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This issue of Conversations brings you a number of history pieces. In the Jesuit world, 2014 marks 200 years since the order was reborn after Pope Clement XIV tried to do away with it in 1773. Readers will find the story of those tumultuous years in their very curious detail in the first couple of stories here.

The seminar on Jesuit higher education, whose journal this is, decided to use this anniversary not to do a complete study of historical causes and effects of this crisis but to examine how Jesuit schools responded to other social turning points – the Civil War, immigration, financial crises, changing Jesuit demographics, secularization. The world into which the Society of Jesus was reborn was very different from four decades earlier – the American and French revolutions had taken place and the American West was undergoing transformation. And the reborn order in the United States devoted considerable resources to the work of education, taking over leadership of some existing schools and founding many more. This issue also includes a capsule history of the 28 current Jesuit colleges and universities and mentions four of those that have not survived.

While this issue was coming together, another event took place that future historians may well consider a significant turning point. On October 11, 2013, the superior general of the Jesuits, Fr. Adolfo Nicolás, met with the presidents and the board chairs of the 28 schools. This was the first time such a meeting ever took place. Father Nicolás challenged these leaders to build a future with optimism and spiritual leadership. Some short excerpts from Father Nicolás's remarks and reflections by a board chair and by a president also appear in this issue.

Crisis, turning point, opportunity – they are related. What they lead to depends in many ways on all of us. But if our prologue past shows us anything, it is that great things are possible, great days lie ahead.

Edward W. Schmidt, S.J., editor

CORRECTIONS

Our previous issue of Conversations included some unfortunate mistakes. The artist whose beautiful work appeared on our cover is Ariana Assaf Jokers; we unfortunately misspelled her name. “Stories We Tell” by Karsonya Wise Whitehead and Jason Taylor and “A Neighborhood Partnership” by Ken Koth were inadvertently left out of the table of contents. And we published an early text of “The Issue of Same-Sex Marriage” by Ennio Mastroianni rather than his final reworked version. To these artists and writers and to our readers, sincere apologies. The corrected version is available at http://epublications.marquette.edu/conversations/
On the early evening of August 16, 1773, a papal functionary along with a small group of soldiers came to the Jesuit Curia in Rome. They summoned Father General Lorenzo Ricci and his assistants and presented to Ricci a document entitled “Dominus ac Redemptor” (“Our Lord and Redeemer”) from Pope Clement XIV. In it, in the words of the document itself, the pope said that “in the fullness of apostolic power we put out of existence and suppress the Society of Jesus; we do away with and abrogate each and every one of its offices, ministries, works, houses, schools, colleges…in whatsoever land they exist…as well as its statutes, usages, customs, decrees and Constitutions, and we declare perpetually abolished and entirely extinguished all authority of the superior general and of provincial superiors and visitors and any and all superiors in the afore-mentioned Society….” Some days later Father Ricci and his assistants were imprisoned in Castel Sant’Angelo. After two years of strict confinement there deprived of enough food, heat, and light, Ricci died a papal prisoner on November 24, 1775.
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Thus did the supposedly universal suppression of the Society of Jesus take place.

But the piecemeal extinction of the Society had begun previously over a period of 14 years before 1773. For decades the Society had been the bête-noir of several quite hostile groups. They included, first, the Jansenists in their rigorist interpretation of Christian life and, on the other hand, many so-called “philosophes,” the deistic or materialistic thinkers of the 18th century French Enlightenment who saw the Jesuits as defenders of an obscurantist church. Second, there were national governments intent on their supremacy in church-state relationships. Third, there were some powerful enemies in Rome who opposed a variety of Jesuit theological opinions and pastoral practices in Europe and Jesuit attempts in foreign mission lands to present the faith in a way consonant with the social and cultural concepts and structures of the peoples of those lands.

The destruction began in 1759 in Portugal, where the government had been determined to bend the Church to its will. For years its leader, Pombal, had waged an unremitting pamphlet war of slander against the Jesuits, seen as defenders of the papacy. Finally, they were packed into ships and unceremoniously dumped on the territory of the Papal States. From the missions in Brazil they were shipped back, many of them to rot in Lisbon dungeons for years.

In France in 1762 the ardently Gallican Parisian Parlement, which had been for almost 200 years anti-Jesuit, decreed the dissolution of the Society of Jesus there. As its decree went on page after page, the Society was guilty, among other crimes, of “simony, blasphemy, sacrilege, magic, witchcraft, astrology, idolatry, superstition, immodesty, theft, parricide, homicide, suicide and regicide...blaspheming the Blessed Virgin Mary...destructive of the divinity of Jesus Christ...teaching men to live as beasts and Christians to live as pagans.” If so, the Jesuits were certainly busy.

In 1767 in Spain, King Charles III, influenced especially by his regalist government ministers to fear the Jesuits, banished them from Spain and all of its possessions, including most of Latin America. Within three days, in Spain itself in March-April 1767, 2700 Jesuits were forced out onto the roads to its port cities thence to be shipped and dumped on the Papal States.

On February 2, 1769, Pope Clement XIII, a staunch defender of the Society of Jesus through all those years, died. After a conclave of several months, with the governments of Spain, France, and Portugal alternately threatening and bribing the participants, finally Cardinal Lorenzo Ganganelli was elected as Pope Clement XIV. Then began four years of incessant harassment and bullying of the pope by the Spanish and French ambassadors to the Holy See. The threats went so far as to include hints of schism if he did not suppress the Society universally. Unable to stand up to the pressure of the Bourbon courts, Clement finally did so.

The apostolic works of the Society of Jesus around the world were destroyed. Their schools (more than 700 of them) were closed. Their libraries were either confiscated or trashed. Their churches were turned over to others. Their overseas missions were ruined. More than 22,000 Jesuits were no longer such. In most circumstances individual ex-Jesuits had to make their own way, with the exception of the work of one young Spaniard, Joseph Pignatelli. Over the long, long years of the suppression he effectively kept united at least in mutual support a great portion of the Spanish former Jesuits.

For the suppression to take effect canonically, “Dominus ac Redemptor” had to be promulgated by the bishop of each diocese in which a Jesuit community was located. This circumstance kept a remnant alive in one place, Russia, contrary to the expectations of everyone, because the document was not promulgated there.

Now onto the stage of this drama came an act with a whole new cast of characters. It included two popes, both favorable to the Jesuits but constrained by the intransigence of Spain and France, an ambitious archbishop, a puzzled superior, a supposedly amused king, and, most importantly, a ruler who tolerated no opposition. It was a serious drama with touches of what was almost comedy.

To start with the popes, Pius VI had been elected after Clement XIV died in 1774. He reigned until 1799, one of the longest papacies and one in its last ten years burdened with the antireligious events of the French Revolution. He and his successor, Pius VII, pope from 1800 to 1823, were each for some time imprisoned by the revolutionaries and Napoleon. Pius VII wanted to restore the Society, but in the turmoil of the time he could not do so.

The archbishop was Stanislaw Sieniawicz, a convert to Catholicism, auxiliary bishop of Vilna and soon to be elevated to a much higher post.

The puzzled superior was Fr. Stanislaw Czerniewicz, designated vice-provincial of the Jesuits in the part of Poland that Catherine had taken in the first partition of the country, apportioned to Prussia, Austria, and Russia in 1772, one year before the suppression of the Society.

Most importantly, the person who brokered no opposition and who set all these characters into interaction was Catherine the Great, Empress of Russia, who willed the suppressed Society into continued existence in her recently acquired former Polish lands.

When the first partition of Poland took place in 1772, Russia acquired territory that had a large Catholic population of about 900,000 and also 201 Jesuits in a variety of residences and schools, 18 communities in all.
Catherine wanted to maintain the good will of her new Catholic subjects and to maintain the Jesuit schools, which were by far the best in all her lands. Typical of Catherine, she had decided to organize on her own the Roman Catholic Church in Russia. So in December 1772, she decreed that a Latin diocese for the whole country be set up at Mogilev. She named Sienstrezencewicz as bishop. All of this she did without the least consultation with Rome. The land was hers, she was the ruler, and her decisions were law.

Frederick the Great of Prussia also kept the Jesuits in existence but only for a few years. To him is attributed the remark that while the Society of Jesus was destroyed by “their Most Catholic, Most Christian, and Most Faithful Majesties” [of Spain, France, and Portugal], it was preserved by “his Most Heretical Majesty” and “her Most Schismatical Majesty.”

When “Dominus ac Redemptor” arrived in Russia in September 1773, Catherine simply ordered that it be considered nonexistent. She forbade its promulgation; she made this quite clear to the bishop; she informed the Jesuits that she was going to maintain and keep them protected in her lands. Hence the dilemma: What were those Jesuits supposed to do? They knew of the existence of the brief of suppression. They knew Catherine’s public position, and they knew better than to contradict it. They also knew of conflicting opinions in canon law on what they ought to do.

The reply in Latin came with infinite diplomatic finesse on January 13, 1776: “Precum tuarum exitus, ut auguro et exoptas, felix.” (“The result of your prayers, as I foresee and as you ardently desire, will be a happy one.”) With that enigmatically favorable reply, the Jesuits in the Russian territory had to be content for the moment. But as one sympathetic observer in Rome remarked, “Intelligenti paucia” (“A few words to the wise are sufficient”). The pope could do no more because he had the Portuguese, Spanish, and French monarchs still adamantly opposed to any existence of the Society. Meanwhile Bishop Sienstrezencewicz had ordained to the priesthood a group of these former Jesuit scholastics “because of parish needs.”

Then between 1780 and 1783 three events assured the existence and growth of this remnant. A Jesuit novitiate opened; a vicar general was elected; and the pope gave verbal but nonetheless explicit approval of who these men were and what they were doing, at least in Russia. Already in 1779 Catherine had agreed to such a novitiate. Then she agreed that the Jesuits in Russia could call a general congregation to elect a superior. In 1782 it chose Czerniewicz. Catherine finally sent an envoy to Rome to regularize her arrangements for all Latin Rite Catholics in Russia, to approve the Jesuit novitiate, and indirectly to approve the election of Czerniewicz. The pope could not at all give that last approval formally in writing, but publicly in the presence of witnesses three times he repeated “Approbo” (“I approve.”) So, just ten years after the universal suppression, the Jesuits in Russia now had a definitive sign that they were still in existence, if only there. More importantly, as the news got out, it inspired more former Jesuits to join their Jesuit brethren there. But at the same time, “Dominus ac Redemptor” was still canonically in effect and the Society of Jesus was still universally suppressed. But was it? If one had put this whole scenario in the form of a novel or a screenplay today and attempted to market it for publication as a book or production as a movie, it would undoubtedly have been turned down for a total lack for verisimilitude. These events simply could not have happened. But they did.

And then, with the French Revolution, kings were swept away, armies marched, regimes changed. In Western Europe two groups formed, pledged to enter the Society if restored. By 1793 one of the now chastened rulers, the Duke of Parma, asked for Jesuits from Russia. In 1801 Pius VII recognized in writing the canonical correctness of the Society centered in Russia. By 1803 provinces dependent on that group were established elsewhere. In 1805 five U.S. members of the Old Society reentered the group. In Russia itself, over the years four vicars-general, successors to Czerniewicz, were elected, and the Society and its works expanded and flourished. With the defeat of Napoleon, the pope returned to Rome from exile and imprisonment.

On the morning of August 7, 1814, Pope Pius VII celebrated mass at the Gesù in Rome. Then he came to the Jesuit Curia next door and in the document “Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum” (“Care for all the churches”) and “despite...Dominus ac Redemptor,” the effects of which we expressly abrogate” he put an end to the Suppression and restored universally the Society of Jesus.

But the Restoration is another story, almost as improbable in its details as is the story of the Suppression itself.
In 2013, for the first time ever, a Jesuit was elected pope. Although this was a first and a surprise, the Society of Jesus has always depended on the papacy for its very existence, just as popes have depended on Jesuits as teachers, scholars, writers, preachers, spiritual directors, and missionaries and for many other roles. Pope Paul III approved the Society of Jesus on September 27, 1540; Clement XIV suppressed it on July 21, 1773; Pius VII restored it on August 7, 1814. For two centuries no pope has reversed Pius VII’s decision, though certain popes, annoyed or angered by individual Jesuits or by the Society of Jesus as a whole, may have given such action some or maybe even a lot of thought. Clement XIV was a Conventual Franciscan friar while Pius VII was a Benedictine, and thus the story of Jesuit suppression and restoration is in some part a tale of rivalry, of misunderstanding, and/or of sympathy or mutual appreciation between religious orders. That part of the story has yet to be given adequate attention by historians, but here I focus on some considerations that may help us to interpret and perhaps nuance or supplement the term restoration for describing what Pius VII set in motion regarding the Jesuits.

How did the Society of Jesus get up and running again after 41 years of nonexistence? And how much continuity or discontinuity was there between the old Society, pre-1773, and what would develop post-1814? In small numbers, there were in fact men who had lived as Jesuits in the period 1773–1814, especially in the Russian Empire, where Catherine the Great had refused to allow legal status to Clement XIV’s brief of suppression. Pope Pius VI (reigned 1775–99) largely ignored questions about what remained of the Jesuits, and what with the revolution in France. From very early on in his lengthy papacy (1800–23), Pius VII encouraged efforts to keep the Society alive; and in 1814, almost as soon as he was freed from a lengthy imprisonment by Napoleon, he issued his “Sollicitudo Omnium Ecclesiarum,” reauthorizing the Jesuits everywhere.

Jesuit formation had always been lengthy, typically more than ten years from entrance as a novice to ordination as a priest, and then still longer until final vows, the definitive incorporation of an individual into the Society. But there had sometimes been diocesan priests who entered, and their formation would be shorter, allowing them to take up full-time work as Jesuits relatively quickly. This also happened in 1814 and beyond. An example is Francesco Finetti (1762–1842), a well-known Italian preacher who entered the Jesuits in autumn of 1814. He continued his preaching ministry as a Jesuit, and among his published works is a sermon he preached in Rome in August 1815 on the theme of St. Peter in Chains: he compared Pius VII to Peter, and Napoleon to the pagan Roman emperors; providence had freed St. Peter from incarceration and so too Pius VII, “the most glorious” of pontiffs. This Pope Pius did have a great deal to do with rebuilding the Church in the early 19th century after its near annihilation in the 1790s, and he could arguably be the most important of the twelve popes who have chosen this name. And as I have told my students at the College of the Holy Cross and elsewhere, without Pius VII there very likely would be no Jesuit schools today.

By 1814 there were not a lot of “suppressed” Jesuits remaining. Many of the pre-Suppression Jesuits had died, others had become diocesan priests, and still others had found more secular careers. There were a few suppressed Jesuits in what had become the United States; some of these were eventually readmitted to the renascent Society of Jesus while others chose not to do so. Bp. John Carroll (1735–1815), suppressed Jesuit and from 1789 the first bishop in the new republic of the United States, was still bishop of Baltimore in 1814, though he died the next year. Another perhaps more surprising and fascinating case of what happened to a suppressed Jesuit is Joseph-Ignace Guillotin (1738–1814). In his post-Jesuit years he became a medical doctor and then at the French Revolution was elected to the
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National Assembly, where his proposal for using a certain contraption for carrying out the death penalty was made law; this supposedly humane instrument of execution was named after him. In his later years Guiliotin promoted vaccination against smallpox. Dying just a few months before Pius's decree of Jesuit restoration, Guiliotin in his burial was reconnected with the Society in a small way, for his tomb is in the Paris cemetery of Père La Chaise, named after a Jesuit confessor to King Louis XIV.

For good or for ill, as a religious order the Society of Jesus missed out on the French Revolution. That meant missing an extraordinary period for promotion of liberty, equality, and fraternity, human rights and democracy; it also meant missing the Terror and its savage, bloody dictatorship and a campaign to destroy Christianity and compel submission to the state's agenda in religion and everything else. In Europe, post-1814 Jesuits generally allied themselves with a conservative political agenda that sought restoration of monarchy and of pre–French Revolution society. Thus European Jesuits for the most part identified with efforts to undo what the revolution had done and return to a pre-1789 world. Yet this was supremely ironic, for the destruction of the Jesuits had been engineered not by republican revolutionaries but by the Catholic monarchs of Portugal, Spain, and France, who had succeeded in pressuring Clement XIV to do what they told him to do. While post-1814 European Jesuits may have sought restoration of the Old Regime in various ways, in fact the nineteenth century, with its globalization and industrialization, was their inescapable reality, and a thorough-going restoration in politics or religion or anything else was not possible.

