

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

VOLUME II

NUMBER 1



JUNE 1939

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

The JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, September, December, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit high schools, colleges, and universities of the United States.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S. J.

Managing Editor

ALLAN P. FARRELL, S. J.

Associate Editors

CAROL L. BERNHARDT, S. J.	JAMES A. KING, S. J.
GEORGE D. BULL, S. J.*	JOSEPH C. MULHERN, S. J.
MAURICE G. FLAHERTY, S. J.	CHARLES M. O'HARA, S. J.
BERNARD J. WUELLNER, S. J.	

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

MICHAEL A. CLARK, S. J.	<i>Maryland-New York Province</i>
HUGH C. DUCE, S. J.	<i>California Province</i>
MATTHEW J. FITZSIMONS, S. J.	<i>Maryland-New York Province</i>
JOHN W. HYNES, S. J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>
JOHN J. KEEP, S. J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
WILLIAM J. MCGUCKEN, S. J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
JULIAN L. MALINE, S. J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
WILLIAM J. MURPHY, S. J.	<i>New England Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE MANAGING EDITOR

6525 SHERIDAN ROAD • CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

166323

* Died May 27, 1939.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

June 1939

CONTENTS

CATHOLIC YOUTH IN EUROPE AND AMERICA <i>John LaFarge, S. J.</i>	5
THE EXPANSE OF AMERICAN JESUIT EDUCATION <i>Charles M. O'Hara, S. J.</i>	14
OBJECTIVES IN TEACHING PHILOSOPHY <i>James A. McWilliams, S. J.</i>	19
JESUIT RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION <i>Wilfrid Parsons, S. J.</i>	24
RESEARCH AND THE JESUIT TEACHER <i>Austin G. Schmidt, S. J.</i>	27
TESTS OF A GOOD JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL <i>William S. Bowdern, S. J.</i>	30
TESTS OF A GOOD JESUIT COLLEGE <i>Arthur A. O'Leary, S. J.</i>	33
THE TRAINING OF OUR HIGH-SCHOOL FACULTY <i>James A. King, S. J.</i>	37
RECOGNITION BY THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNI- VERSITIES <i>Thurber M. Smith, S. J.</i>	40
INTELLECTUAL AND SPIRITUAL STIMULATION OF STUDENTS <i>D. A. Keane, S. J.</i>	44
RECRUITING A DESIRABLE STUDENT BODY <i>John F. Connolly, S. J.</i>	46
THE IMPORTANCE OF HIGH-SCHOOL TEACHING AS AN ACA- DEMIC AND APOSTOLIC CAREER <i>Thomas L. Matthews, S. J.</i>	48

INTER-FACULTY RELATIONS	
<i>Richard F. Grady, S. J.</i>	50
FACULTY STABILITY IN OUR HIGH SCHOOLS	
<i>Nicholas H. Mann, S. J.</i>	52
TRAINING OF THE COLLEGE FACULTY	
<i>Joseph R. N. Maxwell, S. J.</i>	54
THE CLASSICAL CURRICULUM IN THE HIGH SCHOOL	
<i>Hartford F. Brucker, S. J.</i>	56
THE A. B. CURRICULUM	
<i>John E. Grattan, S. J.</i>	58
NEWS FROM THE FIELD	59
CONTRIBUTORS	65

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

INDEX TO VOLUME II

June 1939 to March 1940

Articles are entered under both author and subject headings. Book reviews are listed under the author of the book, with title in italics and the name of the reviewer in parenthesis. The figures refer to the initial page of the articles.

Accrediting Agencies, Revolt against. William J. McGucken.....	127
Alumni College, The Canisius. A. Ralph Carli.....	100
Aristotelian Society of Marquette University. Gerard Smith.....	143
Art and the Objective Mind. William F. Lynch.....	78
Association of American Universities, Recognition by. Thurber M. Smith....	40
Baxter, Edward J.: The Master of Arts in Teaching at Harvard.....	183
Books, Check List of Significant.....	155, 212
Bowdern, William S.: Tests of a Good Jesuit High School.....	30
Brucker, Hartford F.: The Classical Curriculum in the High School.....	56
Butts, R. Freeman: <i>The College Charts Its Course</i> (A. G. Brickel).....	198
Carli, A. Ralph: The Canisius Alumni College.....	100
Catholic Student Peace Federation, Convention of New England. Patrick J. Higgins.....	102
Catholic Youth in Europe and America. John LaFarge.....	5
Classical Curriculum in the High School, The. Hartford F. Brucker.....	56
College, Toward a Liberal. W. Eugene Shiels.....	71
College without Credit. John F. Quinn.....	97
Connolly, John F.: Recruiting a Desirable Student Body.....	46
Curriculum, The A. B. John E. Grattan.....	58
Delanglez, Jean: <i>Frontenac and the Jesuits</i> (Charles H. Metzger).....	212
Donnelly, Francis P.: <i>Cicero's Manilian Law</i> (R. F. Grady).....	159
Doyle, William C.: Introducing Freshmen to Science.....	108
English, Michael I. and William L. Wade: <i>Rebuilding the Social Order</i> (A. G. Brickel).....	159
Faculty, Training of College. Joseph R. N. Maxwell.....	54
Faculty, Training of Our High-School. James A. King.....	37
Faculty Relations, Inter-. Richard F. Grady.....	50
Faculty Stability in Our High Schools. Nicholas H. Mann.....	52
Falley, Louis A.: On Brightness in Writing.....	188
Freedom and Tenure, Academic. Report of Association of American Colleges..	202
Geerebaert-Collin-McCool: <i>Selections from the Greek Lyric Poets</i> (R. F. Grady).....	156
Grady, Richard F.: Inter-Faculty Relations.....	50
Grady, Richard F.: The Quadricentennial of the Society in Our Schools....	90
Grady, Richard F.: Revival of the Jesuit Theatre at Loyola, Baltimore.....	141
Grattan, John E.: The A. B. Curriculum.....	58
Henle, Robert J.: <i>Third Year Latin</i> (Richard M. Green).....	155
Higgins, Patrick J.: Convention of New England Catholic Student Peace Federation.....	102
Jesuit College, Tests of a Good. Arthur A. O'Leary.....	33
Jesuit Education, Expanse of. Charles M. O'Hara.....	14
Jesuit Education before the Public, Putting. Charles M. O'Hara.....	131
Jesuit Education before the Public, Putting: Opinions <i>Pro</i> and <i>Contra</i>	171
Jesuit Educational Association: Program of 1940 Meeting, Kansas City, Mo.	201
Jesuit Educational Association Research Committee. Austin G. Schmidt.....	105
Jesuit High School, Test of a Good. William S. Bowdern.....	30
Jesuit High Schools, Colleges, and Universities, Enrollment in, 1939-1940...	161

