Applying “Men and Women for Others”
to Writing about Archeology

Karen Surman Paley

In archeology we tend to see research as consultative, co-operative. It is “our” work. . . . Grasping the collaborative sense of a project is key.
–Pierre Morenon

*Curriculum personalis* is a rich and interesting phrase used by Jesuit educators. This pedagogy of caring for the whole person describes how a faculty member demonstrates concern not solely for the cognitive acquisition that transpires in a classroom but also for the development of the emotional and spiritual life of a student. While the phrase is widely used in Jesuit colleges and universities, it is not used in any of the foundational texts of the society. Neither does the phrase turn up in the *Concordancia Ignacia*. I find the clearest statement of the pedagogy in a 1977 monograph published by the Jesuit Secondary Education Association (JSEA): “The concept of the personal concern of the teacher for the individual student has always been perceived as a mark of Jesuit education.” As Robert Newton writes, this concern is manifested by “adjusting the educational program to the uniqueness of each student” (13). While there is no body of scholarship on this pedagogy, there are parallel pedagogies grounded in the secular, and we might substitute the phrase “pedagogy of care,” looking, for example, at the philosophy of Nel Noddings who declares that “our schools are in a crisis of caring” (181).

One example of a pedagogy of caring can be found in the classroom and fieldwork of archeologist professor Pierre Morenon at Rhode Island College in Providence. From 2001-2006, Morenon’s summer field school was linked to an interdisciplinary multi-grant project on the Rhode Island State Home and School, a former orphanage and school for abandoned and neglected children. As they excavated for artifacts formerly belonging to the residents of this orphanage and state school, Morenon’s archeology students themselves became aware of what one student called the “living nature” of the grounds, and central to that discovery was the role of writing within Morenon’s pedagogy of caring.

Oral History of an Orphanage

Morenon invited me to observe Anthropology 489, Archeology Field School, in the summer of 2003. Although I did no excavating, I eagerly watched excavations, attended a field trip to the site of a colonial battle with Native Americans, and collected student texts, studying how his pedagogy reflected caring for the whole person. Coincidentally, Helen Whall, an English professor at the College of the Holy Cross,
had just published “Caring for the Whole Faculty” in the Jesuit magazine, Conversations. Her essay reminded me of the very common application of the phrase cura personalis in Jesuit schools, “men and women for others” (14). This phrase was initially put into circulation based on the text by Pedro Arrupe, S. J., in 1971. In his statement “Justice in the World,” Arrupe summarizes what qualities the graduate should possess. By works of justice, he means:

1.) a basic attitude of respect for all men which forbids us ever to use them as instruments for our own profit; 2.) a firm resolve never to profit from or allow ourselves to be suborned by, positions of power deriving from privilege. . . . To be drugged by the comforts of privilege is to become contributors to injustice as silent beneficiaries of the fruits of injustice; and 3.) an attitude not simply of refusal but of counterattack against injustice; a decision to work with others toward the dismantling of unjust social structures so that the weak, the oppressed, the marginalized of this world may be set free. (6)

Morenon’s class and its relationship to the oral history project on a former state orphanage and school on the college campus evoked a secular notion of “men and women for others,” despite his not having any connection with Arrupe or the Jesuits. I had met Morenon earlier when I was a junior faculty member in composition and rhetoric at Rhode Island College, newly appointed to the college-wide Writing Board. He invited me to attend and eventually to join the Steering Committee of the Oral History Project, which was then involved in interviewing former residents and staff of the State Home and School. The summer field study class I observed consisted of six undergraduate students, and I invited anyone who volunteered to provide me with copies of her writing assignments and to meet with me. Morenon did not know who in the class was active in my study.

Two points emerged from the work: the collaborative essence of the work and the students’ sensitivity to the future audience of their writing. Morenon tells me he is not an isolated scholar working alone in front of his Trinitron monitor but

a public scientist who conducts experiments with others (students) in front of a curious audience. . . . [M]ost students think of research in terms of a solitary process. . . . It is ‘their’ paper. In archeology we tend to see research as consultative, co-operative. It is ‘our’ work. . . . Grasping the collaborative sense of a project is key.

This archeology project demonstrates a way to provide “a happier writing environment” (Hyson), as one of Morenon’s students describes his class. Furthermore, it offered a genuine audience for student writing outside the classroom, something compositionists frequently seek. Written assignments from Morenon’s course became part of two public archives, a library consortium, and local print media. His student anthropologists worked in a framework of caring for both the subjects and the place of their research.