Jesuit founder Ignatius of Loyola had insisted on adaptation to circumstances. Jesuits were to give the Spiritual Exercises, for example, in a way that met individuals where they were in their relationship to God. In what ways was this dynamic, flexible Ignatius "recovered" by the restored Jesuits? Jesuit missionaries, most famously Matteo Ricci (1552–1610) in China, had adapted themselves to local cultures; they understood that they were not only to bring God to others but also to find how God was already present wherever they went, perhaps in ways that surprised and transformed them. The 19th century would open a new era of overseas missions, some of them to places Europeans had not gone before, such as the interior of Africa or Australia. It makes no sense to speak of restoration of the Society of Jesus in such places if there were no Jesuits there in the 18th century or earlier. To what extent did Jesuits who were sent to these places attempt to transplant European attitudes and values – imagined as equivalent to "civilization" – and to what extent did they seek to adapt Catholic and Jesuit traditions to local situations? Much more research is needed for an adequate answer. The 19th century would see enormous growth in centralization of the Catholic Church, even as it also reached geographic and cultural peripheries it had previously not known.

In the pre-Suppression Society of Jesus, English-speaking parts of the world had played but a small role, and few Jesuits claimed English as their native language compared to the many who spoke French, Spanish, Portuguese, or German. But after 1814, both the expanding British Empire and the growing United States proved quite tolerant of Jesuits: as in the case of the Lutheran-turned-Russian-Orthodox Catherine the Great, non-Catholics often proved more supportive of or at least less hostile to the Jesuits than did fellow Catholics or countries that continued to have Catholic majorities. Most expulsions of the Jesuits from one or another country since 1814 – and there has been no shortage of these – have been from such countries, France and Spain among them. Switzerland, with roughly equal numbers of Catholics and Protestants, expelled the Jesuits after the Revolution of 1848 and did not admit them again until by referendum in the 1970s. Meanwhile, in the century and a half after 1814 Jesuits in the U. S. grew from a tiny few to some eight thousand just before Vatican II.

What about elsewhere in the Americas? Like Europe, Latin America had very large numbers of Jesuits active before 1773; and as in Europe, extant churches and other Jesuit buildings from that era or ruins of such buildings continue to suggest the widespread presence and influence of the old Society. But the challenges for Latin American Jesuits in the last two centuries have been many, from coming to terms with newly independent republics in the years after 1814, to surviving eras of ferocious anticlericalism, to serving the poor in societies where they have few to speak for them. November 16, 2014, will mark the 25th anniversary of the martyrdom of six Jesuits in El Salvador. Jesuits killed for their advocacy of justice for the poor. In Latin America, as elsewhere, the question of continuity or discontinuity of Jesuit history remains a complex one, and the history of Jesuits killed for their faith, including a faith that does justice, is no small part of that.

But the story of the Jesuits in Latin America and the story of the Jesuits as intertwined with the history of the papacy took a monumental turn on March 13, 2013. Though it is too soon to say how the election of Jorge Mario Bergoglio, S.J., as Pope Francis will change the Society of Jesus, it may be no less significant an event for Jesuits than what Pius VII did on August 7, 1814. Francis describes himself as from a distant place, from the periphery geographically and perhaps in other ways, as he speaks regularly of the urgent need to minister to the most marginalized people. He is now at the center of the Church, a Jesuit pope, something surely inconceivable two hundred years ago when the existence of any Jesuits at all was no sure thing. Perhaps Francis can teach Jesuits along with their colleagues and collaborators how to use positions of power and privilege for the benefit of people on the margins, the periphery. Perhaps Francis can demonstrate how a pope really can be a servant of the servants of God, one of the ancient titles of the bishop of Rome but one that has not always been visible in action. And perhaps he can play a central role, not so much by decrees or directives as by personal example, not in restoring but in reimagining and reinvigorating a Society of Jesus for the 21st century and beyond.
How can a once powerful global institution be resurrected after being extinguished? That was the challenge facing the Society of Jesus after its worldwide suppression in 1773. Churchmen recognized that reestablishment might someday occur, but John Carroll, ex-Jesuit and head of the Catholic Church in the United States, believed that the longer the project was delayed, the more formidable it would be. “When the present generation” of former members “is past, and the spirit which animated the Society is no more,” he predicted in 1782, recovery would be difficult. And a one-sided restoration centered on the letter of the law – the old organization’s rules and regulations – invited failure. Only the sustaining influence of living previous Jesuits could guarantee continuity with the order’s past and preserve what St. Ignatius called its “way of proceeding.”

The tension between spirit and law, especially when applied to pedagogical...
policy, troubled the order throughout the nineteenth century. Much of that struggle centered on interpretation of the Ratio Studiorum, the Society's foundational plan of studies dating from 1599, and the extent to which it should be adjusted to the American scene. Some Jesuits, including John Carroll, believed education should be guided less by fine print than by commonsense and flexible accommodation. Others, including superiors abroad, inclined toward strict adherence to custom.

After restoration, leaders sought to recapture the spirit of the Society in the order's isolated American branch by recruiting seasoned personnel from Europe. The opposition faced by Jesuits in many parts of the world facilitated their enlistment for America. Barely reconstituted in 1814, the group was driven from one country after another, as fresh assaults reinvigorated stereotypes forged in the era of suppression. "Old calumnies, decked out with new colors, are scattered broadcast among the people," Father General Jan Roothaan wrote in 1839, "with word and writing, in book, pamphlet, and periodical flooding the world like a deluge, they daily defame and vilify us." Then disaster struck. In 1848, following additional political revolutions in Europe, a general dispersal propelled half the Jesuits in the world into exile within the space of a year.

Persecution in the old world, however, sparked resurgence in the new. Learning of the plight of asylum-seekers in Switzerland and Germany, a Maryland Jesuit wrote in 1848, "Perhaps with their arrival new houses can be formed in Pennsylvania, Virginia and other states where we have been unable to fulfill our hopes of having schools." Numbering fewer than two dozen in the United States at their dissolution in 1773, the restored Jesuits had by 1860 swollen to nearly 500, facilitating the founding of urban colleges, often in advance of public education, across developing America.

Even before the Society's official restoration, ex-Jesuits led by John Carroll had established Georgetown College in 1789. Others soon followed: St. Louis University, Spring Hill College, Xavier University, Fordham University, and the College of the Holy Cross. The second half of the 19th century witnessed still more foundings as Jesuits from Italy, Germany, and France immigrated to America. Although Anglo- and Irish-American Jesuits staffed Georgetown College, succeeding institutions were forged by émigrés. Saint Louis University was run by Belgians; French expatriates launched institutions in Alabama, Kentucky, and New York; and uprooted Neapolitans created Woodstock College, the order's national seminary in Maryland. German Jesuits deported by Bismarck's Kulturkampf founded five schools across the northeast from New York to the Mississippi River. When the school that became Loyola University Chicago opened in 1870, its staff of 20 numbered only one American. In the Far West, transplanted Italians operated colleges in Santa Clara, San Francisco, Denver, Spokane, and Seattle.

The foreign provenance of the schools had far-reaching consequences. Once-foundering Georgetown College experienced such a surge in enrollment and professors that by the late 1850s it was one of the largest colleges in the United States. But if European transplants brought acclaim to the institutions, they also created disagreement. As the historian R. Emmett Curran has shown, Continental and Anglo-American-Irish Jesuits clashed over adapting Jesuit educational tradition to the republican values of young America. Continentalists championed a traditional course of studies centered on Latin, Greek, and philosophy. Anglophone clergy argued that science – not moral philosophy – should be the curricular capstone.

An abundance of personnel tempted the Jesuits to rush to occupy unclaimed educational territory. As early as 1840, Roothaan warned against overexpansion. "I cannot help entertaining very great fears for that portion of the Society," he wrote, "where the harvest is gathered before it is ripe and where one must look for grass instead of grain." The influx of foreign clergy also sparked nativist opposition that in turn prompted varied responses. Founders of the College of the Holy Cross excluded non-Catholics from their classrooms. Schools planted in friendlier regions admitted them because, Jesuits argued, it reduced prejudice. Expatriates were often not effective educational leaders. Everyone recognized that the best collegiate president was an American or, as one priest put it, "at least a well-Americanized Irish president." But few were to be had. Nowhere was the ethnic character of the Jesuits more acutely evidenced than in their labor to master English. Fluency in the American language was a must for teaching grammar and literature but also for training in elocution, which was highly prized in American eyes. Hence the effort to recruit native-born lay professors.

In the long run, however, national variety proved an asset in a land where by mid century every third person was foreign-born. Guided by mentors who themselves wrestled with the challenge of acculturation, the sons of newly arrived European immigrants filled classrooms from New York to San Francisco. Academies in New Mexico and California were founded to educate Spanish-speakers swept into the United States by the Mexican War, 1846-1848. Enrolling students of diverse nationalities, races, and economic backgrounds, the Jesuit college aimed at strengthening the faith of immigrant children in a culture unfriendly to Catholicism while preparing them to participate in American society.

Like many educators of the day, Jesuits championed a pedagogy that was both formative and informative. "Intellect, body and soul, all must receive their share of development," they insisted. "The acquisition of knowledge, though it necessarily accompanies any right system of education, is a secondary result of education. The end is culture, mental and moral development." The shaping of character required that students enroll at an early age, sometimes as young as nine. Hence the typical Jesuit college was more akin to the European gymnasium than the American college of today. From East to West, formational goals were advanced through classical languages and literature,
Although all Jesuit colleges in the U.S. offered a classical curriculum, institutions in the West and Midwest also provided vocational training. This woodcut is of a class in assaying at Santa Clara College c. 1877. Courtesy of the Santa Clara University Archives.

although with more success in the East. “For the mere bookworm – for the Latin and Greek antiquarian – this is certainly not the country,” a California educator wrote. Nevertheless, higher superiors enjoined compliance with hallowed custom, but resistance to liberal education kept native-born Jesuits in a constant boil over how best to respond to the peculiarities of American learning.

Most students, as at other American institutions, did not remain long enough to earn a diploma. During much of the 19th century, training for the professions was accomplished through apprenticeship rather than by classroom training. Of the nearly 6,000 students attending Jesuit colleges in 1884, less than two percent graduated with the classical bachelor of arts degree. Therefore, in addition to the classics, most schools offered an English program leading to a bachelor of science diploma.

The apex of all study was rhetoric. Mastery of *eloquentia perfecta*, or articulate wisdom, meant not merely the ability to communicate with ease and elegance, but, as one scholar put it, “the capacity to reason, to feel, to express oneself and to act, harmonizing virtue with learning.” To this end, students participated in dramatic productions that inculcated lessons of virtue, enhanced memory, and perfected oratorical expertise. “All our Western boys wanted to shine as orators,” a Jesuit in Kentucky said. “In their estimation, no one in the world was superior to the great Henry Clay or to John C. Calhoun.”

Jesuits were of one mind in the conviction that their schools were explicitly Christian in purpose, not merely value-oriented, to use a spongy contemporary term. And yet formal theological instruction did not occupy a large place in the curriculum. Instead, spiritual values and moral training threaded through every aspect of campus life. Religious holidays abounded; Marian sodalities promoted piety and good example; devotional symbols appeared everywhere; all students attended obligatory church services. In sum, the regimen of the school, the personal relationship of student and teacher, and weekly catechetical instruction all aimed at inculcating the principles and practices of Christian faith.

Students came from every economic class. St. Xavier College, a commuter school in the center of Manhattan’s developing mass transit system, served a blue-jacket, lunch-bucket clientele. “No student, however poor, is refused admission because he is unable to pay tuition,” officials at Boston College reported in 1899, “and of the 400 young men registered in the college, scarcely more than half do so.” Although the Jesuits preferred to run day schools, which necessitated fewer personnel and lower costs, they opened boarding colleges at Georgetown, Worcester, Spring Hill, New York, Denver, Spokane, and Santa Clara. Requiring additional fees, those
establishments enrolled a more restricted clientele. By 1880, the order’s 20 institutions in the United States were evenly split between residential and commuter colleges.

By century’s end, the Society’s far-flung network of colleges had achieved remarkable success against considerable odds. Fifty years prior, European higher-ups had decried the poor quality of teacher preparation and a lack of pedagogical uniformity in the schools. The arrival of professors from abroad had introduced a more standardized curriculum conforming to the Jesuit liberal arts tradition. That reform was strengthened by the 1869 founding of Woodstock College, where European mentors imparted Jesuit educational practice to future Jesuit teachers. The colleges of the Society, boasting alumni prominent in government, church, and the professions, had emerged as conspicuous assets in the eyes of communities across the nation. With the launching of professional schools, some of the more progressive Jesuit institutions were even inching toward university status.

Nevertheless, as they became more and more vulnerable to external forces, these schools were soon swept into an educational backwater. Once the sole center of learning in a city, the typical Jesuit college at the turn of the century faced competition from rising state and private institutions. With the emergence of the public high school, the Society’s integration of secondary and collegiate instruction grew anachronistic. Formerly an advantage, the foreign character of Jesuit academies transformed into a handicap as the American church embraced Americanization. “Only American-born, or Irish priests, would work in this country for the glory of God,” a bishop declared in 1908 at the prospect of receiving European Jesuits in his diocese. When electivism became the hallmark of undergraduate education, insistence on a controlled classical curriculum hobbled the ability of graduates of the Society’s colleges to gain admission to the nation’s top professional schools. The final blow came when accrediting agencies intent on standardizing American higher education judged many pioneer Catholic colleges second rate. By 1900, “we were losing caste as educators,” lamented a St. Louis Jesuit, “being looked upon as high school teachers and little more.”

The crisis had many causes. One centered on the on-going debate about the true spirit of the order’s mode of proceeding, which John Carroll had noted when the Society was restored nearly a century earlier. Educators in the United States often sought to adapt the order’s tradition to America educational needs, but European superiors, usually men without personal experience of the country, insisted everything be authenticated as a bona fide feature of the Society’s accepted educational practice. The Jesuits had also become victims of their success. As early as 1889, a Georgetown president warned there were “too many Catholic colleges in too many isolated places.”

The early decades of the 20th century, then, were devoted to recovering from missteps of the 19th. Schools run for decades on shoestring budgets now struggled to assemble financial endowments and sufficient library holdings, each a sine qua non for accreditation. Pioneer educators’ penchant for launching schools left their successors burdened with so many needy institutions that Jesuit personnel could not be released from classroom work to pursue advanced degrees. The result was that many colleges and universities, lacking faculty with doctorates, fought for years to win the approval of regional standardizing agencies. Nonetheless, in the end reform did prevail. Despite high hurdles, in the early decades of the new century a fresh generation of American educators grappled with the challenge of modernizing the Jesuit system, creating eventually the network of colleges and universities we have today.
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The restoration of the Society of Jesus in the United States marked the emergence of a continental Jesuit educational empire during the antebellum period. In 1805, shortly after five ex-Jesuits received permission from Rome to join up with the Jesuits’ Russian province, which had evaded the suppression of 1773, Bp. John Carroll turned over Georgetown College for the revived Society to operate. Over the five decades after 1808, 15 Jesuit colleges were established. Jesuits began or took over eight colleges from 1843 to 1853. At the beginning of the Civil War, Jesuits conducted 14 colleges from Massachusetts to California.

These colleges were predominately preparatory schools for students ages 6 to 16. The overwhelming majority of the students at the largest Jesuit college, Xavier in Manhattan, were in the lower department. In 1860 Spring Hill College, with an enrollment surpassing 230, graduated two students. For the 1860-61 academic year, collegians made up less than ten percent of those enrolled at St. Ignatius in San Francisco. Almost all of these colleges offered either the traditional classical course or the commercial course that afforded students the opportunity for practical education. Seven of the 14 schools had boarders as well as day students.

Georgetown, St. Louis, Xavier, among others, had heavy enrollment from the South. Even at Holy Cross and Fordham in the Northeast, southerners accounted for a fifth of the enrollment. A majority of these southerners were non-Catholic. Non-Catholics typically accounted for at least a third of the student body.