Jesuit Research, Characteristically. Joseph M. Marique.....	192
Jesuit Research and Publication. Wilfrid Parsons.....	24
Jesuit Teacher and Research. Austin G. Schmidt.....	27
Jesuit Theatre at Loyola, Baltimore, Revival of. Richard F. Grady.....	141
Kay, Joseph J., Jr.: The Symposium Society of the University of Detroit.....	144
Keane, D. A.: Intellectual and Spiritual Stimulation of Students.....	44
King, James A.: The Training of Our High-School Faculty.....	37
LaFarge, John: Catholic Youth in Europe and America.....	5
Leahy, Charles E.: The Religious Atmosphere of a Jesuit High School.....	129
Literature and the Too-Much-Praised. Walter J. Ong.....	93
Lynch, William F.: Art and the Objective Mind.....	78
McCabe, George V.: A Norm for Progressivism.....	195
McGucken, William J.: The Revolt against the Accrediting Agencies.....	127
McWilliams, James A.: Objectives in Teaching Philosophy.....	19
Madgett, A. Patrick: <i>Christian Origins, Part I</i> (Edward J. Hodous).....	157
Madgett, A. Patrick: Positive Theology for Students.....	103
Mann, Nicholas H.: Faculty Stability in Our High Schools.....	52
Marique, Joseph M.: Characteristically Jesuit Research.....	192
Martin, John H.: Progressivism and Jesuit High Schools.....	124
Master of Arts in Teaching at Harvard, The. Edward J. Baxter.....	183
Master's Theses at St. Louis University.....	154
Matthews, Thomas L.: Importance of High-School Teaching as an Academic and Apostolic Career.....	48
Maxwell, Joseph R. N.: Training of the College Faculty.....	54
Morrison, Bakewell: Meeting of the Institute of Religious Education, 1939....	138
News from the Field.....	59, 111, 146, 204
O'Hara, Charles M.: The Expanse of American Jesuit Education.....	14
O'Hara, Charles M.: Putting Jesuit Education before the Public.....	131
O'Leary, Arthur A.: Tests of a Good Jesuit College.....	33
Ong, Walter J.: Literature and the Too-Much-Praised.....	93
Parsons, Wilfrid: Jesuit Research and Publication.....	24
Parsons, Wilfrid: More Writers from Our Colleges?.....	119
Parsons, Wilfrid: <i>Which Way, Democracy?</i> (A. G. Brickel).....	156
Philosophy, Integration of Undergraduate Courses in. Bernard J. Wuellner...	83
Philosophy, Objectives in Teaching. James A. McWilliams.....	19
Progressivism, A Norm for. George V. McCabe.....	195
Progressivism and Jesuit High Schools. John H. Martin.....	124
Quinn, John F.: College without Credit.....	97
Reinhardt, Charles H.: <i>An Outline of Roman History</i> (Raymond V. Schoder)	158
Religious Atmosphere of a Jesuit High School. Charles E. Leahy.....	129
Religious Education, Meeting of the Institute of (1939). Bakewell Morrison	138
San Francisco, Credo of the University of.....	187
Schmidt, Austin G.: Jesuit Educational Association Research Committee.....	105
Schmidt, Austin G.: Research and the Jesuit Teacher.....	27
Science, Introducing Freshmen to. William C. Doyle.....	108
Shiels, W. Eugene: Toward a Liberal College.....	71
Simon, Henry W.: <i>Preface to Teaching</i> (Harry B. Furay).....	95
Smith, Gerard: The Aristotelian Society of Marquette University.....	143
Smith, Thurber: Recognition by the Association of American Universities....	40
Society of Jesus, Quadricentennial of in Our Schools. Richard F. Grady.....	90
Student Body, Recruiting a Desirable. John F. Connolly.....	46
Students, Intellectual and Spiritual Stimulation of. D. A. Keane.....	44
Sullivan, Francis A. (Ed.): <i>Cicero's Oratorical Education</i> (A. G. Brickel)...	212
Symposium Society at the University of Detroit, The. Joseph J. Kay, Jr.....	144
Teaching, Importance of High-School as Academic and Apostolic Career. Thomas L. Matthews.....	48
Thayer-Zachry-Kotinsky: <i>Reorganizing Secondary Education</i> (Julian L. Maline)	134
Theology for Students, Positive. A. Patrick Madgett.....	103
Writers from Our Colleges, More. Wilfrid Parsons.....	119

Writing, On Brightness in. Louis A. Falley.....	188
Wuellner, Bernard J.: Integration of Undergraduate Courses in Scholastic Philosophy.....	83

Catholic Youth in Europe and America¹

JOHN LAFARGE, S. J.

Comparisons of youth in Europe and youth in America have been familiar to us since our earliest years in the Society. They have usually followed along a traditional line of comparing (rather unfavorably) the treatment allotted to much-supervised urchins in the Jesuit boarding schools of Italy and France with the capacity of young America to achieve a manly piety while left by the prefects considerably to himself.

Today, however, the comparison is in another field and upon a different plane. It is no longer a question of diverse educational regimes, national habits, and psychologies, but a question of adapting ourselves in the United States to that specific phenomenon which has swept the whole of Europe like a storm. Great masses of youth are impelled with tremendous energy along the lines of youth programs. These youth ideologies violently conflict with one another; and echoes of the conflict reach us on this side of the ocean. Governments and nations are created by youth and youth programs. The following comparisons, therefore, are made with reference to this situation.

Varied experiences of a European trip in the summer of 1938 brought me in contact with members and leaders of outstanding youth movements, Catholic and otherwise. The most obvious difference lay therein that Catholic youth on the Continent, like youth of every description in those countries, differed from youth in this country by its whole-hearted acceptance of the *Weltanschauung* or 'philosophy of life' idea. Some manifestations of this phenomenon were quite startling. I found, for instance, that Catholic young men and women in Germany, particularly the young women, had worked out an extraordinarily compact summary of Catholic doctrine and practice, under a half dozen headings, in *Weltanschauung* form, based on the idea of the supernatural life in Christ, which was being used in personal contact to fortify the faith of Catholic boys and girls exposed to the devastating influence of the rural labor service in remote, Protestant sections of the Reich. In France and Belgium the members of the Jocist and allied movements had acquired

¹ Paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., April 14, 1939.

an unusual facility in declaring the Christian philosophy of life and in converting others to their interpretation of it. In Italy, I found that social-minded young Catholic Fascisti were quite satisfied when I told them that young American Catholics followed the democratic philosophy of life and despised the Fascist idea. They did not seem to mind if we differed from them, as long as we had some ideology to correspond to their own. Unlike the Jocists, however, they seemed to keep their Catholic and their Fascist philosophies in separate compartments. One expected an explosion if and when the walls of the compartments should break down. Most of the Fascist ideology, in their own words, could be reduced to the simple proposition, "Believe in the Duce." *Crederè, ubbedire, combattere*. The Duce provides plenty of formal object for those who wish to make an act of faith in him.

In Europe, the sharp division of classes greatly facilitates the spread of ideologies. Boys of fourteen are fixed as workers for life, or as students and hence out of the workingmen's class for life. Hence the sense of adventure, the adventure of the Crusades, experienced by the European Catholic Actionist in pushing out the Catholic philosophy of life into various traditionally forbidding areas. The most spectacular results are accomplished in such unusual areas; such as, for instance, among the sons of industrial magnates, supposedly impervious to Christian social and religious principles; among the factory workers, par excellence; among the hard-bitten peasantry, with their indurated division of every town and village between Liberals and Freemasons on one side of the spiritual fence and the pious relics of ancient Catholic tradition on the other; among the boursiers or Stock Exchange employees in Brussels, under the dynamic Father Laureys, S. J., with his *Amicale de Saint-Mathieu*, and the companion movement in France; in aviation circles, just starting up last summer; even among the debutantes. One active group of fashionable young men and women had elaborated a Jocist program for this neglected group and their male admirers. They even had a special section of invalid debutantes who were deprived of admirers. Apparently the plan works, for they have branches all over the country, and their requirements, from a spiritual standpoint, are good and stiff.

Decisive, too, is the difference in rôle between the Continental educational system, with its comparatively narrow scope, and our own. The school in Europe does not provide so satisfying and complete a social environment as does the American school or college; nor does it shut off the student from participation in political affairs. Sport is more play or polite athletic display and less of a warfare between scholastic communities; a fact which made American football fall rather flat last autumn

in Paris, when the French public, under a curious misapprehension, wildly cheered the team every time its members went into a huddle.

Add to this the natural articulateness of European youth, especially in the Latin countries; the freer use of symbol and appeals to the imagination and the communal sense; the violent reaction against the youth programs of Communism, Naziism, and Fascism; the very real difference of operating in countries still in the shadow of an age-old Catholic tradition, reflected in art, buildings, songs, customs, and stories; the ability to get life and fun out of extremely scant material means, a bicycle or a guitar; a willingness to plan and self-impose a vigorous regimentation in the interest of the common good, seen for instance in the admirable work of the youth hostels; a keener interest in basic human needs, in concrete social problems affecting their own specific class; a readiness on the part of young women teachers and social workers to share without reserve the hard conditions of the people among whom they work—miners, peasants, factory workers; many practical derivatives from the rude discipline of military training; an almost painful sense of obligation to their several countries, which depend upon them for defense and future existence: all of these are some of the fine qualities of European Catholic youth to which it is a pleasure to pay tribute, without detracting from the conviction that the Catholic youth of America present the brightest hope for the future of religion and the maintenance of civilization in the world. Nor can we pass over another trait, a boundless curiosity of the student elements about everything American. This will doubtless result in increasing study pilgrimages to the United States.

Without wearying you by listing traits and circumstances of American youth known to all of us, let me pass at once to the problem which lies before Catholic educators in this country: the formation of a youth program adequate to preserve our youth from the contagion of destructive ideologies, which will place in their hands an effective spiritual instrument for the building of a Christian social order, which will fit them to take the part that God expects of them in the life of the Church and of our country. Only such a program will enable them to escape from the deadly and delusive dilemma of a choice between Communism or Fascism.

The problem is obviously many-sided. I merely wish, in the light of what has been said, to point out a couple of decisive aspects, and in so doing to make a plea for what I think is our most essential line of conduct.

A youth program, to meet the insistent challenge of the ideologies, must possess, among other essentials, two eminent traits: *spiritual dynamism* and *practical efficacy*: efficacy, that is to say, in bringing the Catholic idea directly to bear upon the pagan society in which we live.

If the program lacks an overmastering spiritual dynamism, youth will

satisfy its craving for dynamism from other sources, and fall prey to the demagogues, of the pious or of the impious variety. But the source of our spiritual dynamism is plain. It is written large in the fundamental meditation on the Kingdom of Christ. The conquering force of a youth program, sponsored by Jesuit educators, comes from the Divine Person of Christ, whose compelling Humanity we, as a society of priests, make known to the world through our religious teaching: *spargentes sacram doctrinam*.

