it’s something that, oh my God...I’m in crisis. Well, that’s being a victim of crisis rather than seeing crisis as an occasion and moving to meet crisis with intentionality – which is what the arts teach us to do – to look at a crisis situation, to assess the crisis for what it is, and to then be

intentional, using the imagination to form an option in which we are not victims of the crisis but in which we are agents of reforming, of reshaping. The arts need to be given the same kind of respect as our other disciplines. Joyce talked about the need for ongoing professional development. How many people in our schools who run theatre programs have ever had theatre training? How many people who do the musicals really understand what an actor's preparation is and the potential that it can unlock in an individual? How willing are we to sink more money into that kind of development for the arts in a culture that sees the arts as inconsequential? It's a very different context than the European context, the context in which Jesuit schools gave us people like Calderon, like Kornet, like Molliere – these are all products of Jesuit education, and they were able to form the culture of their time. The arts also provide a place for integration, because within the process of doing art we call upon everything else; we call upon history, we call upon psychology, we call upon mathematics for building sets, we call upon all of our other disciplines.

I want to close with a letter from John Cocteau to Jacques Maritan.

“In my school, I shall teach how to fabricate poems and for the rest, I will let God take care of it. I shall teach that art is religious, and I shall reveal the danger of religious art. I shall communicate the strength of little things and the disgust for pomp, which is a mirage the devils use to make us lose contact through the centuries with the human weakness of Jesus and the detail of his fortunes. For just as we remember a childhood pond and shrub as a lake and a tree; in the same manner, seen from a distance, we magnify the low cross and the mound of Golgotha – an intrusion that excites the mind at the expense of the truth which touches the heart. I shall pass on the taste for exactitude which is poetry, the sense of volume and matter to which the public remains insensible, flattered as it is by only silhouettes and wild doblings. I shall counsel students to act in a way that their deeds be approved by God even if they remain incomprehensible, that is to say criminal, at the tribunal of humans.”

GREATEST CHALLENGES

James Gardiner, S.A.

Thank you for the invitation to participate, and thank you for your continuing service to both church and society. We are indebted to you and your colleagues in Jesuit secondary education.

Last Thursday's "Circuits" section of *The New York Times* had two front page back-to-school articles that illustrated for me just how much learning is changing: "For the back-to-school set," one headline read, "electric gadgets abound. Some of them can even be used for learning." According to the article, a survey of 1200 students revealed that, from fall 1997 through spring 2000, the amount of time that college students spent on the internet rose from just under six hours on line per week to 8.1 hours; and many students admitted spending less time reading and more time handling e-mail and web surfing.

In another article, "Choosing Quick Hits Over the Card Catalog," the writer noted that "Many students prefer the chaos of the web to the drudgery of the library, but educators warn that study habits are suffering."

One of the greatest challenges facing society in general and education in particular, it seems to me, is recognizing technology for what it is and can be and integrating it into the larger picture of human destiny.

Two anecdotes, I hope, will illustrate the point I'm trying to make and help me segue into a second point:

Several years ago the American Bible Society unveiled large-as-life biblical exhibits at their Broadway headquarters. Part of the exhibits was devoted to touch-screen technology that enabled visitors to delve deeper into one or another of the biblical episodes depicted. Following the on-screen prompts for several minutes, I got interested in a rather lengthy page of text. Suddenly I became aware of a young boy watching me. Just as I noticed him, I heard him say: "Need help, mister?" "No," I said, "I'm reading." and, for obvious reasons, I stifled the rest of what came to mind.

Several weeks ago I was keeping a follow-up appointment with an orthopedist. He was very cordial when he entered the room. He put my Xrays up, examined them carefully, sat down, opened my file, looked at me a couple of times, and then stared straight ahead for what seemed to me to be minutes. I couldn't stand it any longer, so I said to him: "Excuse me, what are you doing?" "I'm thinking," came his response. And, if he were thinking about my situation, which I have no doubt that he was, it was obviously to my benefit.

The question that occurs to me is: Is the incredible speed with which current technology

is enabling us to access information beginning to encroach on our willingness to invest time in reading and reflection? Reading and reflection have served the human enterprise well down to the present time. I'm concerned that we continually appraise technology for what it is and can be and make whatever effort is needed to integrate it into the larger picture of human destiny.

The second point I'd like to make has to do with the value that's been assigned to immediacy. In my mind, it's disproportionate and it needs to be challenged on two fronts: immediacy as it pertains to speed, and immediacy as it pertains to intermediaries.

To say that we're becoming impatient is an understatement. More and more, whatever it is, if we want it, we want it now. Period.

And intermediaries, once revered, are more and more coming to be viewed as obstacles. Earlier this year I was listening to my sister, who is a nurse practitioner, and my niece, who is a medical doctor, swap war stories about would-be patients who, with the help of the internet, self-diagnose and then demand certain prescriptions for particular medications or referrals for certain procedures. Attractive as self-diagnosis may be from the patient's perspective, some situations (as *The New York Times* pointed out earlier this week) can require the expertise of as many as six or seven specialists!

Immediacy in both senses has its place, but it can't be the ultimate goal. Reading may be slipping on the charts, but it still has the opportunity to open up new avenues. Thinking, as in the case of the orthopedist or any medical professional, is obviously in the patient's self-interest. Immediacy, blindly subscribed to, thwarts the value of reflection, undermines the possibility of contemplation and eliminates the time-honored need for mentors, role models and teachers.

The third thing that occurs to me has to do with overcoming our remaining inhibitions that either prompt us to go it alone or prevent us from being sufficiently aggressive especially when it comes to sharing our faith. I'm convinced, and I know I'm not alone in that conviction, especially here, that religion in general and Catholicism in particular and, within that, the traditions ascribed to Ignatius (among others) have not just *something*, but a *lot* to offer to the progress of peoples.

There are certain things that we as Roman Catholics and you as Jesuit educators bring to every table. And chief among these is the notion of community. To be sure, there are times to "go it alone" as, for instance, when principle requires it (I think of the tradition of the martyrs) or when conviction requires it (I think of our forbears in the faith who stood out --and, obviously, apart from the rest of society -- by the way that they loved one another).

But, for the most part, our "take" and our contribution is that authentic human existence

is a group enterprise going as far back as when God called a people to be “my own” and, even before that, when God created Eve so that Adam wouldn’t be left alone. That’s a basic insight that we bring to everything, one that’s be further developed in the Lund Principle (never to do alone what can be done together). And we either believe that or we don’t.

If we believe this, however, we’ll become more aggressive in ways that will not only rahabilitate that word, but will also steer us toward new agendas and new relationships.

IMPOSSIBLE TO PREDICT

Patricia Wittberg, S.C.

It's really impossible to predict what is going to happen twenty years in the future. The most that any of us can do is to describe trends or conditions that we see today happening, that are showing no signs of changing so far – widening gap between the rich and the poor, or whatever it might be. If you make a straight-line projection with these trends that we currently see, then this is where we're going to end up. But, there's always the possibility that some totally new thing is going to happen. If someone had – and someone did – projected the amount of copper that would be used in wires for telephone and television, and nobody dreamt of fiber optics until we were going to run out of copper by the year 1985, well we didn't... Whole things, like the Internet, nobody foresaw ahead of time. AIDS from a more negative point of view, no one foresaw that there was going to be this major inevitably fatal thing that's going to happen. Also, charismatic leaders... nobody dreamt up say, St. Francis before he showed up, or Adolf Hitler probably either. Weird things can happen that could just totally disrupt your straight line projection and you have to be aware of that. Given that, I don't feel like predicting the future too much and I also have never taught in or gone to a Jesuit school or university, so I feel I bit inhibited by telling Jesuit universities or Jesuit high schools what they should do.

I did want to spend the time talking about how these present conditions and future trends play themselves out in the lives of individuals. Both the passivist and activist aspect of what you do with where you are, especially in the lives of individuals who are in late adolescence, because those are the ones that usually crop up in a Jesuit high school. There was a famous sociologist by the name of Carl Mannheim who wrote an essay entitled, "The Problem of Generations", which I would commend to your reading. I believe it's in a book of his larger essays on the sociology of knowledge. If you can't find that or you don't want to wade through it a guy by the name of Douglas Walrath has written a popularization of it. What Mannheim says is that children initially inherit the worldview or outlook of their parents. And, they adopt this relatively uncritically when they are children. Such that, for example, this fall that a whole bunch of six grade and seventh grade classrooms will have mock elections between Bush and Gore. And, what this is going to tell their teachers is not what those kids think; it's going to tell them what their parents think. You will be able to tell the way that their parents are going to vote by asking six graders, assuming that they are living with their parents, of course. Children adopt their parents' views on a lot of stuff. But, Mannheim says that by the age eighteen or so, give or take a couple of years in either direction, people get sufficiently intellectually mature that they begin to take their own viewpoints on things. Mannheim doesn't say this, but I remember when I read his essay, I thought, oh, it's like another Piaget stage – you know, the various stages that Piaget says that small children go through... well, Mannheim is saying at age eighteen we go through another one. And, at that time, he says, these young people have a clear vision of the defects or the out of date aspects of what they've inherited from their parents. They're not invested in what their parents say... they didn't choose that. So, they feel free to change aspects of it, revolt against it, do something else. There's certainly a bit of, although Mannheim didn't say it, *I don't want to do what my parents did, so I've got to think of something different to do.* Then Mannheim says that once you have adopted your own world-view (at 18, 19, or 20) you freeze, because you invested in that position that you took on any one of a number of

wide issues. So that twenty or thirty years later, you're kids are seeing the out-of-datedness, the defects of the positions that you took. So the cycle repeats, and we alternate between liberal and conservative moments in politics, romantic and realistic moments in literature, or whatever the case might be as these generations succeed each other and react against what it was they inherited. There is a multiplicity of these growing up in the 19___'s as a Chicano in the southwest is different than growing up as an upper middle class Orthodox Jewish teenager in the Northeast, which is also different from growing up as an African American in the South...so you have a multiplicity of these things, but in all cases, the children inherit a world-view from their parents on a whole wide set of issues. When they hit late adolescence they adopt it or change it as their own. How does it work out? Using myself as an example...I was born in 1947, part of the infamous Baby Boom, which means that my childhood occurred in the 1950's at a time of unparalleled prosperity, very conscious of the fact that we had more stuff (we actually could have fads like Davy Crockett coonskin hats and Hula Hoops and whatnot – TV, we were the first TV generation). Our fathers fought in World War II, our mothers worked in the factories or whatever for the boys overseas. Consequently they were very patriotic. So, we learned that America was the best country in the world. I remember my grade school geography books always had the U.S. and its allies in the color green, the Soviet Union and its allies were colored red, and that has all sorts of subliminal messages – red and green; safety and danger. And, all of those countries, like India and Indonesia and those kinds of places were colored pink. So, we knew what side they were really on. The threat of nuclear war was there. I remember nuclear war drills – hiding under desks – and even at the age of seven, wondering if this desk would really protect me if the Russians dropped an atom bomb on the Ford plant a mile away. Somehow, even at the age of seven or eight, I didn't really think that this was going to do much good. I grew up in a Catholic ghetto and didn't really know anyone who wasn't Catholic. This is, of course, Cincinnati, Ohio, so I didn't know anyone who wasn't German Catholic. All of our textbooks (we had David and Ann instead of Dick and Jane)...there would be stories of David learning how to serve Mass, so our readers were Catholic, our history books were Catholic. I still remember the fifth grade history book when we got to the chapter starting at the 1500's in Europe; they had these two little side-by-side line drawings. One was Europe in 1450 or 1480, and it's all these happy peasants walking along the road in prosperous fields and little roadside shrines that they are praying devotedly to, and there's a nice Gothic cathedral in the distance. And, on the other side is the world in 1550, and the fields have been blasted away and the roadside shrine and the Gothic cathedral are in ruins, and everyone is walking around in tatters, totally depressed that the Protestant revolt had happened. So, I grew up in the Catholic ghetto; we went to Mass every day; we had the Baltimore catechism. And, then in the 1960's, of course, the 1960's happened. Our Mannheim period, our eighteen and nineteen year old period, had Civil Rights, Vietnam, the "pill", and also growing up relatively prosperous. My generation was not terribly concerned, and it was fashionable to sneer at material things. Because, you could afford to sneer at them when you've known nothing but prosperity, and we made fun of our parents for their Depression Era preoccupation with security. Vatican II also occurred. That's what shaped us, and that's what was happening when we took our stance against what we had inherited. Fast forwarding to kids who were born in 1967 is the leading age of Generation X, who, by the way, hate to be called that. But, who would have passed their childhood in the 1970's in a time of economic stagnation, gas lines, family break ups, etc. As a child I had a single friend from a "broken home." By the 1970's, that was relatively common. Environmental decay was occurring. The environmental movement hit around 1969 or 70, and among people my age, this was the

new trendy thing, so we had a lot of movies and records, nor realizing what this was doing to the children, who were being told in a way that I was being told, cowering under my desk, that by the time they grew up, there would be no air left to breathe, no water left to drink. It was a time of Catholic disarray. The Baltimore catechism had been thrown into the nearest trashcan, but pedagogically viable alternatives had not yet been created. I remember one young man telling me quite vehemently that his single memory of 12 years of Catholic grade school and high school religion classes was making collages. And, so it's probably no accident that the guy has joined Franciscan Friars of the Renewal. The Catholic ghetto was long gone. I'm honestly not sure which was the more formative impact on me – memorizing those Baltimore Catechism questions or growing up in a Catholic ghetto. Everything else - the May crownings, the daily Masses, the influence of Catholicism through every subject, the censoring of our watching of movies and TV – didn't have as much impact as the insularity of Catholicism. But, by the 1970's all of this was gone for the childhoods of the Generation Xers. They had adolescence in the 1980's in the middle of a recession, in the middle of technological failure – Three Mile Island, the Challenger disaster. The Challenger disaster and the JFK assassination are what are called “sticky” events. They are actually a political psychology. Little children do not normally remember national events below the ages of nine or ten. The exceptions to that are the Kennedy assassination – people who were children as young as three remember the Kennedy assassination – and little children remember the Challenger explosion. The Challenger explosion was a “sticky” event...it stuck in little children's minds. Your Generation Xers would have been teenagers at the time; a very strong suspicion of technology...it fails a lot. Iran beating up on us and the U.S. failing on the global scene. Watergate...the President is a crook. The stereotype of Generation Xers is being rather depressive, passive people. You might be able to understand that if you look at the kind of situation they grew up in, which is rather depressive, and the kind of ghastly things that were happening when they hit adolescence which were not very pleasant either.

I also should not at this point that these generations slide into each other. In theory, Baby Boomers is anyone born between 1946 and 1961-4. I would submit to you that someone born in 1961 and someone born in 1946 – it's a real stretch to call them Baby Boomers and assume that they're going to have the same outlook on life. Similarly, calling someone born in 1967 a Generation Xer might be pushing it on one end. And, maybe someone born in 1964 and someone born in 1967, although nominally members of two different named generations, are closer in outlook; these things slides into one another. Generation X is now fading into adulthood. We're coming up with a new generation, born in the late 1980's or early 1990's. I've seen them called Generation Y or the millennial generation. They haven't hit the high schools yet, but they will soon. And, when they hit, you're going to have to deal with them. I can't predict what kinds of things are going to happen in their adolescence, because their adolescence hasn't happened yet. A lot of it is going to depend on who gets elected this fall and what kind of a president they turn out to be. If there's a major recession, if there's a war, if the terrorists get through and unleash something ghastly on Manhattan subways or somewhere else, it's going to affect this. We don't know what kind of situation is going to be around when they're eighteen, but it will affect them. And, another thing that's going to affect them is the environment that they've grown up in now, and that piece, we already know. They've grown up in a time of unparalleled prosperity; they don't remember a time when the economy was bad. They're the first Internet generation, and we have not yet begun to probe what it's like to have grown up with the Internet. Family break up is as bad or worse than what the Generation Xers experienced. On the religious

level, their parents are post-Vatican II Catholics, whereas the Generation Xers at least had parents who remembered the Baltimore Catechism and whom, if you pushed them, they could recite the seven deadly sins or whatever else. For the millennial generation, their parents haven't really experienced the Catholicism that knew what it was about. That will be important. I don't know how yet, but it will be important. They are further and further removed from knowing what Catholicism is.

I went through, just briefly, this thing and made a tally, because what these kids are seeing (these kids are not millennials yet) are what their little brothers and sisters are experiencing unreflexively. The most common thing the cited was technology as an aspect of their world that was affecting them, and it's moving so fast...to keep up with it. Many of them mentioned competition and the pressure of competition and never being able to stop for a minute...competition driven by greed, competition driven by technology...the pressure of this. And, they mention globalization...globalization of communications or globalization of the economy (dividing into rich and poor nations). It's one thing to grow up with your childhood in the 1980's and early 1990's and hit this kind of stuff as a teenager and make a stance to it, but it's going to be another thing to be ten years old right now and see this. I don't know what to tell you about it, because it hasn't happened yet. There are a couple of things that I would encourage you to do. One, is listen to them. Read stuff like this. It always used to bug me as a child when I was in high school learning history that we would study history time and time again and we'd get up to about World War I and it would be the end of the semester and we'd stop. My teachers assumed that I remembered the second World War, because they remembered the second World War. And, I wanted to raise my hand and say, excuse me, I was born in 1947 and it was biologically impossible for me to remember the second World War. The current crop of fourteen year olds who will be hitting your schools this fall were born in 1987. They don't remember Ronald Reagan, they don't even remember George Bush. The only president they ever remember is Clinton. My sister's got a kid who will be twelve this coming month. She went bopping through the room last year when she was ten (going on eleven) in a T-shirt, and I took a look at her and thought, oh my God. So, I said to my sister, hmmm...am I noticing things that pretty soon she's going to need certain undergarments that she isn't currently wearing. And, my sister said, oh yea, we had to have "the talk". So, they had "the talk", and at the end of "the talk" my sister said, is there anything else you'd like to know about this. And, the kid said, yea, what's this oral sex that Clinton's been doing? Listen to these kids and realize what they have and haven't experienced. Try focus groups. If you can possibly get funding for these surveys, keep doing them and expand them. And, periodically, sit down and try to figure out exactly who are these children and where are they so that you can reach them.

The Risks We May Need to Take, The Messes We May Need to Make

John McDargh

When I arrived at St. Mary's yesterday evening Donna (Andrade) graciously gave me a tour of some of the work you had already accomplished and recorded on the many sheets of poster paper that covered a wall of your seminar room. I was particularly impressed at the wisdom you had to begin this project by brainstorming a *visual* image or *metaphor* of what you imagined to be the process of Jesuit education. Our greatest historical spiritual teachers, not least Jesus, understood what philosophers and cognitive psychologists have come to late, that all genuine insight is cast in the form of metaphor. Furthermore, when we take those metaphors and organize them in ways that move that insight forward we most skillfully do it in the form of narrative or story. This is of course why your colleagues like Ralph (Metts) and Joe (O'Connell) make their yearly pilgrimage to Tennessee for the national convention of story tellers - to find sacred insight in the making.