War’s Impact

The closer a Jesuit college was to a theater of the Civil War, the greater it felt the war’s impact. But whether a school found itself in the path of conflicting armies, as St. Joseph’s, Bardstown, did in the late summer of 1862, or thousands of miles removed from the fighting, the war brought fundamental change to all the colleges.

At the outbreak of the war the superior general of the Society of Jesus, Peter Beckx, issued an order to Jesuit authorities in the United States to make sure that none of their subjects would say anything publicly about the conflict and its issues. To understand this gag policy one must appreciate the sense of being under siege that Jesuits had so acutely had under the pressure of anti-Catholic and nativistic forces over the past generation that had spawned bloody riots, church burnings, tarring and feathering of Jesuits, and assaults on the civil rights of Catholics and immigrants. Behind the policy imposing silence was a primal fear that civil war would somehow untap raw emotions, launching a new “Protestant Crusade” that would especially take aim at the Society of Jesus as the chief culprit for the nation’s woes.

The gag policy worked among the Jesuit faculty everywhere except at Spring Hill, Alabama, where they were open and enthusiastic Confederates. Controlling the speech and
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emotions of the students proved to be another matter. At Georgetown student passions about the issues tearing the nation apart long preceded the actual outbreak of war. In December 1859, just days after John Brown’s hanging had brought to a head the outrage North and South experienced over the slave insurrection that Brown had attempted, the debating society at Georgetown chose the topic: “Should the South now secede?” That topic proved so provocative that the debate extended over the next two weeks, with the affirmative prevailing. A free-for-all broke out, which the faculty quelled. As the Confederacy took shape in the Deep South and war loomed, students from that region headed home, culminating with the mass departure of the southern college seniors in April 1861. Student interest in the war was closely related to how immediate the war’s impact was on the campus. In Baltimore, Loyola students organized drill companies in April 1861 in the immediate aftermath of the bloody clash less than a mile away between Union troops and Confederate sympathizers. The pro-secessionist student militia was forming as part of the effort to defend Baltimore against any further attempts to transport troops from the North to subdue the rebelling states. Their drilling incited a counterattack from Loyola students committed to the Union. In the border city of Cincinnati, students at St. Xavier formed militia units, some of which likely responded to the governor’s call for volunteers to defend the city from the Confederate armies sweeping through Kentucky in September 1862. At Fordham, life went on “as though there was no war,” the students oblivious of alumni like Robert Shaw and James R. O’Beirne, whose heroic action would win the former iconic fame and the latter the Medal of Honor.

By one measure the Jesuit colleges equally shared in the war: that of providing chaplains for the Union and Confederate forces. Of the 54 identified Catholic Chaplains for the Federal armies, at least nine were Jesuits from their colleges. Jesuits comprised a fifth of the known Catholic chaplains that served the forces of the Confederacy. Fr. Joseph O’Hagan of Holy Cross and Georgetown would have been in the Army of the Potomac from the Peninsula Campaign to Appomattox and witnessed some of the most brutal fighting of the eastern theater at Fredericksburg, Chancellorville, and Gettysburg.

The War Comes to Campus

Being in the nation’s capital, Georgetown became the first Jesuit campus to be “militarized” in the wake of civil conflict. In early May, the 1400-man New York 69th Regiment took over most of the college buildings and grounds. During their three-week stay, President Lincoln as well as members of his cabinet reviewed the troops on campus. In August the following year, the government once more appropriated most of the college’s buildings for 500 wounded from the Second Battle of Manassas. Hundreds of them converted to Catholicism, including virtually all of the more than 100 who died. Georgetown continued to function as a military hospital for the remainder of the year.

Across the country colleges adapted to serve wartime needs. For the medical department at Georgetown, the war proved a huge boon for enrollment. As the only medical school in the capital, it became the major training center for surgeons and other medical personnel for the Union army. For some colleges, necessity rather than opportunity prevailed. At St. Joseph’s, Bardstown, government officials appropriated the vacant college buildings for a military hospital.

When both sides introduced a draft in 1862 to raise troops, very few students in Jesuit colleges were affected since the vast majority were under the age of 18. Jesuits themselves, particularly scholastics and coadjutor brothers, were subject to it. The drafting of Jesuit scholastics and priests led Jesuits John Early (Baltimore) and Peter De Smet (St. Louis) to use their connections with Secretary of War Edwin Stanton to secure exemptions for religious drafted in the Union army. Jesuits in the Confederacy were also subject to the draft that the Confederate Congress had enacted but eventually were also exempted.

Survival, Inflation, and Shrinking Enrollments

Student enlistments for both sides significantly reduced enrollment in most Jesuit colleges. For Spring Hill, the occupation of New Orleans by the Federal Army in the spring of 1862 cut off its principal market for both students and provisions. St. Joseph’s of Bardstown, whose boarders were overwhelmingly from the Deep South, lost most of its out-of-staters when the war came. The greatly reduced enrollment and the near impossibility of collecting the fees of the students from the Deep South led to a financial crisis which caused classes to be suspended. It marked the end of St. Joseph’s as a Jesuit institution.

Dependent as it so deeply was on a southern constituency, Georgetown felt the war’s impact at the beginning of school in the fall of 1861, when only 50 students enrolled, a sixth of the number on the books the previous year. Salvation for Georgetown’s enrollment crisis came from a very local source: the District of Columbia, whose population had more than doubled since the war’s start. By 1864, district residents accounted for over half of the college’s student body, many of them the sons of artisans or businessmen and the children of those in government service.

Galloping inflation forced substantial increases in tuition and other fees. Georgetown hiked tuition by 70 percent, even as financial aid was cut. Holy Cross had to impose increases of similar scale. The rise in tuition at Santa Clara brought about a class shift in its student body, as the sons of the wealthy replaced those of the middle class. Bp. Joseph Alemany lamented that “very, very few of my Catholic people” could now afford Santa Clara. To provide an accessible
alternative, the bishop in 1863 founded Saint Mary’s College in San Francisco. Remarkably, by war’s end, the number of Jesuit colleges was the same as in 1861, with the opening of classes at Boston College in 1863 offsetting the closing of St. Joseph’s, Bardstown.

Assassination and Consequences of the War

On the evening of April 9, 1865, the college building at Holy Cross was aglow with candles illuminating its many windows. Lee had surrendered in Virginia just hours before; the war was over. There were no such illuminations at Georgetown, Bardstown, or St. Louis, to our knowledge. For most of the Jesuits and students at these institutions in the “middle ground,” the end of the Confederacy brought at best relief and resignation, not joy and celebration. Six days later, and three days since thousands of federal forces had occupied his campus, the president of Spring Hill College entered the study hall to inform the students that President Lincoln had been assassinated by John Wilkes Booth. He tried to impress upon them what a despicable murder this was as well as the danger they would court with the federal soldiers throughout campus should they betray any sympathy with the assassin. Three Georgetown alumni were eventually implicated in the assassination, including David Herold, Booth’s accomplice in his abortive attempt to escape into Virginia, and Dr. Samuel Mudd, who treated Booth after he broke his ankle fleeing Ford’s Theater. Herold was one of the four conspirators executed. Mudd received a life sentence.

For some Jesuit colleges in the aftermath of the war, the loss of their traditional southern market forced a new concentration on prospects near at hand. Xavier of Cincinnati had success when it discontinued boarding just before the war. St. Louis found it increasingly necessary to replace the heavily Protestant students from the Deep South with Catholics from its metropolitan area. Three factors were at play here: the increasing availability of institutions of higher education in the South, the post-Appomattox poverty that consumed the vast majority of planters and professionals who had traditionally sent their sons north, and the growth of a Catholic middle class in greater St. Louis. The pauperization of so many of the Catholic planting families that had been the bulwark of Spring Hill outside of Mobile, compounded by the smallpox and yellow fever epidemics that struck the region in the late 1860s and the general instability that characterized Reconstruction, led to a sharp drop in enrollment from a peak of 300 in early 1865 to less than half that number by the end of the decade.

Michael David Cohen (Reconstructing the Campus: Higher Education and the American Civil War) found that the Civil War created the forces that have shaped modern higher education in America. The Morrill Land-Grant College Act set the standards that have increasingly defined American higher education as having a diverse student population and a curriculum that privileges vocational preparation and military training. There is a symbiotic relationship between state and school in which the latter assumes a growing role in the public arena. For most Jesuit colleges outside the formal public sphere, the war produced the opposite effects. Their students became increasingly homogeneous; classical education reigned supreme; and they became much less involved with government and the larger society – islands unto themselves, isolated from the social and educational mainstreams.
"A day college for the youth of the city." That was the goal John McElroy, S.J., set for himself when he arrived in Boston in 1847 to become the pastor of one of the largest and busiest parishes in New England. McElroy, who had emigrated from the Northern Irish province of Ulster as a young man, was one of the most prominent members of a new generation of American Jesuits in the years following the restoration of the order in 1814. The Society had come to Maryland with the earliest settlers in the 1630s, and two centuries later its priests and scholastics staffed half a dozen schools around the country, a number that grew steadily thereafter. Jesuits in other cities had plans similar to his, and in 1863 McElroy’s dream was fulfilled with the establishment of Boston College. A year later the first students were admitted. As at so many of the other Jesuit colleges of the time, the fortunes of the school and the fortunes of recent immigrants to the United States were intimately connected.

Famine in Ireland and political turmoil in Germany and elsewhere were sending previously unimaginable numbers of immigrants to American shores, and the change this represented for the country was unprecedented. To some, it was scary. Native-born Americans spoke of the newcomers as a “flood” or a “tidal wave,” hardly metaphors of welcome. Immigrants struggled for such basic necessities as food, shelter, and employment, but even as they did so they also wanted something better for the next generation of their families. That was why most had come in the first place, and education would be the principal means for realizing their hopes.

At first, however, some of the schools in the emerging American Jesuit network remained out of reach. The College of the Holy Cross, for example, only 40 miles from Boston, was already well established by the time McElroy arrived, succeeding in its mission of education. It was a residential school, however, whose students (many of them from the South) lived on campus; and its cost ($150 per year) might just as well have been a million dollars as far as most immigrants were concerned. A common laborer of the time earned a dollar a day if he was lucky, and thus immigrant families needed access to what one bishop called “a thorough education, gratuitously or nearly so.” McElroy pegged his tuition at only $30 per year – not entirely “gratuitous,” perhaps, but at least possible for students who would continue to live at home with their parents.

During its first academic year, about sixty students attended the new college, some for the whole year, some for only a few weeks. Few students had any intention of staying for the complete academic program, a seven-year progression of classwork defined by the Ratio Studiorum, originally published in 1599 and revised most recently in 1832. It emphasized the Greek and Latin classics, but with some concessions to “practical” coursework such as in bookkeeping. Most students and their families wanted to acquire some education, but a little might have to go a long way. Students could take a bit of learning out into the professional workforce, helping to advance the family’s status and perhaps also underwriting a few years of study by a younger brother. The full curriculum would not be in place until 1877, when the first degrees (just twelve of them that year) were finally awarded. Though called a college, this was not higher education as we have come to think of it. One of the students who enrolled on the very first day was only seven years old, and into the 1870s more than half the students were younger than fifteen. Even so, these immigrants and sons of immigrants put their education to its intended use.

Among the early students were those who had been born abroad and come to the United States as children with
their parents. In the first class, for instance, there was Herman Chelius, born in Germany, the son of a musical father; Herman would become a musician and teacher. Frank Norris, whose Irish father was a carpenter, became a widely traveled salesman for a pharmaceutical company. Also from Ireland was Hugh Roe O'Donnell, later the pastor of several large parishes in and around Boston. The vast majority of students, however, were the American-born sons of immigrant parents, and many of these quickly proved that education was indeed the ticket to a better life. John Selinger's Austrian-born father, for example, worked in a piano factory, but young John (who later went by “Jean”) became a noted portrait artist. The father of Edward McLaughlin, one of the first students actually to receive a diploma, was a day laborer his entire life; young Edward became a lawyer, president of several local civic and charitable organizations, and the clerk of the state's House of Representatives. The father and older brothers of William O'Connell (class of 1881) all worked in the mills of the nearby industrial city of Lowell; Will became a priest, a bishop, and in 1911 just the third American ever to be designated a cardinal. Many of their classmates had similar career paths, embodying the very kind of progress across the generations that immigrant families wanted. Some families had already taken halting steps in that direction, and the Jesuit education of their sons helped cement their newfound position. Four McAvoy brothers enrolled in the college's first decade, for instance. Their immigrant father became a successful iron merchant, and their immigrant mother employed Irish domestic servants to help manage the household. The younger generation resisted the temptation to slip back down the economic ladder, and the four boys had careers, respectively, as a businessman, a newspaper reporter, a clerk, and a Jesuit.

Often overlooked or forgotten today, in the earliest years the largest percentage of actual immigrants at Boston College, as at other schools of the Society at the time, was among the Jesuits themselves. Even after restoration of the order, the Society remained controversial in many places, and by the middle 1840s Jesuits were regularly being expelled from one European nation after another. John Bapst, S.J., who would be president of the college in Boston after McElroy, was one such immigrant. He had been born in the canton of Fribourg in Switzerland, and he was ordained in 1846, just in time to be thrown out of the country with his fellow Jesuits for alleged political activity. Bapst landed in America and was assigned first to minister to tribes of Native American Catholics in Maine. To do this, he (a native French speaker) faced the daunting prospect of having to learn English and Penobscot at the same time, though he managed both with ease. He had come to grief in Maine, seized one day by an anti-immigrant, anti-Catholic mob, ridden through town on a sharp rail, and finally covered with hot tar and feathers. (It was said, perhaps apocryphally, that he celebrated mass the next day as usual.) His later time as a college rector and as head of the New York Jesuit province was calm by comparison. Other immigrant Jesuits had not had to face his same harrowing circumstances, but the fact that so many of them were immigrants themselves gave them a deep understanding of and empathy with their students. In many classrooms around the country, there was an immigrant on both sides of the desk.

By the 20th century, at Boston College as at the other American Jesuit colleges, there were fewer immigrants among the students but still many immigrant sons. (Because most Catholic colleges were single-sex until the 1970s, the daughters of immigrants who sought higher education found it at the many Catholic women’s colleges that were maintained by several orders of sisters.) Restrictive legislation in the 1920s closed the nation’s doors to most new immigrants, apparently forever, and the actual experience of immigration in many families grew increasingly remote; immigration was now more likely to be something one’s grandparents had gone through, not something one knew at first hand. Still, until after World War II the overwhelming majority of students on most Jesuit campuses were the first members of their family to go to college, and education remained a pathway to advancement. In a sense, the colleges and the communities they served were getting exactly what they had wanted all along: an educated lay population achieving worldly success even as it remained grounded in Catholic and Jesuit traditions.

Changing laws in the 1960s and again in the 1980s opened the gates of immigration once again, and the newcomers grew ever more diverse. The earlier generations of migrants from Europe were replaced now with strivers from Latin America, Asia, and Africa. As the recent discussions of more changes in the law have demonstrated, these immigrants too often face suspicion and hostility from the native-born; ironically, many of the latter are the descendants of earlier immigrants. The challenge to Jesuit colleges in serving these new populations is no less urgent than it was a century and a half ago, and it is perhaps more complex. The colleges and universities of today aspire to do many different things for many different kinds of students; that is how we have come to define “success.” Those are worthy aspirations, but they must not cut us off from our historical grounding. We do not know how many immigrants and immigrant children, male and female, are enrolled at Boston College or the other Jesuit universities today; for perhaps obvious reasons, we do not collect that data. Moreover, the rising cost of higher education everywhere risks raising new barriers to access, unintended but no less real. If immigrants of the 1860s could not afford tuition of $150 per year, how will today’s aspiring families afford costs that are many multiples of that? But the commitment of Jesuit higher education to serve immigrants and their children must remain no less strong today than it was in the past. This tradition may be an old one, but it must also be a current and future one. Concern for social justice begins at home.
A few years ago, Professor David O’Brien and I were presented the Arrupe Award at the University of Scranton. As part of that convocation, we were asked to speak about our experience of Jesuit mission and identity … an experience usually interesting, sometimes funny, but always serious. We decided that the informal title of our presentation would be “Jesuits and the Rest of Us.” The rest of us, of course, are the significant number of lay women and men as well as some religious, like myself, who are collaborators in this ministry of Jesuit (and in my case Jesuit and Mercy) Catholic higher education.