Experience and reason witness that the more complete is our interpretation of the Person of Christ, the more we give to the world the *entire Christ*, the *totus Christus*, the more dynamic will our teaching be. Christian religious teaching lacks force and pungency; it becomes, as Saint Augustine says, a mere vegetable and not a mustard seed, when it gives to youth a partial Christ, a stunted Gospel.

The ideologies derive their power from totalism: an *objective* totalism, that is to say, an ideal which embraces the whole field of human action; and a *subjective* totalism, that is to say, a total, unqualified self-oblation or *Hingabe* to that ideal. Yet where can we find any school of subjective totalism to compare with the Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius? As Father Hardy Schilgen so effectively shows, in every meditation from the Foundation to the *Contemplatio ad Amorem* they teach the most selfless oblation or *Hingabe*. If, still in the Ignatian spirit, delving into sacred theology, we perfect and amplify the objective Christological content of the Exercises; perfect, too, amplify, modernize, and actualize their dramatic mechanism, we are well equipped to meet the onslaught of totalist dynamism. This is not the work of specialists; this is the work of us all; it is of the essence of our priestly and our religious vocation.

Christ in the depths of the individual human personality which is transformed through supernatural life; Christ living, praying, and acting in the mystically organized membership of the Universal Church, are two master concepts which today must be brought out with piercing clearness and compelling reason, imagery, and force in order to fit our youth with theological armor. Insistently necessary, too, is to recall in new and convincing form those great 'majors' of our apologetic syllogisms, which have dropped out of consciousness in a pagan age: the idea of objective truth, of worship, of God's interest in man; of Providence; of destiny. We need, too, to explain much more fully than was needed in former years the part played by natural human institutions, the family, the economic community, and the state, in the Kingdom of Christ; and thus give our bewildered youth a firm foothold to stand upon, between the abyss of exaggerated supernaturalism, on the one hand, and mere humanitarianism, on the other.

Yet, as priests and religious teachers, how can we supply the other ingredient: immediate, efficacious application of these principles to the concrete situation around us?

We can and should do so within the narrow boundaries of those situations subject entirely to our control, such as our educational institutions and our churches. In the little worlds that we directly administer and rule, we should exemplify in all literalness and uncompromisingness the application of our spiritual teachings, as in a laboratory where all the world may learn.

But in heaven's name how can we, as a small group of priests, hope to work out for our youth, or for the Catholic laity in general, all the *applications* of these same principles in the thousandfold situations of their daily lives? Even if we possessed the supermen and the superenergy to achieve such results, even if we could build up another Paraguay, how would it endure? What political and financial entanglements would it not draw us into? This remark by no means undervalues the practical contributions that a priest may occasionally bring to the troubled world. It does not overlook the fact that in the mission field the priest must frequently be a jack-of-all-trades, from motor-boat mechanic to adviser of princes and mandarins.

When you visit Ljubljana, in Jugoslavia, you see the countrywomen carrying their produce to town in a sort of baby buggy. This, you are informed, was the invention of a former Jesuit professor in our college of that city; and Ljubljana's river was engineered and landscaped by a Jesuit. Civilization is filled with beneficent inventions, scientific and social, of priests and religious teachers. Nevertheless, these are but beacon posts in the cultural mission of the Church. The ability of the religious teacher to find efficacious applications of the Gospel to life's innumerable concrete situations varies inversely with the complexity of the social scene: such as the problems of professional and business milieux; of the trades unions; of the agrarian groups; of interracial and international situations; not to speak of the overwhelming problems of unemployed youth in the United States!

Our effectiveness, as Jesuits, in constructing a youth program that will combine the two traits of spiritual dynamism and practical efficacy, will depend, in my opinion, upon the definiteness with which we assign the proper rôles to ourselves and to the young people we work with. Our proper rôle is that of religious teachers. We are not called to be what we can never be: sources of universal wisdom covering every phase of the apostolate and all social and economic and political relationships. We are not, and can never hope to be, a society of clerical Mussolinis.

To youth we assign the rôle of discovering concrete applications for

daily life of the dynamic principles which as priests and religious teachers we have imparted to them. We do not merely assign to them this rôle; we urge it upon them; we plead with them through their love for the Sacred Heart of our Savior to take it upon themselves. We impress upon them the motives therefor. We make it a capital fruit of our liberal education. We see it incorporated in our professional and graduate education; if not through the actual subjects studied, at least through expert spiritual guidance and abundant extra-curricular activities.

We labor with youth in the fulfillment of their task; counseling, encouraging, and providing for them principles of technique which will aid them in forming their own conclusions. Relative to this work we are moderators, not leaders. Here and there through the country we can point to specialists in social or economic science or the technique of Catholic Action to whom, as to any other educational specialists, our youth may look for competent guidance in particular problems. We consult such specialists ourselves. But all we personally render is our counsel or warning. The task itself falls squarely upon the layman, young or old. Upon us falls the terrific responsibility of so forming our young people in the principles of the Gospel that they will be competent now and later to find the practical economic, social, and political solutions which will exemplify Catholic teaching in modern society.

If they have thoroughly absorbed this teaching, they will direct themselves into those situations which call for special self-sacrifice, which challenge Christian humility and heroism. It is in those tense situations that the dynamism of our faith is made manifest; where the ideologies are met on the battle front.

A clear recognition, therefore, that in this field we are moderators, not leaders *per se*, will save us from scattering our forces over a field which is not properly ours, and can only detract, by such scattering, from the leadership which does belong to us in the field of religious and moral principles. This does not mean that we lose time when we prepare ourselves for spiritual leadership in social matters, through personal analysis of typical social problems. Such personal analysis is educative for us, it sends us searching for the spiritual medicine that can remedy such types of distress. But it remains an educative process; an initiation into the field of leadership that is properly ours. St. Ignatius prescribed the hospital experiment and pilgrimage for the novices not in order to make his future priests infirmarians or wandering mendicants. He wished to give them that spiritual formation that can only be learned by direct contact with human suffering and destitution.

A confident assertion that our leadership proper lies in our vocation as priests and teachers of religion will not interfere with the privileged

position of Jesuit specialists in social sciences. On the contrary, it will place the specialists' work in a position where it will be most fruitful; it will lighten, not render more difficult their task. It will encourage the genuine and competent specialist, and free us from that dilettantism which often passes for social studies.

We need no new organization, no alteration in the traditional constitution of the Sodality nor of the Apostolate of Prayer or any departure from the great lines of the Spiritual Exercises. But a tremendous task lies ahead of us in placing adequate spiritual weapons in the hands of our youth; and—an equally difficult task—in giving them that *confidence* which is now so woefully absent from our Catholic laity in the *power* of those spiritual weapons. They will be told, sometimes by Catholic lay leaders or professors, that society cannot be reformed by idealism; that men and nations will continue to fight and play practical politics despite our ideals and theories. But the weapons we place in their hands are not mere ideals or mere theories. They are the truths of revealed Faith, the apostolic word of God; and they must learn to wield that word as they would wield a two-edged sword.

Much is said about the need of making our youth militant. But militancy is a metaphor. St. Ignatius used it of religious teaching, not of mass pressure and baiting of unbelievers. The most effective weapons are not those which make the most noise but those which win the war; and the weapons which will win the war for Catholic youth are the weapons of personal purity, scrupulous honesty, wholesouled religious practice, overflowing manly charity and practical spirit of cooperation in a selfish, sensual, and pagan world. There are moments and occasions when we need to set off some rockets and disconcert the wicked. Such moments are a picnic for the fanatical minded. But the moments pass; let the fanaticism pass with them; and let us conquer with Christ's weapons, not with sound and fury borrowed from the Marxians.

The bearings of this idea may be made clearer if a word is said as to the specific situation of American youth.

America's strength among the different countries of the world lies in the numerical predominance, self-respect, and solidity of her middle class. This class with us is not subservient to a ruling caste, as in Great Britain; stolidly self-centered, as in France and Belgium; demoralized and disillusioned as in Germany; state-absorbed, as in Italy; uncertain and upstart, as in Central Europe.

Catholic higher education in this country has centered itself squarely upon the middle class, which, unlike the European bourgeoisie, includes a good part of our American labor groups and the bulk of our land-owning farmers. The Catholic Church in America is organized largely

upon a middle-class basis. From it are drawn most of her prelates, pastors, and educators. The Society of Jesus in the United States has adapted itself to the general Catholic line. We, too, have built up our work and our membership not upon the narrow pedestal of the Social Register group, who are marginal in any civic or political sense, even if highly ornamental; not through the proletariat, but through the great bulk of our people who are moderately self-sustaining and independent, whose typical way of living constitutes the typical American way, by whom the country—with all respect to the international bankers—is largely governed.