Honoring your own good intuitions then, I would like to preface my remarks by sharing a poem. It is actually my practice to begin every class I teach by reading a poem, and the one I have here is the one I will use in only three weeks to launch another fall semester at Boston College. It is by one of my favorite poets from one favorite towns, a Pulitzer prize winning native of Provincetown at the tip of Cape Cod, Mary Oliver. It is entitled "The Summer Day".

Who made the world?
Who made the swan, and the black bear?
Who made the grasshopper?
This grasshopper, I mean -
the one who has flung herself out of the grass,
the one who is eating sugar out of my hand,
who is moving her jaws back and forth instead of up and down -
who is gazing around with her enormous and complicated eyes.
Now she lifts her pale forearms and thoroughly washes her face.
Now she snaps her wings open, and floats away.
I don't know exactly what a prayer is.
I do know how to pay attention, how to fall down
into the grass, how to kneel down in the grass,
how to be idle and blessed, how to stroll through the fields,
which is what I have been doing all day.
Tell me, what else should I have done?
Doesn't everything die at last, and too soon?
Tell me, what is it you plan to do
with your one wild and precious life?

Those of us who have been tutored in prayer by St. Ignatius will of course want to argue with Mary that whatever she may think, she does in fact already know a great deal about the matter of prayer. It was the genius of Ignatius to teach us that all prayer begins as a practice of attention, and not attention to some abstracted, unearthly "spiritual" reality, but attention to the concrete particularity of what presents itself to our senses. Not "grasshopper" in some ideal form, but "*this grasshopper I mean/ the one who is eating sugar out of my hand*". It was perhaps for this reason that Jesuit poet Gerard Manley Hopkins found so congenial Duns Scotus' notion of the *haecceitas*, the "Thisness" of reality as it gives itself to us in all its distinctive, irreducible intricacy and variation. Moreover that mode of attention finds its spiritual depth when it operates consciously within an acute and compassionate awareness of our own shared mortality and creatureliness, "*doesn't everything die at last and too soon*".

Mary Oliver’s poem reminds us of is that one of the things we might help our students do with their “one wild and precious life” is to become contemplatives. Here we may find helpful the words of Fr. Howard Gray and his co-authors in the newly published booklet, “*What Are We: An Introduction to Boston College and Its Jesuit Tradition*”. They urge us to view our distinctively Christian, Catholic and Ignatian task as helping our students (and ourselves) to cultivate “contemplative efficiency”.. “the habit of stepping aside to assess, to appreciate the details, and then to revisit the totality of a reality.” It took a cannonball to stop Ignatius long enough from his headlong pursuit of worldly success to begin that process of formation as a contemplative in action. Sometimes I think it would take as much to stop our hyper-active, over-scheduled and relentlessly busy undergraduates ... or their professors for that matter.

But that is another topic.

What this poem also introduces is the contribution I have been invited here to offer to your reflection.. As Fr. O’Connell mentioned in his introduction, I bring an analysis organized by my own professional engagement with two different frames of analysis: the psychological and the theological. At their best, the “tools to think with” (Erikson) that have been crafted by developmental depth psychologists do not function as neat boxes by which to sort out and label human beings, pressing out both human individuality and transcendence. When they work well psychological models of human development help us to see some of the particularity of our students that we might miss or overlook by too easily assimilating their subjective reality to our developmental position in the human life cycle. Moreover, I would hold that when we conduct this analysis with appropriate reverence and modesty, it is itself a mode of contemplation.

Thinking Developmentally

One of those memorable observations we owe to the great psychologist of young adulthood, Erik Erikson, is his assertion that all human beings over the course of their life are challenged to find “personally meaningful and publicly validated” answers to three questions:

- How am I like no other persons?
- How am I like some other persons?
- How am I like no other persons?

We might also think about how those three questions over a life time have to be worked out with respect to three distinct but related “developmental lines” of identity: 1) ethnic/ cultural identity; 2) sexual/ gender identity; and 3) religious/spiritual identity. If we were to organize these three questions and these three domains of self-identity on a grid we might be able to chart in a potentially illuminating fashion how a given individual constructs his or her sense of connection and disconnection with other proximate human beings, with local and national culture and with “the ultimate environment” (James Fowler, *Stages of Faith*). But we have to be immediately aware that such a grid must also be imagined as having a temporal dimension, It is three dimensional if you will. Those answers are provisional and mutable over a life time. Furthermore, the available intellectual or metaphorical resources for an answer also change over time.

	Ethnic/ Cultural Identity	Sexual/Gender Identity	Religious/Spiritual Identity
How am I like no other persons?			
How am I like some other persons?			
How am I like all other persons?			

To illustrate this latter point we need only to recall how our students might have filled in such a grid in the now disappeared religiously homogeneous pre-Vatican II world that Pat Wittberg evoked in her insightful presentation. In that world Roman Catholic educators felt pretty certain how they wanted their students to identify with regard to the “some others” - those were “us” (i.e. Catholics) and we were very clear who was excluded and why. How we might find our similarity with “all others” was also fairly easily determined. The rational deduction of universal human characteristics from certain first principles definitively answered our questions as to what it meant to be human, and even more explicitly what it meant to be male and female.

What the Second Vatican Council and the unraveling of some perceived Catholic consensus (always more imagined than actual) did to the “some others” category, post-modernism did to our presumption that we could rather simply answer the question how we are like “all others”. The most radically deconstructive position simply abandons hope that we can ever make categorical and universal claims about a shared humanity. The compelling recognition of the inescapable shaping power of class, gender, race and culture on all knowledge seems, for many, to preclude the possibility of generalizations about “human nature” or how we are like “all other persons.” Where that line on our grid was filled in confidently at any earlier time, now it is often left blank. Now I happen not to hold that position, but it is the good labor of such Jesuit or Jesuit trained philosophers as Ron McKinney here today, or Walter Conn at Villanova, or my colleague Jim Bernauer at Boston College to demonstrate that in our own time we can only win our way to understanding what is univocally shared among human beings by passing through an honest recognition of our radical particularity and very real differences. More on that in just a little bit.

What I want to do now with this “tool to think with” is to use it to make three related sets of observations. (1) The first has to do with how we enable our students to answer the question “how am I like no other persons” and it is the place where I want to offer an observation about “interiority” and the gendered dimension of that capacity for inwardness. (2) The second has to do with diversity, a theme which I found consistently running through the focus group feed back assembled from the dozen or so Jesuit high schools reported to your group. (3) The final, and perhaps most provocative observation has to do with what I did not find in those focus group summaries which I read with some care late into last evening. Conspicuous by its absence was any substantive reference to sexuality. I will risk some ideas I have as to why I think sexuality has “gone missing”, as we used to say in the South.

Observation 1.

It is pretty easy to see the lengths that young adults will try to go to assert their distinctiveness and personal uniqueness - their desire to be “separate and apart”, . It is also poignant to note how that desire is always found in tension with that other profound human need, to be “a part of” and in connection with those of their own kind (see Kegan). So every new body piercing or shoulder tattoo both serves to shout, “this is me” while at the same time helping to link up the individual with his or her own tribe. The great challenge I see for us as educators is precisely that contemporary consumerist culture offers a myriad of seductive and conscriptive ways to declare one’s uniqueness and they all uniformly involve the purchase or acquisition of some thing. Now Julie Andrews was perhaps in the proximate ballpark of this notion that “I am what I like and enjoy” when she sang “These Are a Few of My Favorite Things” to the Von Trapp

children. The problem arises most acutely when those favorite things can only be had from the pages of a Sharper Image, Abercrombie and Fitch or J. Crew catalogue. The solution is not some appeal to simpler modes of consumption or appreciation. The really radical answer to the question, “How am I like no other persons?”, is to be found in the utterly unique and idiosyncratic way in which the Creator of all Being addresses each human being in the solitude of his or her heart. This at least is what I take to be the foundational assumption of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius. It was this that the Jesuit poet Hopkins understood when he wrote of “that inmost self of mine which has been said to be and to be felt to be, to taste, more distinctive than the taste of clove or alum.” [G.M. Hopkins, “Comments on the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola”] Thus the issue becomes, how do we learn to listen attentively and reverently to the subtle leadings and responses of my own disciplined subjectivity; in a phrase, *how do we develop an interior life?*

I have commented earlier on the way in which the pace and pressure of contemporary high school and college life militates against this mode of contemplative attention. Now I must add that something more far reaching and less easily understood also makes the development of that interior attention and affectivity more generally problematic for males in this culture than for females. Here I am instructed by the work of Harvard psychologists Kindlon and Thompson and others who argue, persuasively I think, that the “boy code” [ie. “don’t feel, don’t be vulnerable, don’t express ‘weak’ emotions”] cripples the emotional and - by extension - the spiritual lives of our sons. In their book *Raising Cain: Protecting the Emotional Lives of Boys* they argue that one of the greatest services we can do for our male students is this, “**Give boys permission to have an internal life, approval for the full range of human emotions, and help in developing an emotional vocabulary so that they may better understand themselves and communicate more effectively with others.**”

What does this involve and what would it look like? I offer one clue given to me by one of a number of alumni of Jesuit high schools whom I interviewed in preparation for this presentation. This particular young man said that perhaps the most unforgettable moment of his high school career occurred the morning after the martyrdom of the Jesuit teachers in Salvador and their housekeepers. That morning the Jesuit geometry teacher came to class and setting aside the scheduled agenda shared deeply and from the heart the welter of feelings and reactions he had to these deaths, including the ways in which the news brought him back to an awareness of the vision of justice and love that had originally drawn him to life in the Society of Jesus. It was “an internal life”, and a connection of head and heart that this Jesuit high school alumnus had never before experienced in one of his teachers.

Observation 2.

Let me move on to my second set of observations. These concern a theme I found prominent in the high school focus group research which the Think Tank commissioned and which I was given to study last evening. Along with the issue of technology and its impact on their lives, I found that the other most consistent concern that threaded its way through every one of the groups reported was whether their Jesuit education had adequately prepared them for life in a diverse and pluralistic world . Some of our student respondents were emphatic that they felt it had not, and they were frankly worried. As the students at Bellarmine Prep put it, in words that had echoes in statements from many other sampled schools, “There is very little diversity at Bellarmine and we will be thrust into a university of up to 35,000 persons with all kinds of backgrounds , races and groups, many of which we will be unable to deal with and/or appreciate.”

When I examine these student comments through the lens of developmental theory, I note that for many of these novice adults the concern about diversity at this developmental stage is largely recruited to the service of that second identity question, “How am I like some other people”. They experience their education as limited in its provision of opportunity to define themselves in relationship to the “other” - whether female, poor, “minority” or “non Catholic” and they are not sure who they will be or become when they have to encounter that otherness in the world beyond high school. Other student comments, however, suggest a more matured or advanced understanding of why an experience of the range of genuine human diversity needs to be part of their educational program. This presents as a recognition of their need to develop tolerance and understanding. Justice, and not simply identity formation or survival, is what is at stake for these students.

This is not small accomplishment and I would not want to dismiss it. Twenty plus years of counseling lesbian and gay undergraduates at my college has made me acutely aware of how much less painful and damaging our educational culture would be if this attitude of tolerance were more wide spread among our students and more realized in the operation of our administrations. Still, if we adopt a wider developmental lens, perhaps of the sort crafted by clinical developmentalist Robert Kegan, we would see both of these positions as still defined by traditionalist or modernist assumptions (Kegan, 1994). A fully post-modern perspective, he would suggest, involves recognizing that I positively need the “other” in order to become myself, precisely because my own identity contains within it that “other”. Thus, I need as a male to engage fully with women in order to recognize how my notion of being male has been constructed in relationship to women’s lives. Christians need to be in vital dialogue with Jews to understand how Christianity inextricably is bound up with the history of our mutual relationship. The respectful inclusion of lesbian and gay persons in our educational community is needed so that heterosexuality itself can become the object of critical reflection, more intricate understanding and a fresh appreciation for its unfolding construction. . Keeping our eyes on the prize of this developmental trajectory is necessary in order to interpret both what our high school students are asking for in these interviews, and what they need but do not yet understand why.

Observation 3.

Now on to my final observation: what was NOT said in the focus group conversations reported out to you. Save for one comment by a student at St. Ignatius College Prep, San Francisco, and excepting the refrain (presumably from students at all male schools) that there was a need for women students in the community, *there was no mention of any issues related to sexuality or gender relations.* Now obviously - if we honestly interrogate our own memories of adolescence and recall what we know about our students when they share in more confidential settings - we have to acknowledge that if sexuality has “gone missing” it is *not* because it has ceased to be a relentless preoccupation of 14 to 19 year old human persons. High school teachers commonly quip that all of their teaching is done in unfair competition with the raging hormones of their students. What to make then of the disappearance of sexuality from the discourse of high school students when asked to comment on what their Jesuit education delivered and failed to deliver?

I was offered some relevant insight into this absence in my own “focus group of one” conversations with BC graduates who also attended Jesuit high schools. The informant here is a young man who in a great many ways embodies the very best of our Jesuit educational program. A graduate of a highly respected co-educational Jesuit secondary school, “Mike” (not his real name) was a science and philosophy major at Boston College and served two years in the Jesuit

Volunteer Corps upon graduation. He is now preparing to enter a career in medicine, a discernment he has made with all the sensitivity and spiritual self-awareness one could want or expect from a person formed in the tradition of Ignatius. Reflecting on his Jesuit high school experience he was unambivalent in his praise of how his school awoke him intellectually, taught him to question rigorously and think strenuously. There was, however, one significant lacuna in this education, and it was in the whole area of human sexuality - not the biology or the hydraulics of sexuality, but its real human meanings and relational complexity. This was most tragically apparent to him when a well-liked lay teacher died of AIDS and the school administration, in his view, reacted with anxiety and denial. The official response apparently was to invite in a lay woman religious educator, appointed and approved by the diocese, to speak to an assembly of the entire student body. The lecture was described by Mike as a dismal version of "just say no" that addressed none of the real questions and concerns of the students and in any case was structured to avoid hearing any of them. This "null curriculum" around human sexuality was experienced by Mike as delivering a very clear message - "in this area of your life you are on your own because it is simply too dangerous, shameful or confusing for us to openly discuss". It was with sorrow that I heard this quite compassionate and aware heterosexual young adult describe how the failure of his high school teachers to open up honest and candid discussion of sexuality (his college teachers did no better) contributed to a kind of "sexual self-loathing" that he has taken years to work through.

How might we understand the failure of otherwise good hearted, intelligent and caring high school teachers to effectively address something so vital and urgent in the lives of their students? This was the question I was pondering earlier this summer when I went to visit my mother's home town in Pennsylvania. I took off by myself one afternoon to pray at the graves of my grandparents in the old Catholic cemetery up on the side of a hill outside the town. In route I began listening on the car radio to an interview on National Public Radio with Garry Wills, the Pulitzer prize winning author of *Lincoln at Gettysburg* and recent biographer of St. Augustine. The interview however was focused on his most recent book entitled *Papal Sins: Structures of Deceit*. I was riveted by the reflections of this essentially conservative and deeply faithful Roman Catholic intellectual and sat in the car in that cemetery and listened to it to the end. When I returned to Boston I made it a point to make his book part of my summer reading. Though not without its flaws I commend it to you as Fr. John O'Malley, S.J. did in his recent review in *America* (July 1-8, 2000), "a serious book by a serious author that needs to be taken seriously".

Without rehearsing its full argument, I would suggest that what the book offers to the immediate issue is this analysis. According to Wills the besetting dilemma for those who must teach in a Catholic context is that on a range of issues, not least those around human sexuality (contraception, masturbation, extra-marital sexual life, homosexuality etc.) the "official" arguments that have been put forward have largely been formulated to maintain the power of a church hierarchy that sincerely believes that its teaching authority would be disastrously compromised if it admitted to past error on these issues. The attendant distortion of history, the uncritical use of scripture, and the ignoring of the traditions of moral casuistry that have been carefully developed by Catholic ethicists over the years, all make it difficult, Wills maintains, for persons to teach the magisterial position with intellectual integrity. Furthermore, Wills argues, the *aggiornamento* of Second Vatican council has been followed, under the present pontificate, by heavy handed efforts to rein in and control critical theological discourse and debate. Wills example of this is the case of Catholic University ethicist. Fr. Charles Curran, but he could as well have cited the discipline exercised over Fr. Robert Nugent and Sister Jeannine Gramick or any number of cases better known to us who teach in Catholic departments of theology. The result is that a great many priests simply have chosen not to speak to these

matters at all in any public forum. As Wills notes, when was the last time that anyone heard a sermon preached on contraception or masturbation? There is perhaps a small wave of highly conservative clerics coming up through our diocesan seminaries that will not hesitate to speak on these topics, but the generational gap between these younger men and their older and differently educated colleagues has already been noted in studies of the Catholic clergy in the U.S.

None of this of course is news to this group, but I take the risk of naming it because - to use that old AA expression - it is perhaps the unacknowledged elephant in the living room of that Christian family that calls itself Roman Catholic. Other Christian communions have other elephants to be certain, but this is one is ours who teach in Jesuit and Catholic institutions, whether or not we are personally members of that tradition.. Most relevant to our work here, as educators, we need to recognize the subtle but very real impact that our silence on these matters has on the religious and psychological development of our students. As Mike sadly observed, the great contradiction of his high school experience was the disillusioning dissonance he and his fellow students felt between the injunction they got in the classroom from their Jesuit and lay teachers, "you must be able to make and intellectually defend an argument for your position" and a message they felt was coming down from on high, "some positions can not be argued against but must simply be accepted on authority". But when the positions concern a matter as essential, inescapable and fundamental as the constitution and conduct of human intimate life, this prohibition on critical inquiry is demoralizing at many levels.

One of the most astute things any one every said to me four years ago when I became a parent was that "children are exquisite observers but very poor interpreters". Applied to family life this means that if there is dysfunction and conflict in the family system, no matter how hidden or denied by the parents, the child will inevitably notice it. The real problems arise as the child tries unsuccessfully to make sense of what he or she observes but can not understand. Similarly, if Wills has accurately if stridently identified a deeply running conflict in the family that is the Roman Catholic church, you may be sure that at some level young persons in Catholic institutions are quite aware of it. Tragically the interpretation they may make of this conflict is that there is no place for thinking, growing, sexually loving persons in the Catholic Christian communion. I think that the task of the educator in the Jesuit tradition must be to continually strive to articulate and enact what my colleague Dean Mary Braebeck of BC's School of Education calls a "big tent Catholicism" - one that has a genuine place for all the differences and diversity that make up the human condition. We must find ways of witnessing to the possibility of living lives that have intellectual and spiritual integrity by refusing to yield the power to define "church" to our brethren whose vision is too small and too excluding. (see George Drance's observations on this point)

In conclusion it is only honest to recognize the great difficulty and even danger that acting upon what I have said here may involve for teachers and administrators at the high school level. It is perhaps cheap of those of us at the university level to say these hard things who are, at least for the present, protected by the structures of tenure. I can only conclude by sharing with you a challenge to boldness and hope that was issued me by the human being who over the last four years has been consistently my more demanding spiritual guide - my adopted son. A year into his life in these United States (he came from Russia), we were vacationing with seven year old Sasha in Provincetown. It was low tide and we were at the town dock. Sasha was eager to explore under the wharf. Now believe me, one does not want to see what is under a fishing wharf at low tide. All manner of flotsam and jetsam, most of it dead and decaying, accumulate there. It is, in the parlance of first graders, "yucky". When I declined to join Sasha on this little adventure of discovery he paused and looked up at me with fierce determination. Doing his best

imitation of Miss Frizzle - Lilly Tomlin's indomitable heroine of the children's science show, "The Magic School Bus" - Sasha exhorts me, "Papa, if you want to learn things you have to TAKE RISKS AND MAKE MESSSES!" Well.... turns out there are things to learn even under a fishing wharf at low tide..