Allow me to share how the place we call the University of Detroit Mercy began. I must admit the beginning of the idea to join the University of Detroit and Mercy College of Detroit was rather casual. My partner in this important endeavor was Fr. Robert Mitchell, S.J., then president of the University of Detroit. I was president of Mercy College. We were both attending a meeting of Detroit Catholic college and university presidents. During the luncheon break he began talking about things that our two institutions might do together. Why, he asked, should we be competing for students rather than collaborating on programs as one institution? I must admit that during the remainder of that meeting I was more than distracted by his question. We agreed to meet later in that week to explore what such a collaboration might mean. I do not intend to describe in detail the work that went on for the next two and a half years, only to write that after extensive study and planning undertaken by the two boards, the faculties, the administrators, and the staff the University of Detroit Mercy came into being in June 1990. I was elected to become UDM’s first president, a position I held for the next 14 years.

An old Jesuit proverb goes something like this: Bernard loved the valleys, Benedict the mountains, Francis the towns; Ignatius loved great cities. I think I could safely assert that Catherine McAuley, the foundress of the Sisters of Mercy, also loved the cities. Both founders, Ignatius and Catherine, discovered the heart of their ministries in the great cities of the world. In 1990 the questions before us were: How does commitment to a place influence the shape and success of our ministry? How can the University of Detroit Mercy legitimately integrate the justice of solidarity and compassionate service in a globalizing world into its academic and educational mission?

Part of the answer to those questions depended on an understanding of the choices that the two legacy institutions made during their histories. Those histories represent not a
single choice but rather a series of choices. The University of Detroit was a foundation that responded to the call of the Church in a growing urban center. When Bp. Casper Borgess invited the Jesuits to open the College of Detroit in 1877, the population of the city was close to 100,000, and industry had begun to flourish, moving Detroit towards the industrial giant it would later become. The Church in the city was predominantly made up of foreign-born people not long removed from Europe. Bishop Borgess hoped that those first Jesuits would create a Catholic university that “would produce people who would give a healthy tone to society, to defend and practice the noble virtues of honor, justice and truth.” (Herman Muller, S.J., *The University of Detroit 1877-1977*, p. xi) When Sister Carmelita Manning, the founding provincial of the Detroit Province of the Sisters of Mercy, opened Mercy College in 1941, her vision was to prepare women for careers of useful service to the Church and the community through an education that combined excellent professional preparation with a rigorous foundation in the arts and sciences, inspired always by the Mercy dedication to compassionate service to those in need.

Those were their beginnings. But as we examined their history over time, we observed that they both continued to contribute to the educational demands of the city around them. In addition to the liberal arts, we noted the establishment of a law school, a dental school, advanced nursing and health programs, social work, science, technology, colleges of engineering, business, and architecture, graduate programs in religious studies, education, and other disciplines in the humanities and sciences – all responses to the needs of the civic, business, and faith communities.

During the turmoil of the 1960s, both institutions remained committed to Detroit, once more affirming their commitment to the city and its needs. As the population of the city began to change, as the phenomenon of “white flight” became a reality, both institutions chose to stay even as the city of Detroit faced more and more problems. But staying, despite enormous pressure to move, was not enough. It was clear to both institutions that if they were to be responsive to new groups of students other strategies must be undertaken. Hence initiatives like Project 100 were begun – efforts to successfully incorporate these new students into college and university life. There were many choices that were made during the tumultuous years of the 60’s and 70’s – choices that demonstrated once again an unwavering sense that Detroit was the place that would
remain home and its future would directly impact both institutions. Many contributions were made during those years, contributions both educational and civic, that demonstrated this commitment.

What difference does this University of Detroit Mercy make for Detroit and the region at the front edge of the 21st century? How does it, through the academic programs, educate students to live, work, and contribute in a world that is far different from the world of 1887, 1941, or even 1990? How are students prepared to grasp issues such as globalization, immigration of people and jobs, the evolution of technology, and the phenomenon of “shrinking cities?” As other urban universities address difficult times, here are a few examples of how Detroit Mercy responds.

**Immigration**

Detroit is situated on an international border. Scores of immigrants, particularly from countries of the former Soviet Union, are making their way into Detroit looking for refuge and stability. The Immigration Clinic sponsored by the Archdiocese of Detroit and the university’s School of Law assists these men and women in clarifying their legal status as well as in acting as a reference to other agencies that will assist them in finding shelter and employment. These efforts are more than service, for they expose students to the grim realities of international migration and its social and economic impact. The Detroit region provides UDM with an opportunity to participate both in understanding the challenge and in contributing to the solution – drawing deeply from religious convictions rooted in a dedication to justice, solidarity, and compassion.

**Shrinking Cities**

Detroit, like many cities in the industrial crescent, is plagued with migration, deteriorating infrastructures, and poverty. Revitalizing the city is a task of enormous proportion. How has the university assisted in this task? One response is the Detroit Collaborative Design Center – a center situated in the School of Architecture which works with community groups and other not-for-profit organizations in designing structures that reflect both beauty and utility, contributing to the revitalization of the city and its neighborhoods.

**Health and Wellness**

No one needs to be reminded of the crisis in health care particularly for the poor and the uninsured. The challenge is both a local and national one. The UDM College of Health Professions is reaching out with students and faculty in establishing clinics throughout the city in an attempt to provide basic services in health education and disease prevention. Similarly, the School of Dentistry continues its work at the clinics it operates both at the university and in the core city. The dental school is one of only two in the state of Michigan, and many of its graduates serve people in the greater Detroit area.

**Community Involvement**

There are so many examples that illustrate the university’s commitment to its urban location, examples that demonstrate how the city affects the university and how the university has an impact on the city. The faculty and students of the College of Engineering and Science work with hundreds of inner-city children in a recognized program that encourages these young students to consider careers in engineering and science – encouragement that gives testimony to their dignity, their possibilities, and their hopes. The honors program in the College of Liberal Arts and Education and the Leadership Development Institute both demand that students volunteer significant time in various areas of need. Finally, the Institute for Leadership and Service is an initiative whose mission is to “provide opportunities for all members of the UDM community to engage in social change for the common good.”

All of these efforts demonstrate ways in which UDM acts out its faith-inspired mission of justice, solidarity, and compassionate service. These initiatives include opportunities that integrate the theoretical dimensions of the various experiences. Consistent analyses enable students to learn how these local conditions have ramifications regionally, nationally, and internationally. These activities, in or out of the classrooms and labs, are supported by research and teaching that searches for a deeper understanding of the complexities of this world, thus enabling the university to continue educating students who will lead and serve in their communities.

Creating the University of Detroit Mercy meant that its educators in the Mercy and Jesuit traditions would be serious about the university’s commitment to educate men and women of justice and compassion. They continue to summon their talents as philosophers, theologians, historians, and writers to assist the students – in the words of the poet Dana Gioia, “to rise out of their self-referential world” and offer their talents in a wider context that demands consistent participation in the larger society. (Dana Gioia, “Can Poetry Matter?” *Atlantic Monthly*, May 1991). They must continue to be courageous enough to rise out of their own self-referential world in order to fulfill the mission given to them by Ignatius and Catherine. It is only in taking to heart the mission of the University of Detroit Mercy that all its people can have an impact on Detroit.

There is no doubt in my mind that the city has had an impact on UDM; its needs have helped shape its programs, its directions, and its future. And in this time of new issues for Detroit, the UDM community surely renews its resolve to continue having an influence on the city by its understanding of and participation in a tradition rooted in faith and committed to justice and compassion. UDM’s founders would ask for no less.
colleges and universities are being challenged today to pursue what Clayton Christensen calls “disruptive innovations,” i.e., imaginative new solutions for higher education's multidimensional problems. This would not be the first time higher education has been asked to respond creatively to new and demanding situations. Consider how Jesuit, Catholic higher education responded to the challenges it faced in the late sixties and early seventies.

After World War II, the GI Bill had led to an influx of veterans that both increased enrollment and diversified the student body. An infusion of federal dollars in the fifties and sixties spurred an explosive growth. In 1955, John Tracy Ellis asked, “Where are the Catholic intellectual leaders?” sparking a new quest for academic seriousness, if not excellence.

The Second Vatican Council (1962-65) opened up new horizons for a more dynamic Church with lay leadership at its core. The council's document “The Church in the Modern World” would find its university parallel in “The Catholic University in the Modern World” (1972). The social unrest of the late sixties and early seventies raised new opportunities for social outreach by the university. The seventies brought double-digit inflation to already struggling budgets.

In the midst of these Church and societal upheavals, Jesuit, Catholic colleges and universities had to search for new ways of governing themselves, since the older ways were simply not up to the task. Until the mid-sixties, Jesuit and Catholic colleges and universities had often comingle their operation and resources with the operation and resources of the religious community, but this model became less and less effective as the institutions grew more and more complex. The institutions responded by: (1) staking out a claim to a necessary autonomy; (2) encouraging separate incorporation of the religious community and the college or university in order to clarify the roles of each; (3) developing independent boards of trustees composed of both religious and lay members. These steps could have been and often were interpreted as lessening an interest in Catholic and Jesuit identity, but actually each step was taken with an explicit commitment to preserve that identity.

This essay briefly chronicles how Jesuit schools sought successful ways to be appropriately autonomous while remaining faithful to their Jesuit or Ignatian identity. That quest continues to this day, with many of the neuralgic issues still in play.

An Essential Autonomy

In 1967, as part of the preparation of a document on the distinctive character of a Catholic university in the light of the recently published Vatican II document “The Church in the Modern World,” Fr. Theodore Hesburgh hosted a meeting at the University of Notre Dame villa in Wisconsin, from which resulted the famous (or, to its critics, infamous) Land O’Lakes Statement: The Nature of the Contemporary Catholic University. This statement helped frame the issues that have been the basis for tensions between Church authorities and American Catholic higher education for nearly fifty years, especially when it insisted that “the Catholic university must be a university in the full modern sense of the word, with a strong commitment to and concern for academic freedom, and that this institutional autonomy and academic freedom are essential conditions of life and growth, and indeed of
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survival for Catholic universities, as for all universities.” Critics of this so-called “declaration of independence” often forget the distinguished composition of the group issuing the statement. It included two bishops, two high-ranking monsignors, one of whom became a cardinal, the superior general of the Congregation of the Holy Cross, the assistant superior general of the Society of Jesus, and the presidents of Notre Dame, Boston College, Fordham, Georgetown, and St. Louis. Also forgotten is that of the ten sections of the document only the first spoke of autonomy and academic freedom. The other nine sections were devoted to how Catholic universities could assure that Catholicism would be “perceptibly present and effectively operative” on Catholic campuses.

Henceforth, institutional autonomy and academic freedom would become essential to all descriptions of the Catholic university up to and including *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, but with somewhat different interpretations of the terms.

**The McGrath Thesis and Separate Incorporation.** Already in 1965, Fr. John McGrath, a canon lawyer at the Catholic University of America, had introduced what came to be known as the “McGrath Thesis,” arguing that if an institution had been civilly incorporated it was no longer a “juridic person,” i.e., subject to canon law. Thus the institution’s assets were no longer “ecclesiastical property” subject to canon law, and the religious community no longer owned them. Quickly, religious institutions sought to adjust governance to clarify the separate roles of religious community and institution. Religious communities incorporated themselves civilly and separately from the college or university.

Following the McGrath thesis, there was no need to seek permission from the Church to “alienate” (transfer) ownership of property when the religious community incorporated separately from the institution and magnanimously relinquished institutional assets. As in the case of Land O’Lakes, McGrath, while arguing that colleges were not Church property, suggested various ways for keeping them “Catholic,” such as through charter and bylaw provisions.

In June 1966, Jesuit colleges and universities formally embraced the McGrath position. In 1967, reflecting both the McGrath thesis and Vatican II’s interest in lay leadership, Saint Louis University became the first major Catholic institution to vest legal ownership and control in a board composed of both laymen and clergy. Fr. Paul Reinert, the university’s president, had consulted widely in the United States and in Rome before receiving approval from Father General Pedro Arrupe for the move. Unlike Fr. Theodore Hesburgh at Notre Dame, who was pursuing the same course of action, Father Reinert did not take the added precaution of seeking permission from the Vatican to transfer the property of the university. Rather, he simply followed the McGrath thesis that held that such permission was not necessary.

Soon after approving the St. Louis governance change, Father Arrupe commissioned the board of governors of the Jesuit Educational Association, who were the American provincials, to draw up a statement on ownership, separate incorporation, and freedom. The statement sought to “establish that our colleges and universities [and high schools, if they were civilly incorporated] are not ecclesiastical property, or if they were, were alienated upon becoming civilly incorporated.”

By November 1967, Father Arrupe was beginning to worry about the “identity of an institution as Jesuit, if the responsible superiors of the Society could exercise no authority in it.” But American Jesuit presidents pointed out that the Society had often had its name associated with apostolic causes without owning or controlling them. The crucial element was not structure but rather the extent of the commitment of the Society to a particular work as a corporate apostolic activity.

In 1968, Father Arrupe, apparently having resolved his doubts, gave his general approval for separate incorporation of communities from institutions. Within a few years most Jesuit schools moved in the direction of separate incorporation, but none asked permission to alienate property.
Father McGrath’s sudden death in 1970 meant that he was not around to defend his thesis when Fr. (later Cardinal) Adam Maida published his opposing view in 1973, arguing that civil incorporation does not destroy the canon law status of Catholic institutions or their nature as ecclesiastical goods. By the time Maida’s critique of the McGrath thesis appeared, 20 of the 28 Jesuit colleges and universities had undergone separate incorporation. In December 1974, the National Council of Catholic Bishops’ committee on law and public policy found that the McGrath thesis had “achieved acceptance far beyond its merits” and recommended a comprehensive study. Several studies were begun, but nothing of substance emerged.

In April 1975, Cardinal Gabriel-Marie Garrone, prefect of the Sacred Congregation on Catholic Education, wrote to Father Arrupe asking him to inform “appropriate Jesuit authorities in the U.S.” that the McGrath thesis has “never been considered valid by our congregations, and has never been accepted.” Referring to the study by the U.S. bishops conference, Cardinal Garrone asked Father Arrupe not to allow further action on the basis of the McGrath thesis and to ask “all those responsible to prepare to rescind any possibly invalid actions on this basis that have been made in the past.” Father Arrupe wrote to the president of the Jesuit Conference asking him to communicate with the president of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU) and ask for comments, but no action was taken.

In 1976, the National Catholic Educational Association produced a document, “Relations of American Catholic Colleges and Universities with the Church,” seeking to combine affiliation with the Church and institutional autonomy. The document asserts that a juridical relationship between the Church and the university is neither desirable nor possible in the American context. It sought “both healthy distance and needed closeness.”

Despite the insistence on autonomy, relationships between American Catholic colleges and universities and American bishops remained healthy. A committee of bishops and presidents was established in 1974 to deal with the possible tension between the rights of ecclesiastical teaching authority and the rights related to academic freedom. The same spirit of cooperation was found in the U.S. bishops’ 1980 pastoral letter, Catholic Higher Education and the Pastoral Mission of the Church.

In the meetings considering the draft of Ex Corde Ecclesiae, the vast majority of participants recognized the importance of providing language for a model of a Catholic university that would be Catholic by reason of its institutional commitment but independent of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

In 1990, canonist Fr. Robert Kennedy published an article critical of both the McGrath and the Maida positions. He noted that McGrath had overlooked the case of an institution that had canonical status prior to civil incorporation and that Maida’s argument that subsequent incorporation does nothing canonically was oversimplified. Canonist James Conn, S.J., argues that changes in governance of Catholic universities did not alter their status as juridic persons subject to rights and obligations in the Church but holds that an institution with two-tiered governance (one board for ownership and one for management) does not have the problem of invalidly alienating property. Only four of the 28 AJCU institutions have two-tiered governance.

The lack of action by the U.S. bishops’ committee, by Father Arrupe, and by even the Vatican itself in the years after McGrath suggests the difficulty of resolving the tensions between canon and civil law. When the Congregation for Catholic Education ruled in 1997 that the properties of our universities were “ecclesiastical goods” and that our universities were “owned by the Society of Jesus,” the AJCU insisted that such a position was simply not workable in the United States. Two cases involving the sale of university property were handled quietly in a way that protected both the Church and the universities involved, but the tension between two points of view remains unresolved.