Our identification with the middle class offers certain disadvantages. It narrows our sympathies. It places us out of touch, to a considerable extent, with the rapidly increasing proletarian groups, urban and rural and racial, and the problems that agitate them. We have little contact with these groups save through our parish missions and some of our home missions and chaplaincies. But this disadvantage was outweighed in the past by the opportunity to build up a great system of Catholic education free from state interference; something the want of which is greatly felt among Catholics in Great Britain today. This limitation is outweighed at the present time by the opportunity that presents itself to the Catholic educator to render an indispensable service to our country and to the world by the preservation of the middle class. For if its middle class perishes, America perishes with it. If America perishes, all western civilization comes tumbling down.

Here lies the peculiar danger of Naziism and Fascism. Communism, it is true, makes its appeal to certain labor circles, to certain 'out' groups, to certain politically and educationally powerful elements: pedagogical theorists and economic brain trusters. But Naziism and Fascism appeal subtly to the middle class; racial and national prejudices help to prepare the way. Their doctrines are absorbed, to use the hallowed metaphor, like water into a sponge. Yet the middle class which absorbs these doctrines drinks its own death in the process. Behind the fair promises of Fascist or Nazi ideology comes the national Socialist juggernaut which grinds the middle class to powder in the interest of an omnipotent state; just as the workingman finds his rights ground to powder under Communism.

Shall we Jesuits, then, abandon our present post, acquired through generations of toil, and launch forth on a totally new apostolate, multiplying our practical problems, our financial worries, our intricacies of training, equipment, and personnel? Or shall we adopt a different strategy, one entirely in accord with our history and with the traditions already established of Catholic Action?

I believe we can answer this latter question in the affirmative pre-

cisely through the program of youth which I have just outlined. Our work is not to abandon the middle class, but to inspire the youth of the middle class with that apostolic knowledge, charity, and zeal which will send *them* out to the social frontiers, there to win souls and win society for Christ.

Through our priestly teaching and example we shall inspire our youth to save their own class from the devastating evils which threaten its existence, the craze for pleasure, the indifference to home stability and home ownership, the horror of manual labor, the slackness toward personal integrity and morality, the cynical distrust of spiritual ideals. Out of this class we shall form the apostles whose work will gain in permanence by its identification with the present character and the past tradition of our nation. In other words, we shall bring Christ to American society upon typically American lines.

In the near future, it may well be that we shall need to branch out to a greater extent into the vast field of specific spiritual guidance for the laity, young and old, where Father Lord has laid down the basic principles. More will need to devote themselves to particular problems of expert counsel as moderators of Catholic Action; we shall need more competently trained Jesuits as experts in social sciences in our colleges. This may cause disagreeable inroads into our personnel, insufficient as it is. But none the less, all such things are but incidents and auxiliaries to that great work to which we are all called, our leadership of youth as priests and priestly teachers and guides. In that priestly work our brothers and our scholastics take part quite as much as do our ordained priests; for our spirit is one and indivisible. The test of that priestly spiritual teaching is its flowering out in the practical, socially constructive efficacy of our disciples. The pledge of its success is the pledge of the Holy Spirit to us through our vocation in Jesus Christ.

The Expanse of American Jesuit Education

CHARLES M. O'HARA, S. J.

This paper describes statistically the Jesuit contribution to Catholic higher education in America. The emphasis falls chiefly, and significantly, on a decentralization which is characteristic of the existing Jesuit system and which tends to obscure its broad effectiveness.

First, there is a territorial decentralization. Refusing to remain, as they might have, in a single location, Jesuits have deployed forces in search of the student.

This was the appropriate thing to do, especially in America. Lay people seldom realize the extent to which the American college student goes to school near home, their attention being naturally directed to this or that unusual lad who travels far for his education. This student is no more typical of American education than is the school which draws its students from great distances. Neither is the national type. For example, during the last session, the University of Wisconsin drew 74 per cent of its students from its own state and 83 per cent from its own and contiguous states. Indiana drew 90.3 per cent of its students from its own state and 95 per cent from its own and contiguous states in the same year, while Nebraska was registering 92 per cent from its own state and 96.3 per cent from its own and surrounding states. Even Yale counts 72 per cent of its class of 1941 from the five closest states, where the distances are quite small. The high-born Clark University of Worcester is drawing 50 per cent of its students from the relatively small city of Worcester, 75 per cent from its own state, and 92 per cent from its own and the surrounding states.¹

American students go to school near home. The implication for Catholic educators is: unless you spread your forces, even at the expense of weakness and the loss of prestige, Catholic students will end up at schools without crucifixes in the classrooms.

Mere spread, however, is not enough. Locations should coincide with the potential student concentrations. Inquiry shows the foresight of earlier Jesuits on this point to have been outstanding.

For example, note the Jesuit coverage in the ten most populous states.

¹ Compiled from catalogues of the various institutions, latest editions.

Asterisks tell the story, while the number of individually organized institutions is given at the right:

*New York	8	*California	6
*Pennsylvania	2	*Michigan	2
*Illinois	3	*Massachusetts	3
*Ohio	4	*New Jersey	2
Texas	—	*Missouri	4

More interesting is an investigation of the chief population centers, the largest cities. These are the twenty largest, treated as above:

*New York	6	*San Francisco	2
*Chicago	3	*Milwaukee	2
*Philadelphia	2	*Buffalo	2
*Detroit	2	*Washington	3
*Los Angeles	2	Minneapolis	—
*Cleveland	2	*New Orleans	2
*St. Louis	2	*Cincinnati	2
*Baltimore	2	Newark	—
*Boston	2	*Kansas City	2
Pittsburgh	—	*Seattle	2

Eighteen of the twenty largest cities have the facilities of Jesuit education, Newark being adjacent to New York and Jersey City.

Conversely, only two of the ten cities next in size have Jesuit schools, and only one of the next ten.²

A consultation of the Catholic population gives the same results. The left-hand column lists the first states in order of Catholic population, with asterisks indicating Jesuit coverage, and the right hand column lists the first archdioceses in order of Catholic population, with asterisks indicating the presence of Jesuit institutions in the metropolitan cities:

*New York	3,279,454	*Boston	1,164,300
*Pennsylvania	2,145,246	*Chicago	1,159,390
*Massachusetts	1,839,854	*New York	1,000,000
*Illinois	1,513,381	*Philadelphia	840,000
*New Jersey	1,172,360	Newark	751,000
*Ohio	1,084,222	*Detroit	552,743
*California	1,030,202	*Milwaukee	450,000
*Michigan	934,869	*St. Louis	440,000
*Wisconsin	815,405	*San Francisco	410,000
Texas	694,238	*Baltimore	362,158

In the case of Newark, Jersey City is within the archdiocese.³

² Ranking of states and cities according to official census of 1930.

³ Population ranking compiled from *Franciscan Almanac*, 1939 edition, pp. 452-54.

American students in Catholic institutions profit by this coverage and the resources which it demonstrates. Jesuit colleges and universities for lay students in the country number twenty-four. This represents 13.7 per cent of all the Catholic colleges and universities in the country. But according to the latest published and comparable statistics, the Jesuit institutions are educating 44,721 students of the total enrolment of 113,230 in all Catholic higher schools, or 39.4 per cent of the total. Thus, about one-eighth of the institutions are educating about two-fifths of the students. The ratio is close to three to one. To digress, more than 24 per cent of all the women who are attending all forms of Catholic institutions open to lay people are registered in Jesuit institutions, and Jesuits are educating nearly one-sixth of all the major Catholic seminary students in the country.⁴

These percentages are borne out by the relative sizes of the institutions themselves. According to the latest edition of the generally accepted statistics for institutions of higher education published annually in *School and Society* by President Walters of the University of Cincinnati, thirteen Catholic institutions merit the right to be placed in the category, "Universities and Large Institutions of Complex Organization." Of these thirteen institutions, nine are Jesuit schools. It is interesting to note how the first few place in point of student enrolment. Jesuit schools are in second, third, fourth, and fifth places, followed by two non-Jesuit schools. First place is held by St. John's University of Brooklyn, New York. But with regard to the size of the teaching force engaged to instruct the students, Jesuit universities rank first, second, third, fourth, and fifth.⁵

The territorial spread indicated above was precisely what Catholic education in America needed, and the Jesuits have given it, at the expense of dispersion of their resources. To realize how great this dispersion has been, one has only to call to mind the names of the best known Jesuit universities and colleges in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to the Gulf, and consider the prestige and power that could be established had they been concentrated in one locality. Consider the educational power of the teaching resources of the 5,319 American Jesuits were they to be centralized, or, for instance, were they not to maintain almost twice as many missionaries as any other American Catholic organization and more than three times as many as the organization third in line, and so forth.⁶

The power of this immense educational organization has been dispersed, not only according to a territorial spread, but also, and, in this case, contrary to the Jesuit tradition of the secondary-college field, by a

⁴ Computed from official statistics of N. C. W. C., published in 1936.