May the Spirit embolden all of us to take the risks we need to take, and make the messes we need to make, to learn what God is about beneath the chaos and confusion of our lives in history..

John McDargh, Ph.D. Associate Professor
Boston College Department of Theology, mcdargh@bc.edu

Walter Conn *The Desiring Self: Rooting Pastoral Counseling and Spiritual Direction in Self Transcendence.*
Paulist Press, 1998.

Garry Wills, *Papal Sins: Structures of Deceit* , Doubleday, 2000.

Erik Erikson, *Identity: Youth and Crisis.* W.W. Norton, reissue, 1994

Dan Kindlon & Michael Thompson, *Raising Cain: Protecting the Emotional Life of Boys* , Ballantine, 1999.

Robert Kegan, *In Over Our Heads" The Mental Demands of Modern Life* . Doubleday, 1994.

Mary Oliver, *New and Selected Poems* , Boston: Beacon Press , 1992

CHALLENGING TRENDS

Scott Pilarz, S.J.

1. DISINTEGRATION OF COMMUNITY

My own thinking on this issue is stimulated by Robert D. Putnam's book, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, which observes how more Americans are bowling now than ever before, but that league membership is at an all-time low. Bowling alley owners are troubled by this, since they make their money on leagues. When people bowl in a league, they are more likely to eat and drink; and that, apparently, is the primary revenue source for people in the business. Putnam shows how we are becoming increasingly disconnected from family, friends and neighbors. Our stock of "social capital" is waning, and our lives and our communities are impoverished. As educators in the Ignatian tradition, we should be bothered by this, as well, in terms of what it bodes for American civic and religious life. How will our students imagine themselves in relationship to the communities (or lack thereof) that shape their experiences and for which they are responsible? Are we educating them for associational life, or do we encourage atomization? Obviously, too many factors contribute to this trend to name here, and I'm not a sociologist. But such disintegration runs counter to the kinds of cultures supported by Jesuit and Catholic school rhetoric. From my own perspective as a member of a university faculty, the effect of this trend on higher education may result in a growing pressure on residential colleges to articulate their reason for being. Can we make a convincing case that students learn best in a cohort or community - and a real, as opposed to virtual cohort or community? Can we argue effectively that it is in rubbing shoulders and matching wits in real time that sharp minds are honed sharper still, that imaginations stretch and become more flexible? If we can't, then most residential colleges will do the way of the dinosaurs.

2. CYNICISM ABOUT INSTITUTIONS

This attitude would exacerbate the kind of disintegration described above, and it undermines all sorts of institutions including schools themselves (e.g. the rise of home schooling). Do people feel so removed and doubtful as to give up on the opportunity to shape the institutions that shaped them: government, church, school, (for Jesuits I might add the very religious order to which they belong)? The root causes of this cynicism are manifold and some may be well-warranted. Will our schools cultivate the virtue of hope in the face of this trend? Upon what will be base our hope? Again, the effect of such cynicism on higher education might be deadly. The academy is already held up for ridicule in many circles. This is especially true with respect to research institutions, which are viewed as big, bloated and inefficient. Cynicism will reenforce a utilitarian approach to education so that we may run the risk of returning to the bad old days of Charles Dickens' Mr Gradgrind in *Hard Times*.

3. RELIGIOUS ILLITERACY

This results from the disintegration of Catholic culture and cynicism about the institutional church, among other things. I encounter it, for example, when I teach medieval and Renaissance religious literature. It's not that just my students don't know what Chaucer's prioress was and why she really shouldn't be drinking mead at the Tabard Inn. They have a hard time naming the four gospels and the seven sacraments. I spend a fair amount of time doing basic catechesis. And often times the ignorance is compounded by ill-will. A good number of my Catholic students exhibit hostility to matters religious. This may come from parents. It may even come from Catholic educators, committed as they might be, for whom the church, its history and its hierarchy, are treated as embarrassment. Such ill-will is propaedeutic to ignorance. Another phenomenon related to this ignorance is, oddly enough, a nostalgia among some young people for a church they never knew. This nostalgia can evolve into a polarizing sectarianism. Young people grow intolerant of the "other" who is perceived as a threat to their fragile sense of identity. In terms of higher education, specifically Catholic higher education, this combination of illiteracy and ill-will can put us out of business. It should come as no surprise to you that institutions such as my own are home to significant levels of anti-Catholicism. I encounter this among my faculty colleagues. Many are disinterested in Georgetown's Catholic and Jesuit identity. Some - and an increasingly vocal some - would happily be rid of Jesuits and even happier to sever any ties with the church. The best response to this, it seems to me, is a cadre of well educated, articulate Catholic intellectuals who are at home in their own tradition regardless of their academic discipline. In other words, we ought not ghettoize Catholic issues and interests in departments of theology or Catholic Studies programs, though these departments can play a critical role in cultivating the next generation of Catholic thinkers who can work against illiteracy, ignorance and intolerance.

4. AESTHETIC IMPATIENCE

Here, I'm talking out of my own shop. I think of contrasting slogans: there's Goethe who says, "life is short; art is long"; in other words, it takes time to appreciate the good, the true and the beautiful. And then there's the advertiser who says, "Life is short; play hard." I'm all in favor of play, don't get me wrong; but all play and no work makes Jack a poor student of poetry. Again, so many cultural forces contribute to this trend. But as an English professor I'm always looking for ways to slay the dragons of the short attention span, the desire for quick fix, and the easy answer. How can we encourage among our students the necessary embrace of complexity? I start every course - and almost every talk I give at Georgetown - with the same lines from John Donne's *Satire III*: "On a huge hill,/ Cragged and steep, Truth stands, and he that will/ Reach her about must, and about must go;/ And what th'hill's suddenness resists, win so; Yet strive so . . ./ To will implies delay, therefore now do: Hard deeds, the bodies pains; hard knowledge too/ The mind's endeavors reach, and mysteries/ Are like the sun, dazzling, yet plain to all eyes." In other words, getting near the truth through art, literature and music is damn hard work. Our students expect science and technology to be complicated. But if they can't penetrate to the heart of a sonnet in the length of time it takes them to read 14 lines, they all too readily abandon the field. Will they do the same when they come up against life's inevitable and intractable mysteries: God, love, sex and death? For higher education this might mean the undermining of the traditional core curriculum. A growing number of my

own students need to be sold on the idea that courses outside their major are worth taking. Scarier still, I hear the same sentiment expressed by Board members on both the secondary school and university level. And there are outside, professional accrediting agencies who drive this trend. Undergraduate business majors, for example, have fewer and fewer opportunities to take courses in the humanities. For education in the Ignatian tradition, which foregrounds the formations of the whole person, this trend is alarming.

5. LAST, BUT HARDLY LEAST: LOSS OF CONFIDENCE IN PROJECT OF MAKING MEANING

In words popular among practitioners of my discipline, this trend can be called “the postmodern predicament.” Some of my colleagues celebrate it as the shattering of outmoded constructs that for too long constricted imaginations and limited fields of inquiry. They are only partly right. I’m all for intellectual liberation so long as we hold out the possibility that life may have meaning beyond the struggle for power, privilege and prestige. The problem with postmodernism is that it can seem to reduce every aspect of human experience to quantifiable categories. By conviction, Catholic educators point to certain irreducible elements in our lives and the lives of our students. Current intellectual trends leave no room for the transcendent, and it wants to marginalize anything that smacks of mystery. Traditionally, universities have tried to produce knowledge, and they still do. The postmodern predicament, however, undermines any efforts to integrate that knowledge. Disciplinary boundaries grow more impenetrable. Academics from different departments make fewer efforts to talk to one another. Conversation among colleagues is a fragile business at best and fractious at worse. Students are sensitive to these developments and it affects their own world view. If professors can’t participate in the meaning making process, who can?

Preliminary Responses and Possible Implications

The obvious challenge to us is to resist these trends. At the level of higher education, (and secondary education, I’d assume) this means cultivating leadership: Board leadership, administrative leadership, faculty leadership, alumni leadership, and – here’s a category almost entirely overlooked - Jesuit leadership. Mark Twain’s quip comes to mind when I think about Jesuits my age and younger: “Rumors of our death are greatly exaggerated.” This is a particular hobby horse of mind, but Jesuits have done a miserable job of mentoring other Jesuits. And we have not done much better at encouraging young men to join us. I also wonder whether our lay colleagues ever think about encouraging any one to join the Jesuits. At all costs, we need to encourage a new generation of leaders, lay and religious, for Catholic education. If we do not I would hazard a guess about a few implications:

- 1) We will have schools more concerned about markets than about meaning.
- 2) Schools will be over-defined by forces from without as opposed to mission statements generated from within. (As examples, I’d point to the pernicious effects of the *US News and World Report* rankings of American colleges and universities. And my experience on one Jesuit high school board makes me wonder whether college admission statistics don’t overly define a high school’s measure of success or failure.)

3) We will not be able to maintain our commitment to and convictions about the value of community. Catholics have traditionally emphasized salvation by association and resisted atomizing and antinomian movements. This instinct is jeopardized by these implications.

Values To Be Maintained and Strengthened

1. THE PRIMACY OF WISDOM OVER INFORMATION AS THE END OF EDUCATION

This presents me with an opportunity to mention a scene from one of my favorite films, *Atlantic City*, starring Burt Lancaster and Susan Sarandon. Lancaster plays an aging, small time gangster who is down on his luck at the film's start. Sarandon is a beautiful young woman who moves all the way from Saskatchewan to South Jersey to find fame and fortune in one of the brand new casinos. Through a series of accidents, this unlikely pair falls in love and comes into a pile of money. To celebrate, Burt takes her to what used to be Atlantic City's most elegant eatery, *The Knife and Fork*. He orders a bottle of wine and performs the proper rituals. Susan is mightily impressed. She looks into his eyes and says, "Teach me stuff." He responds with the best line in the movie: "What do you want? Wisdom or information?" We need to keep this distinction in mind because it is not always obvious to our students or to us. There is increased pressure to amass information, which is obviously more readily available than ever before as a result of new technologies. The overplus of information requires well defined discernment skills; otherwise our students will be overwhelmed. All of us need to get better at determining what sorts of information are worthy of sustained attention. Attaining wisdom, of which discernment is an integral part, takes time. It is not immediately cost-effective, and it is hard, if not impossible to measure. To date most schools in the Ignatian tradition carve out time for the cultivation of wisdom, but I am afraid that the rapid pace of our lives will impinge adversely on this in the future. Too many other interests and issues clamor for our attention, so we must reconfirm our commitment to becoming contemplatives in action.

2. THE VALUE OF SHAPING FLEXIBLE IMAGINATIONS APT AT IGNATIAN ADAPTABILITY.

One of the reasons why the Society of Jesus and its schools thrived for so long in so many places is that Ignatius promoted adaptability in the Society's foundational documents. In the *Spiritual Exercises* and the *Constitutions*, Ignatius often concludes an instruction with the qualification that it should be followed in so far as it is possible or fitting. This kind of flexibility is future-oriented, and it enables us to embrace what is to come instead of slavishly imitating what was done in the past. Ignatius was able to be so flexible because he was confident in his core values and the goal set that grows out of those values. As educators with an eye toward the future, we need to renew constantly our commitment to key Ignatian values and insights so that we can articulate goals appropriate to our circumstances. We also want to introduce our students to this dynamic - and warn them that balancing timeless values while setting timely goals is bound to cause tension. I have heard Ignatian educators talk about the tensions our alumni experience when they enter "the real world." Perhaps we can't resolve those tensions for them. Perhaps we should not even if we could. But we might want to give them a head's

up about the counter-cultural quality of the education they have received. Perhaps, too, we can encourage them to be creative in the context of tension. Tension is not all bad. It can be the occasion for tremendous ingenuity.

3. THE VALUE OF EDUCATION FOR THE SAKE OF REACHING OUT RATHER THAN MOVING UP.

The most fascinating aspect of your self-study, to my mind, is that students recognize the lack of diversity in most of our schools. They intuit that our schools can become the preserve of the privileged. I think, for example, of the way we celebrate "Senior Week" at Georgetown. It is enormously costly for graduating students and their parents, and this expense comes after they have already paid \$120,000.00 for their education. The week culminates in a black-tie ball, and the presumption is that every one at Georgetown can afford such extravagance. We ought to take a look at the prevailing cultural ethos at our institutions, asking, "who would be comfortable here? Who would feel excluded?" Exclusivity on social and economic grounds will create an atmosphere in which prejudices are confirmed. Inclusiveness marks God's spirit moving in our midst. If our institutions do not reach out in real, significant ways to the poor and powerless, how can we expect our students to do so? They will begin to suspect that service programs are simply window dressing, or worse, a form of *noblesse oblige*.

4. THE VALUE OF SELFLESS LEADERSHIP GROUNDED IN GRATITUDE

I find that many of my students want to be leaders, but for lots of wrong headed reasons. They want power and influence, but to what end they have not a clue. I am more and more convinced that cultivating a sense of gratitude is at the heart of the Ignatian charism. The centerpiece of the *Exercises* has us filled with gratitude for what God has done for us in Jesus Christ. Only then do we ask what we can do for Christ. I am not always sure that our students, or most of us for that matter, realize how much we have been given. Perhaps before we send them out to help save the world, we need to do a better job of helping them understand why it's worth saving. The "why" is best understood as a grateful response for what God has done and is doing for us.

ARE WE BECOMING “GATED COMMUNITIES”

Joe O’Keefe, S.J.

Both in terms of the way I structure my remarks and the content of my remarks, you might think that Scott and I got together and decided what we were going to say today, because I too have five categories, and you’re also going to see a lot of overlap of themes. The way I decided to do this, thinking of the current context in which Jesuit schools exist and what the situation would be twenty years from now, I placed myself twenty years ago. Next week, twenty years ago, I started my first year of Regency at Chevrus High School in Portland, Maine. Some of the contextual issues I would never really have predicted and some issues that I might have predicted but really wouldn’t really have understood the extent of the change. And, so I want to talk about the context in those terms. Twenty years ago, if I had been wise and able to predict the future, these are the things I would have seen but didn’t.

First, the whole question of the rate of technological change and the breadth of technological change simply astounds me. I’m astounded by how rapidly information and access to information is changing the way we think. Just some astounding figures...one quote I’ll remember from Al Gore last night was that there is more computer power in a Palm Pilot than in the rocket that put Neil Armstrong on the moon. I think back to the early 1990’s when I became a great fan of the GOPHER. It was the University of Minnesota that had this ability using text, and I remember one of our faculty members talking about technology and said, down the road we’re going to have this thing called the World Wide Web, and it will be much easier access and it will have all kinds of images (not just text) and I thought to myself, I’m not going to give up the GOPHER because I know how to use the GOPHER. Just think of that as an astounding dimension of the world that young people come from. This is literally just off the press...it’s an NCEA publication of the SPICE program (Selected Programs for Improving Catholic Education). In 1999 the seminar had to do with forming innovative learning environments through technology. I’ll leave it here. It’s both a combination of exemplary programs and also some input from people with expertise on the issue related to it. Listen to what David Thornberg said in his address:

“Some people think that the web is a fad, that it is going away soon. Let’s dispel that notion. It took radio 38 years to reach 50,000,000 users and television 13 years to reach that point. The web reached the 50,000,000 mark in only 4 years, making it the fastest growing communications technology in history. To get a sense of how fast it is growing, note that in the first seven days of 1999, AOL added 180,000 new users – the same number they added in the first seven years of their existence. (When we think of especially young children, he says)...children are fearless in the face of these tools, because they have never known a world without them. For them, life in a network world is an expectation, not a distant dream. A year ago, Jupiter

Communications did a study on the number of children on line. The study projected that between 1998 and 2002, the number of networked teens in the U.S. would jump from 4.5 to 11 million, but the number of wired pre-teens would, in the same time frame, jump from 3 million to 20 million, almost a factor of seven.”

So, certainly the rate and breadth of technological change is an issue. When I was in California last week, there was this issue of shortage of electricity and how to deal with that. And, the thought of being in Los Gatos in Silicon Valley... imagine life in Silicon Valley without electricity. The issue comes in several different ways and its ramifications are many, and we could be here all day thinking about them. One issue, for example... I'm on the board of school launching a capital campaign and one of the things we need to do from our last accreditation report is to build a library. The planning committee of the board came and had designs for a library that is wonderfully suited for 1955. What will schools look like? Think of physical plant issues. I think this is a helpful way to think of technological change. A second issue is the digital divide and the impact of that. In April 2000 a White House paper talked about the digital divide through socio-economic status. People with higher educational attainment, higher income levels, white ethnicity, those race and class issues, have a much higher use of technology and access to the web. What does that mean for us? Questions of epistemology... raising this issue in a post-modern context. What is knowledge? Who owns knowledge? And, also the question of how does one sort through the enormity of information. In many ways I think learning in light of technology is like trying to take a sip of water from a fire hose. How do we wisely discern? And, then, finally, the whole questions of time and space and how they have been affected by technology. The notion of instant information... how you had the experience of having an upgrade on your computer – working on your new computer and then going back to the older computer – and you feel... come on, come on... the clicking of the mouse is not happening quickly enough. What does that say, for example, about the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm, where so much of it has to do with reflection on experience? The notion of contemplation and issues of time and technology. Certainly, the question of space... imagine what the school of the future will look like. But, then also the whole issue of breaking down of cultural barriers by geography and the impact of that... so, changing notions of time and space.

This leads to my second point, which is one of globalization. I suppose in some ways, not as a professor but as a French teacher, I spend a lot of time in the 17th century. The waning of a western European cultural hegemony and the extent to which that has happened is quite dramatic, especially when looking at issues of curriculum. The increase in transportation and bridging barriers of culture, the question of mobility, and it's quite astounding when we look at these geopolitical changes and the way we understand the world. I remember being lucky enough to get bounced off of a TWA flight and being able to use a voucher to go to the Holy Land. I'm arriving at the airport, my first time in the Holy Land, and I look out on the tarmac, and there is a Luftwaffe jet with the Iron Cross. It so happened that Helmut Cole was making a state visit to Israel. But, it's astounding when you think of the German air force being at BenGurion Airport. I spend some time studying in France, doing theology and some history work in France, and I was struck by the whole notion of the European Union, the EURO... imagine

French and Germans actually working together (French and English are still having a harder time). The notion of these changes is incredible. Look at maps of the world with young people. Isn't that astounding? What a map in 2000 looks like as opposed to a map not only in 1980 but also 1990. So, this enormous political change and certainly the demise of communism and the impact that that has had is a real issue.