Course Goals

Morenon’s goals for the project are quite clear. He comments:

I was interested in incorporating writing into this course more
intensively than in the past for several reasons: First, I am eager to examine the way “experience” informs writing and vice versa. What do students think about as they go through the process of excavation? Second, I am interested in maximizing the process of fieldwork. How can we extend fieldwork from day to day, from daily routine to curious exploration? So writing becomes both an opportunity for reflecting upon and extending what is an apparently tiring, dirty process.

Along with Diane Martell from the School of Social Work and Sandra Enos from the Sociology Department at Rhode Island College, Morenon is a leader of an oral history project funded by grants from the Rhode Island Council of the Humanities (RICH) and a faculty research grant from the college itself. For three summers he and his assistants have been excavating an area that once housed the State Home & School for Neglected and Dependent Children (1885-1947). Their work provides a service to the community of former residents and staff by recreating a space to return to for memories and reunions; the undergraduate archeologists contribute to that service. The Oral History Group holds reunions of former residents and staff, bringing together people who had not seen each in other in years, and even siblings who had been separated in childhood. As members of the Oral History Project steering committee conducted interviews, Morenon and his students found recreational items mentioned in some of the interviews, such as marbles, jacks, a toy truck, a handle to a porcelain teapot, and a piece of vinyl record. In the first day of the summer class, Morenon told his students, “This is not your typical archeology project. Hardly [any archeologists] work with children. . . . Who speaks for the children [the former residents]?”

The past and the present came together during the excavation when former residents stopped by to watch the excavations. Rhonda Hyson, a student who was especially sensitive to what she calls “the human aspect of the site,” writes in her daily log, “I thought we were lucky to have a former resident on hand” (8). Later, referring to a reunion of former residents and staff organized by the steering committee, she journals,

After sitting and talking with Mary, Elenore, and Dorothea, I realized how super important this project really is. These people thought their lives would be forgotten. But because of their willingness to share their past, the project has taken shape into a bigger thing. . . . They are living history. I was proud to have made their acquaintance and look forward to seeing them again. (14)

Clearly the course meant more to Rhonda than simply reading lives and events widely removed from the people, places, and period of her own life. The course provided Rhonda with “histories” of these people, and the writing enabled her to realize a part of her desire to be “a woman for others.” Rhonda was able to feel the importance of the people, the remnants of whose lives she and her classmates were retrieving. She was being educated in more than the material tools of the archeological profession. The Anthropology 489 students who attended one or more meetings of the steering committee of the Oral History Project really could not ignore the connection between the artifacts they located in one of forty-six test pits and the human lives they revealed. They became participants in Morenon’s “public science.”
Real Site, Real Audience

Journal writing is writing-to-learn pedagogy as opposed to writing-to-test. Students have a private place to record data and emotional responses to readings. As Sheridan Blau writes, “The principal use of a log is to encourage students to record the questions, confusion, and difficulties they experience in reading texts” (154). In their logbooks, the archeology students could ask questions such as “when do you adjust for transit height?” (Whitmore 2), or they could interrogate the “textual” meaning of the finds. Jan DeAngelis, another student, wrote, “As we retrieve these objects we can’t help but wonder about the children who last touched them. It also conjures up thoughts of your own childhood such as a favorite toy or a favorite place to play” (4).

Melissa Mowry, like Rhonda and Jan, appreciated the deeper connection between the physical work and the human history: “It is a truly rare opportunity to be excavating objects from a site and interviewing the very same people whom they belonged to or possibly belonged to” (2). One might call it an expanded perspective on learning. Melissa also allowed herself journal space to “tell it like it is” after one of many days of excavating in the rain: “We’re learning this is indeed a tedious practice, very dependent on outside influence” (2). She continues to comment on “the tedious nature of archeology” even after finding a white porcelain handle perhaps from a teapot. “Everything is not fossils and ‘treasures.’ Hey, everything isn’t even quartz.” On the other hand, Alisa Augenstein reports, “I have wanted to become an archeologist since I was in the 6th grade, and this is the first step I am taking to make that a reality” (2). She discovers, “I really like getting my hands dirty; it makes me feel like I accomplished something” (6-7).