⁵ Computed from statistics in *School and Society* 48:767, December 17, 1938.

⁶ Computed from *Franciscan Almanac*, 1939 edition, p. 297.

spread to university education. This may prove to be even more weakening than the factor of territorial spread. Only one or two of the characteristic types of university divisions can be considered here.

The contra-traditional development of Jesuit secondary-collegiate institutions into universities was in answer to a dire need of American Catholicity, and has had a marked effect on the developing vitality of Catholic culture. For example, in the case of the medical profession, not many years ago it was almost impossible for the majority of Catholic families in this country to secure the services and advice of a Catholic physician or surgeon in the medical crises that descend upon every home. In the light of the wave of unethical medical sentiment that has swept the country since then, where would Catholic culture be today without its splendid and available body of trained Catholic medical men? It was up to Catholic education in those earlier days to provide for the future, to shoulder the imposing ethical and financial responsibility of providing medical education. There are five Class A Catholic medical schools in the country, none of lower rank. All are in Jesuit schools.

Law presents another interesting example. Eleven of the fourteen Catholic law schools that are approved by the American Bar Association are Jesuit. It is due largely to these eleven schools that in this country today there is always and everywhere available a Catholic attorney of high principles who is ready to reconcile possible divorces, to reject questionable cases, and to serve all types of Catholic corporations and institutions for little or nothing.

The following table gives the number of non-Jesuit Catholic schools and Jesuit schools that are approved by the proper accrediting agencies in the various professions:

PROFESSION	NON-JESUIT SCHOOLS	JESUIT SCHOOLS
Architecture	2	0
Business	0	1
Dentistry	0	5
Engineering	0	3
Journalism	0	1
Law	3	11
Library Science.....	1	0
Medicine	0	5
Music	3	1
Pharmacy	3	2
Social Work.....	0	3
	—	—
Total.....	12	32

Thus, American Catholics rely on non-Jesuit schools for approved professional training in the fields of architecture (two) and library science (one). They may receive approved training in law, music, and pharmacy in both types of schools. In all other professions they have only the Jesuit institutions.⁷

The field of graduate studies is considered of great importance today, and rightfully so. A few years ago there were no Catholic scholars with Catholic training, and no American Catholic scholars who could find a Catholic post from which to train others in turn. The extent of the Jesuit contribution to these large deficiencies can be seen from the fact that Jesuit graduate schools according to the latest statistics register over 60 per cent of the students in Catholic graduate schools and employ over 60 per cent of the faculty members. The relative quality of the work in Jesuit institutions can be inferred from the fact that they confer only about 50 per cent of the degrees.⁸

The drain of this second type of spread on Jesuit resources is significant. In one Jesuit university, out of the thirty-eight Jesuits engaged in educational work, the equivalent of at least fifteen excellent full-time men are employed in these fields which are beyond the pale of Jesuit traditions. Were the traditions to be followed these thirty-eight men could conduct an outstanding collegiate institution, saving wholly the immense outlay for professional and graduate departments and lay professors.

The above described two-fold spread of resources, so necessary for Catholic education in this country, has been the sacrifice of the Jesuits. Their trials are not over; in fact a paper could be written to prove that the future is going to mean increasing strain on the most vital points. Badly needed help must come. Those in the logical positions to direct help must come to realize the extent of the Jesuit contribution, unknown today in comparison with its magnitude.

⁷ Compiled from N. C. E. A. Proceedings, 35th annual meeting, pp. 139-40.

⁸ Compiled from reports made to N. C. E. A. Committee on Graduate Studies, 1938.

Objectives in Teaching Philosophy¹

JAMES A. MCWILLIAMS, S. J.

A discussion has been raging for a number of years about the objectives of education, and, as concerns us particularly, about the objectives of our courses in philosophy, both graduate and undergraduate. The majority of teachers would, I presume, prefer to be left alone to teach the way they have always taught, and the way they were taught by their own professors, or at least by those professors whom they admired. Yet, in a meeting such as this, we cannot decline to take up this question, however extrinsic it may seem to philosophy proper.

Objectives which have been proposed are (1) interest in philosophy, (2) acquaintance with the literature of philosophy, and (3) the philosophical habit of mind.

Mere interest in philosophy produces the dilettante, and perhaps that is all that is aimed at in some secular institutions. But the second objective, acquaintance with the literature of philosophy, may be, I believe, two-fold: either it is purely informative as to fact, a knowledge of what has been published under the head of philosophy; or it may be a study of the genesis and development of philosophical thought from man to man and from age to age. This last is essential, I think, to graduate study at least. Then there is the habit of philosophical thinking. This can be regarded in three different ways. First it means the assembling of philosophical truths, or theses, which one regards as objectively certain, together with the ability to defend them against all opposing and variant opinions. In practice this is what is required of our scholastics in order to merit a *superavit* in the *De universa*. But the philosophical habit of mind has also been introduced into theology. Theology is divided into positive and rational. It is in rational theology that philosophy plays a part. Surely St. Thomas's *Summa* is sufficient warrant for our using philosophy in this manner. More particularly is this the case in our day when assaults on the faith are so numerous and are made from a basis of reason instead of revelation. This has necessitated the separation of apologetics from theology proper. Though philosophy is not the only natural science there

¹ An address delivered at the meeting of Jesuit teachers of philosophy, Xavier University, Cincinnati, December 29, 1938.

employed—historical and documentary criticism are others—philosophy nevertheless does take on the rôle of defender of the faith. There is a last meaning for philosophical thinking. It may mean the pure delight of philosophical speculation for its own sake.

For my part, I believe that pure philosophical speculation is reserved to the few who have the leisure and the capacity for it, just as is the case in mystical contemplation. Of course, as St. Thomas explains in his second Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles (C. I., No. 6), spiritual contemplation is quite different from philosophical contemplation; but both are practiced for their own sake, without direct thought of their bearing on ordinary life. That all who can should indulge in philosophical contemplation is indeed eminently desirable; and when one has finally broken away from texts and the constricting trammels of 'spot' sources, and can make philosophy his very own, then the experience is akin to and even surpasses the delights of poetry. Such an objective is certainly not to be banned, but it seems to me too high to require of everyone who takes up philosophy, and in any case it is experienced even by the best of men only at intervals. It is not an everyday goal for every man.

The practical objectives for the teaching and study of philosophy must, I believe, be found between the two extremes of dilettantism and pure contemplation. That leaves us with the history of philosophy as a factual and as a genetic study, and with systematic philosophy either as a mental discipline taking within its purview the whole of natural knowledge or as an instrument for the defense of the faith on rational grounds. This leaves us four subdivisions of objectives: two in history of philosophy and two in systematic philosophy. It should be evident that no one of the four excludes the others.

Father Miltner (*New Scholasticism*, October 1937, p. 350) makes a distinction between direct objectives and by-products. Can we, for instance, in the teaching of history of philosophy aim directly at the acquisition of the philosophical data of the past and hope that the student will work out for himself the genesis and development of philosophical thought? And in systematic philosophy will it be sufficient to give the definitions and arguments for a set of theses and trust the student to acquire for himself a personal grasp of the system, so as to be able to apply it to the multifarious new questions that arise continually, and at the same time defend it against all comers?

In answering these two queries I should like to make a distinction. We must distinguish between beginners and those who are proficient in philosophy. For beginners (let us say the undergraduates) I am convinced that the teacher must not only present the positive matter, but he must organize it for the student. In the history of philosophy this will

mean that the student is not merely to amass the raw material of philosophical literature; he is to be assisted by the teacher in singling out the salient doctrines, in discovering their sources in other philosophers, in comprehending their divergence from other doctrines, and the general trend whether of evolution or regression. In systematic philosophy (at the undergraduate level) the subject matter must be similarly organized by the professor; both the system itself must be clearly expounded, the inter-connection of the different parts or divisions must be explained, and the criticism of the system must be organized, as is usually done in the 'objections.' This I take to be the objective of the undergraduate teacher—to assist the student in organizing the history and the system taught.

Nor is this a case of indoctrination pure and simple. Indoctrination is the taking of the word of the professor, or of the text, uncritically. Indoctrination is excluded by two things: by the appeal to the personal reason and experience of the student, and by framing historical and reasoned objections against the doctrine presented, as well as the difficulties which the student himself may propose. In this way he learns to use his own mind in a reasoned acceptance of the subject matter of the course. In the history of philosophy it will mean an appeal to original sources for a confirmation of the facts and to secondary sources for an interpretation independent of the professor's. In systematic philosophy it means the reading of other texts, by preference the *Summa* of St. Thomas, and, for criticism, an appeal to each one's own personal experience, ultimately to sense experience, upon which all our knowledge is ultimately based.