That leads to my third point, which is called "commodification". We live in a time of capitalism triumphant, where the free-market become the dynamic in which all human enterprises are managed. Think, for example, of education policy and a lot of education reform. It really is based on a free-market approach where parents, children, families, make consumeristic choices about education. Now, there are all kinds of issues about cheapening of education by making it into a commodity. But, parents choosing a Jesuit school as opposed to other schools in the same way that one would say, "Am I sending the package to Fed-Ex, the U.S. Postal Service, or UPS?" Where do I get the biggest bang for the buck? And, when you look at the high value of education and aspirations of education, the cheapening through this market-based world. Another issue, of course, in the free market when we look at education policy, it is a matter of "winners and losers", survival of the fittest, social Darwinism, and it prompts a lot of my work on issues of school choice and some of the limits of school choice plans that the Catholic community often espouses, often quite uncritically. My colleagues in the UK have been very helpful in that regard. I worked on a book in 1996, "The Contemporary Catholic School," where they looked at a lot of the efforts of the Thatcher government, especially league tables. These league tables are publications of test scores, and the higher the league table score, the better your funding. A friend of mine, Gerald Grace, did a study of talking to Catholic head teachers (Catholic principals) in the UK, and all the pressure was on them to not accept or to eliminate those who don't do well on standardized tests. High-stake testing, competition, and the U.S. News and World Report "coin of the realm" and when I look at the decisions that are made at the Boston College School of Education based on our rankings and what it might do to our rankings. This question of a business mentality...everything is a business. I see it very much in my work on boards. For example, targeting financial aid to kids who are in the 99th percentile as opposed to by need, because they're more likely to be Merit scholars which means more status. And, in this market-based world it's not good enough to be good, it's only good enough to be "better than." This notion of really pernicious comparison raised the question, what does that say when we look at Jesuit institutions (Catholic institutions) and the barriers to effective collaboration? It is really an utterly pervasive notion, a kind of a narcissism that is fostered where one's needs are the primary criterion for decision-making. When we look at the notion of competition at all costs, being good isn't good enough – only being better than, and then we look at something like the Grad at Grad. I think the challenges become very real.

Another issue that I would have not foreseen to such an extent is the whole rise of a religious fundamentalism that grows out of this fear of uncertainty, the post-modern world where there is no overarching framework for making meaning, and relativism becomes a pervasive way of looking at the world. I think of grounding that in a way that isn't fundamentalistic. And, it raises this issue of Roman Catholicism in the year 2000.

After Regency, I will never forget arriving after teaching school one day at the bulletin board and looking and seeing that the Society had been taken over by Papal intervention. Is it going to be another suppression? It has not been an easy twenty years for us in the Roman Catholic Church. The extent of centralization within the church, from the appointment of bishops to control over curriculum to freedom of thought...on the one hand, the Catholic sensibility toward unity and community and on the flip side the kind of controlling uniformity that, I think, is a selling short of our tradition. I also find (and I probably shouldn't say this on tape) that there can be within the Church a resurgence of a clerical dominance that I see growing very much, and I never would have predicted that twenty years ago. Where that's all going to go, who knows. But, along with centralization is a related movement toward a fundamentalistic thinking. I think that fear of relativism drives people to kind of an intellectual dishonesty in some ways. For example, take the issue of women's ordination...some would say, Jesus only ordained men at the Last Supper. The reality is, Jesus didn't ordain anyone at the Last Supper. We know that order emerge over the first generations of the Christian community. Metaphorically speaking, sure, there's a truth to that in a poetic way. I think this notion of a dishonesty about the complexity of our own history is a real serious issue within the Church. Third, is a nostalgia...longing for a frozen state of perfection that never existed, and often by those who never experienced the reality. So, how do we deal with this reality of post-modernism with it's pluralism a given? How do we have a kind of rooting in our own faith, the particularism that is not fundamentalistic? How we rooted and open at the same time? My work with Jewish colleagues in education, talking about a Jewish way of life, raised the question, "what is a Catholic way of life?"

Point number five is the whole question of personnel in Catholic schools, and, certainly, in a lot of my work with the broader Catholic education community, that is very much a reality. I think when historians look back at the history of Catholic schooling in the United States, they will see that 150 years ago Catholic schools were the work of religious communities. Now, and in the future, they will see that Catholic schools are a ministry of lay people. Only 8% of personnel in Catholic schools nationwide are members of religious communities. One of the questions that comes out of that is the whole issue of charism and spirituality and what will that look like where the presence of religious communities are waning. I think there's an excitement about that. I think, for example, some of the work that we've done with diocesan folks around the country, building programs for spiritual development for teachers, looking at the whole question of parenting and the spirituality of those people who are parents, and the kind of charism that comes from that. Let me talk, more personally, about this personnel situation. I suppose I would not have predicted the impact of the decline of members of the Society and their aging. We had a Province assembly in June in the New England Province, a command performance – the last time we had that was 1986 – everyone had to be there. And, it was simply astounding to look around, and it is a story of death and diminishment. One of our exercises, much grumbling happened about this one, they handed out the crayons and paper and said, draw the Province. And, we were saying, we're far more sophisticated than that, we shouldn't be doing things like drawing. What emerged was amazing, and I was one of the table leaders, and there was one guy who said almost nothing, and what he drew – the center of his picture – were those classic

Jesuit tombstones (the cemetery). It's over – that sentiment – and the extent of it came through. What does it mean for us in terms of a structure of the Society – the ten Province structure? To me, this makes absolutely no sense. Our issues of turf, our internal questions...we didn't have any first year novices this year, but three who just took vows last week, and I thought, looking at those pictures around the wall and looking at the people and looking at this question of diminishment and aging and death, why do they stay? Why did they enter, and why do they stay? And, it's certainly the fundamental tertianship question that I have just finished, and especially now I'm saying, I'm tenured, I have a job for life. Why do I stay? But, I think the impact of that in terms of the Society, not only in terms of numbers but in terms of morale, underscores that these are difficult times. It is difficult to live daily in the face of death and diminishment. One of the most chilling images is in the movie *Beau Geste* where they propped up the corpses on the parapets to make it look like they were still powerful...a chilling image. And, when I think of simply the changes...when I started regency twenty years ago there were 18 Jesuits at Chevrus, a range of ages, a kind of normal across the span of scholastics to elderly. Now, we're sending one scholastic there. He is not only the only scholastic, but he's the only teacher along with a chaplain and the president. In twenty years, that's an amazing change.

Let me just end my comments and go to some questions of what the Jesuit high school is like. The Jesuit high school of the future as:

- **A Gated Community** – Literally, that's true in many of our schools, especially in urban settings. But, given this whole notion of commodification and the market, I think the pressure is on us to create our "gated communities" that are lovely little gardens of Eden and a lack of connection to the broader community and to other institutions.
- **Website** – That whole issue of space and the way we think of what a school is.
- **Corporation** – As I was saying last night, one of the terms Disney uses – they hire people they call "imagers" who create images and project them. Certainly, Georgetown and BC...look at the hype. One of the problems becomes, without the reflection, without prayer, you start to believe your image. What is important is what sells best in this corporate view. It's about bottom lines, it's about profit margins, it's about competition.
- **Parent** – I hear it constantly from educators across the country this notion of raising children in school. That has to do with the time commitments of parents. It also has to do with different notions of what parenting is, etc.
- **Church** – It's one of the realities that came home to me...I had the good fortune of being a visiting scholar at the Australian Catholic University two years ago and traveled around the country there, where given issues of the aging of clergy and the fewer number of clergy, etc....questions rocked by a lot of pedophilia scandals in Australia – enormous issues of cynicism about the Church. For many people, their only connection with the community of faith is not at all in the Church but in schools. School has become the center of religious faith; the school has become a Church. I think that happens at Jesuit colleges at their best. The first time that young people encounter lived religious community is at the school, and that has all sorts of implications for the way we look at ourselves.

- **Global Network** – The individual Jesuit high school, in its own place, is part of a worldwide family. This can have a tremendous impact on the questions of what issues are important issues, issues of politics, issues of culture, questions of curriculum. One of the issues, if you look at the New England Province and our Province assembly or the Province in India, think of the differences even in terms of questions of future, vitality, aging...that the future of the Church in many ways is not western Europe and the United States. The future of the Church is in the developing world. What does that really mean to be part of that global network?

The Unfinished Business of Collaboration

Geoffrey Dillon, S.J.

Espoused Theory / Theory in Use

ESPOUSED THEORY OF ACTION

IDEAL: How will the organization behave - *What they say they will do*

THEORY IN USE

Values, norms, strategies that govern the organization's (individual's) actions - *How, in fact, they will behave*

If ETA not = TIU --> Dissonance

Espoused Theory: Collaboration 1

In recent years, a developed theology has explicitly recognized and encouraged the apostolic role of lay people in the Church. ... Echoing this theology, recent General Congregations of the Society of Jesus have insisted on lay-Jesuit collaboration, through a shared sense of purpose and a genuine sharing of responsibility, in schools once exclusively controlled and staffed by Jesuits (Go Forth & Teach, #7,c).

Espoused Theory: Collaboration 2

Cooperation with the laity is both a constitutive element of our way of proceeding and a grace calling for individual, communal, and institutional renewal.

Cooperation with the Laity in Mission [GC 34, Decree 13] (1995)

Dissonant Theories In Use 1

JHS Leadership requires an S.J. Leader

Ignatian Vision / Identity is only known (guarded) by an S.J.

In so far as Jesuits talk about identity issues as "deep mystery this, source of inexhaustible meditation," they have a control device to make lay persons always know that they are not privy to the mystery -- and living in the shadow of some greater insight the Jesuits have. (Rowe, NJN 4/2000)

Dissonant Theories In Use 2

**Collaboration is pragmatic response to diminishing SJs
Collaboration is not an historic part of SJ identity or
governance**

While collaboration seems the only honest and sensible way to proceed, given the reality of our numbers and the scope of the apostolates we are involved in, it does not seem part of our Jesuit Identity at all. While the Society is encouraging collaboration among Jesuits, it is hardly "ours" and certainly not part of our historic, or even recent, identity or practice as an order. (Rowe, NJN 4/2000)

Dissonant Theories In Use 3

**... nor a part of the Church's governance or identity, prior to
Vatican II.**

Theories In Use 4

"We used to think of the institution as "ours", with some lay people helping us, even if their number was much greater than the number of Jesuits. Today some Jesuits seem to think that the number of lay people has so increased and the control has been so radically transferred, that the institution is no longer really Jesuit (*Theory-in-use*)...

I would insist that the [school] itself remains an apostolic instrument: not of the Jesuits alone, but of Jesuits and lay people working together." (*Espoused theory*)

The Jesuit University Today, Peter Hans Kolvenbach, 1985)

Theories In Use 5

When we speak of "our apostolates," we will mean something different by "our." It will signify a genuine Ignatian partnership of laity and Jesuits, each of us acting according to our proper vocation. Lay persons will rightly take on a greater role of responsibility and leadership within these works. Jesuits will be called on to support them in their initiative by Ignatian formation, the witness of our priestly and religious lives, and

promotion of Jesuit apostolic values. If our service will be more humble, it will also be more challenging and creative, more in accord with the graces we have received.

(GC 34- 354.29)

The “Other” Issue of Collaboration 1

With Lay or Jesuit Leader:

Who has access to:

DECISION-MAKING

POLICY-MAKING

VISION-MAKING

What KIND of Leadership is Exercised?

Hierarchical / Pyramid

Collaborative - Participatory – Shared

The “Other” Issue of Collaboration 2

ESPOUSED THEORY

All those engaged in the work should exercise coresponsibility and be engaged in discernment and participative decision making where it is appropriate. Lay persons must have access to and be trained for positions of responsibility according to their qualifications and commitment.

(GC 34, 343.13)

The “Other” Issue of Collaboration 3

Perhaps most important, we (Jesuits) join with them (lay persons) in companionship: serving together, learning from and responding to each other's concerns and initiatives, dialoguing with one another on apostolic objectives.

GC 34 337.7)

The “Other” Issue of Collaboration 4

DISSONANT THEORIES in USE

Traditional Organizational Structures & Governance: Pyramid

“Top-down” leadership & decision-making

To “co-labor” is NOT to “co-determine”

The “Other” Issue of Collaboration 5

FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

**If Real Collaboration/ Codetermination is new to
organizations, school & church-**

HOW / WHEN are people trained to participate in such an organization?

**If Real Collaboration / Codetermination is grounded in
Vatican II model of Church**

What effect of current attempts of reframing and revisionism of Vatican II?

NOW AS IT WAS AND EVER SHALL BE; DOING THE RIGHT THING FOR THE RIGHT REASON

Corrine McGuigan

It's so interesting to me when we talk about the issue of higher education and the secondary schools when we talk about teaching and learning. I think that the Jesuit secondary schools are at least twenty to thirty years ahead of where the universities are. And, if the Jesuit secondary education continues to advance its work and its methodologies that it's done in the last fifteen year, you will be a hundred years ahead of the colleges and universities...which is good news for the colleges and universities, because when we go to do our visioning for what's going to happen in the next 50-100 years, we simply can pick up the JSEA documents for secondary schools and say, here's sort of an outline of where we are. That's sort of good news and bad news, isn't it? It's sad that our institutions of higher education are so reductionist in how we think about teaching and learning, but it is where we are. And, so we enjoy that spot, take it for what it's worth and then try to do what we can.

My comments have to do with teaching and learning, primarily how I have envisioned them in the secondary organizations, influenced by my theology and my care for the Jesuit schools, and then my knowledge of what's happening in the teaching profession. I'm going to start very, very globally. I'm going to start with the big, big picture and then take you down to some really nitty, gritty issues.

It was interesting when Joe started the prayer for yesterday's meeting, he started with Glory be to the Father...One of the things I've learned to come when I work in the field of education over the last, especially the last twelve year, is the realization that keeps me sane, and that realization is this: Now is as it was and ever shall be. In the big picture, you and I get to spend our lives here trying to do the work of education. We'll do the very best we can, and I suspect in the cosmic reality, it will be very much like the work that people did a bizillion years ago and a bizillion years ahead. I find some comfort in that, so that if I screw up, in the big picture, it's like the screw up that was and the screw up that will be. And, then it keeps me a little humble if I think that maybe we're making some progress...I can say, well, progress was made more and progress will be made in the future. So, we can keep that wonderful balance of perspective in the midst of change. I think those are especially important considerations for you and I in this decade when we're actually studying leadership, change, organizational structures, and how one ought to behave according to one's beliefs. We need to remember that we're not the first people to take this up...we might be the first people using the language and the jargon that we've taken up. So, my first assumption is: NOW AS IT WAS AND EVER SHALL BE, and to enjoy the comfort that we find in that.

The second thing is, whether we are a teacher in a public school or a teacher in a high school that is Jesuit or a teacher at a university, whether we're a parent, we are charged with God, that we are grafted to the divine. In our huge world, I continue to run into fewer and fewer people who will say, I am without a theology. That is just my experience. I know the experience is different for others, but it's quite comforting to me to know that humanity is rich with those who know they are grafted to the divine. And, that when we get into the issues here of teaching and learning, we can accept that there are some scientific, mathematical, philosophical facts, and there is a life and an energy that sometimes we cannot describe adequately enough, nor can we measure. That fundamental charge is with us. As Catholics, we can take that merging of the divine down and enjoy the joy that it gives us. It seems to me that this is the joy that compels us to try to do the right thing for the right reason. I love that we're compelled to use our life for the creation. Why do we have Jesuit high schools? Because, we're going to co-create for the greater glory of God. The fundamental reason we all spend our lives, whether it's on the board or in preparing teachers or in doing administration or teaching in the classroom, is that we want to do the right thing for the right reason. So, we have a mission – fundamentally, to do the right thing for the right reason. There is a wonderful Sufi mystic who is thinking about his life and he's getting toward the end of his life. He's saying, I've paid attention to my conscience and I really have enjoyed being in your presence, I've really worked on behalf of your creation, and he goes on in the prayer sort of congratulating himself on the great work that's been done, and he realizes how important he's been to God, and he ends this prayer with, oh my God, when I die, what are you going to do without me? It's a great, great way of being in the world. That joy of doing the right thing for the right reason because we're grafted to the divine in the great cosmos here gets more specific when we come down to, what is the right thing for the right reason for you and I where we have adopted a particular theology or try to live out of it. What is that? This advocacy for – we used to call it “preferential treatment for the poor” – the losers is tremendous. That's what we're supposed to do; that's what the gospel compels us to do – advocate for the losers. And, then, of course, when you try to put that hat on in terms of education, and then say to get into our schools you have to have an ACT score of this and our reputation is based on ranking and all those kinds of things, you say are we being faithful to our...living the advocacy we're called to do and the mission we're inspired by. Those are my big picture things, and they're important, because when I get down to talk about the little things, about the economics, about professional development and the economics of paying teachers, you have to keep coming back to these beliefs. You take those beliefs away, and, you know, I could go become a businessman and be a nice person (with a nice car; a rich person with a nice car).

What is the most significant event I think that's going to influence education? You know, teacher reform left to its own devices will plug along, and we'll make progress slower than the hospital system will, because we have fewer real levers to make progress. But, something is going to happen, I suspect, in the next ten years (maybe five years) to make us jump out of our current shoes and step into the world in a new way. And, I think, based on the conversations I've been privileged to have in the last two years, I think that single event is going to be the genome project, the mapping of human life

given DNA. That new knowledge base is predicated by some to change our society ten times as much as technology changed it in 1960. We see it – how technology has changed. Conversations I've had seem to indicate that technology will be old hat compared to what we'll learn about knowledge and human life and how we can manipulate human life and the moral and ethical dilemmas that leaves us with. And, then that throws us into, what constitutes quality of life – now we're moving away from quantifiable to qualifiable – and opens up a whole new world to us. The advances we're making – we call in brain research now – are increasing exponentially. From a neurological standpoint, we're in the infancy stage compared to what we're going to know in five or seven years about how the human brain works. What we know about how children learn language, where language is formed, and by what age it is formed... Why are we teaching philosophy to an eighteen year old when we know that part of the brain that would be terrific for the development of thinking about logic develops at two or three or five. It ought to upset, grossly, our elementary curriculum. I'm a futurist. I think that's going to happen. I think our elementary curriculum and how we think about teaching and learning are going to be drastically affected in the next five to seven years, and I think it will be, in part, due to the human genome project, because we are going to be able to see learning happening physiologically in the brain.