**Independent Boards of Trustees**

The third step taken to adjust governance to the actual needs of colleges and universities was the development of boards of trustees independent of the sponsoring congregation and including both lay and religious members. Lay advisory boards had long been common with all-religious boards of trustees, but now lay men (and soon lay women) became members of the governing board with full authority for the institution. Lay members today comprise the majority of boards, and the chair is most often a lay man or lay woman.

Each of the above steps was taken with no little hesitation and often with opposition because of fears that Jesuit, Catholic identity would suffer. In actual fact, our colleges and universities under the new dispensation have not only made major strides in increased strength, quality, professionalism, and respect among peers but have arguably become more intentionally Jesuit and Catholic because of the many and varied steps taken to foster that identity.

There is still much to do and the task is not easy. We are trying to create what has never existed before: a Jesuit, Catholic identity combining Ignatian spirituality, the Catholic intellectual tradition, and Catholic social teaching—all forged with diverse colleagues in a pluralistic, postmodern university setting while facing scarce resources and the challenges of a globalizing world.
In the 17th century, the Society of Jesus began a new work for evangelization in the Americas. The Jesuits likely read and adapted their mission plan from *The Only Way*, a blueprint for evangelizing the native peoples by Bartolomé de las Casas, a Spanish Dominican who began his ministry in Hispaniola (today’s Haiti and the Dominican Republic), moved to Chiapas, and finally served as a bishop in Peru. Las Casas was famous for his defense of indigenous peoples; he had witnessed the annihilation and enslavement of large numbers of them in Peru, where they were either killed or forced to
During the mass of St. Ignatius, the Ensemble Moxos, the choir from the local conservatory of music, sang the traditional 17th-century "Ignaciano" compositions they learned from the Jesuits.

Left: Bishop Adolfo Bittschi Mayer, Auxiliary Bishop of Sucre, the Bishop of Trinidad, Julio María Elias, OFM, Bishop Hubert Bucher and Bishop Emeritus of Bethlehem, Free State, South Africa, lead the statue of St. Ignatius through the streets of San Ignacio.

Below: The various tribal bands of Macheteros lead an afternoon procession around the town to celebrate the feast of St. Ignatius.

The Tintiririnti, the “herald of the feast,” is a young man chosen for his virtue, who leads the procession around the village toward the church.
Above: The Jesuits learned the local languages quickly and a brother infirmary’s medicines proved more effective in healing illness than the local shamans, leading the people to trust the Jesuits.

Right: The people themselves, overcoming their initial fear of revenge from their gods, took part collectively in removing all traces of ancestral cults. As new epidemics occurred, the missionaries as physicians and surgeons made strong efforts to care for those affected. Their remedies proved more effective than those of their shamans, increasing even more their prestige and making their message more convincing. The new religious system kept alive the deep religiosity of the native peoples.

harvest natural resources in what was once the Incan empire. The Jesuits thus started a new model, which would later be called reductions.

Many who are familiar with Jesuit history have seen the movie “The Mission,” which depicts early Jesuit work with the Guaraní and related tribes in today’s Argentina, Brazil, and Paraguay. One can still visit these reductions, most of which have been restored but are now uninhabitable. Less well known is that this missionary plan was also instituted in the Viceroyalty of Peru and that a network of reductions extended across most of today’s northern Bolivia.

There were two unrelated tribes in these Jesuit reductions. The Chiquitos tribe lived in an area now called the Chiquitania, which spanned a large area to the north and west of Santa Cruz. The Moxos, a separate cultural and linguistic group, lived in a large area of inhospitable climate that stretched north and west from modern-day Trinidad, near the start of the Amazon rain forest. These Moxos people formed a fierce interconnection of tribes which never accepted defeat at the hands of the Spanish or Portuguese armies.

The first Jesuits in this area suffered greatly from the rough climate. A large variety of diseases like malaria and cholera and predators such as the panther, the anaconda, and a wide variety of venomous snakes and spiders complicated movement during the rainy season. Jesuits had difficulty traversing the land and were forced to travel by river, especially dangerous when encountering the more unknown and violent tribes, not to mention the piranhas and crocodiles that infested the rivers. Eventually they founded several reductions, the first headquartered in Trinidad. Most of these reductions took on the names of Jesuit saints such as San Ignacio or San Francisco Javier.

The Jesuits who came into contact with the Moxos people quickly learned to evangelize through art and music, even while they attempted to learn a language that was unrelated to that of any tribe they had previously encountered. Jesuit artists were sent to narrate the gospel stories through paintings and sketches. Musicians were sent with instruments, and they wrote compositions to incorporate indigenous instruments...
Left: In each of the Moxos churches the choir was located at the entrance, where the church orchestra performed, using instruments brought by the missionaries, as well as native-made instruments. In the school the students best gifted for music were selected and in the workshop various instruments were made: violins, base violins, organs, “monochords”, psalters, clarinet-like “chirimías”, oboes, and a few others. Music was heard every day in all the places of the mission.

Below left: With the growth of the population, Fr. Ciprincio de Barac, in 1688 introduced 86 head of cattle. Cowboys, specially trained in cattle and horse raising, were able to multiply this herd and distribute them among all the missions, creating new jobs working with meat and leather.

Below center: The Jesuit fathers and brothers gradually introduced new technologies and skills: carpentry, blacksmithing, jewelry making, leather work, etc. Every reduction had a mill for the elaboration and refining of cane sugar. The apprentices acquired skills to a high degree of dexterity, passing on their knowledge to new generations.

Below right: On February 27, 1767 King Carlos III issued a despotic royal decree ordering the immediate expulsion of the members of the Society of Jesus from all his territories. It was to Colonel Antonio de Aimérich y Villajuana, commander of the forces sent against the Portuguese, that fell the thankless mission of expelling the 24 Jesuits fathers and brothers from the territory of the Moxos.
with baroque instruments like the viola, flute, and violin. Botanists recorded the wide variety of flora and fauna, documenting specimens and sending them to Lima for further categorization and study. Linguists developed the first dictionary, divided into three dialects based upon the locations of the various reductions; thus Trinitario was spoken in the east near Trinidad, Ignaciano in the center and south near San Ignacio, and Javeriano near San Javier in the north and west. In San Ignacio there is still a pictorial representation of the day a number of chiefs brought representations of the gods they had worshiped – the fish god, the panther god, the snake god, and others – and had them burned in front of the cross of Jesus Christ.

Through music, art, dance, language, liturgical processions, and basic catechism the Jesuits were able to evangelize
Far left and left: On the day before the feast of St. Ignatius, on July 30th, the procession through Ignacio Los Moxos begins at 4 AM and ends at the church at 6 AM when the sun’s first light can be seen in the sky.

Below: An Achus, or “elder,” represents the ancestors. Their leather wide-brimmed hats protect them from the fireworks.

Below: Many groups of dancers had a young woman leading them in the procession.
a large area of what had previously been a fiercely hostile grouping of tribes. The Moxos reductions flourished and quickly became the envy of neighboring Spanish and Portuguese settlements. The Moxos people quickly learned how to harvest crops through cooperative farming. They raised a breed of cattle that flourished and was so plentiful they sold the surplus in Spanish and Portuguese towns. They also were known for their beautiful tapestries and wool work. In addition, they formed one of the largest orchestras in that part of the world and played music by the Jesuit composer Domenico Zipoli, fusing baroque instruments with their indigenous music. Many of these compositions survive today and warrant further musicological study.

The age of the reductions came to an end with the suppression of the Society of Jesus. In 1778, 24 of the remaining Jesuits were led off in chains to Lima, but only 14 arrived safely. Of these, only six would arrive in Europe alive, so rough was their treatment and so rampant the disease on the ships they sailed on. Soon the Spanish and Portuguese settlers, armed for war, forced the Moxos people either to submit to their will or to flee into the Amazon rain forest. Somewhat amazingly, many descendants from these Moxos tribes preserved their Catholic faith and traditions over the centuries. Each year 12 “caciques,” or chiefs, were chosen to lead the solemn processions at the major holidays – Christmas, Easter, the reduction’s feast day, St. Ignatius, St. Francis Xavier, Trinity Sunday, etc. Not only did they guard the religious artifacts made during the time of the Jesuits and their reduction churches, but they also kept the traditions instilled by the Jesuits. Even the system of governance of the tribe, tribal council, shared goods, and materials were maintained by most tribes. Shockingly, in 1973 one group, the Moxos who spoke Ignaciano, were “rediscovered.” The first thing they asked for was the return of the Jesuits. In 1982, the Jesuits returned and found treasure troves of baroque instruments, music, religious artwork, tapestries and religious artifacts, dictionaries and botany books from pre-Suppression times. The basic structure of the church in San Ignacio still remained, with its almost perfect acoustics due to the design of the Swiss Jesuit brothers who had built it. The Jesuits quickly went to work, starting a grade school for the rural poor and a boarding high school for those in more remote areas who did not have access to a high school education. A health clinic was also started to serve the region. In the 1990s, money was raised to restore the original mission church. While this and the restoration of artwork are still works in process, one cannot help but be impressed by the original architecture, beautiful murals, and altar pieces. More recently Jesuits and their lay collaborators helped to found a music conservatory, which specializes in baroque renaissance music and in performing the old fusion between the baroque style and native compositions. The baroque music group of the conservatory, Ensemble Moxos, has earned international acclaim.

Often couples choose to celebrate their wedding during the octave of the feast of St. Ignatius.
But perhaps most impressive are the liturgical dances and processions, which date back to the pre-Suppression period. Don Doll, S.J., and I had the privilege of attending the celebrations in San Ignacio de Moxos for the octave of the feast of St. Ignatius. From the announcment procession of St. James the Apostle to the sunrise procession to welcome the town patron, Saint Ignatius, to the closing masses and bull fights, the pageantry and bright tropical colors evident in the native costumes prove inspiring. Some of the dance groups date back to the pre-Suppression Society, including the Macheteros, who represent the guardians of Ignatius, and the Achas, who dance like whirling dervishes with fireworks on their heads, heralding the celebrations and providing comic relief as the “tricksters” of the procession. Both men and women join in the procession and dance, each year continuing a tradition more than 300 years old.

Now the Jesuits have also been incorporated into the processions, and in the final procession to close the feast of St. Ignatius they walk near his statue, reminding everyone of the Ignatian heart of the town. Having participated in the celebrations for the 324th anniversary last July, I can only imagine the “fiesta” that will take place next year for the 325th. Proud traditions have been maintained, and new ones express the fusions of Bolivian, Spanish, and native cultures, as the Society of Jesus walks once again with a proud Moxos people.

The author, John Thiede, S.J., is an assistant professor of theology at Marquette University. The photographer, Don Doll, S.J., is a professor of journalism at Creighton University, where he has taught since 1969.
In *A Secular Age* (2007), the philosopher Charles Taylor challenges us to appreciate the significance of genuine spiritual experience in human life, an occurrence he refers to as *fullness*. Western societies, however, are increasingly more secular, and personal occasions of fullness are becoming less possible.

Generally understood as a socio-cultural dynamic in apposition to the religious, secularism is often recognized as a process of losing or letting go of religion and its myriad influences. In some places around the world, secularism may be a catalyst for individual and social dignities and equalities. In regard to our western context, Taylor discusses it differently. He views our variant of secularism as a crisis of relating (such as to a higher power). Despite powerful spiritual yearnings and expressions in our lives, western secularism is a process that distrusts, misinterprets, and even prevents spiritual experiences from happening. The demise of fullness, he suggests, proffers tremendous existential cost, and he urges us to resuscitate parts of our lives that are gasping.

As Taylor’s discussion of fullness drives a nearly 900-page historical narrative, a Jesuit sensibility burgeons. Fullness is portrayed as heightened moments of God’s love similar to the personal experiences of transformation that revolutionized the life of St. Ignatius of Loyola, the late-Medieval Spaniard and founder of the Society of Jesus, and the animus of our educational enterprise. In his writings Ignatius indicates salient moments of spiritual consolation, describing them as instances of connection, reconciliation, light, purpose, peace, and general confirmation. In Ignatian diction, they are moments of God’s grace, and they frame for us an explicit connection Taylor is trying to reestablish.

In *A Secular Age*, fullness represents a point of contact, and in our modern lives multiple intersections cease to be engaged. We are less relational, and fullness invites a way of being human – an operative subjectivity – that is open to emotional, cultural, social, political, and spiritual possibilities. Fullness is not unrelated to capacities for friendship, intimacy, dialogue, moral responsibility, social and political cooperation and action, prayer, and social justice. The ambit of fullness is wide, and in both its fundamentals and its future – and in the midst of a pervasive secular milieu – Jesuit higher education can open our lives to various points of contact. I propose three educational strategies from the Jesuit tradition that can do this.

These strategies – what I refer to as pedagogies of fullness – augment waning relations. A pedagogy of study, a pedagogy of solidarity, and a pedagogy of grace focus upon the contexts of the self, others, and an Other. Philosophically, they correspond with epistemic, moral-ethical, and metaphysical realities, but because they network layers of meaning and relating in our lives, they are all existential.

Much can be said about each. They reveal elements and inspirations of the Renaissance humanist tradition of Jesuit education, the Jesuit administrative and curricular plan of education known as the *Ratio Studiorum* (1599), the Ignatian Spiritual Exercises, contemporary practices of faith-doing-justice, and the local and global networking more increasingly exhibited by our colleges and universities. As they display recognizable expressions of our campuses, they demonstrate both an educational sensitivity to the forces of secularism that mitigate relating and a way forward.

The pedagogy of study is valued as an exploration of the self. The work of Jesuit education can celebrate individual acts of inquiry and isolated ideas as well as the multiple intellective capacities of students. A robust
The concept of study appreciates the full range of one’s thoughts, feelings, intuitions, and imaginations. Jesuit educators can provoke the personal insights, emotions, interests, impulses, conflicts, and credences of students to expand understandings of themselves. We can amplify self-awareness.

As a pedagogy of fullness, study is an intentional exploration of one’s whole life, including the many familial, ecclesial, social, and civil relationships that form and inform it. In exposing the messiness and mysteries of life, the role of the humanities is ever essential. More strategically, consider the Renaissance humanist perspective of Michel de Montaigne. His philosophical method – a testing and trying of the self (through the writing of essays) – is not unlike some of the thoughtful, discerning portrayals of the activity of study in the *Ratio*. There are precedents within the Jesuit tradition for showcasing curricula in self-awareness.

As the first pedagogy explores and integrates the depths of the self, the pedagogy of solidarity explores the frontiers of alterity, or otherness. It cultivates within students an orientation of adaptability to the environments – the lives, cultures, customs, and concepts – of others. The engagement with alterity facilitates relationships to other persons, perspectives, and places. Dimensions of flexibility and adjustment to difference let students assess and appropriate experiences of otherness and establish meaningful associations.

Think of the grim global realities of poverty Peter Hans-Kolvenbach beckons us into in his address to American Jesuit Higher Education (2000). Or consider the late 16th-century efforts of Christian enculturation in China and India demonstrated by Jesuit missionaries Matteo Ricci and Roberto de Nobili. They entered foreign contexts with deep respect, genuine curiosity, intensive engagement, and receptive hearts. Regard also an underappreciated mandate in Part IV of the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus for Jesuit-sponsored personnel and programs to adapt to “times, places, and persons,” or, finally, the early Jesuit Jeronimo Nadal’s concept of a Jesuit’s “home” being anywhere he finds himself. These are significant pedagogical precedents.

Curricula, programs, and educators on our campuses can prompt study and engage alterity, but the third pedagogy – a pedagogy of grace – represents what is not planned or what is unprepared. Like the pedagogies of study and solidarity, it cultivates a dimension of openness, but it does so for inexplicable and phenomenal moments of wonder, awe, gratitude, and confirmation that suddenly fill our lives. A pedagogy of grace orients students to expressions of revelation and signification. It invites an aptitude for an Other, or an awareness of the extraordinary.

Study and solidarity widen sensibilities within the self and around. Grace opens oneself to transcendent impact. Classically, the Spiritual Exercises do this. What is important in this pedagogy is a metaphysical dimension and a leaning into what Taylor refers to as the “ontic commitment,” a willingness to debunk the self as the sole locus of meaning and reality. How can we recognize the many sensations of grace – such as peacefulness or a sense of purpose – as responses to something beyond us? Moreover, how can we describe these dynamics of experience-and-response in relational terms?