If there is any need of a teacher at all, he must do these things for the student. We cannot turn students loose and expect them to find out everything by themselves. St. Thomas is explicit on this point. He says:

There are more people who can acquire truth by learning it from others than can discover it by themselves. And even every discoverer learns more from someone else than he discovers by himself. But since this learning from others cannot go back to infinity, it must be that men learn many things by personal discovery. And since all our knowledge begins with sensation, and many sensations make up experience, it follows that intellectual ability requires experience over a long time (*Ethnicorum*, No. 246).

The teacher's experience in the subject puts him in a position to assist the student, and yet not do so by pure indoctrination. This is surely true on the undergraduate scale.

For graduate work, the student is sufficiently equipped to venture out on his own resources. This means two things: the student is presented with new material not yet resolved by competent investigation, and it means that the director, instead of taking the rôle of leader, assumes that of *advocatus diaboli*. In the history of philosophy on the graduate level new texts may be investigated, or old texts subjected to newly organized

criticism. In systematic philosophy it means that new fields, such as the new physics, the new political science, the new monism, etc., are taken up in the light of the accepted system to discover how that system applies, or even where it may need revamping. The director is needed here to see that the student proceeds on solid ground and does not jump at conclusions. In systematic philosophy as a graduate study the history of the particular question must necessarily be studied, because without a knowledge of that history no such understanding of the question can be had as will enable the student to see its application to altogether new material, nor can one safely modify an accepted thesis until one has examined all the ways in which other thinkers have regarded it.

Should graduate philosophy, then, be historical or systematic? It must be both. Emphasis may be put on one or the other, but neither may be excluded. No one can effectively discuss the historical progress, or regress, of philosophy unless he has a thorough understanding of a comprehensive system, such as the Scholastic, which has points of contact with every other system. Without such equipment the student can never sufficiently grasp the exact point under dispute to be able to follow the history. Likewise, the systematic philosopher never really understands the meaning and bearing of any doctrine until he has seen it at first hand in its historical perspective.

The objectives, therefore, as I see them, are: for undergraduate work, the discipline of philosophical thinking, whether as a direct result or a by-product; for graduate work, the employment of this discipline in the conquering of new materials.

Should graduate study, then, be research? If you take 'research' in the sense given it by secular institutions—namely, the finding of new knowledge such that it falsifies all our old knowledge—then research is an *ignis fatuus*. But if research means, as it should, the discovery of new items of knowledge which must find a place among the old, either to replace some detail not too well thought out, or to enrich what was already there, then research is a necessary endeavor of all graduate study.

We have left only the objective of defense of the faith, or apologetics. When Hutchins condemned utilitarianism in education he meant 'jobs,' money-making; he did not mean to exclude anything like defense of truth. Hence the theologian may without scruple use philosophy in his apologetics. The teacher of religion in the college may also use it for that purpose. But it is not the objective of the teacher of philosophy as such. But we should not subscribe to the opinion that if a teacher has ever had a course in theology he is *ipso facto* excluded from the chair of philosophy. That is like saying that a man who has had algebra should never be allowed to teach arithmetic. It is, on the contrary, reasonable to

suppose that the wider acquaintance a man has had with his subject the better he is able to teach it at any level and in any course.

These, as briefly as I can summarize them, are the objectives which I think the teacher of philosophy should have in view. They are, moreover, the reasons why I contend that in our scholasticates the essentials of the whole of philosophy should be covered in two years, and that there should be two courses in third year, one for those working for a graduate degree in philosophy, and one for those who are not working for that degree.

Jesuit Research and Publication¹

WILFRID PARSONS, S. J.

It seems to me that we are faced with two cardinal points around which this whole discussion revolves, and that on that axis, as it were, we will find the truth. Those points are these: that there lies upon us as Jesuit professors in Jesuit colleges and graduate schools an obligation to produce scholarly writing that will affect our generation and those that come after; and secondly, that we are simply not fulfilling that obligation.

On the fact of the obligation I need say very little. A brief glance at any list of Jesuitica in any bibliography of the Old Society will show anyone that the Society took very seriously its obligation to contribute to the learned world the result of its researches in the whole field of the arts and sciences. In any given generation of, say, the early seventeenth century, there were literally hundreds of books from every nation which had a profound influence on the thought of their times. This literature ranged from the writing of poetry and drama, creative production, to the publication of the profoundest works on theology, philosophy, physical science, literary criticism, and history.

It must be remembered, too, that it was a time of the widest and most enthusiastic missionary work at home and abroad, of tremendous expansion in collegiate building, of intensive parochial work, just as our times are. The fact is, therefore, that the tradition of the Society is wholly on the side of research and writing.

If we turn to modern times, we find that the secular colleges and universities with which we supposedly are in competition make it almost a condition of employment that their professors engage in research and publication. In fact, the value of an educational institution is most often judged by the literary and scientific productions of its teaching staff.

If you say that this production is not uniformly of a very high grade I answer that this is simply not true. If you say that it very often contains the most pernicious errors, I agree, but would like to know whose fault that is. In the realm of pure history, for example, if a professor brings out a work which offends the canons of historical criticism, or is the fruit of prejudice rather than of research, then there are a dozen colleagues, who in book reviews and rival productions will take him to task and correct his falsehoods. If a shoddy piece of scientific research

¹ Paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., April 15, 1939.

escapes into the light, it is very quickly stigmatized for what it is and is rejected.

If, therefore, in the whole field of writing there are manifold errors in books that appear, mostly from the philosophical standpoint, it means that the learned world simply lacks one element that will set it right, and that is the contribution which the Catholic scholar should make, and does not make.

This brings us face to face, then, with my second fact, and that is that we Catholics, and we Jesuits in particular, are really not bringing to the learned world that part of the contribution which the interests of truth would demand that we bring.

Need I labor the fact? There are exceptions, of course, to my general rule. The fact that they stand out as exceptions shows that the rule is a valid one. The fact remains that very little, pitifully little, research is being done by Ours, and that what little is being done rarely sees the light of day. And I am ashamed to say that compared with two generations ago we are doing even less than was done at that time.

What is more important is to attempt to explore the causes of such an unfortunate situation.

I am bound to say at the outset that most of the causes usually alleged do not appeal to me particularly as having much weight. We are often told, for instance, that we have a great deal of scholarship, but it is of an absorptive kind, not productive. So far as that distinction has any meaning at all, it seems to me that it proves my case. In any circumstance, it is an explanation, not an excuse; and as an explanation it does not go very far.

We are told that our men are too overburdened with work to be able to write anything. I see no validity in this argument. In the first place, hardly a man of us has more than twelve hours of teaching in the colleges, and in the graduate schools still less. And in most cases we are teaching subjects that we are highly familiar with, and which need little proximate preparation. The fact of the matter, too notorious to need proof, is that the most prolific production is always done, and always has been done, by those who have most to do otherwise.

I would simply ask this: would the books get written and published if we had less to do? I think not. What we do not commonly understand is that books do not write themselves. They are a long, hard, laborious process. Research itself is painful; it consumes weeks and months of agonizing labor. If we think that lots of spare time is what is necessary to have books produced, we know little of what it means to write and publish. If we think that the process of writing is an automatic thing, merely requiring leisure to do it in, we have mistaken the whole essence of the problem.

I think, therefore, in all sincerity, that we cannot excuse ourselves for our desertion of the field of the publishing battle on the score that we have too many other things to do. It seems to me we must look elsewhere.

First of all, then, what causes books of the kind I have in mind, research of the sort I am discussing, to get themselves undertaken and written? I am taking for granted that the deepest motive, the zeal for truth and the salvation of souls, is present in Ours. Granted, then, that this supernatural motive is present, it seems clear that we must look further for the causes of our present condition. We must look to the natural motives which normally inspire and hearten the writer in his research and in writing his work of learning.

What are these natural causes?

First of all, there must be a great curiosity about and dissatisfaction with the state of knowledge on the particular field in which we are laboring. That is the germ from which all scholarly work proceeds. Without that intellectual curiosity, we shall not have any incentive to pursue any line of study further than the mere textbooks with which we happen to be acquainted. Without that intellectual dissatisfaction, we will not have the anxious desire to see truth probed more deeply and facts explored more widely.

I can, however, conceive it to be possible that this curiosity and this dissatisfaction may both be present without their subject being any further impelled to examination, research, and production. He must also have conceived a knowledge of his field so great as to have instilled into him a humility with regard to it, so that he feels abashed at his relative ignorance of it. The impulse to overcome this ignorance I conceive to be the strongest motive for research and writing. Complacency over one's own fancied omniscience is the surest hindrance to scholarship.

But still that is not enough. The research student who publishes his findings in writings must be willing to face the scourging agony of composition. I repeat, books just do not get themselves written. They are the product of infinite pains, hard-won accuracy, and thoroughness. Perhaps it is because people have got the idea that it is easy to write a book that so few books are written by us. The first faint touch of suffering in composing a work of any kind is frequently enough to persuade an easily persuaded conscience that book writing is not for us. When we make up our minds that research and writing are the products of the direst kind of self-sacrifice, then perhaps we will see the day when the Jesuits will take their place with the scholars of the country in the production of the works of scholarship which are awaiting us.