That brings me down to the mapping of life and the wisdoms of learning. How are we going to begin to accept the fact that some of the things we've accepted as fact are not, in fact, fact at all? One of my favorite examples of this is: in 1957 or 1958 when pulsars were discovered by a scientist at MIT, and they didn't know what they were when they saw these pulsars coming through the universe, and so they actually called them LGM's (little green men). They recorded these pulsars coming through the universe and were able to see something they had never seen before and name them. And, from that fact, they created theories about what these bodies out in the universe must be like. And, they developed a whole bunch of theories around that. Then, about six or seven years ago, an MIT scientist sitting at his computer waiting to go home noticed a glitch coming up on his computer, and because he was a perfectionist, said, I don't want to come back tomorrow morning and have to look at this glitch, and he tried to fix it, and he couldn't fix it. The date kept coming in, and he discovered the binary pulsar. He got a Nobel Prize for it. The guy's like thirty-two years old. What did he discover? This pulsar that was coming down through the universe wasn't a pulsar at all, it was a solid stream of energy, and, in fact, what he was seeing was the lighthouse effect. That is the thing that was solid emitting energy all of the time in a consistent way just happened to pass his window every so often and gave the illusion of a pulse. But, in fact, it was like a lighthouse, turning all the time. That new knowledge, that new discovery upset the current theories and we had to start all over again in terms of binary pulsars rather than pulsars. Is this a new thing in our world? No, you can go back and read the letters of Aristotle – Aristotle is criticizing the Pythagoreans for having theories, and, then, when the facts came up saying, you're distorting the facts to match your theory. I always think that that what we do with women's ordination – the facts say it should be okay; it's been done before so we should be able to do it – but we have these theories, so we will manipulate the facts to do that. Can our world stand to have such poor thinking in the future? No, because of life and death issues – what we consider to be life and death

issues are going to be a part of this. So, our thinking has to become clear, has to be more rooted in the truth, and has to be more challenged. We need better thinkers, because we cannot allow the decisions of life in our world and our divinities and the way we are (how we co-create) – we cannot allow the created world to be left in the hands of just a few, who, because of their education and their privilege move themselves into positions of power and authority. Our schools ought to educate everyone that we come in contact with to become co-participants in the decisions of things that affect the world with each of us using our talents and skills according to our gifts.

Knowledge is going to keep coming at us, so we might as well enjoy it. Now this is my observation – this is a McGuiganism – I think what happens as we get more stuff is that on the continuum (and in some ways it's not a continuum, but for my purposes here), if we look at knowledge and being in the world as good and evil – going back to the fundamental thing, if you're a creator and you gave everybody free will, you're going to wind up with good and the powers of evil. In our world, as we discover more about who we are, as we can name the things that are happening to us in our existence, we end up with fewer things that are absolute and fewer things that are absolute in terms of evil. I'm simply using here the terms good, i.e., that which co-creates the creation, keeps it moving, and evil in terms of that which destroys that which was aspired. Most of our life is in between those two small absolutes. I wish it were like the commercial where they throw a whole bunch of dirt on the ground and they say, life is messy, clean it up, then they pull out the little vacuum cleaner and everything is lean. The more we learn, the more we realize the interrelatedness of all information so that it becomes more complex, the more complex information is the harder it is to think about it in terms of right and wrong, the more it's difficult to think about living in the midst of abstraction, i.e., to realize that a lot of life is in the gray, the more uncomfortable many of us become, especially if we were poorly educated. Life is messy; it is complicated; it's uncomfortable, and I think that's the reason that when we were talking about the reaction to fundamentalism, that people run to fundamentalism is because it tells me what is absolute in a world that is not. The problem with fundamentalism and searching out for comfort in that mode, it seems to me, is that it's rooted in a search for righteousness, i.e., I need to be right. The problem with that is that when I need to be right, you need to be wrong. And, so we end up in a world that's judgmental. Our schools need to be concerned with, how do we help people to know good and goodness and avoid evil and do the right thing for the right reason without becoming judgment.

Education, then, has two huge parts for me in the next twenty years. True, active exploration of knowledge – not information. Knowledge, and by that I think all teaching will have to be interdisciplinary by nature once we have some fundamental information down. Science with philosophy and fine arts with the skills of social and political analysis, because the world we live in is already global and it's going to get smaller. Conversely, because we are seeing this as part of the co-creative process, we cannot teach, be teachers, or be students without a life of contemplation, because fact without thought or inspiration, living without grace, teaching without intent rooted in mission, rooted in existence, rooted in being immersed with God probably is not going to happen. So, if I had to say anything in terms of where should Jesuit education move into new

ground and reprioritize, it would be in the area of the importance of contemplation as an active part of our day – not starting with our administrators and our teachers, but starting with our administrators, our teachers, and our students at the same time; building that into our curriculum so that our education is a delicate balance of these things we know to be true. Our education, just from a straight pedagogical perspective, has got to be more flexible, timely, effective, etc.

There are some fundamental processes that I am beginning to uncover that I think are going to be important to schools. That is, all teaching is going to have to have the element of belonging. If kids don't belong, they have to find a place to belong in that school. If teachers don't belong, they have to find a place of belonging. And, in the big picture, that is, in fact, the belonging that allows us to be faithful to the Creator. Competence – but I mean competence in both the active exploration of knowledge and be able to say what knowledge is of most worth, because there's going to be so much of it...so the learning about how I process and prioritize knowledge along with that place that makes me wisdom are my competencies for the world. Think of those kids that will be born in 2010, who will die in 3000. Think of the competencies in wisdom and knowledge that they'll need. That's where our schools can go, and that's kind of cool. From there, that should lead us to interdependency and a kind of generosity as God is generous in terms of seeing the world as very, very large – good and evil coexisting, the right of will being explored throughout time.

Lastly, going down to the tiny, tiny parts of the things facing us in terms of the attributes of educators. Not that people come to us with these things, but they are things that we develop over a lifetime, and there are things that are not just for Catholic, Jesuit educators but for all educators. We've got to teach from a passionate center. The spirit of killing kids' curiosity, knowledge, drive and enjoyment of learning by the third grade has got to stop. If you can't be passionate about teaching, get out of the profession. I think we have to be hard nosed about that. We need honest teachers who are honest learners. You don't get to protect your content anymore if you're not also going to explore it. But, protecting it and exploring it is honest and has some integrity to it. We have to have people in classrooms who have lives outside or beyond as well as within their own home culture. Only then, are we going to have multicultural things. We're moving in the right direction. I don't think we're without it. I think we are more comprehensive. A Latino in most of the classrooms I go into would not be as comfortable as a white kid going into that classroom. That's a problem, and we ought to start saying that to the people that enter into our classrooms. In addition to those, educators in Catholic schools are going to have to be contemplative. I don't know whether all Jesuit educators will go through the *Exercises*. But, it's kind of an interesting thought. What if our teachers who were out ten or fifteen years had some sort of tertianship for educators? How would our schools and our partnerships change because of what we know works in formation if we applied it to those who were doing some of that stuff? They will have to be, as Catholics, faithful to the community as a Eucharistic community. You can't believe that we are bread broken for each other if you can't believe that we spend our lives on a common mission. Then, you know, a Jesuit school is probably not the right place for you. You might not be doing the right thing for the right reason.

I think the issues are going to be: (1) getting people with generous leadership styles so that they can engage in the kind of collaborative leadership that Geoff Dillon was talking about. This says PSI, which simply is a pressure index. If the pressure on an administrator is 50 lbs., and the support for that administrator is there but it is 10 lbs., what's going to happen to the administrator? They're going to be crushed. The same thing with our teacher, and the same thing with our students. Our professional development and our support of our professions have to be greater than the pressure index that's upon them. If I saw a single flaw in our administrative codes right now it would be that the pressure is greater than the resources to support it. And, if the pressure is the same, then all you get is status quo. So, our positive pressures have to be greater than our negative ones. (2) The need for staff development – remember I said that education has two big bars: the exploration of knowledge and contemplation. Professional development has to be the place where we bring those two things together. We have to start doing in practice what we think we know.

What is the single most influential factor in the next 3 years affecting Jesuit education? It's going to be the teacher shortage across the board – those of you hiring know this, and those of you hiring administrators know this. The overwhelming shortage of good teachers who are willing to work for the pay. If things work out well, pay will go up. Now, what that does to private and Catholic schools is affect our tuition base. Are we going to, then, further ourselves from the very poor? If pay scales don't go up and teacher salaries don't go up, then we know statistically from a report that came out last month on the National Center for Educational Statistics, that our very best teachers will leave education. So, you get your pick of two difficult problems there. I think the way we're going to approach that immediately is to look at large endowments for teacher salaries so that we don't have to out price ourselves for being an advocate for the losers. It's difficult, but, you know what, maybe you could have two cars instead of three.

HUMAN DIGNITY AND THE FIRST PRINCIPLE AND FOUNDATION

Gordon Bennett, S.J.

Good morning. Since I see that there's a record being made, let me say for the record how very much I appreciate this opportunity to be here. It's certainly been area of very thoughtful, fruitful consideration and judgment for me considering the fact that being a bishop now and having a whole new set of concerns doesn't eliminate the affection and passion I have for Jesuit education. It really only enhances it and puts it in a different and somewhat larger context.

I'm going to take a few minutes to respond to the second and third questions that have been presented for consideration by the guests of the Think Tank. One of the disadvantages of going first is that I have no idea whether or not these thoughts will come out of left field and be really relevant. The advantage of it is that there are certainly not derivative and, hopefully, they will be useful and challenging.

With respect to the second question which has to do with the great challenges and opportunities that young adults should be prepared to meet in the year 2020 – in thinking about this and taking into account what we have experienced as a worldwide, global culture within the last decade of the 20th century and what we're likely to experience in the 21st century with all the achievement that has been secured and all of the possibilities that are yet to be discovered about this wonderful world, it seems to me that beneath all that there is really only one challenge. That is, how to preserve our human dignity. It seems to me that method in education is one. But, the method needs to derive from philosophy. It is kind of that take that I would like to explore for a few moments this morning. When I say, preserving human dignity, I mean precisely that. I mean how we teach young men and women to live within the balance of discovering everything that is possible in this wonderful world and yet, at the same time, make sure everyone has a consciousness that they, along with everyone else, are a unique gift to this world created by God and endowed with an inalienable dignity which cannot be take away from them – everyone without exception. The first two millennia since the birth of Jesus concentrated to a large extent on individual morality, that is to say, how an individual interfaces with God, with one's loved ones, with one compatriots, with strangers, and even with enemies. And, the converse of a life lived in virtue produced several reflections throughout those two thousand years on the seven capital sins. As we begin the third millennium that individual morality, while not being put in the background in any sense or denigrated in any way, needs to kind of take a second place to a continued reflection on social morality. In the 1940's, Gandhi elucidated what he called, the seven capital social sins. He said they were

- Politics without principle
- Wealth without work
- Pleasure without conscience

- Knowledge without character
- Commerce without morality
- Science without humanity
- Religion without sacrifice

This extremely prescient reflection on the part of Gandhi is a kind of bellwether about the society and the culture which the entire world could slip into to if we don't take great care to live in balance between achievement and preserving human dignity. Every single one of these, we certainly, in today's world, see the beginnings of. Above all, the challenge that young men and young women educated in Jesuit schools will have to face is how to continue to draw upon what is essentially God's work not only for themselves but for everyone else on the face of the earth. That's an extraordinary challenge. As I was saying last night to our little group, we can presume, I think, that Jesuit schools will continue to work hard to achieve the goals of academic excellence. I have no doubt about that. But, it's this deeper challenge, this more philosophical challenge which is going to continue to be brought into higher and deeper relief as the years roll on.

In the third question which names the goals of Jesuit education asks us to reflect on, from what we know about Jesuit schools, what values and traditions should our schools strive to maintain and even strengthen for the benefit of their students and parents. The thing that strikes me and is in concert with what I've said in response to the second questions has to do with maintaining the sense of integrity to the Ignatian tradition. What I mean by that is this. It seems to me that what Jesuit schools should continue to proclaim with even deeper and greater clarity is that becoming part of a Jesuit school is to become part of an intentional community, which is to say that it is not a haphazard association of people. Those who are responsible for the institution and those who wish to become a part of it come for a specific reason with a specific goal in mind. The Jesuit school is centered around a point of view, and the point of view needs to be continually and explicitly and clearly associated with the charisma of Ignatius of Loyola. The way that this has laid itself out for me is a reflection on *The Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius. The *Spiritual Exercises* can be misconstrued as basically a reflection on the life and the mission and the message of Jesus Christ. While it's not wrong, it's incomplete, because there is a deeper, more pervasive attitude that Ignatius presented even before the meditations on the life of Christ that I think all Jesuit institutions and ministries need to emphasize more. It has to do with the First Principle and Foundation which is, as you know, the prelude to the *Exercises*. Ignatius didn't just start with Jesus. He put Jesus into a context. The first thing that happens for Ignatius is that before you get to Jesus, you have to think about what our purpose is – what is the end of human being; why are we here? That is the reason why he begins the journey with Jesus with a series of reflections on what it means to be a human being at all. We just don't jump into meditating on Jesus and walking with Jesus. What we do first of all is look at the purpose of human existence. And, Ignatius says that the purpose of human existence, all human existence, the reason why God's saving and creating activity is going on in us at all is to call each and every human being to three activities (not just ideas, but activities): praise, reverence, and service of God. Praise, reverence, and service of God who is the creator and to know God, not only in his creation but to know God in himself...in this

sense – we know God in his axioms (God who is one, God who is true, God who is beautiful, and God who is good). At least one of the foundational purposes of what all of Jesuit ministry is to reveal God in those ways and to call everyone to those three activities – praise, reverence, and service. This is a worldview of Ignatius which is essentially optimistic and that’s another think that Jesuit education should emphasize – that the world is basically beautiful because it is charged with the grandeur of God. It is good. God has created everything good. But, human beings in distinction to everything else in creation are called to a relationship with the creator which transcends everything in creation so that we don’t stop with anything that is created but see in it the glory of God. We are always faced with the temptation and the question about everything that we encounter, does this lead to God or does this lead away from God? As long as it leads to God, you should do it and as long as it leads away from God, you should not do it. This implies a specific and serious and necessary discernment of absolutely everything Does this lead me to God? Does this lead me away from God? The activity in all of Jesuit ministry but particularly in the schools needs to help people answer that question. The other thing that is important about the First Principle and Foundation is that Ignatius’ view of the purpose of humanity is very, very strongly imbued with a tremendous and profound respect for human beings, not so much because of what they’re capable of but because of what they already have. Those two things are intellect and will. What God has given us is an intellect which can know the truth and God has given us a will with which we might love the good. That, as part of a tradition and part of the values we share, means that what we need to do is to provide the milieu in which people can know what is true and to love what is good. Seen in that background, then it is possible to go on and meditate on Jesus Christ, because Jesus Christ is the embodiment of that kind of human living which shows a profound respect not only for oneself and all others but particularly in the relationship with God. In answering the question, what values and traditions need to be preserved, strengthened, maintained, I would say it is the emphasis on the purpose of human existence and how important it is to discern what leads to God and what leads away from God and, thirdly, the unambiguous presentation of Jesus Christ as the model for human living.

I want to close this reflection by quoting from “A Man For All Seasons” by Robert Bolt which celebrated the life of Thomas Moore in which Robert Bolt puts in the mouth of Thomas Moore something that I think Ignatius would certainly have agreed with. This comes at a time in the play when Thomas Moore is just about to be arrested for treason, for not going along with the oath of supremacy and there are asking him why he resists it. This is an exercise for him – it’s not being petulant, it’s not being mean, it’s not being stubborn – of his human dignity. He says:

God made the angels to show him splendor as he made plants for their simplicity and animals for their innocence. But, human beings God made to serve him wittily in the tangle of their minds.

I think that’s what Ignatius would say – that our whole purpose is to serve God wittily – to use our minds to know the truth and to love what is good. That seems to me to be the value that Ignatian education needs to pursue not only in these next twenty years but forever.

MEGAFORCES OF GLOBALIZATION

British Robinson

As I don't have an educational background or real experience in Jesuit secondary or higher education, it is helpful for me to set the context from which I am going to approach your questions, what some of us call "thunder thinking." I approach this presentation through the lens of the social apostolate in really what is going on politically and socially in our society whether that be local or global.

I understand you have heard a lot about globalization—the big G; given that, you probably have more than enough understanding or grasp or are really confused. Globalization is a tough thing to get our heads around. And that's the problem. Therein really lies the problem. How do you deal with all of this? You could term it as chaos. How do you deal with educating our students trying to understand globalization? It's hard to simplify the definition. I want to quickly run through that just to situate us and then move from globalization, the big effect or overarching international system that we're seeing affecting so much of lives, really affecting the spiritual and cultural challenges of what we're dealing with. And then move to what I would say is, and focus a little bit more on, what we call globalization on the micro level or the local level, and for us as Christians and as Catholics and people who believe in Ignatian spirituality, to the community level where social teaching tells us subsidiarity which moves us to Jesuit high schools as instruments of the community, Jesuit high schools as stake holders. And that's where I want to leave you-- with response to the challenge of megaforges around regionalism and globalization.

First, really quickly, just to situate us, we describe globalization as the worldwide web. It's the hundred-yard dash, run over, anxiety, fear, and change. We're all connected to the Internet. Nobody is in charge. There is change in the power structure, change between nation states and government, change between global markets, now what we call super empowered individualists. So there is all of this chaos going on as we move out of the Industrial Era into what we call the Knowledge Era, again education being so critical to moving us along, culturally and spiritually.

Many of you might know about Thomas Friedman who wrote this wonderful book called *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. He does such a good job of simplifying globalization for us and he uses the term, Lexus, the car, and the olive tree in that he really says that the Lexus is about modernizing, streamlining, privatizing economies and global systems. Then he explains the olive tree as it's us, community, family, tribe, nation, religion, culture, all of that. As Gordon (Bennet) said, there's a huge tension between globalization, modernizing technology and what we call ancient forces or culture and geography-conditioning communities.

There are five areas in which Friedman points to for an understanding of globalization. 1) **The fight**: fighting over economic development and material fulfillment, religious and cultural identity; individual and community identity. 2) **The threat**: to the olive tree, for us. The Lexus represents an anonymous, transnational, homogenizing, standardizing

market forces and technologies that make up today's globalizing economic system. From that we see a backlash which some would argue bring about the dissolution of our communities, our culture and our spirituality. 3) **Empowerment**: globalization has a positive side: it can empower the smallest, weakest political community to actually use the new technologies and markets to preserve their olive trees, their culture and identity. You can really see that in the Third World and in our context with people who are refugees seeking asylum. They're really able to connect and to understand what it means to move across borders. 4) **Challenge**: individuals/countries to find a balance by preserving a sense of identity, home and community doing what it takes to survive within the globalization system. 5) **Survival**: Survival is going to depend upon the balance between the Lexus and the olive tree, the balance between all of these forces and keeping in mind our spirituality and what it means to be community.