Teaching about the constraints of audience is de rigueur for composition classes. Text after text educates the novice writer about the importance of considering audience and purpose. However, the audience for composition classes is often nothing more than a mise-en-scene, frequently limited to the teacher and fellow students. Except when so designed, such as a letter to the editor, much of the work of the freshmen writing class, is not for “a real situation,” but rather a “sophistic” one: “Real situations are to be distinguished from sophistic ones . . . and from fantasy in which exigence, audience, and constraints may all be imaginary objects of the mind at play” (Bitzer 11). While writing professionals try very hard to prompt students to produce prose with the reader in mind, as opposed to the self-directed prose with only the writer herself in mind as described by Linda Flower, audience beyond the classroom is most frequently imaginary. To use the terms employed by Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford, it is invoked as opposed to addressed. “The ‘addressed’ audience refers to those actual or real-life people who read a discourse, while the ‘invoked’ audience refers to the audience called up or imagined by the writer” (156).

Morenon used a real situation in his course. His students did not undergo “a simulation experience” (Wygota and Cain 32). The archeological site for Anthropology 489 was on the students’ own campus. Rhonda, for example, was very much aware that they were dealing with a real situation. She referred to “the humanity of the site” in her second paper for the course. First, the site was an Indian settlement, then a mansion, then a school for children, then a college, and now a “project.” “I mean you probably walk across places like that all the time but you don’t realize it. I felt like the site itself was alive” (emphasis mine). Be-
cause the archeology project was tied in with an oral history of former residents of the State Home and School, there was no need for simulation. Morenon does not plant objects in the ground for his students to “discover.” As he puts it, “An archeology project is real. We did not dig up the State Home and School as some imagined exercise–like recording the anatomy of a plastic fish in a laboratory, for example.” His students knew right away that their papers, even their informal logbooks, would become part of a publicly accessible archive.

In other words, these assignments brought with them a guaranteed audience outside the classroom and the field site. I asked Morenon about what appeared to be his pedagogy of pre-professionalizing students. He responded, “They are being asked to function not as pre-professionals, but as professionals with quite a bit of oversight.” Admission to the class is selective, and student work is supervised. Once the class and the teams are determined, there would be very carefully produced excavation records. Morenon does recognize the need for training, a point he raised in a comment on one of Melissa’s papers: “The education protocol has to go hand in hand with the research protocol” (Mowry 2). He developed this point in an email to me:

Perhaps the discursive writing that was part of this field experience was less about precisely recording our findings and more about finding something else. . . . As each student wrote they may have discovered whether they were students, like young birds in a comfortable nest, or professionals who really did want to fly.

The only warning he issued was for students to consider what they wrote in their logbooks, making sure it would be something appropriate for a wider audience.

I wondered if this open-minded acceptance of and willingness to make student writing public would challenge them in such a way that they would produce their best writing or if it would inhibit or frighten them. After all, the nest is comfortable. I brought the topic up in the last class and later discussed it with three of the six students: Rhonda, Melissa, and Helen.

Rhonda

Rhonda is a married student in her early twenties who returned to school some time after completing a two-year art degree. She had a longstanding interest in archeology that began when she was in elementary school: “When I was a kid I used to actually dig in my backyard all the time. I still have stuff that I found when I was a kid, minerals and broken silver quarters . . . antique glass jewels.” Her joy in discovery is tempered by her self-concept as a writer: “I have no confidence in my writing. It’s not that I haven’t been trained well enough. It’s just that when I went back to college the second time around, everything is different. It’s not like there’s a standard any more. It’s all per teacher.”

On September 11, 2003, a month or so after the summer session ended, Rhonda spoke to me of her mixed reactions to learning that her logbook and her two papers would be made public. At first excited to “become a part of history,” she later grew concerned about what she had put in her logbook. For example, a casual conversation with a former resident of the State Home and School yielded “sensitive” information. Recording this information in her logbook might not have
given Rhonda much pause for concern had she not attended a meeting of the Oral History Steering Committee where there was much discussion of the need for a careful protocol and guidelines for obtaining permission to quote people. Rhonda became concerned about her own ethics, wondering about the fact that she had not received permission from the former resident before noting their discussion in her logbook. The person had shown her a rock where, on a particular day, she had been asked to serve as a lookout while some residents went into the woods “where they learned to have sex.” After an Oral History steering committee meeting on protocol, she wondered about recording even the lookout story. “Here I am. They just thought I was hanging out talking with them. Maybe they wouldn’t have told me their stories if they had known [I might write them down.]” When she did transpose some of the stories into her logbook, she reports having felt guilty, “almost like I was doing something wrong and I knew it but I wasn’t sure if it was wrong.” She resolved the dilemma by deleting last names and by “writing everything in pencil.” A psychologist might note that Rhonda appears to have taken on some of the guilt of the former lookout. Sociologist Sandra Enos, one of the co-directors of the Oral History project, comments on a draft of this essay, “Rhonda may also have been troubled by the stance of the researcher, when any gesture, comment, or even silence can be fodder for analysis.”