Research and the Jesuit Teacher¹

AUSTIN G. SCHMIDT, S. J.

I have been asked to discuss the values of research to the Jesuit teacher—that is, as I take it, the values of research to our organization as a whole, since whatever the individual Jesuit teacher undertakes is undertaken for the benefit of the entire group to which he belongs.

Research may be defined as the purposeful and orderly attempt to solve some problem by searching for evidence. As a piece of historical research, for example, one might undertake to discover what the post-school careers of our early graduates were and what influence they exercised upon their communities. When Father Robinson studied the extent to which Jesuit institutions in this country were using the radio for educational purposes, he was doing research of the survey type. Philosophical research has to do, in general, with problems of the wiser and better ways of doing things considered ethically, politically, or socially. For example, the only Catholic medical schools existing in this country at this time are under the control of the Jesuits. One who attacked the problem whether it is desirable or not that we should maintain medical schools (I do not at all mean to imply that we should not do so, but the question might be raised) would be embarking upon a piece of research of the philosophical type. The fourth and last type of research, experimental research, consists in setting up a controlled situation for the purpose of gathering evidence concerning the influence of some factor or for the purpose of comparing one method with another. If with one group of students we taught Latin by reading a comparatively small number of lines very thoroughly, and with another group by reading a larger number of lines with less insistence upon grammar and parsing, and then compared results for the purpose of determining whether intensive or extensive reading led to greater mastery of Latin, we would be doing research of the experimental type.

The essential feature of all research is that it represents an honest, impartial, objective, and scientific effort to gather whatever evidence is available for the solution of some problem. The man who approaches a problem with his mind already made up, and who seeks, not to collect, analyze, and critically evaluate all the evidence, but rather to search for

¹ Paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 15, 1939.

evidence supporting his antecedently formed opinion, is very far indeed from having the spirit of a true research worker.

There is no doubt about the fact that a very great deal of the educational research now being done is stupid, misdirected, and valueless. But, on the other hand, contributions of great importance have been made and are being made as a result of research. When I went to school as a boy we learned to read by first learning the alphabet. We do not teach children that way any longer. We first teach them to recognize entire words, phrases, and even sentences, and we are certain as a result of research that this is the better way. Grace Fernald, as the result of a quarter century of careful research, has discovered that children who have had difficulty with reading can be taught to read by the use of kinesthetic methods. Fifty years ago practically nothing was done or attempted for the child who had serious educational handicaps. Now in all our larger cities we have special classes for these problem cases—classes in which we do sensible and effective things that have resulted from years of study on the part of research workers.

I believe that we can distinguish three important values of research for the Jesuit teacher.

The first is that, if a teacher becomes imbued with the spirit of research, masters its technics, and attempts to carry it through even in a humble way, he will become a better scholar, a better teacher, and a better man.

The second is that activity in the field of research would make our schools, our Order, and our entire educational system more respected by men whose respect is worth having.

It is my bad fortune to have to read some two hundred educational and psychological journals every month. Years ago I came across in the old *Pedagogical Seminary*, founded by G. Stanley Hall and now known as the *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, a piece of research by a British Jesuit on the imagination of young children. That article was published in the 1880's. I know that a number of our men who received their degrees in education have published dissertations representing research of the finest type, but so far as I know the Jesuits, in the fifty years that have intervened between the publication of this research article and the recent appearance of Father Baxter's excellent research report in the *Educational Record*, have not submitted to any learned periodical a single research report in the field of education.

The third value of research is that it would result in the improvement of our teaching. Take the three subjects which we esteem most highly—religion, philosophy, and Latin. Surely much could be done to make our instruction in these subjects even more effective than it now is. The first

step toward improvement would be research of the survey type, by means of which we would ascertain precisely what we are attempting and what results we are getting. Next would follow research of the experimental type, undertaken for the purpose of testing certain hypotheses or of comparing certain methods.

Who can even imagine what work might be done if the tremendous ability and the man power of the Jesuits of the United States were used for the making of a concerted attack upon educational problems of interest both to us and to the profession in general? True, the individual Jesuit teacher is usually a busy man, nor has he in every case been trained in the use of research technics. But a plan for research could be worked out by some central board, entrusted to the regional directors, and executed by individual teachers under the direction of their principals. The inevitable result would be, first the accumulation of useful data, and secondly, the growth on the part of every participant in the spirit of research and in control of its processes.

I have already urged this concerted attack upon some selected problem. Present today are representatives from all the provinces in the United States. If we could take definite steps toward organizing some plan for research during the coming year, we would undoubtedly enjoy next year the satisfaction of listening to a research report containing data and conclusions capable of leading us onward in our quest for better and more effective methods.

Tests of a Good Jesuit High School¹

WILLIAM S. BOWDERN, S. J.

What is the purpose and end of education? It is to repair, with natural and supernatural means, the threefold loss of Adam in original sin, physical health, knowledge, and virtue. The child must grow in "wisdom and age and grace with God and man." St. Ignatius dedicated his Company to the education of "true and finished men of character."

The true test of a school is its product. Are our alumni a good product? The high school has a very important part in that product, for it builds the foundation on which college and university enlarge. What are its tests? How does it form its graduates?

The first test asks if the authorities and teachers are fully conscious and appreciative of their great apostolic work of training boys in high school. Are they fired with enthusiasm for their work? Is a fair proportion of our best men assigned to teach in the high school? By some of "the best men" in the province I do not mean necessarily men who combine the letters of the alphabet to make an imposing array of degrees, but men who are by nature good teachers, men who can teach and who like to teach. A good teacher knows that Phidias spent a lifetime chiseling a statue out of marble, and that a teacher's marble is the heart and soul of boys. A good teacher thrills over the thought and the work. How many such have you on your faculty?

The next test is the *esprit de corps* of faculty and administration. The rector, the principal, the prefect of discipline must be schoolmen and interested in everything that concerns the school. They must be men who can work with other men and with whom other men can work, harmoniously. The teachers must be interested and interesting in their teaching. All must be zealous and enthused, friendly, just, impartial, spiritual men with common sense and good judgment.

A good teacher is the busiest man in the world. What might be his spare time is taken up with boys who want to see him or whom he wants to see. Frequently during these informal periods the teacher's best work is done. He has no 'after-hours of leisure'; he has no time, literally, for

¹ Summary of an address given at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 11, 1939.

what some men call 'self-improvement.' His time is for the improvement of others. We have no good Jesuit high school if the teachers repair behind closed doors at three in the afternoon, and all the boys disappear as if by magic to the four corners of the city—all except the football squad. The most anemic boy and the least attractive one have souls as precious to God as that of the most popular boy in the school, and in nine cases out of ten they need our help far more than does the last named.

What of the student counsellors? They should be good men, set aside for the work because they understand and can help the boy, not mawkishly sentimental but men whom boys can approach. Among other things they should direct seniors to a life work, in business, in college, or elsewhere. Other teachers should participate in this work, as it is beyond the powers of one or two. Do the old graduates ever return to talk over matters with their old teachers? If they never come back we should question the influence we exert. Or does a frequent change of faculty make this impossible? All good schools carry men to be links between different generations of students.

Do we train the boys to be good men? Do they know their faith? Do they appreciate it, live it, love it? Are the sacraments more than a study? Are some inspired to do something big for Christ? The faith should be as natural to them as the air they breathe. Then will we produce "the true and finished men of character" of whom Pius XI wrote.

What of intellectual training? Our tradition points out our method. We do not aim to make our boys walking encyclopedias; we seek to discipline the mind. We begin by teaching the boy how to use his mind, how to study, how to analyze, how to think. Do our schools justify that boast? We next teach them how to use their English language, correctly, clearly, persuasively; we teach the boys the English language so that they can use it. Command of the vernacular presupposes the mental discipline; it is the fruit of the vine. And what of our devotion to the classics? Father Pernin wrote: "The boy should derive from the classics a mastery of language, a power of imagination, a force of expression, a breadth of judgment, and a finer spirit of culture. His understanding should be invigorated, his taste refined, his ideas broadened, and his sympathies deepened. He is a part of all he has met. He is a member of what Lord Bacon finely called 'the grand catholic communion of wisdom and wise men throughout all nations and all ages of the world.'" Does the high school impart this culture to its students?

The handmaid of culture is good manners, that fine sensibility of feeling of which Cardinal Newman writes. A good high school trains its boys to be perfect gentlemen; formally and informally it teaches,

exemplifies, and enforces good manners. Are our students cultured, courteous, well-mannered?

A good Jesuit high school trains its boys to be good citizens, truly loving their country, obedient to its laws, and respectful of its authority. They know their country, appreciate it, are grateful to it. They are deeply and genuinely patriotic, willing to serve and obey the country in time of peace and to die for it, if necessary, in time of war. Our record on this test is honorable.