So, given all of that, it's critical that we have a moral framework and values from which to work. I'd like to read this quote from Michael Maza who wrote a book about global trends. He says, "The fundamental character of the social economic and cultural renewal will urgently need more to acquire a need to change our hearts and minds. But the change will demand a new kind of politics, a politics with spiritual values. Our societal failure to address a belonging for spiritual connectedness tempts us into the no-spiritual excesses that threaten to bring us to ruin. That's just a little bit of context and that leads almost to the confusion around our culture: spiritual emptiness, longing, is there real hope, values being in flux because of tension between prosperity and materialism, individuality and individualism, cultural expression, and cultural sort of inclusion all being stressed together.

Culture is critical. It's no less a resource than really the condition of an environment. And culture is also in the knowledge era. Culture is being considered as the prism for shifting and refocusing the effect of globalization. In an *Invitation to Sociology*, P. Berger says that 'Society and culture not only control our movements but shapes our identity, our thought, and our emotions. The structures of society become structures of our own consciousness.'

Given that culture is so important in cultural clashes-- we're seeing it now and it will only intensify over the next ten, twenty, thirty years-- it's very important that we get a hold of that because it's already causing, focusing misunderstanding, cultural clashes whether we look at the inner city of Baltimore, at Ethiopia and Eritrea, at what's going on in the Middle East, or the Sudan. It's global and it's local. How do we get a handle on that?

The other major trend that I want to talk about—looking at globalization in a kind of micro way—is what we call trends in shaping the city and I am not sure that you all are aware of this, but my own background is in housing, community and economic development, and I'll be remiss if I do not give you some sense of that. We would say in the development community: what is left in our inner cities? Really it's some core elements of civil society. If you go in and it's burned out, bombed out, you see depression and marginalized people, churches, high schools, universities. That's what is left in our inner city. How are those critical institutions of society responding to the

crises of the day? I know that we're doing things and we're doing quite well at them, but my argument would be that we need to be more intentional, more deliberate.

Let me just give you some statistics as to the new face of the city, suburbs and what we call regionalism: what it's going to look like in 2030, and these data just came out two weeks ago. There are four megaforges that are shaping regionalism: 1) high-tech, global economy, 2) new demography or demographics, 3) housing challenge and 4) decentralization or what we call land use. Quickly, the high-tech global economy is creating winners and losers; there is a digital divide. In the suburbs jobs are growing 30 percent faster than in the cities. 1 in 8 cities is doubly burdened so they have high unemployment, population loss and high poverty rates. The second point is the changing demographics: our cities and regions are multi-generational, multi-racial and multi-ethnic. In 2000 our population hovers around 275 million; in 2030 it will hover around 350 million. The projected additional 75 million will be immigrants/children driving economic expansion in the demands for goods and services, demand for education in how we close the digital divide through education. In 2030 there's the biggest change— increase in elderly population. We are getting older and we're living longer. Our elder population in core inner cities, what we call first-ring suburbs, will double to about 70 million, which will make up approximately 20 percent of the total U.S. population. We're aging in place; they are going to stay in the inner cities, and many will live below the poverty line and they will face very special challenges. One of those challenges is that the housing is aging. In 2030, 3 million seniors will need housing repair. They'll be economically pressed and won't have the money or needs to fix their dwellings.

The other key piece of the demographics is race and ethnicity. Again immigrants are feeling diversity both in the suburbs and the cities, and it's no longer homogeneous. So how do people in the suburbs deal with that? The third is the housing challenge. There is a strong economy paradox. Right now there are about 5.4 million low-income families paying more than 50 percent of their income for housing and/or in severely distressed housing, and that will lead to further impact in our inner cities. We're also seeing some people move out to the suburbs, seeing an increasing growth in our neighborhoods. The face of that really is the stress of being overcrowded. Even as we move out to the suburbs people are moving further and further out, further apart, and the homes are even larger. Again, isolation, individualism - who are we connecting? Who is community?

The 4th megaforge shaping our metropolitan areas is what we call decentralization and how we're using land. We are building and building. We haven't looked at the impact of infrastructure. There are a number of unintended consequences to all of this building. The first and most crucial, when you look at education, is the draining of resources, the draining of the tax base in our inner cities, whether it be roads, hospitals, in particular schools, because it's all going out to the suburbs.

This leads to one of the things that Jesuit education can really assist with. And this is really thinking outside the box. This is not about us but about outside, the community in which we sit. How can Jesuit education/institutions assist in improving education more broadly, whether that be public education, other schools around us, needs of the

community, training, after school classes, English, technology—that's something we really have to think about. Schools need to look at regional cooperation. How do we link the cities to the suburbs, help people join forces across local jurisdictions around issues like transportation, environmental protection, housing affordability, concentrated poverty, and economic development?

About 50 percent of our schools are in metropolitan areas, and you have people commuting in. We need to begin to have students and parents understand their responsibility, what's really happening in that core inner city, so that they become stakeholders.

Finally I want to get to some of those answers about being a stakeholder. If globalization and trends of the megaforges raise new kinds of complexities in these issues, not only local but also global, these complexities challenge us to move outside the box beyond old methodologies. Avery Dulles said that we have the opportunity to show how faith and reason can collaborate in promoting respect for human dignity. Schools can be centers for retrieving the philosophical and religious heritage that underlies the American experiment in ordered liberty. In broad terms, one of the suggestions is subjects taught have changed but the teaching methods have not. This is what Maza argues. He says that reform in education requires one clear thing: it needs to be more holistic. It needs to show relationships between disciplines and issues, must be more high tech using software games, virtual reality, and must be characterized by more choice in competition at all levels. We must teach students how to learn, how to weave together the disparate perspectives in order to produce a broader picture. Students need to really see globalization in a more holistic fashion, thereby ordering the chaos. In other words, change the curriculum so that we help students to be real strategists, keep the forest as well as the trees in view, and have awareness of the whole so they don't see the drift. The drift comes, which is what we're seeing now, and it is producing spiritual desolation.

Coming back to the social apostolate, if our goal is authentic community, do we see the high school as church, is the high school a change agent? I think that Catholic social teaching and Ignatian spirituality call us to see our institutions as change agents, as institutions that can rebuild community which in and of itself is social. And this gets back to Joe O'Connell's point yesterday: the social apostolate undergirds for us, people working in the Jesuit schools, everything we do. That points us in a direction that tells us we can break down the order and chaos through some social way of acting.

I'll conclude with these thoughts. School as stakeholders: I said earlier you should be more deliberate and intentional as a stakeholder retaking that place in civil society as institution, as an instrument. Community service: you do that and you do it well, but how can you change that and do a better job? I would say with aging population, take that data, put it with community service. I think about St. Ignatius in Cleveland. They built housing in that neighborhood—as populations age, how do our high schools become builders of housing, helping the elderly people stay there and survive? That's one critical thing, and you can twist community service in a number of ways without getting into details. Religious formation, things like prayer groups, CLC, faculty/staff and parent involvement. Parents just can't get into the Volvo and drive their children from Potomac,

Maryland to Gonzaga everyday. Again, creating the community and that speaks to the megaforges of the urban, the regionalism and the sprawl. Investment—this is way outside the box. How are we using our money and our investments? How is Jesuit education doing social responsible investing? Are there alternative investments? Again, putting money into housing, community economic development projects on the local level. Globally, can schools twin more with those who are in other parts of the world to really help the students to get a sense of the international perspective?

Finally I think looking at development and megaforges will really help to change the balance of power, creating authentic community, helping all of us who are trying to reach out to the poor and the marginalized to come together.

AUTHENTICITY IN ACCOUNTABILITY

Michael Guerra

I have a long history of association with Jesuit education. I was formed by Jesuit educators; I owe them a great debt. In the course of my work at NCEA, Jesuit educators have been great partners. A lot of very important work is going on in Jesuit schools and particularly at JSEA. We've been able to collaborate in a number of ways. People have done very important things for others in Catholic education to share some of the work that's gone on through JSEA in recent years. So, both personally and professionally, it's a pleasure for me to be here, and I feel it's part of a debt to pay.

Let me begin with a pop-quiz. Don't respond until I ask you to. There was a movie in which the late Alec Guinness starred. It had to do with the building of bridge. Don't respond now. The bridge was built to accommodate the enemy and to allow the enemy to accomplish the enemy's mission. Yet, it was built with great pride. Without identifying the title of the movie, I want you to respond musically in a way that identifies that movie. Can you do that? Do that now, please...(da na, da na na na na na, da na, da na na na na na). That's terrific. That is my genuflection to multiple intelligence. How does it end? What's the last word in the movie? Madness. A lot of issues going on there. Why were these people caught up in the building of that bridge? And, who determined where the bridge would be built? Who determined what river the bridge would cross? The context issues, I think, are awfully important.

I agree with 97% of the eloquent presentation that Gordon made. One piece that I do not agree with is the notion that we can take academic excellence for granted. I would suggest that all of us in Catholic education are caught up in a set of accountabilities. One of the two or three major challenges we face is to not only understand and articulate an authentic mission, but to understand and deal with appropriately a variety of levels of accountability. I don't think we can simply take it for granted; that the way in which that has happened in the past is the way in which it will happen in the future. Everybody is called to talk about what the future will be like. One way to do that is to take the present and one point in the past and to draw a line and then to suggest that the line continues. The fundamental assumption there is that this is a linear function, and that's ridiculous. Anybody who looks at reality knows it's much more complicated than that. So, if you take a number of points, you see the ups and the downs and the dips of a much more complicated, non-linear reality. I want to take a few of those points in the past in order to create a running start before I leap into the abyss.

When I began as a baby headmaster some years ago, I had a colleague who shall be nameless; a young Jesuit who had just returned with a doctorate from Stanford. He remains prominent in the world of Jesuit leadership. He was fond of speaking about the need to break out of the old model; to get away from teacher-centered classrooms; to have students become much more active in controlling their own learning. He spoke

endlessly about that topic and took no interruptions. There were always bets made about how long he would go. It was hard to overestimate how long he would go. The legendary Bob Newton leaned over once and said, "it wouldn't be so bad if he wouldn't insist on starting with Genesis." I will try not to go back that far, and I will move quickly through some of this history. This will be the Cliff Notes version of the history. I'll talk about Catholic education, and, ultimately, I'll talk about accountability in, perhaps, three different directions depending upon the time that we have. I'll suggest that all Catholic schools, as schools, are accountable to the civic community. And, as Catholic schools, they're accountable to the Catholic community. That has played out in different ways at different time. Let me say in the beginning that the pattern here in our relationship with the civic community is roughly this: hostility, tolerance, indifference, enthusiasm, embrace. Our relationship to the Catholic community is roughly this: enthusiasm, hostility, tolerance, indifference, enthusiasm, embrace. I would conclude that to be embraced is a mixed blessing, and we need to think a little bit about that.

Let me work through the pre-embrace in our history starting in 1925. This is the 75th anniversary of the Pierce Decision. The Pierce Decision is the moment when one particular state, the state of Oregon, said that kids can only be educated in public schools and that there is no way that the society can be served appropriately unless all of its children are educated in the public schools. The Catholic community came together and challenged that. The Supreme Court struck down that law. From that moment on it was clear that parents have the right to educate their children in non-public schools, including Catholic schools. That decision also includes language that says that the state has the right to provide reasonable supervision of these schools. That's not often quoted. What's often quoted is the language, the child is no mere creature of the state (very powerful language). That laid out some markers. Following that period of time there was largely indifference and tolerance on the part of the civic community, but the Catholic community was energized, and there was a great movement to demonstrate the quality of Catholic schools. Two of the high points of that movement would be the teacher formation movement that religious women, who were doing most of the teaching, should have the opportunity for professional training and the other would be regional accreditation, particularly for high schools. The overwhelming majority of our schools are now members of regional accrediting agencies, and I would argue the impetus for that initially was to demonstrate that we were good, professional, and competent. 1965 is kind of a quantitative high-water mark. We have about five and a half million kids in American Catholic schools, and we're in the throws of a building campaign. In lots of places across the country, new schools are going up. There's no question but that this is important to the whole Catholic community. Diocesan drives raise money to build diocesan high schools. Suddenly that comes crashing down for a variety of reasons. Some of them, I would suggest, are ecclesial, some are political, some are sociological. Certainly at the end of the council, questions were raised about the value of schools. Is this a disproportionate commitment of resources? The question was raised about the value of institutional apostolates, a reflection of a larger question in society of the authenticity of all institutions and a kind of failure in confidence. Lots of institutions were lost during that ten-year period. Maybe they were inevitably lost. Maybe it was a function of leadership. The fact is that institutions were lost. In the 1980's things begin

to change, and they begin to change, I would argue, because of some external forces and some research, notably the research that James Coleman did in 1982 and 1987, and also a report of the Commission on Excellence in American Education commonly known as “A Nation at Risk.” That report looked at American education generally and said it is mediocre; excellence is the exception and not the norm. One can see that as the starting point for what is called the educational reform movement. But it also raises awareness about this question of the quality of education and its impact on the larger community. It changes the array of forces, and all of a sudden people begin to look at Catholic schools and say, these schools seem to be working and working rather well. Lots of people outside the Catholic community are saying this, and there’s a renewal of energy and commitment. Now, go back to the early 70’s. Two things happened pretty much at the same time. One is the founding of this organization – the JSEA – and the other is the bishop’s pastoral letter, “To Teach as Jesus Did”. I see some similar motivations driving that. The bishops, perhaps, don’t have as wonderful a story of the upper room that the JSEA has and the Preamble, but in each case there is an examination of mission. Do we really know what we’re about? Is it slipping away? Are we just going through the motions? Or, is this something unique that we can articulate? Then we can get behind it and generate some energy. In each case, I think those documents served a seminal purpose. For the document, “To Teach as Jesus Did”, the essence was to affirm the commitment of the institutional Church. There was a time lag between the affirmation and the implementation, but that’s another issue. If our schools are true to their mission and the marks that were laid out – message, community, service – didn’t solve all the problems and didn’t provide a set of litmus tests to be used in any given situation but provided an intellectual construct and a sense that we were engaged in work that was important to the Church and important to the world and deserved our best effort. I think that’s still true. That enthusiasm which begins to converge, an enthusiasm of the Catholic community, an enthusiasm of the civic community, leads to an embrace. I was in Poland before the government changed, and I remember talking to a young Pole about the relationship of Poland to Russia. He said mother Russia loves Poland, and mother Russia embraces Poland, but mother Russia is a bear. And, one has to be careful when one is being embraced by a bear. I think this question of the embrace by the civic community and to some extent the embrace of the Catholic community is a multidimensional issue.

Let me now talk about accountability as an aspect of authenticity. It is, in my view, a new world in which it is unrealistic to assume that educators at any level are operating with complete autonomy in determining their mission and determining the way in which they’ll be held accountable for their mission. And, yet, if we are not intentional, if we do not articulate our mission in a way that’s understandable to other, and if we don’t identify the measures by which we hold ourselves accountable, those measures will be identified externally. A couple of examples – what is called the standards movement, assessment. Does this impact our schools directly? In some cases yes and in some cases no. But, it certainly impacts all of us indirectly, if not directly. If in a given state high stakes tests are not mandated for all schools, then there are ways through regional accreditation, through the perceptions of parents, through markets (and the markets are irresistible) that those high-stake tests are relevant to what we do. Do that matter? I say it matters immensely. Because, competence – academic excellence – is not a category apart from

formation. I would argue that our mission incorporates a vision of academic excellence and faith commitment and service that are aspects of a single reality. When they are compartmentalized, the tendency is to trivialize them. The same can happen on the other end. The institutional Church may call for measures of accountability for our religious purpose that prescind from our academic mission. I would argue that we have to articulate our mission in such a way that it is holistic, that it isn't pulled apart.

Gordon talked about Bolt's "Man For All Seasons". I remember this conversation. Richard Rich asks Moore what he ought to do, and Moore says, "you'd be a terrific teacher." Rich says, "but, if I were a teacher, who would know?" And, Moore says, "you would know, your students would know, God would know – not a bad trinity." Powerful line, and it certainly speaks to the importance of teaching. What it overlooks, I think, is that it is not a private act. It isn't simply a matter of the student, teacher and God. It's also a matter of the world. The world should know, or the world should in some sense be different because of this act that involves the student, the teacher and God. It is important for us to hold on to that power at the same time that we acknowledge our accountability. There are legitimate claims on us. I don't want to dismiss the civic community's right to know what it is we're about, and I certainly don't want to dismiss the Church's right to know what we're about. Just as standardized tests may represent a very narrow focus of our mission, so certain measures of course content, teacher certification in religion, and religious practice would represent an incomplete version of what we're about. So we either get there first or others get there before us. And, we find our mission being defined in ways that may not really work for us and for our students. Authenticity in accountability is one of the great challenges we all face. For Jesuit schools, as for all schools, with a connection to a religious community there is still another layer of accountability. These schools are part of an Ignatian community, and they need to be accountable, in appropriate ways, to the Ignatian community and for a fidelity to that Ignatian vision. The second great challenge that all schools face, and I think that Jesuit schools are among them, is access. This is a very complicated question that I don't think we really have time to explore. Who comes to our schools? Who are they? Let me go back to Peter Henrio – the great Jesuit who was at the Center for Concern and has been in Africa for a number of years. He did a wonderful analysis on the preferential option for the poor, and as part of that analysis, had a number of criteria. I recall Peter said, "It is not simply or primarily a question of whom you teach. If it were my Jesuit colleagues would be in bad shape. It is primary a matter of what you teach and how you teach and what your students do with their lives." And, I think that is true. If, in fact, our people are making a difference in the world and living lives of sensitivity to the marginalized, that doesn't relieve us of the burden of asking, who comes through the door? And, that doesn't relieve us of the burden of seeing our schools in a context that is larger than any single institution. Let me go back to the time I was at Loyola. When I was at Loyola, we paid dues to everybody. We paid dues to the National Catholic Education Association. We paid dues to the Jesuit Secondary Education Association. We paid dues to the Middle States Association for Secondary Schools. We paid dues to the New York State Association of Independent Schools. And, we paid dues to the National Association of Independent Schools. That amounted to an awful lot of money. We did it, however, because we had interests in all of those communities. I think it's a

mistake for us as Catholic educators and as Jesuit educators to identify an interest with independent schools as primary, because the independent schools by definition are autonomous institutions. And, our schools, while they enjoy an appropriate and essential measure of autonomy, are part of a network of institutions, a family of institutions, and the challenge for us is to find appropriate relationships between and among all of those institutions. We don't always do that well. Here's particular case. If we are in an urban area in which there are many, many schools, it's reasonable that individual schools may take on a portion of the service to the Catholic community. If we're in an area where there are very few Catholic schools, it is hard to justify a mission statement for any one school that is largely exclusive, because it makes statements about the Catholic community that we could not defend if they were raised up. If we make decisions at the school level that adversely impact other schools and we do that without any conversation or reflection, that makes a statement about the Catholic community that we cannot justify if we raise it up. The way in which we use the appropriate level of autonomy at the institutional level to serve the mission of the Church is extremely important. I would argue it is not simply a mark of our Catholic identity, a mark of our Jesuit identity, it is also enlightened self-interest. The existence of Georgetown Prep and of Gonzaga depends in no small measure of the success of the archdiocesan school, Archbishop Carroll. Because, if Archbishop Carroll is succeeding in serving that sector of the community, that's fine. If that school disappears, for whatever reason, other schools will be challenged to reexamine their mission. How can the Archdiocese of Washington sustain a network of schools that seems to exclude a substantial and very important and very needy portion of the population? The access issue needs to be addressed in conversation with others, and we have to look at our openness to be part of that conversation. I hope we can do that and still resist the embrace of the bear. Having been in a Jesuit school, I know that diocesan offices, with all due respect, can at times be perceived as bears. And, the embrace can be chilling. Conversation and collaboration between and among Catholic institutions is critically important if we are to be stakeholders and resources to the whole community. The third critical issue that we need to deal with, and I think Jesuit schools and Ignatian educators have dealt with it extremely well, is the question of leadership. First, defining leadership broadly so that it includes but is not limited to the usual suspects, i.e., the chief administrator of the school, members of the board, etc., but also department chairs, campus ministers, key people in the school, and the whole faculty ultimately. To think about the identification, the mentoring, the promotion, the encouragement of leadership is critically important for all of the Catholic educational community. It's an assumption that has been challenged by the new realities. The old assumption was that someone takes care that. You would call the Provincial and say, we need an English teacher. It probably doesn't work that way any more. In fact, sometimes you have someone saying, I'm looking for work. It's a whole new world. The retention of those folks and the ability to keep those people engaged is increasingly difficult, and there are some very practical issues. Some of you know in New York, there is now a public relations campaign to recruit teachers out of Catholic schools into public schools by offering exceptional compensation. In other parts of the country I hear of principals being recruited abruptly out of Catholic schools. It's uncomfortable for me to think of someone in that position leaving with a month's notice. It was difficult to deal with teachers who did that. To think about administrators doing

that is difficult. This is a very difficult time for retaining some of our good people, and we need to help one another to do that. Some schools are better able to do it than others in terms of compensation. Collectively, we can broaden our understanding of the value of teaching and we can make it clear that this is an exciting ministry to be part of. But, it doesn't absolve us of the need to provide appropriate compensation. I think we have to help one another or we're going to find ourselves being stripped away of some of our best people.