By engaging and networking multiple intellective construals of individual insight, immersing students into contexts of alterity, and validating inexplicable and phenomenal moments of grace, the pedagogies of fullness demonstrate Jesuit higher educational invitations to openness. The pedagogies focus the work we do as relational. They also establish for us a way of negotiating suffocating dynamics of western secularism.

When Taylor laments the demise of fullness in our lives, he characterizes it as a kind of disenchantment. The pedagogies of study, solidarity, and grace can be valued in their ability to reenchant our modern lives. To ourselves, others, and an Other, Jesuit higher educational enchantment awakens relations. Most of our students leave our programs after four quick years. Let us assure that they will be connected for the rest of their lives. ■

Matteo Ricci S.J. and Chinese scholar Hsu Kuangchi.
It was a privilege for me, as chair of the board of trustees of Loyola Marymount University, to attend the AJCU meeting in Chicago with Fr. Adolfo Nicolás. I had previously met with him and others in Rome, where I had learned what a humble, holy, and astute man he is … and that he listens intently! His interest in hearing and learning more from board chairs led to the Chicago meeting.

Two points impressed me about Father Nicolás’s vision of how leaders engage in decision-making. First, as most of us have experienced, presidents and boards of trustees face tough decisions on a regular basis. Father Nicolás emphasized that their decision making must come from shared values within each campus community. His vision for involving the community in decision making, rather than having a single person decide tough issues, is his first prerequisite for leaders who make good decisions. If these decision makers and their communities do not share the same values then they cannot achieve the same objectives. This is where universities sometimes have difficulties.

Father Nicolás noted that there are many understandings within individual colleges and universities, and the broader culture as well, of what it means to be an American, Catholic, and Jesuit institution of higher education? This question has been around for decades since the religious communities stopped owning and fully controlling these schools, but discussions were often casual or anguished and answers tentative. Father Nicolás now brings new energy, determination, and urgency to these issues and in so doing looks forward with optimism. It is up to the leaders who heard him to push forward, deciding from among competing values and divergent directions, choosing a future rather than just letting it happen.
and meanings of who we are, so that we can make better decisions based on Father Nicolás’s vision.

Second, he noted that decision making must be open and free. All voices must be heard “without fear of recrimination.” He stressed that participants must speak their minds during the process and that leaders must set up processes that allow for maximal participation. If people wait until the decision-making period has ended and then wish to voice their objection to the decision, he noted that “[their] power is illegitimate.”

Finally, Father Nicolás candidly noted that presidents of Jesuit colleges and universities no longer need be Jesuits, priests, or even Catholics. Furthermore, he did not hesitate to discuss the fact that the future of Jesuit higher education in the United States rests more and more in the hands of boards of trustees and other lay leaders. In fact, he underscored with enthusiasm and confidence the role to be played by the laity who serve as trustees in the successful future of Jesuit higher education, a partnership that must be strong and engaged.

Fr. Nicolás’s openness and inclusive nature are extremely welcome for those of us who work in this apostolate, and it is personally very exciting for me to be a part of this significant moment for Jesuit higher education in the United States.

Kathleen Aikenhead is the president of the William H. Hannon Foundation in Santa Monica, California; she has been chair of Loyola Marymount’s board since May 2011.

Here are some excerpts from Fr. Adolfo Nicolás’s address to the presidents and board chairs of Jesuit colleges and universities.

“Leaders of a Jesuit institution must reinforce and motivate their members and communities in the values and attitudes that are based in the sacred Scriptures of the Judeo-Christian tradition. Leadership at a Jesuit institution is about evangelization – for Jesuit institutions exist only because of the particular, scripturally based faith perspective that led to their establishment.”

“The principal function of a leader is to help the members of the community grow to become the living presence of God in the world. In the Ignatian concept of service, growth leads to transformation. If there is no transformation, then the school or the parish is not Jesuit.”

“My purpose today is to make sure everyone knows that the future of Jesuit higher education in the United States is in the hands of boards of directors, and that I am very happy that is the case because I know, looking at you, that it is in good hands indeed.”

For a full text of Father Nicolás’s address, see http://americamagazine.org/issue/call-spiritual-leaders.
The recent meeting of AJCU presidents, board chairs, provincials, representative rectors, and Fr. Adolfo Nicolás at Loyola University Chicago was significant for its context, content, and consequences.

This meeting was the first time that the board chairs of the 28 schools of the AJCU had met together, and their presence along with Father General’s visit significantly energized our gathering. The assembly made very clear that when the presidents and board chairs convene the majority of the leadership of Jesuit institutions is now in the hands of the laity. It is also made clear that we have a long way to go before there is greater gender and racial diversity among our leadership. I appreciated having my board chair, Kevin Condron, with me so that power of the experience and the wisdom of the general were being heard and later could be shared by more than one person upon returning to Holy Cross. We have subsequently decided that the focus of our September board meeting will center on our Catholic and Jesuit identity. I was also pleased to meet Kip Condron, Kevin’s brother and board chair of the University of Scranton. Kevin and Kip are the first brothers to serve simultaneously as board chairs of a Jesuit college and university.

While the provincials and Father General met separately during the first session, the higher education participants were led through a guided meditation and group reflection based on the Spiritual Exercises, a new experience for many but one that was well received. We soon understood its relevance as Father Nicolás’s presentation emphasized our respective calls to be spiritual and heroic leaders. Given the uncertain context of higher education today and our difficult financial realities, the rapidly diminishing number of Jesuits on our campuses and the growing number of lay presidents, as well as the pending mergers of our United States provinces, I suspect that many of us were initially surprised that Father General began by talking about spiritual leadership rather than the practical implications of the realities we face.

By the time Father Nicholas ended his presentation, however, and challenged us to discern our future as institutions, as the AJCU, and as soon to be reorganized provinces, his intent was evident. Making the difficult decisions needed to ensure that Jesuit higher education in the United States continues to be viable and transformative will require ongoing discernment based on detachment, indifference, and freedom. These prerequisites cannot be assumed but, he implied, will come only as the result of a more rigorous appropriation of Ignatian spirituality. In our highly individualized culture, where even Jesuit institutions are used to competing among themselves for students, resources, and rankings, Father General seemed to suggest that our future existence as the AJCU will depend on how committed we are to being a more intentional community of shared values and creative vision willing to face difficult realities together.

Father Nicolás ended his presentation with a simple and humble request of our board chairs. He asked them to share with our provincials and presidents how their recruitment of employees could help us in the recruitment of Jesuit vocations. Not only is the future of our Jesuit colleges and universities dependent on our lay/Jesuit collaboration; but apparently so is the future of the Society of Jesus itself.

Philip L. Boroughs, S.J., has been president of the College of the Holy Cross since January 2012, before that he was vice president for mission and ministry at Georgetown. He has served on the boards of the University of San Francisco and of the College of the Holy Cross.
Portrayals of Jesuits in Popular Culture

Stories elsewhere in this issue of Conversations detail the political and cultural forces that led to the suppression of the Society of Jesus in the mid 1700s. These years generated a lot of stories that fed the popular imagination. In South America, the government agents who confiscated Jesuit property hoped to get their hands on the legendary hoards of Jesuit gold locked in the vaults of their houses. The fact that they found none simply confirmed how sneaky those Jesuits were, hiding their treasures beyond finding. Treasure maps came to be printed for the gullible: Buy this map and you will get rich. Then there was rumor of a Jesuit letter that disputed King Charles III’s legitimacy, which infuriated the king and fueled his purpose against the Society. No such letter has ever been found.

Stories led to literature like Voltaire’s Candide, which takes place partly in the Jesuit reductions of South America; Candide’s beloved Cunegonde has an unnamed brother who was a leading Jesuit there. In Eugène Sue’s notorious The Wandering Jew from 1844, the Jesuits d’Aigrigny and Rodin scheme to take possession of a family’s fortune while Gabriel, a family member who was a Jesuit for a while, shows “the fatal stamp of that enervating subjection, that moral emasculation with which the victims of the Company of Jesus are always branded, when they are not fortunately delivered in time from their homicidal influence.” Two centuries later, Modest Mussorgsky’s opera Boris Godunov presents its own unflattering Jesuit characters.

Jesuit characters still appear in print and film. A southern publisher still puts out anti-Jesuit works in books and comics. More positively, last summer Judith Rock’s fourth novel appeared featuring Charles du Luc, a Jesuit scholastic solving crimes in Paris in the late 1600s. And the trend is far from over: coming soon to a theater near you, Laurie Ann Brit-Smith notes in the next article, are two new films with Jesuit characters, The Jesuit and Silence. And in the subsequent article, Ernest Fontana studies a prominent Jesuit character in Italian literature (The Leopard).

Jesuits in Film

Pioneers, Musketeers, Exorcists

By Laurie Ann Britt-Smith

A fascination with the ideals and history of the Jesuit order has seeped into popular culture though all types of media, but particularly film. Type the word Jesuit into the search window of the Internet Movie Database and this coming attraction pops up: The Jesuit (2014) “A man nicknamed ‘the Jesuit’ is imprisoned for a crime he didn’t commit. When his wife is murdered and his son kidnapped to Mexico, he devises an elaborate and dangerous plan to rescue his son and avenge the murder.” This kind of vigilante story is ubiquitous in the crime/thriller category, but one has to wonder at this attempt to goose audience interest. Why create a character with that name or try to market a picture with that title? There is some kind of pop culture shorthand at work that connects the concept of Jesuit to the willingness to go to an extreme in the cause of correcting a serious injustice. Whatever the genre, this is not the only incident of this type of characterization. Movies, for better or worse, are primary texts in American culture and have tremendous influence in establishing definitions, prejudices, and personal values. For those unfamiliar
with the term, the identifier Jesuit can be set into context only through what they have seen and heard. So how do our movies answer the question, “What is a Jesuit?”

Many films featuring Jesuits are historical dramas; however, the film that ranks first in keyword searches is one of the most infamous horror movies ever produced, *The Exorcist* (1973). Although Jason Miller’s Father Karras and Max von Sydow’s Father Merrin are never identified specifically as Jesuits, Karras works at Georgetown. Special-effect creep out factors and projectile vomiting of pea soup aside, the audience is left with the impression of two men of faith fighting to overcome their own internal conflicts while engaging in a sacrificial battle with the ultimate evil for the good of the innocent child involved. The film’s iconic image of the man in black sto- 
ically marching towards his fate has been etched into the visual language of film and shows up in some form whenever a Jesuit is involved.

In *The Man in the Iron Mask* (1998), Jeremy Irons portrays the retired Musketeer Aramis, who has become not only a priest but a Jesuit, and not just a Jesuit but the general of the order. This ridiculous premise fades into the background as the action sequences kick in, but there are some interesting parallels between the dual identities of Musketeer and Jesuit. Aramis has made a terrible mistake in service to the king and is now dedicated to correcting the injustice he has caused, even though his odds of success are almost zero. His only hope comes from the community of Jesuits who provide a network of safe houses and from his primary community, the Musketeers reunited and reunified in purpose.

Of course there is a difference between historical fiction pieces like *Iron Mask* and those that are based on historical fact. Several movies feature the Western frontier experiences of Jesuits, and a few filmmakers from South America have focused their lenses on them. Most familiar are *Black Robe* (1991) and *The Mission* (1986). Both are based on historical accounts of Jesuits in the field. *Black Robe* is set among the Algonquin nation and *The Mission* in the jungles of South America, and both are complicated by questions of colonial influence on and interaction with native cultures. In *Black Robe*, Father LaForge (Lothaire Bluteau) must learn to truly see and speak properly to the native peoples he seeks to convert before they will trust him and the new God he wants them to follow. *The Mission’s* Father Gabriel (Jeremy Irons) learns similar lessons and yet finds himself in the middle of a war he cannot win. Neither his faith nor the military plotting of would-be priest Rodrigo Mendoza (Robert DeNiro) is enough to stop the rush of violence that destroys their work and costs them their lives.

The unifying thread in all these films is dedication to whatever justice these men seek to the point of self-sacrifice. In the best, that dedication persists in spite of serious soul searching and conflict. The evidence of success is found in the relationships Jesuits create, and the greatest tragedy is the destruction of those relationships. Because it runs so counter to many of the narratives of popular culture, there is always a bit of mystery surrounding such deep commitment to faith, justice, and community. Perhaps it is the desire to understand that mystery that continually draws filmmakers to reexamine the history and character type.

Martin Scorsese has announced that his next project is *Silence*. Based on the novel by Shusaku Endo, it follows two 17th-century Jesuits as they witness the persecution of Christians in Japan under the Tokugawa shogunate. It will be fascinating to see how this master filmmaker answers and complicates the question, “What is a Jesuit?”

Laurie Ann Britt-Smith is an associate professor of English at the University of Detroit Mercy and the director of the university’s writing program. She is a member of the Conversations seminar.
The Leopard: A Classic from Italy

By Ernest Fontana

More nuanced than James Joyce’s representation of the formidable and authoritarian Jesuit pedagogues in his *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* is Giuseppe Di Lampedusa’s presentation of Father Pirrone in his novel *Il Gattopardo*, published in Italy in 1958 and in English translation as *The Leopard* (Archibald Colghoun, trans., New York: Pantheon Books, 1960). In this historical novel, set during the invasion of Sicily by Garibaldi’s 1,000 Redshirts in 1860 and the consequent collapse of the Kingdom of Two Sicilies and its incorporation into what will become the unified modern Italian state, the Jesuit Father Pirrone serves as the private chaplain for the Salinas, an ancient, princely Sicilian landowning family. In contrast, Joyce’s pedagogues are educators of an aspiring but politically and socially subjugated Irish lower middle class.

Father Pirrone, the “sheep dog” of the Salina family, functions as a mediator between the Salina woman and the prince, Don Fabrizio (played by Burt Lancaster in Luchino Visconti’s memorable 1963 film version). In this role Father Pirrone resembles his father, who worked as overseer for a large monastic agricultural estate, mediating between the peasant laborers and their distant, privileged employers.

Father Pirrone is treated with affectionate disdain by the prince, who tauntingly invites him to share his carriage so that the Jesuit can visit his confreres in Palermo while he visits his mistress. On their return the prince will silently contrast the stale body odor of the Jesuit with the remembered fragrances of his mistresses’s perfumes. The following morning Father Pirrone discreetly invites the prince to make his confession, to which Don Fabrizio curtly replies, “Confession? It’s not Saturday.”

Father Pirrone’s stale body odor (perhaps too obvious a metaphor) emerges again in the scene in which he, sweating profusely, visits the prince, who is enjoying a luxurious bath. In this scene, the splendidly nude prince will suggest to an awkward and embarrassed Father Pirrone that the Jesuit would be wise to have for himself an occasional bath.

Father Pirrone’s mission in this scene is to suggest, in his role as gender go-between, that the prince’s pious daughter Concetta marry the prince’s penniless but dashing, orphaned nephew, Tancredi, who has joined the invading Redshirts. The prince, who is ambitious for his nephew, hopes instead to marry him to the daughter of the vulgar, aspiring, and wealthy mayor of Donnafugata, an ally of the new political order. He impatiently dismisses Father Pirrone’s proposal that has been communicated to him on behalf of his daughter Concetta.

Yet the proxim, shy, pedantic, and odiferous Father Pirrone is, in the later chapters of the novel, proven to have been, surprisingly, prescient. Years later a comrade of the now-deceased Tancredi will reveal to Concetta, living unmarried among dubious and inauthentic religious relics, that Tancredi was in fact in love with her rather than with the woman he was encouraged by the prince to marry.

A foil to the terse, authoritative prince, the pedantic and prolix Jesuit, whose long discourses put even his humble relatives to sleep, will also prove himself more politically prescient than the cynical, worldly prince, whose guiding paradox is “if we want things to stay as they are, things will have to change.” In a scene in the palace observatory (the prince is an amateur but published astronomer) Father Pirrone, a dogged and inflexible reactionary, speaks of the dire consequences of the political and social modernization that will follow from the absorption of the sclerotic Kingdom of Two Sicilies into a united Italy: “our property, which is the patrimony of the poor, will be seized and carved up by the most brazen of their leaders; who will feed all the destitute who are sustained and guided by the Church today?” Later in the novel, after the prince has witnessed the rapacity of the new order in the figure of Don Calogero, he ruefully admits to himself that “what the Jesuit has predicted had come to pass.”

