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The discussion regarding the nature and purpose of university education has a distinguished and complex history. Within recent memory, the 1987 publication of Alan Bloom’s The Closing of the American Mind—a work that earned him enthusiastic admirers and ardent critics—gave rise to a spirited debate regarding general versus specialized education, the implications of knowing and learning, and the intellectual, social, civic, and moral health of university students. While affirming the value of knowing and learning as legitimate ends in themselves, the Catholic intellectual tradition also honors the integral relationship among knowing, learning, and becoming. In ultimate terms, Catholic education has a telos, an end—one that is related to the student as a person.

In its document “Our Mission Today: The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice,” the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus highlighted the relationship between faith and justice as a preeminent feature of Jesuit identity, one that marks Jesuit educational institutions as well. These essays attest to the attention paid in such universities to the service of faith and the promotion of justice. And while the title of this book does not include “faith,” there is no doubt that the thread of faith, in consort with justice, is interwoven through the tapestry of these essays, as expressed in “Encuentro Dominicano,” by Tom Kelly: “The key to the transformational process is a commitment to academic rigor in the context of community-based learning, and an emphasis on building relationships and spiritual reflection through commitment to faith that does justice” (54).

All too often, Catholic educators are quick to confirm that their tradition of education pays particular attention to the education of the whole person, but they rarely provide an accompanying analysis of how this is realized in the school or university. (It must be recognized, of course, that the education of the whole person is a perennial process). It is refreshing to see that these essays are attentive to some of the deeper matters that pertain to the education of the whole person; they deliberate on what is required and necessary for such an education. And while the essays view the educational task through the lens of justice, a sufficient edifice is constructed to declare that while the education of the whole person includes intellectual knowledge and knowing, it is also a process of becoming, one that is both internally transformative and liberating and externally caring and responsible. In good Catholic tradition, one is warned of the corrosive danger of individualism and selfishness, whereby there is no longer a “common good, only my individual good” (64). Catholic education must be ever vigilant to avoid straying from the truth that education, to paraphrase Jacques Maritain, is not simply a stuffy and disconnected shuffling of ideas, an intellectual snobbery unrelated to the being and becoming of the person and the world. Thinking and feeling, justice and action, the spiritual life and community, learning and choosing, and knowing and evaluating are all indispensable elements of the education of the whole person. With such pillars in place, students are called “to use [their] intellectual gifts and studies to understand the reality of the world” (277). If education is ultimately about freedom, then it is also about transformation; without both elements, education fails to take place. Education must sow the seeds for recurrent growth from being to becoming. These essays, in one way or another, all look on education and learning as potentially transformative, which is surely one of the distinguishing features of the education of the whole person.
Reviewing a collection of essays is never easy, even when they are unified by a common theme. Each essay deserves comment, but a book review permits no such luxury. Some essays are stronger and more focused than others; that is, they are able to situate the intellectual mandate of the university and the promotion of justice more clearly within the overall mission of the church. One such contribution is “Adopting the Mission of Social Justice in a Political Science Department,” by Freie and Behuniak. The theme of the students’ transformation is front and center in this essay, and this transformative change is situated in the context of the life of the university and linked to “active and participatory citizenship” (92–93). Also explored are the intersections and connections between “foundational courses,” “social justice,” and “the everyday interests of students” (95). A second such essay is “Opening Remarks to the Justice Conference, June 18, 2009,” by von Arx. Particularly arresting is the astute observation that the “whole person” of the twenty-first century is not the “whole person” of the Renaissance (228). Building on this distinction, von Arx explores whether professional programs in Jesuit universities are “tailored specifically toward the service of faith and the promotion of justice [as the] primary focus, to the exclusion of more secular concerns” (232). Also pertinent, in the context of service learning and immersion programs, is his charge not to reduce the “gritty reality of injustice” to an arcade of “spiritual and moral tourism.” Indeed, participants in such programs should be more concerned with their “emotional and spiritual footprints” (233). Knowledge and learning become the foundations for the transformation of the student, but in ways that are neither bookish nor faddish. Education for freedom and liberation is nourished by books and ideas, but must lead to a transformation resulting from a personal appropriation of what has been learned and understood. Finally, a third essay—“Doing Well by Doing Good: The Application of Ignatian Principles to Legal Education” by Kolesch—applies St. Ignatius’s principles and his distinctions between consolation and desolation, as laid out in the Spiritual Exercises, to the area of legal studies. Law students need more than just awareness that lawyers are prone to “addictions, stress, depression and suicide” (184). The stress and competition that law students face create a fertile field for the weeds of individualism, which strike at the very heart of the education of the whole person. Ignatian spirituality is grounded in mission and service, leading Kolesch to ask how the faculty and administrators of a law school can “foster a desire among students to serve others—to transform the world within the narrow confines of legal education” (185). While there can be no dilution of the intellectual demands made on law students nor any reduction in the sheer volume of knowledge that future lawyers must acquire, and while it must be recognized that “Christian piety can never be a substitute
for professional competence” (194), there is nonetheless an expectation that future lawyers trained at Jesuit universities embrace the principle of justice which holds that “solidarity is learned through contact rather than concepts” (183).

One recurrent problem in this volume is the creation of an artificial distinction between the terms “Catholic” and “Jesuit,” as exemplified in phrases such as (a university that is both) “Catholic and Jesuit” (66), “contemporary Catholic and Jesuit perspectives” (114), “Jesuit and Catholic care for the earth” (285), and “Catholic and Jesuit identity of the institutions” (317). The Society of Jesus is part of the Roman Catholic heritage, whether as a religious congregation or by virtue of its contribution to the Catholic intellectual tradition. These distinctions between “Catholic” and “Jesuit” are not helpful, nor do they contribute to the fabric of the historical Catholic experience. A clearer recognition of the distinguishing features of Jesuit education, situated within this greater Catholic tradition, would have been preferable, and would have made for smoother reading.
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