I would simply summarize by saying we've come through some very difficult times. To me, it's a matter of great hope that we've come through those times. We did lose some institutions, but we lost far fewer than we thought we might at one moment in time. We've also managed, largely through the work of the Spirit, to identify many good people to step into leadership. And, people around this table will call themselves Ignatian educators. This notion that the charism is dependent on the presence of vowed religious in the schools is challenged by the reality in many of the schools represented around this table. That's a source of great hope for the future.

CHALLENGES AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Katarina Schuth, O.S.F

I was very heartened by the first three talks this morning, and if you've had a dozen or more like that this week, then I can't imagine how filled you are. As I was listening, I was trying to think a little bit about what other angles might I provide, because, certainly, you have covered such important and major pieces of the work of the Jesuit high schools. British made reference to "making people a little uncomfortable". So, I thought that would be a good place to look at. I'd like to talk about four challenges and educational opportunities that were part of the first question, and then to end up with some values and traditions that you want to maintain and strengthen as well as values that you might want to consider for new directions.

On the four challenges, it's very clear to me that Jesuits, generally speaking but especially in the high schools, have a very good grasp of providing an education that will make for very good members of the civic community – members who are great in the public realm through the tremendous academic education that is provided. I believe also that the schools have within them the potential to create members for the Catholic community, i.e., members who will become true leaders in the Catholic Church or other churches if they are not members of the Catholic faith. It is on that point of Catholic membership and leadership that I would really like to make my four points. I can't do that without including some other dimensions of the civic and public realm, but, nonetheless, I think that is very important. Earlier this week I was in New York with a group of theological education folks who were asked to talk about where we thought theological education would be in twenty years. This must be the new format – twenty years from now. In the responses, there were four. One was the old line Protestant church's mainline, the black churches, the evangelical churches, and the Roman Catholics. I spoke from the Roman Catholic perspective. I was struck by what the person representing the old-line traditions said. Basically, mainline churches are declining tremendously in membership, because they have put all their eggs in the basket of social reform and have failed to really emphasize their foundations in Christ. I thought that was very powerful and also quite sad. The black churches, the evangelicals and Roman Catholics, on the other hand, have, I believe, tried to explicate their own place and position in society by using Jesus as a foundation. So, that's the same kind of foundation in Christ that I would like to suggest is extremely important and an important challenge for the Jesuit schools as well.

Let me begin with the first challenge as I see it. I believe that we need to educate our students to live with multiple diversities, and a number of you already have spoken about what some of those are – ethnic, cultural, racial, generational, economic, educational

differences, etc. The one that I would like to speak a little bit more about is the religious dimension – the diversity within the Catholic Church to say nothing of the diversity between and among the churches. It seems to me the educational opportunity is for you to create “bridge builders” among your students. That notion that Gordon mentioned earlier along the human dignity of every person is foundational. What do we do in order to ensure that human dignity for all people? It seems to me that the most important thing is to develop patterns of mutual respect. I have been deeply influenced in the last four years with Cardinal Bernadine’s *Catholic Common Ground Initiative*. I have been part of that group from the beginning. That movement calls for renewed dialogue, for openness, honesty, and civility in our dealings with others. It asks us to presume that those with whom we differ are acting in good faith, that we should put the best construction on different positions, and not seize upon the weakest arguments to discredit those differences. It asks us to be cautious in ascribing motive. I think each of those phrases could give us pause as to how we talk about, think about, articulate our relationship to parts of the Church that are not so comfortable for us. I don’t know where all of you stand in the ideological sense, but, generally speaking, I think those in Jesuit high education and secondary education are probably standing on the moderate to more liberal end of things. It’s very easy to put language to the “other side” that would really alienate others. So, the first challenge is in that diversity – to remember that we are all children of God – and in the how do we bring in and remember those who are not part of us? I am reminded of the book, “Courage to Teach” by Parker Palmer, and I’m sure that many of you know that book. There’s one little part that really has struck me very much. He said that we tend to teach our children to think the world apart. We think in terms of debates, rather than dialogue; we think in terms of difference, rather than similarities. So, that “bridge building” dimension gets lost – the “bridge building” to all different kinds of people within the Church and within the larger society. In doing that, how can we have integrity and still incorporate so many different views and people? I just think that Jesus is the measure of all that we do. And, the struggle to find what Jesus is saying, what should we really be aiming for, what is our goal or purpose. So, that’s the first challenge.

The second challenge has been spoken of so much that I don’t know that I can add a new dimension to it, but let me try a little bit. I’m really speaking of the social mission of the Church and the social teachings of the Church. I think the challenge is to help our students and eventually the graduates to live moral, ethical lives and to consider ways to provide leadership in their work and in their family so that they can bring these principles that they learned well in the schools to bear on the rest of their lives and to model ways of living these values that we hold so high. We recognize, of course, in our society that ethical lapses are rampant. Behavior of individuals is considered their own business. Beliefs and standards are left up to the individual too often, and, in the midst of that, we have a Catholic Church that is very clear about its moral teachings. I think the challenge is to articulate the standards of belief and behavior that the Church expects in a way that young people can understand them. How do they think about a variety of issues? What is a compassionate and appealing way of presenting the teachings of the Church? This, I think, is such a huge challenge for us. I’m reminded of students in my undergraduate classes, and as I ask them about what they’re thinking about the Church, what is said over and over is that the Church always has the answers and they don’t care what I think

about. I think that's a huge mistake that we can make is to pretend we have all the answers. It reminds me of the person who talks on and on about the Church should be student-centered or that teaching in the classroom should be student-centered and not teacher-centered. How well are we able to get into the mindsets of younger people? You did a lot by asking young people what they're thinking. But, I think we can still do a better job of that. The effects of understanding the teachings of the Church will help them to carry that into a new world – into the business world of global trade, into the world of people suffering from hunger and lifelong debilitating illnesses in the world that we're trading with – and it is not forgotten in the midst of making money. We need to make them aware of the need for philanthropy. In medicine, biomedical ethics and the enormous scientific advances that need to be studied and taken care of. In technology, the access to it is remarkable and yet so much of it needs to be assessed that we can't simply accept all part of it. In other words, taking the teachings of the Church and making them practical but also listening and making it a two-way street is important.

The third challenge is connecting student, parent, our whole constituencies with a larger whole to help them bring meaning into the communities in which they find themselves. How do we help build a sense of community? How do we create a culture of neighborliness in the midst of isolation? Ron Rolheiser is an oblate of Mary Immaculate and has written a book called "The Holy Longing". He talked about some tragic divorces in our Church and society and about that lack of connection that exists. One is the divorce between spirituality and ecclesiology, between spirit and religion. Young people in all these surveys say they are spiritual but they don't go to Church. What is it that has caused that disconnect? What kind of Church are they looking for? This morning at breakfast we were talking about pilgrimages and young people's seeming desire for that. As I look around some of you are young enough probably to appreciate sleeping on a gym floor for three nights, but it's beyond me. However, we do need to remember or find out what it is that is memorable in the lives of students so that their spirituality, their connection with God is a connection that, in fact, involves the Church. I think we have an opportunity to teach and model through theology classes how actions and worship are connected. If students are impressed by big Masses, liturgies, Eucharist that draw a thousands of people together with loud music, maybe we need to allow some of that. Making the Church come alive for them in whatever way it may be is important. I remember as a junior in high school going up to St. Paul, and I lived 100 miles south of St. Paul, so to go to a big city was something in itself in those days to a Jesuit sponsored conference. It was, I suppose, a forerunner of the sodalities. There were probably four or five hundred kids from around the state who had come to this. I remember being taught how to meditate for the first time. I've never forgotten that moment. What kinds of things can we do that are comparable today that bring that present moment to the students in a very alive way, to bring their faith alive in that way? I think it's a real challenge with the Church. A second divorce that Rolheiser talked about was a divorce between justice and piety. He said that too often the just aren't pious and the pious aren't just. How do we bring together spirit and truth – the spirit of our worship, of our faith inspiring the truth of our life and our work; our life and our work giving flesh to the spirit of worship? That connection needs to be made. The final point that he made was about the divorce between energy and wisdom. I think that pertains especially when we're speaking of

high school level youngsters. He said that the culture of youth is filled with energy, with wit and humor, music, sound, action. All of these things drive our culture. Wisdom is often not connected to that. It is colorless, old, and grave; it is split off from energy. So, how do we reunite energy and wisdom in one place so that the benefit of wisdom is brought to those who have all of the energy? Energizing, bringing life and wisdom to these young people who have so much energy, I think, is such a wonderful thing to do. The opportunity, then, is to connect younger people in our schools with some of the great traditions of the Church – to make these connections, to heal these divorces.

A fourth challenge, and the last I'll mention, is one to develop and maintain a deep spiritual life in these young people to the extent that it is possible at this level. As I look back on my spiritual life, it was pretty undeveloped at that state, and yet there were seeds that were planted that have never left me. I think we can't forget that. These young people are capable of enormous amounts of reflection and we need to give them just the best that we have. We need to teach students to reflect and pray and deepen their lives – to live in the present moment knowing that God is present to them. The Ignatian exercises have so much to offer. We need to help them attend to the deterrence of their growth in faith by becoming aware of their self indulgence, restlessness, their perpetual distraction with sports and sitcoms and talk shows, and to help them assess all of that and how it affects their lives. Deepening their core practices of a healthy spiritual life means some very simple things. Regular prayer is one, for without prayer we can sometimes become depressed or inflated (obsessed with our own ego) or bounce back and forth between the two. Another is the practice of charity and self-sacrifice, both locally and universally. There is also concrete involvement with the poor through parish or other organizations, and a willingness to be vulnerable for the love of Christ as Christ was vulnerable for the love of us. So, a spiritual life that has many dimensions and can develop very well in students this age is a great opportunity.

Finally, to close this part and then I'll have a few concrete suggestions, ultimately, if we are to do these things and connect ourselves very intimately with the Catholic Church, we need to encourage young people to be part of the Church and not to step aside from it. I think we have to ask ourselves, can we drink this cup? I believe that the practice of asceticism is absolutely necessary if we want to achieve real communion, and that communion is with many people, but I'm suggesting right now the communion with the Church. What does that require of us? To surrender ourselves, our egos to God – to give over our valued insights for the sake of the common good, to pour ourselves out for the sake of others and expect no return or gratitude, at least not right away, and then to ponder and carry the tension that is involved with holding all of this within us. This is from Ron Rolheiser's book again – he says to ponder in the scriptural sense is to hold something inside one's soul complete with all the tension that brings. Mary kept all these things in her heart and pondered them, as beneath the cross she stood vulnerable and unable to do anything. That sometimes seems they way we are. We can't change the major things that we would like to change so much – sometimes about the very Church we love and are working with. To revitalize our faith, we need to do that same kind of pondering as Mary did. It calls for a certain greatness of soul. If we try to resolve tension too soon, we miss a more sublime experience. It may mean persevering through

a class that's very difficult to work with or resolving some other situation in the schools that are difficult, perhaps personnel issues, bearing with one another in our work settings. We need to sublimate our need for resolution, to put other people's needs into the equation. He ends with this wonderful phrase, "great joy depends upon, first, having carried great tension." I think that's a very worthwhile thing.

In trying to do this, I was struck by the last line from the book, "The Chosen". It's a dialogue between the father and the son. The son, in this case, has gone off and left the Hasidic Jewish community and went off to practice psychiatry on his own, and the father says to the son, "return to me as far as you can, and I will come to you the rest of the way". This shows that sense of meeting together or bridging the gaps.

Values to strengthen and maintain. Obviously, the promotion of social justice, being bridge builders, the use of media and technology for good (analyzing it carefully), and inviting students to consider religious life are important. We have 102,000 fewer priests and religious today than we had forty years ago, about 60,000 fewer than we had twenty years ago. Where's the leadership of the Church to come from? It's important that it comes from the Jesuit schools. If you have about 10,000 graduate and 39,000 students, it will only take twelve years to make up the gap for those that we've lost. I think that requires the good kind of faculty development that you have so much of. Here are some new values and directions. One is taking responsibility for the growth and development of the Church, urging students to participate in their parishes, not to walk away from disagreements with the Church but rather to engage them, to be more aware of world religions, and cooperation with Catholic secondary schools. Above all, I think Ignatius stood always in the heart of the Church. To be part of the Church and to make it better, I think is the goal, not to stand outside and critique it. To be most deeply Catholic, I think we uphold the social teachings of the Church as you do so well, but there's also ways in speaking well of the Church at all times that I think could be very fruitful in the long run for the Church.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Elaine Schuster

Let me begin by saying how very impressed I am with this gathering and with the time that has been given and taken for this Think Tank. I've thought more than once in the short time I've been here of the level of commitment on the part of the Jesuits and on the part of all of the institutions represented here to give you this time away to think, to pray, to reflect. It says a great deal to me about how very, very much you care as Jesuit high school leadership about the future of what you do in these wonderful Jesuit high schools throughout the country. I congratulate you, compliment you and thank you for the bit of time I've been here, because it's been a real prayerful, thought provoking time for me. I have never worked directly for the Jesuits. I have journeyed with and walked with the Jesuits for a long time. When I was in the school office once before, Brad was the head of St. Ignatius College Prep, and then, when I came back as superintendent, he was the Provincial, and I'll come back to that. Lorraine and I have known each other from past life working at a women's high school and then Lorraine and I worked together in the Office of Catholic Education. So, we also have tremendous collegueship, friendship, and love for the Catholic high schools in the Archdiocese. Bernie and I were colleague principals – he was a headmaster and I was a principal. I chaired your North Central process once upon a time, and then, again, when I walked in as the new superintendent in 1991, one of the first messages I got was Loyola Academy wants to go co-ed. My experience has been in the years I've worked with the Jesuit high schools in Chicago an experience of collaboration and willingness to dialogue and an understanding that the Jesuit high schools have a great deal to contribute to the other Catholic high schools in the Archdiocese of Chicago. I want to say that as I thought about it, it has had a whole lot to do with the leaders I'm speaking about in this room and some other who understood that they had something to offer to the broader Church and to the other Catholic schools in the Archdiocese. Let me just say that I have very positive memories about Loyola Academy when you started to go co-ed, because there was a willingness to sit down and really dialogue with the other Catholic high schools in the area who would have been very hurt. There was an openness on the part of the Jesuits and that board to enter into a real collaborative sponsorship with one of the women's high schools, and, unfortunately, the women's religious congregation made the decision not to do that. Then, Brad, when he was Provincial, walked in my office one day and said we're going to build a new high school, and I say, oh, you are? And, they did – Cristo Rey High School is now a part of the Archdiocese of Chicago serving the Hispanic community. Once again, I compliment the fact that when I said you've go to do this in collaboration, consultation, and conversation with those who will be very threatened by this, it was done that way. My experience in working with the Jesuits in secondary education has been, for the most part, most positive and very collaborative.

My comments on premised on the fact that Jesuit Catholic high schools are excellent schools – based on a premise of academic excellence is a top priority. I would agree with something Michael said earlier with tremendous challenges to make sure that academic excellence continues as you move these schools into the 21st century. I think all the

challenges around that are escalating. Academic excellence as we knew it is not going to be the same as we move these schools forward. There are huge challenges, even around that basic premise. I also say everything that I say from the premise of academic excellence in a context of Jesuit Catholic identity, which says to me that it isn't worth any of this if these Jesuit Catholic high schools are not also about the many things I've heard you talking very seriously about – formation of these young people in faith, learning and understanding what it means to be really part of a community, the whole understanding of service to the wider community, and the importance of educating them to the traditions, the history, the rituals of the Catholic faith. So, academic excellence surrounded by and suffused with this whole call to all the other things you're calling them to are the premises from which I make some of the remarks I'm going to make.

I think that those of you who lead Jesuit Catholic high schools have tremendous opportunities, because you have the reputation, you have the history, you have the tradition, you have strong alums who believe in who you are and what you do and you carry those alums with you. I think it's most important for you to walk into the future with an understanding of the strength from which you build, and I say that as someone who watches Jesuit Catholic high schools in the context of all sort of Catholic high schools. I'm going to challenge you to capitalize on the strengths that you have, and then I'm going to ask you a little later one to continue to share the wealth of what you know and who you are with some others who may not be quite as strong in this enterprise as you are. I think your opportunities for formation of young people is absolutely crucial. You have the opportunity to either form these young people, as I think we have for a long time in the history of Catholic schools in this country, to mainstream them. We've done this really well. You, as Jesuit high school leadership, have done a great job of educating many of the leaders in this country – corporate leaders, government leaders, religious congregation leaders, Church leaders – and you have the opportunity to continue to do that. I think the huge question is, how are you going to do that? Are they only going to be the corporate leaders and the moneymakers and is that why young people come to you? Or, are they also coming to you either because they know or they figure out as they're with you that there's a whole other world for them to lead that has to do with Church and service and the rest of this globe we're talking about. I think you're right on the edge of huge challenges that demand some really gutsy responses.