Though obviously a mismatch, temperamentally and physically, the prince and his Jesuit chaplain come together in their pursuit of otherworldly astronomical knowledge. Father Pirrone, a trained mathematician, assists Don Fabrizio in his astronomical calculations. The novel also delicately suggests that perhaps Don Fabrizio might have also called upon the pedantic Father Pirrone more readily in both his familial and political calculations. Although not a completely flattering fictional portrait of a Jesuit priest, Di Lampedusa’s Father Pirrone reminds us that the Jesuits of the 19th century often attempted to serve the powerless by ministering to the powerful and the privileged.

Ernest Fontana is a professor emeritus in the English department at Xavier University.
The Many Births of Jesuit Education

28 Current Schools, 4 Gone by, and a National Honors Society

Education has been a hallmark of Jesuit ministry from the Society’s earliest days. But the stories of the 28 schools in the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities in the United States tell of a great variety of founding circumstances, local needs, challenges, struggles, and achievements. Still, they serve one mission: to educate young women and men for others, inspired by their own faith tradition, so that they have an experiential solidarity with the poor and are enabled to build a just and humane society.

**BOSTON COLLEGE.**
Founded by the Society of Jesus in 1863 to serve the sons of Catholic immigrants, Boston College was the first institution of higher learning chartered in the city of Boston. On September 5, 1864, Boston College opened its doors to 22 students, providing a liberal arts education – with an emphasis on Greek and Latin classics, English, rhetoric, mathematics, philosophy, and religion – based on the *Ratio Studiorum* (Plan of Studies) that had guided Jesuit universities in Europe and the Americas.

**CANISIUS COLLEGE,**
found in 1870 in downtown Buffalo by German Jesuits, originally served the city’s growing German immigrant population. Today Canisius is located between the historic Hamlin Park neighborhood and Delaware Park. It offers undergraduate, graduate, and professional studies programs to regional, national, and international students.

**THE COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS,** Worcester, Massachusetts, was founded in 1843, by the second bishop of Boston, Benedict Joseph Fenwick, S.J. Catholics were pouring into New England in great numbers, fleeing religious persecution and famine and seeking economic opportunity. On November 2, 1843, with six students aged 9 to 19, the first classes were held. At its first commencement in 1849, James Healy, the son of a slave, was the valedictorian.

**CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY.**
The Creighton brothers, Edward and John, were prominent Omaha philanthropists and pioneering businessmen. The brothers married two sisters, Mary Lucretia and Sarah Emily Wareham. In 1876, Mary Lucretia bequeathed Edward’s estate for a Catholic college, because few educational opportunities existed for the children of the newly arriving immigrant families. Jesuits moved to Omaha to create the school, which opened its doors in 1878.

**FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY** became the 26th Jesuit university in the U.S. in 1942, founded to educate men from underserved communities in Connecticut. The original charter provided for a preparatory school as well as Fairfield College of St. Robert Bellarmine, now known as Fairfield University. From a founding class of 303, Fairfield is now a coeducational university with five schools, serving over 5,000 undergraduate and graduate students.

**FORDHAM UNIVERSITY** was founded in 1841 as St. John’s College in the village of Fordham by the Right Rev. John Hughes, Coadjutor-Bishop (later Archbishop) of New York. It was the first Catholic institution of higher education in the northeastern United States. In 1846, the college was strengthened by the addition of 28 Jesuits from the shuttered St. Mary’s College in Kentucky. In 1907, the name was changed from St. John’s College to Fordham University.

**GEORGETOWN** in 1789 to serve the needs of the Church and the new American republic. Open to students of all faiths, Georgetown fostered a religious toleration such as Catholics had not generally experienced in the colonial period. Jesuits began staffing Georgetown in 1805 after the Society was reestablished in the U.S. in affiliation with the Jesuits in Russia.
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY was opened by the Jesuits of the Rocky Mountain Mission in 1887, six years after a small group of citizens from the frontier town of “Spokane Falls” wrote to Jesuit superior Joseph Cataldo pledging their support if he would establish a college there. While the Jesuits’ original intent may have been to serve the Native Americans, fiscal considerations quickly led to its opening to the broader community.

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY was founded in 1886 as St. Ignatius College on Cleveland’s west side by German Jesuits of the Buffalo Mission. Negotiations with the bishops of Cleveland over the school’s nature – the Jesuits sought to protect German Catholics from dangers they saw in American culture; Bp. Richard Gilmour wanted to Americanize his flock – delayed its opening. The college always served the ethnically diverse Catholic community of Cleveland. In 1935 it moved to suburban University Heights. It has approximately 3,000 undergraduates and 700 graduate students.

LE MOYNE COLLEGE. By the end of World War II, Catholics in central New York, especially veterans funded by the G.I. Bill of 1944, felt that they could now obtain the higher education that had been denied to most of their parents. Bp. Walter Foery and the New York Jesuits collaborated in opening Le Moyne College in 1947 as a coeducational institution. It was named after Fr. Simon Le Moyne, S.J., who at great risk converted a large number of Onondaga of the Iroquois Nation in the middle of the 17th century.

LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY. In 1865 St. Vincent’s College opened its doors in Los Angeles, but by the early 20th century the Vincentians, who sponsored the college, were experiencing financial difficulties and apparently did not share Bp. Thomas Conaty’s dream of a major Catholic university for the now thriving metropolis. So the bishop turned confidently to the Jesuits, who arrived in 1911 to launch the institution that would eventually grow into today’s Loyola Marymount University.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO finds its origins in a young, charismatic Jesuit missionary, Fr. Arnold Damen, S.J. In 1856, Father Damen offered a mission for three straight weeks to over 12,000 Catholics and Protestants in Chicago’s St. Mary’s Cathedral. The Society of Jesus soon after commissioned Damen to found a parish and a college. Thereby, the Jesuits established their first foothold in a burgeoning city with a growing, immigrant Catholic population.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY MARYLAND. Founded in 1852 by Fr. John Early and eight other Jesuits, Loyola College was the first college in the United States to bear the name of St. Ignatius Loyola. It became coeducational in 1971 following its merger with Mount Saint Agnes College. That same year, the college’s board of trustees elected its first layman chair. A decade later, Loyola established a separate business school to meet the demands of its growing undergraduate and graduate business programs.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY NEW ORLEANS. Jesuit missionaries arrived in New Orleans in the early 1700s, but it was not until 1837 that the first Jesuit school was founded in Grand Coteau, Louisiana. As New Orleans grew dramatically in the late 1800s, the local bishop desired to have a Catholic school to educate Catholic youth, and the College of the Immaculate Conception was opened in 1849. In 1904 Loyola College, now Loyola University New Orleans, opened on a new site and received a state charter in 1912.

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY. John Martin Henni, the first bishop of Milwaukee, came to the city in 1843 with two ambitions: to build a cathedral and to open a college like the one he had administered and turned over to the Society of Jesus in Cincinnati. He received the Jesuits’ help to open a boys’ academy – a grade school and high school – in 1857, but this failed after
two years. In 1881, when Bishop Henni was aging and infirm, the doors to Marquette College opened under Jesuit sponsorship.

**REGIS UNIVERSITY** was started by a group of Italian Jesuits who had been expelled from their home province of Naples during the turbulent period of the Italian civil war in the 1860s. They initially came to the mission territory of New Mexico to do parish work, eventually adding a school in 1877. In the 1887-88 school year, they relocated the high school and college to the university’s current location in Denver, Colorado.

**ROCKHURST UNIVERSITY** was established in 1910 for the education of young men in Kansas City. The largest donor said, “Do not build small.” Civic leaders wrote a public letter of support stating that “Rockhurst would appeal to all classes and that every shade of religious belief would be received on equal terms.” Catholic education and the education of young people in general have always been part of the mission.

**SAINT JOSEPH’S UNIVERSITY.** English Jesuits were a permanent presence in Philadelphia by 1707 and almost immediately began to consider a college in Philadelphia. A small school may have opened in 1734; for sure, Fr. Robert Molyneaux, S.J., established the oldest Catholic school in the U.S., St. Mary’s, in 1782. Molyneaux maintained this work through the first 15 years of the suppression of the Society of Jesus. He and four other former Jesuits joined the unsuppressed remnant in Russia in 1805, and the school continued expanding into a college in 1841.

**SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY** began in 1818, three years before Missouri became a state. Louis William DuBourg, bishop of Louisiana, opened an academy to educate young men so that “the pioneer settlement would benefit from higher education.” In 1823, DuBourg turned the academy fully over to the Society of Jesus, which grew the fledgling academy into the full-fledged Saint Louis University it has become today.

**SAINT PETER’S COLLEGE** was founded in 1872 in Jersey City, N.J., to educate the Irish, Italian, and German immigrant laborers. Declining enrollment during World War I forced Saint Peter’s to close, but it reopened in 1930 and moved to its present location in 1936. Changing demographics in the early 1970s prompted many to consider moving the college to a suburban location, but Jesuit leaders decided to remain true to the original mission. Today Saint Peter’s University students represent over 60 national origins, with 65% from minority backgrounds.

**SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY.** Writing from the Pacific Northwest to Rome in 1849, Michele Accolti, S.J., observed: “I think we ought not to show ourselves indifferent” to a place “that will not fail to offer considerable advantages.” In 1851, hopes were realized when Giovanni Nobili, S.J., and a few displaced Italian Jesuits transformed a decaying Franciscan mission into what would become Santa Clara University. Serving students from the array of cultures that populated Gold Rush California, these clerical refugees established this initial outpost for Catholic higher education in the Far West.

**SEATTLE UNIVERSITY.** Jesuit fathers Victor Garrand and Adrian Sweere, aided by the Sisters of the Holy Names, founded Seattle College in 1891 as a parochial school for 90 boys and girls. Washington State recognized the school as a college in 1898. The first catalogue of 1901 stated the college’s purpose: “As educators [Jesuits] aim to secure the gradual and just development of mind and heart together…” The college largely closed in 1919 but reopened in 1931. It became Seattle University in 1948.

**SPRING HILL COLLEGE.** Founded in 1830 by Michael Portier, first bishop of Mobile, the college was his first major project for the new diocese. From the beginning it was open to both Catholics and Protestants and also had a seminary division for the training of future priests. By 1840 the bishop was searching for a religious community to take charge of the college. After failed attempts by two small French congregations, the Jesuits of the Province of Lyons took over in 1847.

**UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT MERCY.** In 1877 Bp. Caspar H. Borgess realized his dream for Catholic education in Detroit, wooing the Jesuits by bundling a commitment to found what would become the University of Detroit with pastoral rights over the Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul. In 1941, the Sisters of Mercy built Mercy College to train nurses and teachers for hospitals and schools. In 1990, their two boards created a female-male collaborative educational venture, the University of Detroit Mercy. The two charisms have grown together ever since.

The **UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO** began on October 15, 1855, as a one-room schoolhouse named St. Ignatius Academy. Its founding is interwoven with the establishment of the Jesuit order in California, with European immigration to the western United States, and with the population growth of San Francisco following the California Gold Rush. Although only three students showed up for the school’s first day of classes, today USF enrolls more than 10,000 students.

The **UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON** was founded as Saint Thomas College in August 1888. Diocesan priests and seminarians staffed it until 1896. From
1897 until 1942 the Christian Brothers administered the school, renamed The University of Scranton in 1938. In the late summer of 1942, nineteen Jesuits arrived to administer the university. They restructured and strengthened traditional and preprofessional programs emphasizing liberal arts. The university has grown from a primarily commuter school with fewer than 1,000 students to a broadly regional, comprehensive university with more than 6,000 students.

WHEELING JESUIT UNIVERSITY. “Will you accept responsibility for the Liberal Arts College I will build in Wheeling, West Virginia?” Bp. John J. Swint asked Fr. John Nugent, Jesuit provincial of Maryland, in 1951. Fr. Edward Bunn, future Georgetown president, urged acceptance: “No territory has as great a need.....” In September 1955 Wheeling College, “a Catholic College of Liberal Education,” officially began with 90 students; 35 of the students were women, which was a first for the Maryland Province.

XAVIER UNIVERSITY. In 1831, Bp. Edward Fenwick founded The Athenaeum of Ohio in downtown Cincinnati; it was the oldest Catholic seminary west of the Appalachian Mountains. Nine years later, Bp. John Baptist Purcell, Fenwick’s successor, invited the Society of Jesus to assume responsibility for the school, and it became St. Xavier College. It was moved to its current location in 1912 and was renamed Xavier University in 1930.

The 28 schools profiled above are not the only Jesuit schools of higher education; others served their purpose and then changed course, others still fell to hard times and population shifts. Here are four brief stories. From the mid 1820s, successive bishops of New Orleans asked the Jesuits of the Paris Province to establish a school for young men in Louisiana. On July 31, 1837, ground was broken for St. Charles College, in Grand Coteau, Louisiana, which remained a boarding and day school for boys for nearly 90 years. It serves today as a Jesuit novitiate and infirmary. In Kentucky, various bishops sought Jesuit help for education. Jesuits from New Orleans assumed responsibility for St. Mary’s College near Marion County, Kentucky, in 1831, but left in 1846 to take over St. John’s College in New York, now Fordham University. Not far away, in Bardstown, in 1848 Jesuits from Missouri took over running St. Joseph's College, which had opened in 1819 and flourished until it became a victim of the Civil War. Its building was converted to a military hospital, and after the war the Society of Jesus did not have the resources to resume leadership there. St. Mary’s College in Kansas was founded in 1848 to serve Native Americans; in 1931 it suspended standard college activities and served as a Jesuit school of theology until 1968.

Another Jesuit work of higher education is the honor society that includes members from all 28 Jesuit colleges and universities. In 1915, Fr. John Danilhy, S.J., founded Alpha Sigma Nu at Marquette University to promote excellence in Jesuit education. At this time, Catholic universities were systematically locked out of honor societies such as Phi Beta Kappa. Father Danilhy’s purpose was to honor students not on the basis of scholarship alone but also for their commitment to the search for truth, to loyalty to the ideals of Jesuit education, and to serving others. Today, Alpha Sigma Nu encourages its over 74,000 members to be lifetime leaders with Ignatian vision and values.
To See the Love, to Share the Joy

World Youth Day

By Erin Verdi

As a young Catholic living in a markedly secularized and materialistic society, it is sometimes a struggle to express or even to remember my spiritual identity. “Catholic” means universal, and yet even at a Jesuit institution I could feel isolated from my faith and by my faith. My decision to go to Brazil stemmed not only from a desire for culture and an altered perspective but also from an unspoken need to reaffirm my membership in the global Catholic community. So often my Catholicism is repressed as a secondary aspect of my person simply because it is easier to do so, and I felt something vital was missing from my life. Though it took me a few days to adjust to the lack of warm water and warm beds, my Brazilian experience was ultimately invaluable. It let me view my faith and my religious community from a different angle, to see the love there, to share the joy.

One scene in particular stands out in my memory – the day Pope Francis was rumored to drive by the high school the MAGIS participants were calling home for the duration of World Youth Day. Everyone was rigid with excitement and made hasty plans to line the streets until they glimpsed the Holy Father. No one could cite the source of the rumor or tell if the rumor was anything more than a popular wish, but everyone filed outside early that morning anyway, just in case. As young Catholics, none of us could pass up the chance to see the pope, who represented not only the tradition of the Church but change within the Church as well. We were willing to brave the elements, to risk wasting our time and our hopes.

The weather in Rio, being unpredictable, was often inconvenient. Winter rain poured down on our heads, which were shielded with everything from plastic ponchos to backpacks to a neighbor’s outstretched arm. It seemed like there were hundreds of us out there, enthusiastically anticipating the arrival of Pope Francis even though we were cold, and wet, and suddenly deprived of every semblance of personal space. We clustered around each other like family, anxiously asking when the pope was allegedly driving by.

At this point, I took a mental step back and observed my peers. All of them looked like they should have been miserable, but they weren’t. They were infectiously enthusiastic. And after three hours, when Pope Francis sped by in his gray sedan and waved, the entire crowd erupted in joyful shrieks and applause as if there had been no wait, no uncertainty. All of us had traveled to Brazil and then to the streets not only to express our faith in God but also to express our faith in the Church and its ability to overcome recent challenges through Pope Francis. We were all hopeful for the future of the Church, just as the Church is hopeful for our futures.

