Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education

Volume 11 Article 10

4-1-1997

On Wholes and Parts

William M. Shea

On Wholes and Parts

WILLIAM M. SHEA
ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

There must be a point to all our talk about whole - person education, but the point is not easy to get or make. The terminology is as slippery as it is important. Given the weight of the terminology in our various traditions (Catholic, Jesuit, and American education in general), it can hardly be ignored, but for the very same reason its meaning cannot be taken for granted. Above all, its use should not mislead us into the mistaken and even invidious judgments of other educators. Laudable as it may be as a terminology for educational ideals, it is far less than laudable when it implies pedagogical inferiority on the part of colleagues and competitors.

While *knowledge* is invariably abstract, *knowing*, even theoretic knowing, is invariably concrete and involves the "whole person." To think or talk otherwise is as silly as the claim that it is not the whole person, but only a "part" of the person, that sleeps or eats or has sex. Is it only part of the person that inquires? thinks? learns? plans? decides? acts? And if so, which part? The notion runs against the experience of anyone who has understood anything. Understanding and the quest for it satisfy the body as well as the mind.

We ought to reject the notion that knowing and truth exist in a realm distinct from feeling, desiring, imagining, hoping, fearing, as if truth and the quest for it were not felt, desired, imagined, hoped, and feared. We should not plunge into dualism, dividing soul from body, spirit from flesh, mind from matter, thought from experience, contemplation from action. Inquiry surely involves abstraction, understanding, conceptualization, and judgment, but it is driven by passion and practical aim, as part of the process of deliberately induced change.

A view dividing living and learning, thus dividing the "whole person," may show up in arguments between faculty and student services personnel. The latter may think they deal with the "whole person" while faculty

deal only with (and thus only care about) the abstract, the technical, the theoretic (thus with only "part") of the person; or faculty may assume they deal with the important part of the person, the intellect, while staff deal only with ancillary, mundane, practical and so less important aspects of student life. (I hasten to add that no such argument goes on at Saint Louis University where everyone deals with whole persons all day long!)

The same linguistic glitch turns up in the recurrent campus discussions of integral education. Probably every one of our twenty-eight Jesuit institutions and the other two hundred Catholic colleges and universities are either coming off, entering upon, or suffering through a core revision and a round of strategic planning, and discussion of the "whole person" in all likelihood fills the air in many places. The specialized nature of contemporary collegiate education is commonly taken to be inimical to liberal ("integral") education, and thus we find ourselves fighting over the size of the humanities core. Some justify our relatively high requirements in philosophy and theology in terms not only of the religious mission of the college but also in

terms of "whole person" education—as if six or nine credits in either or both will make a person "wholer" than he or she would be without them! A serious discussion of the aims of collegiate education is submerged in bureaucratic and ideological units' counting and defending their pile of credit beans.

The issue becomes acute in science education, which calls for intense degrees of specialization and concentration. How can it be real education, we ask, absent an infusion of an integrating philosophy or theology, or without a sufficient dose of both and of the other humanities? How can it be a Catholic higher education, which (perhaps unjustifiably) prides itself on its "liberal arts" orientation? How can it be Jesuit education if it doesn't involve a big chunk of the core devoted to peace and justice? Catholic educators often huff and puff on such questions. Lurking in the background are convictions that Catholics and Jesuits have the patent on and special responsibility for "integral education" and that higher education itself can effect or should aim at personal or social transformation.

Finally, the dichotomy turns up again when Catholic educators assert or imply that non-denominational educational institutions do not do the "whole" job because the religious, theological, and humanities dimensions are not central to the education they offer, and thus they do not care for the whole person. Some say that students get something unique and special in our system that they cannot get elsewhere, such as instruction in ethics or religious life. Some may think that "they" do not have it and we do, for we have the mission to the whole person and integral education, and they do not.

Between non-denominational and Catholic higher education there are differences, surely, but the differences are not helpfully and accurately stated in such simple contrasts, even for the advertising wars. When we talk this way about state-sponsored or private non-denominational education, we appear to be beating the tribal drums for commercial battle and releasing ourselves from attempts to understand what we and others are up to in our work. We need to clear up what we mean by the whole person we intend to educate and just how we accomplish this education while others do not.

Perhaps theory and theoretic assumptions can helpfully be challenged on the basis of experience. Unification and integration are names in the first instance for moments in experience, in life lived. They occur in a variety of contexts: religious, aesthetic, political, interpersonal, individual and communal, practical and even theoretical. When the moments come they are wonderful and sometimes even profound (like falling in love), so profound that they can justly be called religious conversions. Some of them may shape a life. Some give a person an end in view, a unified perspective on life, sometimes even a start on a unifying conceptuality in philosophy or theology. But just as surely there are "parts" of us and our world left out or unassimilated in these moments; internal tensions and conflicts are left unresolved, and the darkness remaining just beyond the rim of feeling, attention, and reflection presses back upon us. In this sense there is never a whole person if we mean by "whole" a person fully formed—we leave that to the resurrection. This ought to keep us from kidding ourselves when we are swept up by our own rhetoric and inclined to denigrate the work of others even if only by implication. A touch of realism would not hurt Jesuit and Catholic educators in this regard. Moreover, theologically speaking, it would be well to keep in mind that the Spirit is at work in "the world" as well as in the church, and in non-denominational as well as in denominational education. We can presume that the only place in which the Holy Spirit is *not* effecting conversion is Hell.

I am confident that the term "whole person" has meanings much different from those I have contrasted here—a nearly vacuous Catholic language of self-congratulation and market strategy on one hand and, on the other, a language denoting moments of personal integration as *gratia gratis data*. It can refer to an intention we share with all genuine educators at every stage in the practice and theory of education: to convey the skills students need to make their way in the world today and to fill out a view of cultures, self, and God. The "filling out" in higher education is, of course, critical.

Do we not all aim to educate the "whole" of the young as "wholly" as the cultural and personal circumstances, and our own horizons, permit? The state university I worked in for a decade intended to convey both skills and culture (with the appropriate Constitutional reserve about teaching religious doctrines). Moreover, that university has an ample supply of professors, staff, and administrators whose work is underpinned by religious faith which they convey in various ways to their colleagues and students. They clearly intend, as we do, to educate the whole person, including the religious dimension so far as it falls within the limits of their work, as we do. The contrast with our own aim is not as sharp as our hopes would have it.