Melissa

The future public nature of their writing was also a concern for other students. They questioned their abilities and whether what they had to offer in their papers would have any scientific validity or could really add to the body of knowledge about the field site or the conditions at the State Home & School. When I asked Melissa what had been her initial reactions to learning that her writing would be part of an archival exhibit, she told me, “I thought it was very thorough to do that; then I wondered if MY findings would really matter to the project as a whole.” Why? Melissa described herself as “learning as I go” because it was her first experience with archeology and she was not a professional: “How would I really say something that someone in the future would . . . look at as information that would really matter?” Since her evaluations were not “scientific,” how could anyone learn from them? In the early stages of her logbook, she reports forgetting that it would be made public, and so she wrote “naturally.” “Then I remembered, sometimes mid-sentence, and tweaked things a bit. By the end I didn’t care.”

And what did the tweaking entail? She would recall that her audience had not seen what she had, that she had “memories to know how [she] meant [by] her words.” So she searched for stronger adjectives and words “to make them understand what happened since they weren’t there.” By “not caring at the end,” Melissa meant that the future audience “would be looking in on [her] experience anyway, so [she] could have the right to kind of leave it the way [she] wanted to leave it.” The evidence of logbook “tweaking” remains buried beneath the text.

From 18 July 03: On the last hole we found a very fancy, formal white handle (porcelain) to perhaps a teapot. For me, this first time of actually getting to dig, led to a more precise understanding of the tedious nature of archeology.

From 25 July 03: It really seemed that we were finding
something continuously. . . . While trying to incorporate ideas for the 1st paper with today’s findings, I realized that archeology is so much more experimental than I realized.

Morenon comments on my reproduction of Melissa’s logbook: “Totally experimental! Students have a hard time understanding that one is expected to learn during an experiment. One learns through action, through the work; just as one learns through memorization, imitation . . . and simulation.” Digging and cataloging are “writing”-to-learn exercises, not heavily based on received information.

As Melissa began to transform some of her field experiences into papers, she remained reflective and worried about the phenomenon called “disturbance”:

What we touch will never be the same again; maybe the tossing of worms brought on these feelings but I was thinking, what about the stuff we are disturbing when we dig? What could I potentially be chipping away at when I drive the shovel in the pit? I sense that at any dig, the thought of making the initial “incision” is quite unnerving. . . . Imagine taking this great find back to the lab, perhaps the ossuary of “James the brother of Jesus,” then realizing you have no accurate record of where it was located? . . . Regardless, the dig is not about what you are finding, but what information that discovery will render later during analysis.

Morenon comments next to Melissa’s last line, “This is an important point—we are collecting information, not artifacts” (3). In relation to her fears about disturbance, he notes on my draft, “This is the universal fear of all beginning archeologists. I suppose the intern thinks the same way: “What if I slice through his heart?”

As the paper draws to a conclusion, Melissa tells us, “Archeology is about telling a story without a story; a story that previously had no words, no record” (3). In none of these sentences do I see a writer constrained by an audience who might judge her lack of expertise, her earlier stance. She worries about archeologists damaging the earth and about claiming inaccurate locations for religious relics, but there are no concerns that any particular findings might later be judged as “not mattering.” The voice is as self-assured as it might have been if her professor constituted the only audience. Morenon views her as “constrained by her own sense of limitation—error, inaccuracy, mistake; rather than the real limits—curiosity, intensity, hard work.”