My experience in Brazil was like a shot of adrenaline. It reawakened my passion for Christ and reaffirmed that I was not alone in my faith. There are many in my faith community, all of them willing to share their love with me.

Erin Verdi, from Las Vegas, is a senior at Seattle University with a double major in psychology and creative writing.

The Fathers Who Founded Us:
Reflections on the Jesuits Reborn

By Nicholas Sawicki

If you take a short walk just beyond the University Church at Fordham’s Rose Hill Campus, you will find a cemetery in which 124 sons of St. Ignatius are interred. Amongst the tombstones, all of which list the place of birth and death of the individual they mark, one finds an astounding array of ethnicities and cultures represented. There are, for example, 6 Canadians, 7 Germans, 5 Italians, 4 Belgians, 24 Frenchmen, 46 Irishmen, 27 Americans, and one Czechoslovakian, an Austrian, a Swiss, a Scotsman, and an Englishman. Upon closer inspection, you find that many of the men from Europe entered the Society prior to 1850, and almost no Americans are found as members of the Society in the cemetery before that point. It is fascinating that, in what was still generally a parochial time for most people, this bustling international community of Jesuits made it to Fordham, and one cannot help but wonder how this came to be.

Let us rewind to the significant year of 1814. It was a world which witnessed
the first abdication of Napoleon after his defeat at Toulouse, one in which Sir Walter Scott and Lord Byron were the envy of the literary world throughout Europe. With the skillful diplomatic machinations of Prince Metternich influencing the Congress of Vienna, the Holy Roman Empire was dissolved, and the Treaty of Ghent was signed ending the War of 1812 between Britain and the United States. It was also the year in which Pope Pius VII escaped France and reclaimed the See of St. Peter in Rome. It was upon this explosive scene that the Society of Jesus was restored.

Many consider the suppression the darkest days of the Society, and rightfully so. For all canonical and legal purposes, the Society did not exist. Its schools, missions, apostolates, and institutions had all been dispersed. The internal structures necessary to train new Jesuits – novitiates, scholastics, theologates – had been dealt a similar blow. However, the most spectacular sunrises occur only after the darkest of nights.

So, what does suppression and restoration have to do with a vibrant, international community of Jesuits forming 2,000 miles away from Europe? The answer: everything. For one, the existence of the Society of Jesus is inherently necessary for it to have existing members. Second, the time in which the Society was restored and the approach that the surviving fathers chose to take were both pivotal in creating the Society we see today.

The post-Suppression Society of Jesus is a stronger, globally focused one, but it would not be the same if it had been restored earlier or later. The benefit is clear in terms of timing for the restoration: Europe and the world were changing. With the soon-to-be-developed concepts of communism, nationalism, socialism, with the expansion of imperialism, and with the emergence of labor unions and social welfare just around the corner, the Church would need a way to respond. The Society was restored early enough so as to be significantly influential and was able to adapt sufficiently to the oncoming social struggles of the 19th century, yet late enough not to be considered directly part of the older order of Europe, which had cast them out. This allowed the Society to develop and emerge to meet the world as it was changing, mimicking its creation during the Reformation in the 16th century. It was because of this timing that Jesuits for the past 199 years have been identified not only with their trademark pursuits in academia and missionary work but also as social reformers and labor negotiators, significantly expanding the Society's work to meet the times in which it continues to survive.

The second benefit to the Society was how the surviving fathers structured the training for the new members who flocked to the novitiates. There was a greater focus on integrating Jesuits from across Europe into international communities. For example, there are records of Jesuit novices being sent from Ireland to France and from Germany to England and Italy, and vice versa, to complete their training. This was for various reasons. First, it allowed the Society to focus its limited resources in the earliest days to provide the best training they could. Second, it ensured that the education was streamlined and that new members received the same education with the same mission in mind. Third, it allowed the men in formation to receive a broader knowledge of the world, i.e., a familiarity with foreign cultures, languages, etc. Fourth, with the limited number of men generally having a familiarity with one another and having experience in each other's languages, it made international apostolates easier. The Jesuits may have been more comfortable moving as there was a good chance they knew someone in the new country because of the international communities that were formed in training.

It was because of the formation of international communities, the timing of the restoration, and the streamlining of Jesuit education that the Society was able to become the globalized network that it is today on a grander scale than ever before conceived. The 124 markers in the Fordham cemetery and the markers in the many Jesuit cemeteries throughout the United States are reminders of the work the early fathers of the restoration accomplished and how the modern Society of today began to take shape.
The Jesuits of Amazonia were gathered together in 1759 in the college chapel of São Francisco Xavier in the port city of Belem at the mouth of the Amazon River. They were tied together and marched to a nearby ship to return to Europe after the their expulsion by the Portuguese crown from all its territories. Some 250 years later, four Jesuits returned to that chapel along with 30 young people and celebrated mass to begin their MAGIS pilgrimage just prior to the recent World Youth Day gathering with Pope Francis in Rio de Janeiro. It was the first time Jesuits had celebrated mass in that chapel since their expulsion from Brazil.

I left that Eucharist in the trunk of a small car – a hatchback, technically, so not as cramped as it may sound. I was being taken along with four companions to a local family’s home for dinner. It was a tight fit but much better than being tied up and thrown onto a prison ship! But the parallel was hard to ignore: Centuries ago Jesuits left that chapel crammed into ships as exiles, but this summer we left crammed into compact cars as honored guests.

This narrative could be one of a triumphant return or a tale of hospitality. I’ll follow Pope Francis’s lead and take the latter tack. The people of Brazil were a true embodiment of Francis’s image of a humble church of mercy and service. Again and again they seemed to say, “By any means necessary, we’ll make room for you!” The one word every pilgrim was sure to learn in Brazil was obrigado. Thank you!

About a week later I was in another tight spot: crammed onto Copacabana beach with 3.5 million young pilgrims from around the world. Pope Francis smiled and waved an arm, and the people came. They found a place on the sand and made space for each other.

Pope Francis’s homilies were straightforward calls to Christian charity. With his trademark simplicity, he drew three points from the readings at mass: Go. Do not be afraid. Serve. Each of these gospel imperatives captures a glimpse of Francis’s vision for the Church, a vision that was deeply attractive to the cheering young crowd.

“Go.” Francis is showing his Jesuit roots here. Perhaps nothing defines the life of the Society of Jesus more than this simple imperative, “Go!” To the missions, to the frontiers, to the poor, to the powerful ... for the greater glory of God just go! In his Contemplation to Attain Divine Love, St. Ignatius tells us that there are two things we should know: Love is active and it is mutual. We show our love more in deeds than in words, and we give to one another whatever we have, whatever we are. In this sense, Copacabana was not so much a destination point as a missioning station. And as at any eucharistic liturgy, we were gathered there to be sent out.

“Do not be afraid.” Francis has repeated many times his preference for a Church that takes risks “in the streets” over one that protects itself behind closed doors. In very plain language he has told theologians to do their work passionately and without fear of a call from Rome. He’s also said that we need a deeper theology of women - a statement I find to be more encouraging of young feminist transform.
theologians than dismissive of the womanist theology already on the shelves.

In Brazil Francis said again and again that he wants the young to make noise, to stir things up, even to “make messes” in their dioceses. Strange parenting? Perhaps. But he encourages the obvious: Theologians shouldn’t fear the Church; women shouldn’t fear the Church; young people shouldn’t fear the Church. Each of these claims speaks to both sides of the fence: You who think you’re “inside” stop scaring people away; you who think you’re “outside” find yourself welcomed.

“Serve.” A central duty in the Christian faith is quite plainly the duty of love. When people fulfill this duty, Francis presupposes that they will work to answer all other questions. The call to service is particularly attractive to young people because it’s active, it’s real work, and it’s not a foregone conclusion.

Young people want to participate in the work of the Church, and they largely understand this to be work of justice and love. Ours is a faith to be lived. Christ is a person to be encountered. Strangers and enemies are guests to be welcomed. Differences of culture or creed are opportunities for dialogue. For the young, the Church may be a rock on which to stand, but it is also a body to be moved.

Ministry to young adults is a risky endeavor. I think they are sometimes feared because they’re a marginal population, a liminal people; they live between one place and another. Their youthful imagination meets the reality of adult responsibility, and this begets a crisis. Francis has repeatedly called for a culture of encounter, and World Youth Day was certainly that. In the streets or on the sand you literally couldn’t help but run into people. It was chaotic to be sure, but the joyful spirit was one of encounter more than crisis.

Walking with young pilgrims, I heard many naming their desires. It’s impressive how vulnerable you become once you expose your hopes. Along with any desire comes the fear that it won’t be satisfied. All the noise and dancing and general high energy of this youth gathering was layered above some very real hopes and fears. Young people live with youthful energy and mature concerns and the combination of these is experienced as anxiety. They’re worried. They don’t need correction. They need encouragement.

They wonder what happens when the high energy of youth is no longer available to them, when their friends leave or grow up, when the dancing stops and the silence starts. They need to know that they can still find joy. They need companionship. To be with them is to risk not having answers, to be open to change, to surrendering control.

Pope Francis affirms their joy. He listens to their fears and concerns, and he speaks with confidence directly to their hearts: “Go. Do not be afraid. Serve.”

Thinking back on the mass in that old chapel in Belem, one final image comes to mind. Belem, you see, is Portuguese for Bethlehem. With such a name my heart would be foolish to forget the defining moment of Christian hospitality. Long before we were welcomed back into that chapel as Jesuits, long before Francis was welcomed back to Latin America as pope, a young migrant family was welcomed as guests into a small space behind the inn of their census-crowded hometown. That poor young couple welcomed a fresh blue baby into the world with their own sweat and blood and tears. He cried for milk and love just like the rest of us. In that place they knew something of God, and what they knew they shared with all. May it be so for each of us.
Faculty and staff at Catholic colleges are divided in their views about sports on campus. Some believe that athletics, especially high-profile, competitive sports, divert resources and attention from academic pursuits. Others, like myself, consider sports to be integral to a well-rounded college experience, fostering an active lifestyle and community building. Countless hours are spent debating the proper role of sports in meetings and around the water cooler.

Patrick Kelly, S.J., brings an important perspective to this debate by illuminating the centrality of sports in Catholic theology and spiritual practices throughout history. He argues, contrary to prevailing accounts, that sports have been integral to the spiritual life of Catholics from the medieval period to the present. His study employs a combination of theological argument and historical analysis that establishes a foundation for his observations about Catholicism and sports in America. His work highlights the fact that debates over the intersection of sports and faith far predate the establishment of Catholic academic institutions.

Father Kelly demonstrates that sports were readily accommodated in medieval and early modern Catholic culture and institutions, including schools. Games were played on Sundays and holy days around faith practices. Thomas Aquinas, humanists, and early Jesuits believed that diversions like sports were necessary to achieve a virtuous life. Indeed, Aquinas felt that “it was possible to sin by having too little play in one’s life” (5). In keeping with these sentiments, early Jesuit schools in Europe and in the North American missions made sports central to a student’s experience.

Puritan notions associating work with godliness and play with sin shaped early Americans’ beliefs about sports. American Catholic clergy and laypersons embraced play and readily integrated sports into their daily lives, reinforcing their status as outsiders. Jesuit schools, in keeping with their European counterparts, established elaborate facilities and made sports integral to campus life.

Small yet compelling portions of the book address women’s participation in sports, an area that usually receives scant scholarly treatment. Fr. Kelly challenges conventional assumptions that females did not engage in athletic play in medieval and early modern times. Women workers, like their male counterparts, played team sports, including football, cricket, and a precursor to baseball, and ran foot races, while aristocratic women hunted and played tennis. Young American women attending Catholic schools as early as the 1930s played competitive sports, offering a contrast to the male-dominated institutional church hierarchy and signaling possibilities for a more feminine view of the faith. The Immaculata College “Mighty Macs” women’s basketball team revolutionized the game and won the first women’s national championship in 1972, repeating the
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The Catholic faith/sports nexus was seamless for Immaculata students whose community, under the tutelage of the Immaculate Heart of Mary sisters, was united in prayer, a “love of work,” and “a love of play.”

In the final chapter, Father Kelly addresses sports in the contemporary context in light of the considerable challenges that have emerged as athletics have become synonymous with business and entertainment. Athletes are pressured from an early age to perform and win prestigious scholarships or professional contracts. Such pressure takes the joy out of sports for many athletes and makes them vulnerable to chronic injury. Jesuit institutions face the conundrum of how to be competitive in this environment while remaining true to their mission. Father Kelly draws upon the insights of theologians from earlier periods to provide guidance. Pope John Paul II believed that the goal of sports should be to foster spiritual growth by emphasizing the dignity of the human person. Sports should be part of a balanced life, and Father Kelly asks us to consider Aquinas’s emphasis on moderation and enjoyment. He concludes, “An important task of Catholic theologians in the contemporary context is to safeguard the play element in sport, and particularly in youth sport. After all, if play is similar to contemplation, then the experiences of a person at play must themselves be of considerable significance” (154).

Father Kelly’s well-researched, neatly articulated volume fills a major void left by Catholic theologians’ reluctance to address the connection between religion and sports. The book appeals directly to sports scholars and enthusiasts, theologians, and Catholic historians. It is a must-read for university faculty and administrators who deal with athletics. The book also is suitable for a general audience, including those who are not interested in sports. Father Kelly makes sophisticated theological arguments accessible and relevant while taking readers on a lively journey through Catholic and Jesuit history in brief.

Diana Owen is an associate professor of political science and the director of American Studies at Georgetown University. She is a member of the Conversations seminar.
The Real and Urgent Conversations We Need

By James E. Hug, S.J.

In “Ending Absolute Poverty” (Conversations, Fall 2013 (44), pp. 32-33), Stephen Rowntree, S.J., asks whether “Redistribution or Economic Growth” can do it. His position, in short, is that ending absolute poverty requires economic growth.

Rowntree’s presentation and assumptions overlook several critical realities that shape our lives today, making them both inadequate and dangerous. Here are four points to get our “conversation” to a more fruitful space for serious education and research, along with an invitation.

1. Globalization. Over the past several decades, national economies have become more and more intertwined, so that we now have one global economy. It is no longer possible for a poor country to address absolute poverty by simply launching a growth strategy to end that poverty. It must enter the globalized system and play by its rules. Social activists, including Nobel economics laureates, have long demonstrated that those rules are rigged in favor of wealthy nations and corporate powers.

   Rowntree’s model, however, is beginning to look like the dying phase of economic development as we know it. The gap between the wealthy and the poor is growing nearly everywhere. Upward mobility is disappearing in the U.S.: the economic gains of the last three decades have gone to the wealthiest one percent or so of the population while the middle class is shrinking and workers’ incomes are stagnating or eroding. Similar dynamics are emerging in China, India, Brazil, and South Africa. The Arab Spring began because masses of people lost hope that economic growth would be shared widely. Wealth brings social and political power that is used to consolidate wealth by those who have it. This situation is socially unsustainable.

2. Ecological Limits and Climate Change. The challenge of poverty today must always be addressed within the context of our awareness of planetary constraints. There are two dimensions we must be aware of.

   First, the human community is already overusing the planet’s resources. In 2012, “Earth Overshoot Day” (the day we began to use more of the earth’s resources than it can renew in a year) fell on August 22. Each year that day comes earlier than the year before. The pattern is clearly unsustainable. We must end poverty, but over the long term that can happen only through redistribution and a reduction of resource overuse globally.

   Second, the type of economic growth that we currently produce – consumption driven, fossil-fuel based, globally competitive – is steadily warming the planet, contributing to climate change that further impoverishes the already poor and threatens to destroy life as we know it on earth over the next century. We must find creative new sustainable patterns of development.

3. Catholic Social Tradition. Jesuit higher education is part of a strong Catholic social tradition that for five decades has called humanity to deal with poverty as a global issue. In Caritas in Veritate, Pope Benedict XVI described globalization as revealing God’s call to create one human family living sustainably in peace on our limited planet. We have a religious calling to address poverty and all the urgent social problems we face in global solidarity.

   These four contextual realities frame the urgent conversation, education, and research needed to create a just and sustainable future. I am planning to set up working groups on the website of Academics at Jesuit Universities and Schools (www.ajus.org), a new initiative to facilitate global networking. Please check it out and consider joining our conversation.

   ■

James E. Hug, S.J., is the president emeritus of Center of Concern.
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