As I thought about challenges and opportunities, what struck me were the polarities. These young people are walking into a future that could either go here or go here. And, we don't really know which way it's going to go. The multicultural, multiethnic, multiracial, multireligious thing that's out there is huge. They're not walking into the world that any of us grew up in. I think from that we are either going to see tremendous growth, collaboration, cooperation, community building around the world, or we're going to see tremendous break down, competition, more division – wealthy and poor. We're either going to see peace or violence. All those if's are there. All those polarities are hanging right out there in front of us. We're seeing it happened in small examples – religious wars, wars of the wealthy against the poor. We talked last night about the poor in Africa being ignored and wondered, what's going on here? We know so much now about what's going on everywhere that we cannot ignore it, and yet on some levels we

seem to continue to. I think because of technology and the worldwide commerce and communication, the demands on our young people for technical knowledge is incredible. I think the whole world of education is changing and whether or not Jesuit Catholic education in another twenty years will be housed in brick, boxy looking buildings or not I think is a huge question. It may not be like that at all, and yet there are huge challenges around what do you do then with community, with ritual, with worship, and with tradition. I think we are facing in this country some huge issues around societal break down. Integrity of government leadership...I think the whole issue of who wants to be a government leader right now and why is a huge issue in the whole sense of government leadership as service to this country and to the world. I wonder if we encourage young people to work in government. I think we're in a crucial mess around what's going on with government leadership. I don't want to talk about politics, but I think we have some real problems. Are our leaders only media moguls or are they people who really want to serve?

We've talked a lot about this whole issue of respect for the dignity of the person. I think that's so crucial. Without that respect, we move to self-centeredness, to selfishness, and then back to all the things I just said – of war, of rich and poor, etc. The downside of the tremendous wealth in this country are the things we've seen – violence, drugs, alcohol, theft. And, yet we know so much more about peace, health, community, etc. It's another polarity. The whole issue of individualism versus not for ourselves. Do I really believe that I'm not in this for myself? is a crucial question. Then, there's the whole issue of Christian conservatism or religious relativism. And, then, somewhere, it seems to me, in here is Catholic universal teaching. My brother, who graduated from St. Xavier High School in Cincinnati and then Xavier University, was in Kuala Lumpur about a year ago. He's a management consultant. He was consulting with the president of a company who is making huge amounts of money because he's figured out that all the rubber plantations in Kuala Lumpur were a wonderful place to start a factory that manufactures all those little rubber gloves that everybody wears over here in grocery stores, drug stores, hospitals, etc. They went to dinner one evening, and my brother was talking about growing up in Cincinnati going to St. X and this young man was talking about going to Xavier High School in Kuala Lumpur. And, they talked about the commonalities in what they learned. My brother said it was the most fascinating conversation about social justice and service and concern. And, then they talked about how he is taking care of his employees in this company. I thought, isn't this interesting? That, to me, is the universal Catholic teaching that we're talking about. In the midst of recognizing and respecting the different cultures and the multicultural, we've got to keep driving home to these highly idealistic adolescents the simple message of Jesus, which is service, community, and dignity of the person.

What do I think needs to be emphasized as you move these schools into the future? When I was writing my notes, I said, I think these are values that you need to maintain and strengthen for the future of students, teachers, board member, and parents. I think one of the things we have to do is get gutsier about what we say to the parents about why they are sending their children to you. There's a tremendous educational opportunity there. I think Jesuit Catholic high schools have to continue to have a universal Catholic

identity, which is basic teaching about calling these young people to a way of life. It seems to me that you are called to prepare the leaders for the future of the Church and society that says they are young people rooted in an inclusive way of life. Gospel message must be taught to these young people in a compelling, realistic and relevant manner. You must connect the Gospel to where they are, and, to me, who Jesus was and is still at the heart of it. Idealistic adolescents connect with his story. I really think the whole concept of these schools is community with more time for prayer and reflection is absolutely crucial. These young people don't have enough time. I think your emphasis as Jesuit high schools on service is to be commended. You are way ahead of some of your colleague Catholic high schools on this. But, as you've said and as your young people have said, I think you need to continue to push at that in terms of, what does that service really mean? Is it something I do just to get the credit hours I need, or am I really being helped to reflect upon the fact that I can make a difference in the lives of senior citizens, children, etc. in the community where my school sits. I think the challenges around that are absolutely crucial. I think a deep sense of the social justice teachings of the Church is a way to get at these adolescents. If we really take to heart what the Church teaches about dignity of person, economic justice, right to a job, right to a house, then you get to their hearts. I think education of their mind and their heart and their spirit is how we do it.

I want to jump to two things that I would challenge you, as Jesuit leaders, to do. I think, as we talk about some of what Michael was talking about in terms of our schools being part of the common good and our schools being part of the contribution of education to this country, you as Jesuit high schools and leaders with your boards and alums have got to help us more with some of the legislative issues around – support for non-public schools, vouchers, tax credits, etc. My sense has been that there's been a little bit of "that's not us", and I think we really need your help with this, because, even when I hear you talk about the crucial issues of not being able to pay teachers, we've got to get more funds to keep these schools alive. The other thing is that I do think as we move into the future, there's a whole issue of who will sponsor Catholic high schools. There's been a lot of talk about collaborative sponsorship through NCEA. We tried it and came close. We don't have a whole lot of good models yet on this whole issue. Who's going to keep these Catholic high schools alive through the next century? You, as the Jesuits, are stars at this and leaders in it. Your numbers as Jesuits are going down but you've got strong boards. I would plead with you to get more involved with what's going on in your diocese with Catholic education. If another Catholic high school around you closes, what's your responsibility then? I think that's crucial. Bottom line, as I was thinking about this as an educator, is that your education has to remain holistic; it has to be religious and cultural; there has to be leisure and arts. These young people have to see beauty and hope around them, so that's got to be part of it. I'll end with the thought of education for the simplicity of living. Care for others, care for the earth, collaborative community living. Education which is truly Catholic is rooted in the simplicity of the message of Jesus. It all comes down to, "you are a child of God." Please remain courageous. Don't let the government or the Church oppress. You know who you are and what you're about. Keep your act together and neither the government nor the Church is going to stop you.

CATHOLIC IMAGINATION, INTIMACY, AND TRANSCENDENCE

Brad Schaeffer, S.J.

Brian Paulson, who is now president of St. Ignatius, when he was a scholastic, he was helping to build our new community, and he took us into the house and the frame was there and he was saying this is here and this is there. I was saying, Brain, I don't have a clue was this is going to look like. I don't learn that way. And, I was thinking of Joe Casey, one of our presidents, who is a nice man but clueless, who was building a new library. The principal, who wouldn't normally do those things, actually was building the building. And, he was walking Joe into the building and he said, the computer lab will be here and the kids will be doing interactive learning. And, he said, isn't that noise going to create a problem, and the principal said, no Joe there are two walls – one goes here and one goes here. Joe didn't even see the frames for those walls. That is the context that I come to something like this with.

With this particular challenge, what I have tried to do is give some larger elements and then some smaller pieces that I'll throw on it which are probably more important or significant to me but may not seem academic or Jesuit enough. John Pabrook has an excellent construct in talking about the early pioneers in the Middle West, the Jesuits in particular. He says that had maps, they had imagination, and they had their experience – those three pieces. I think that for Jesuit education, that's the context. And, then I want to talk about three things that I think will be essential for Jesuit schools in the future.

The maps are obvious. We've got them all over the place. We have the *Ratio*, we have the *Exercises*, and we have the *Constitutions*. We also have all the documentation from the Catholic tradition. We have the gospels. So, we've got the maps. The maps are all in front of us. Our experience is important, and even in watching it and listening from a distance what's developed in Jesuit secondary education with the stuff on Ignatian Pedagogy is exciting, because it is clearly taking some of the key insights from the *Exercises* which ground everything Jesuit and applies them to education. As the world gets fluid or stays fluid or gets more fluid, that ability to discern which is really what you're engaged in right now – the realizing that God was there before we got here; a real simple insight. What we're trying to do is find out where God is in the midst of all this. What's the good spirit and what's the bad spirit. By doing that, you're valuing your experience believing the experience is sacred and reflecting on it. And, you're doing it with imagination. What I think you're modeling here what individual schools and what the collective effort of Jesuit education needs to be about. Within that context, then, I'd like to reflect a little bit on the focus of mission. Clearly, if you don't know what you're doing, you should die. But, focused on mission and as that's going to be articulated, especially with faculty, staff, board, administration and parents, realize that the Baby Boomers really are going to be your parents of the next twenty years. Now, that's the group I'd pay attention to, because those are going to be your parents who are going to make the babies that are going to be your kids in the next years and they're going to be

the one forming them. Within that context, then, I would say three things – charges that I would see you have to do. One, you have to really focus on, contribute to, increase, develop, foster Catholic imagination. The second is intimacy, and the third thing is transcendence. Those words coming out of my mouth seem absurd, because I don't generally think that way. But, I really do think Catholic imagination, intimacy and transcendence are three of the elements you're going to have to take a look at. How you articulate those locally is going to vary. To me the brilliance of Ignatius (you see it in our *Constitutions*, especially on Part 7 on the assignment of men to particular works) is in adaptability. There are guidelines that are set forth. They are clearly articulated. The criteria are established. And, then the end of the sentence always is, but adapt these as necessary or as individual experience proves. There's always a flexibility to them that allows you to take the principle and adapt. So, Catholic imagination, intimacy and transcendence are three things you are going to have to teach to, educate for, hire for, form for...but, it's got to be done locally; it's got to be done with a local flavor however that's going to particularly look. If you don't, like that TV show, you're going to get kicked off the island.

Catholic imagination I'm really taken with. Andrew Greeley has taken a lot of this. A number of people have written about it, but I happen to really like Andy a lot, and I know he's controversial to some segments of the Church, and I wouldn't want to be his enemy. But, I think he's a terrific priest, and he loves the Church, and he's picked up on that whole notion of Catholic imagination. I'm just in the middle of his book that just came out, which is a nice piece. Just at the very start of it he talks about Catholicism this way: "Catholics live in an enchanted world, a world of statues and holy water, stained glass and votive candles, saints and religious medals, rosary beads and holy pictures, but these Catholic paraphernalia are mere hints of a deeper and more pervasive sense of religious sensibility which inclines Catholics to see the holy lurking in creation. As Catholics we find our houses and our world haunted by a sense that the objects, events and persons of daily life are revelations of grace and are sacramental." We need to rebuild the Catholic identity in the United States. That's what the Catholic imagination has to do. I don't know what that's going to look like, but we can't be threatened when younger people are looking for some of the things we threw off. This is a generational issue. Scapulas work in Beverly. I don't know why, but in a particular southern haven of Chicago land, scapulas are important. Well then, by God, let's get the kids scapulas. Let's teach them about Our Lady of Mount Carmel. Let's get them a little beyond the superstition that may be attached to them and be part of the Catholic faith. Greeley's on to something. We're a great faith, because we have tremendous stories, and we need to impart that to the next generation. What that's going to look like, again, I leave that to you folks. I think Gordon pointed to it with looking at various pieces of the *Exercises*, Katarina in terms of foundations in Christ, and the other speakers as well. Grounding us in our tradition, the very best of the Catholic tradition, which is strong, which is good, and which is true; making sense out of that so that the kids can appropriate it themselves. They are not going to come with it, because they're going to be children of the Baby Boomers who don't have the religious education. I'll quote some date later, but this professor, William Dingis at Catholic University, has a work that's coming out soon on Baby Boomers. They're talking about the fact that everybody says that religious

education has failed widely. There is some sense that Catholic education helps at one level or another, and the more Catholic education you have, the better it is. Greeley is strong on that and the sociology that's been done there. How do we help develop this Catholic imagination given the kids we're going to have? A concern I have is that we're going to move and in spite of what the hierarchy's trying to do, become more congregational. As much as they want to centralize, and I understand that movement because there's a fear that we're too Catholic – we're too all over the place – I think it's going to be a move that makes us even more congregational, especially if we have no ordained clergy. If we're not Eucharist-centered, which we have to be at our core, we're going to be more congregational at a very time when we don't need to be congregational. We're not a congregational Church; we're catholic. We're going to have to fight that. The Eucharist is at the center of our lives, and, I think at our schools the Eucharist, the sacraments have to be an integral part, and how that's going to happen with fewer ordained clergy, I don't know. We're teaching a variety of prayer service, fine; different ways of praying, good; spirituality, good; we're still centered in the Eucharist, and we have to find some way of providing for that. Working closely with parishes will help, but at the school itself, I see it as crucial to the integrating life and worship of that body. All this in a society, as this Catholic University professor said, with heavy mistrust of truth as objective, highly pluralistic without a center, a move to separate the spiritual from the religious, a belief that individuality is far more important than anything else; that there's a seeker's mentality not necessarily a believer's mentality; a society heavy with a reticence about any institutional affiliation let alone a church which speaks truth, with experiences normative over doctrine created tradition. Those are the tensions we're going to be fighting, which reduces religion to ethics and the thing that says, I'm a good person so what more needs to be done than that; a society which mistrusts authority and institutional commitment. It's a heck of a challenge but an exciting one. One of the neat things that everybody knows is that you're dealing with young people. I get to see the Society of Jesus in incredible incarnation throughout the world here in the state. In the states most Jesuits would say we do our best, most consistent work in our high schools. That's the large we. I think it's because we build a mission, we've reviewed the mission, we actually do work collaboratively (we struggle with it but we deal with it). Catholic imagination – I think the real challenge is how you're going to do that in the next generation. I hope I'm a part of it.

The second thing is intimacy. Part of that is just the identity formation of adolescence, and since adolescence is stretching further and further part, the beginnings of that are extremely important. In a society where intimacy and relationship are not valued heavily, you're going to have to nurture that. The most obvious places where that gets done is the kids between themselves and the teacher-student relationship. Any teacher knows that – that's the essence of education. If I did anything as an administrator, I think the best thing I did was hire the right teachers along with firing the wrong teachers and then letting them loose. Making sure we're all trying to pull the wagon in the same general direction, trying to head down the same basic paths, and then basically staying out of their way. Good teachers run, because the relationship between teacher and student is what's essential. That's where the learning goes on. That relationship has to be central. If we're going to teach intimacy the healthy boundary appropriate relationship between

faculty, staff, counselor, students and administration is essential. Family structures are going to be as varied as we have now. We're going to have to give them some experience of community beyond the family. And, so the relationships among them, their diversities are so important. How you structure that and how you resist that tendency – that strong U.S. tendency – to be individualistic is going to be extremely important.

Transcendence is the third piece. “The” relationship – their relationship with God – is also extremely important. The relationship to the other; the relationship that grounds them in all those other relationships has to be nurtured. Reverence for others in those relationships for creation is so important. For the goodness of God, for the tradition and the grace and the sacramentality which is essential to us is extremely important and that's got to be tended to. As I said before, I think the *Exercises* are an extremely valuable tool in all of this. You can't educate for this and you can't care for this unless you're hired for this. You have to have faculty who are open to this, and then you got to do things with the faculty to help form them. Your faculty, in addition to the students are coming out of this Generation X experience, so you have to work with them on building community and faith and relationship to God. In hiring practices, I remember being sensitive to...in hiring, if you limit it to just religion and you're worried about just if we have good religion teachers who are Catholic – that's fine too, but an English teacher can do a heck of a lot with faith. Literature does a whole lot. Science and math folks as well. They drive me crazy, but they can help with love and fractals. I don't know what a fractal is, but they get excited about it...they're finding God in mathematics land. So, you have to hire for mission; it's got to be a piece of that whole and they have to be comfortable with the transcendence as well. If a teacher isn't comfortable with his or her relationship with God, there's a problem. We have to interview for that. If there's an openness and they don't know what it is, then we've got to form for it, and we have to lead them to that. There's a great diversity in our faculty. We need that kind of diversity, but there's got to be a critical, you know that, a core of believers who have the Catholic imagination, who have an ability to be intimate, properly so, and to be in touch with the transcendence. The schools have to draw the transcendence out of the students and then lead them and the faculty as well the best they can.

Sponsorship issues, accreditation, all of those things, we have to keep looking at that. How the Society and the Church are going to formally relate to these schools is extremely important. The Society of Jesus is going to be radically different in twenty years. We're going to look far more like our early companions that we look now. We're just going to be radically smaller. We're not going to disengage from secondary education, but we're going to be fewer. How we're going to be present, what do you need, how do you need us to be present, and we've got to be thinking about how we're going to do this in the future? That said, how do we open new schools? In a sense, that's not your issue, but it is. And, maybe you can help us in different ways. I look at the needs of the Church. Whenever I meet a bishop, I ask what do you see as the needs of the Church, and how can we help? Consistently, they mention education leadership which means a lot of different things, and a lot of different people can respond, but we can. That was my whole thing with Atlanta last night, or Miami, or Orlando, or Oakland, or Minneapolis/St. Paul. How do we start new things, because if we don't, we're dead. When religious start

thinking small for Jesus, they're done in and we're done in as religious communities, and the Church is dead. How do we think large for Jesus, and is there a way that you could help us with that? To look at models, to make schools available for the poor – Cristo Rey is one model. There's a group getting together to see if a South American model could be adapted. How is the Society of Jesus and how is the institutional Church going to relate to these institutions? With trust and imagination. We need the juridical piece, but you know as well as I that once you have to get to the juridical piece, you're dead.

Alumni. I know you struggle with this. Father General has consistently asked us to do more with alums. Not just to look to them for development purposes, but to have the kind of conversations Elaine was talking about between her brother and that businessmen in Kuala Lumpur. How can we do that better? How do we network the alums in a proper way that will allow them to do the kinds of things British is talking about? How do we do that and nurture that?

What's the reformulation of the leaders in service for men and women for others going to look like? What's the next Grad at Grad going to look like? How is that going to get articulated? The most important thing is that the JSEA, I think, continues to strive and be strong. It's a great tool, and this is an example of that. It pulls the schools together and sends them back out and has them appropriate that locally. I was just visiting two of our schools in Lithuania which have just started. The principal/headmaster is there because of what the JSEA has done. They've reclaimed these colleges that were opened in the 1600's and have started them again and already they're the best schools in the towns. That's tremendous. That's your work spread wide. Tom Roach is going to Poland in a few days to try to bring the experience of Jesuit education into that context. The Polish Province is actually entrusting some of its members with us, which is pretty significant. I just end by thanking you. You know from the teacher-perceiver the most important thing is that the teacher knows that he or she has a vocation to teach. And, that's what you want – the passion. To see you doing this is extremely encouraging and it gives hope to the Church. We are in, with and for the Church. That's important. And, whenever we separate ourselves out, that's not from the good spirit. We have to be unique in our mission, and we have to articulate that mission in a way that's always a reflection of discernment going on. We have to begin with and for the Church. I hope you will be able to model that use of experience through maps and imagination and the intimacy and transcendence that are going to build the Catholic imagination.