By her final paper about interpreting an archeological site, Melissa has found a voice and utters what Aristotelians call deliberative discourse, urging the college to protect the historic site of the State Home and School. Her earlier concerns about disturbance are focused on the specific dig:

I am quite perplexed at how the State Home and School has been treated: I see attempts to plant tulips, and sod, in front of the Murray Center [another building on the campus], but no action to preserve a piece of national history. So perhaps now, with the glitter of a prehistoric site found by archeologists, attempts will be made to fund both the preservation and the further excavation of the area.
What Melissa has to say here about funding for preservation is something for the public, the audience outside the classroom that has the ability to change. She is saying, “We have a historical site. . . . Let’s not change it, but continue to fund excavation.” She does not appear to be writing with the tentative voice of a student here, but rather with the voice of a concerned adult who has some professional training and an ecological conscience. It is the voice of a subscriber writing an open letter to the editor of a local newspaper. She has gone from being a passive recipient of knowledge to public educator and agent for change.

Helen

Unlike Rhonda and Melissa, Helen was a practicing professional, a registered respiratory therapist who had been in the field for 8 years. Her second paper on how to interpret an archeological site reflected her background. She told me that public access to her writing did not “bother her” and that she did not think the logbook would “be a big deal.” Nor did she reflect on the public audience as she constructed her first paper on how to organize an archeology project. However, with her second paper, a piece she calls medical archeology, she worried that she might offend someone.

For this paper, Morenon requested that students do some interpretive work based on the data analysis that took place in the last class. My second visit to Morenon’s indoor classroom occurred on August 8, the last class of the summer session. At the left side of the room, there was a floor to ceiling display case, about a foot deep, enclosed with sliding glass doors and containing some stone heads, plaster casts of various “peoples” around the world.

Students were given carefully labeled and sorted bags with artifacts from each of the 46 test pits. Each test pit bag had a number of smaller bags containing the findings and a small yellow card called the “excavation record card,” representing each 10-centimeter layer in the pit. The rocks were quartz, quartzite, and hornblende. Some students found broken pieces of sewer pipe and “flakes,” or what Morenon described as the whittlings from Native American arrowheads. As Melissa commented, “My god, we found all this stuff,” and Morenon noted, “And all of this was invisible to you [before excavation].”

As the class proceeded, students became anxious, asking what Morenon was looking for in their second paper on how to interpret an archeology site. Morenon encouraged them to link their ideas with the evidence. Helen continually noted that she did not feel she had enough evidence. Morenon’s responses invited speculation: “To me every excavation poses a question that can be answered, like ‘I wonder what happened here.’” Morenon was asking them to create knowledge, and Helen appeared more accustomed to working with received data. Morenon suggests that Helen’s response was a typical one:

Helen is thinking inductively, like the history or English student that is looking for a critical document that they will “interpret.” I do emphasize that excavation is usually deductive in its structure—you ask the question first, and then seek the evidence, through the excavation, to answer that question. Students are used to reading, which they see as “evidence,” and then “interpreting.” Of course they are usually just describing what someone else said, reorganizing the evidence. Students need to
discover that summarizing what others have said is not interpretation. Artifacts don’t talk, so Helen needed to ask a question first.

Mary Rose O’Reilley tells us in *The Peaceable Classroom*, “I think that students . . . write better essays about what they themselves notice than about what they have been told by critics and teachers to look out for” (24). Yet, when suddenly thrust into this level of intellectual responsibility, students can panic. To me, Helen seemed very anxious. At one point, Morenon referred to a “hypodermic needle” that he and his assistant, Skip, had found, and Helen asked if the class could see it. As a medical professional, she immediately recognized the object as an antiquated piece of phlebotomy equipment, not as a hypodermic needle at all.

I found her ensuing paper to be an interesting report on the sanitary conditions of the school, although initially I worried that this topic was far removed from the bags of artifacts the class sorted and analyzed; I worried, on her behalf, that she might not be following directions. Fortunately, her paper received 19 out of 20 points (the highest grade I saw), and the comment,

This essay is very good. You have done a nice job considering a range of health concerns. You might have started your paper with a question, but the overall structure makes sense without that device. The paper would be stronger with more physical evidence: artifacts, maps, floor plans; and with more oral and written evidence: comments by residents, public records. In 1890, for example there was a committee hearing on issues of abuse, inadequate food, etc. There are also records at DCYF (Department of Children, Youth, and Families).

Morenon’s comments show that he takes this student’s work very seriously. Encouraging further professionalization, he writes, “You might consider working on a collaborative study with someone in nursing on an expanded version of this paper.” Apparently not anticipating this type of encouragement, Helen told me, “At first I thought he wanted me to rewrite my paper!”

The paper itself, as Helen explains, falls in the realm of “medical archeology”; it begins with a critical stance and ends with an unsupported positive conclusion. Her introductory paragraph ends with, “Although the State Home and School was established to cope with the community’s neglected children, evidence from the school’s history may support the idea that living arrangements and eventual overcrowding of the children may have contributed to high incidences of illness and even death at the school”. For example, in 1887, out of 110 children at the school, 73 had whooping cough or b. pertussis (3). She tells her readers that until a vaccine was invented in the 1940’s, “it was known as a killer of children” (3). The conditions allowed for facile spread of the disease: children “slept in open bays” with more beds than rooms were designed for. Keeping windows closed made the rooms warmer but created poor air circulation (3). Conditions were also favorable for the spread of tuberculosis, a disease that can lie dormant for years. In the paper she wonders if, through interviewing former residents, researchers might determine how many residents did become actively tuberculous. Shared unwashed toys might have contributed to the aggressive spreading of the common cold. She reports that in 1938, 54 children became ill from
“tainted” food and two died. The records show that 11 other children died during the school’s existence, and Helen expresses interest in exploring the causes of these deaths. Her evidence and speculations are disturbing, but the paper concludes with nothing but praise for an institution that created an otherwise safe place for children and separated them from criminals: “The health status of the children of the State Home and School may never be fully known. What is known is that the school provided an invaluable service to the children of the state for many years” (emphasis mine).

In a subsequent email exchange and interview, I questioned Helen’s use of the word “invaluable” at the end of a paper that convincingly argued that the sanitary conditions were not what they could have been. While she told me that she did not give much thought to a public audience when she wrote in her logbook, recording but not speculating about facts, the question of audience was very much in her mind as she wrote the second paper. This paper was “more what I thought . . . and I began to worry that someone would be offended” by a discussion of improper hygiene “because the school did a great service to the community.” I now think Helen was able to balance the differing aspects of the school, but the word “invaluable” reminded me of many freshmen essays that describe very troubling incidents yet end with proclamations of never-ending friendships or true love or other immutable sentiments in which young people are still capable of believing. Morenon adds humorously, “She is also unsure of the accuracy of her ‘interpretation.’ She does not want to go out on a limb because she thinks that someone will discover that definitive evidence that disproves her claim. So, she takes the middle road: ‘Everyone died, and they were happy in the end.’”

For Helen, the paper presented the first time she had to write something based on inferences. She was not working from anyone else’s findings. As she told me, “This [paper] is mostly my thoughts about what the evidence could possibly mean.” In only one other class as an undergraduate was she asked to make inferences. Thus, Morenon’s assignment provided an intellectual challenge. Morenon values the intellectual abilities of his students. His pedagogy works to enhance cognitive acquisition in a way that develops the students’ thinking abilities and confidence in expository and archeological skills.

Aspects of Pedagogy to be Imitated

I cite Rhonda’s email response to an earlier draft of this essay to help me draw to a close: “It was enlightening to think that your work might be used by other professors to encourage a happier writing environment” (19 June 2004). By contrast, Rhonda told of a response that offended her that came from another member of the school’s anthropology department. On the first day of that other class, students were asked a question and directed to freewrite a response. Rhonda said when the professor collected her writing, she said aloud, “Next time you might want to write more.” Rhonda was offended by this comment. “She hadn’t even read my response. How did she know I hadn’t fully responded to the question?” Students are uncomfortable living with a fear of being brought up short. In a class governed by caring for the whole person, the student feels that the teacher is rooting for her and eager to see her work in the best light. In such an atmosphere, the student feels freer to explore and generate her own analysis as we see in Helen’s paper on the sanitary conditions of the State Home and School.
Morenon is not a Jesuit, but he is affiliated with The American Friends, and the pedagogy of Quaker educator Mary Rose O’Reilley as expressed in *The Peaceable Classroom* provides a look at a secular version of the pedagogy of *cura personalis*. O’Reilly speaks of compassion as a form of critical inquiry, and the book’s second chapter is entitled “Inner Peace Studies and the World of the Writing Teacher,” where she confidently declares that she distrusts any pedagogy that does not begin in the personal (1) or conclude in the communal (62) where it is “subject to the checks and balances of others, the teacher, the tradition, the texts” (61). This approach is surely compatible with *cura personalis*, and Morenon clearly exemplifies this Jesuit philosophy. What I learn from Morenon is a spirit of generosity toward student analysis. Instead of immediately looking for the shortcomings or errors, why not see what is new that we can learn from the student, treating the person as a colleague?
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