In summary the test of a good Jesuit high school is the reaching of our Jesuit ideal, which I think is this: to develop young men with accuracy of mind, strength of will, power of clear thought and neat language, interested in things of the mind, refined in manner, loyal to country and to God, measuring all things with the yardstick of eternity. To do this, we must ourselves reach our own ideal as it is strikingly pictured for a Jesuit scholastic in the famous sketch written by Father Lucas in *At the Parting of the Ways*.

Tests of a Good Jesuit College¹

ARTHUR A. O'LEARY, S. J.

I

A Jesuit college, like any other college, consists of buildings and equipment, administration, a teaching staff, and curriculum. It includes some students as well.

1. We all desire to have our physical plant as perfect and as up-to-date as our income and our personal sacrifices allow. It is commonly said that we cannot compete with the more wealthy colleges, and that therefore our advantage lies elsewhere. Let us not, however, because of this, blind ourselves to the real duty we have of maintaining our physical plant in as high a state of perfection as we can. There is a certain Jesuit pride involved, apart from the obvious advantages in attracting students.

2. In regard to administration and the Jesuit teaching staff, our Jesuit colleges are not independent units; each college is part of a system, and necessarily shares with that system its wealth or its poverty in man power. However, there is perhaps one aspect of this question that the Jesuit Educational Association might well explore, to wit, the possibility of the colleges seeking further cooperation with the province in realizing the fulfillment of their own particular needs.

Another aspect of our peculiar Jesuit problem is the lay teaching staff. I have not the figures at hand, but I am sure that this part of our system has greatly expanded in recent years. In spite of the growth of the provinces, the needs of the missions, for one thing, seem to keep our Jesuit teaching staffs at a standstill, while our student bodies are quite generally increasing. Even if the presence of many laymen on the faculty may make for efficiency in some departments, we always have to face the complaints of parents who want their sons taught by Jesuits. Further, taking for granted that we have a system, we must give serious consideration to the fact that the majority of our lay teachers have been formed, and have even imbibed their philosophy, outside that system. It seems to me possible, at least, that the attempt to absorb a large number of heterogeneous laymen into our colleges might result in those colleges turning out to be very different from what we intended them to be. A severe process of selection will to a certain extent but not altogether

¹ Summary of an address given at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 11, 1939.

exorcise this danger. On the other hand, if we accept as teachers only those who have been trained in our own system, we run the risk of being charged with faculty inbreeding. Is it not possible for our graduate schools to have a closer contact with each other, so as to know the needs of the colleges with which they are connected, and thus perhaps avoid this double danger of the unsympathetic mind and the inbred staff?

II

The Jesuit system, of which I have spoken, has its own characteristics; and I will say immediately that the test of a Jesuit college is whether it exemplifies that system or departs from it. I take for granted that we are in the educational field for certain definite purposes, that these purposes are peculiar to ourselves, and that they really specify our colleges as Jesuit. What are these purposes?

I would say that they are three: religion, humanism, and philosophy. These three elements, I dare say, are those which make our colleges Jesuit, not merely educational, not even merely Catholic. And I mean, of course, the conjunction of all three at the same time in the same institution.

1. I use the word *religion* in its broadest sense, not merely in the sense of a course in Christian doctrine. In his Encyclical on Christian Education of Youth, the late Pope Pius XI laid down the principle that the Catholic faith must permeate all branches of education, from the lowest to the highest. I believe with G. K. Chesterton that there *is* a Catholic way of teaching mathematics, for instance. There is absolutely no excuse for our existence unless our colleges are breeding places of religion, not of a mere classroom knowledge of the catechism, but of the practical Christian religion as something that is lived as well as known.

2. I think that alongside this religion the Jesuit system places what seems at first sight to be the contradictory, or at least alien, spirit of humanism. By this I do not mean merely the teaching of the classics. There are two approaches to the classics: the scientific and the humanistic. Perhaps, in the stress on research in graduate schools, the scientific approach has overwhelmed the humanistic. It is easy, after all, to count the subjunctives in Ovid; it is much harder to write a thesis on his imagination. What I plead for is that, after the graduate has written his thesis and framed his diploma, he revert to the spirit of the classics and be prepared to teach them as a part of the study of man, which is, after all, our main preoccupation in the college.

It is true that both theism and humanism must hold sway in our colleges. But it seems to me to be the peculiar glory of the Society that it attempted to solve and has solved the problem of their apparent contradiction. A purely theistic education would be some kind of evangelical

fundamentalism; a purely humanistic education would be a brand of polite paganism.

Nor, in pleading for a humanistic curriculum and spirit of teaching, am I thereby excluding the sciences—physical or social. It has been a tradition of the Society that physical science is an integral part of an arts course. Where we would depart from the Jesuit tradition would be in teaching those sciences in the arts course in a manner alien to the humanistic spirit. Is it not true that science in the A. B. course has a different aim and method than it has, say, in the B. S. course, which is our bow to the modern spirit? Yet I wonder if this difference is always observed in our colleges. The social sciences, too, have a place as an auxiliary to philosophy.

3. It is certainly essential to our Jesuit college tradition in America to emphasize philosophy in our various curricula. Even as a pure educational discipline, philosophy has no rival subject. Any teacher who has witnessed the unfolding of a boy's mind in his years of philosophical study will agree with me.

It seems to me, then, that our problem is the living synthesis of these three: religion, humanism, philosophy. It is in the fusing of all three of them into one living whole that lies the test of a good Jesuit college.

DISCUSSION OF PAPERS BY FATHERS O'LEARY AND BOWDERN

Father Gerst (Loyola, Chicago): One of the tests of a good Jesuit college or high school in the eyes of many parents is the number of Jesuit teachers on the faculty. Since it is impossible to supply Jesuit teachers for all classes and subjects, a middle course might be found by conducting courses for the lay teachers which would instruct them in the Jesuit tradition and Jesuit philosophy of education. Father McCormick conducts such courses at Loyola, Chicago. There is also the question of inbreeding. It would be helpful to send prospective Jesuit teachers to other universities for courses or degrees, so as to acquaint them with methods and techniques current in other systems.

Father Conway (Rockhurst, Kansas City): The main test of a college or high school is good teaching. Being a Jesuit does not necessarily mean that a man is *eo ipso* a good teacher. Many good religious are not good teachers. There is need to improve and stimulate our teaching skill. We should have programs in methods and techniques for the younger men. We must take account too of the constant danger of teachers losing enthusiasm after a few years. Our 'customers' are questioning our rising tuition fees. They demand service commensurate with the fees.

Father Keegan (Marquette): One great need is Catholic lay teachers adequately prepared. Could we not plan mutual assistance among our colleges in acquiring laymen to meet our needs?

Father Killeen (St. Andrew-on-Hudson): Is *inbreeding* of its very nature disreputable? As our schools develop, may we not find that our needs can be filled from our own schools? Need this inbreeding necessarily mean that we are narrowly provincial and circumscribed?

Father Higgins (Georgetown): In the recruiting of laymen for our faculties,

there is question at times of ethical procedure in soliciting desirable teachers. The JEA might well consider setting up some policy for the future, so that one Jesuit college cannot intrude upon the faculty of another Jesuit college to recruit members for its staff.

Father Schwitalla (St. Louis): On the question of inbreeding, might it not rather be reason for boasting that we have men similarly trained for the attainment of our special unified objective? Instead of boasting of differentiation, we should try to convince standardizing agencies of the worth of similarly trained men to effect a special objective.

Father Lucey (Georgetown): Experience would prove that the training of teachers in other systems than ours has definite advantages in stimulating spirit of work and in broadening the scope of interests.

Father McManus (St. Louis University High School): Should the Jesuit high school limit its enrollment to Catholic boys only? Why should non-Catholics be excluded?

Father Bowdern (Campion): Our Catholic schools were built by Catholics for Catholics.

Father McKeon (St. Joseph's, Philadelphia): But why give athletic and other scholarships to non-Catholics?

Father Barras (St. John's, Shreveport): It is possible to convert non-Catholic students, if not to the Faith, at least to a sympathetic understanding of our religion and work.

Father Rooney (National Secretary): It is as possible, certainly, to explain the conditions for admission to our schools to students as to explain to teachers conditions for teaching in our schools.

Father Lucey (Georgetown): Are we conducting an offensive or merely a defensive campaign for the Faith? We are supposed to be apostolic.

Father Bowdern (Campion): There is a vast difference between the high-school and college situation. High schools are the training ground for *Catholics*, and not convert fields. Teachers become stilted and are otherwise conditioned by having to avoid injuring the sensibilities of non-Catholics in such classes as history, literature, etc.

Father Conway (Rockhurst): It is the wish of the Apostolic Delegate that wherever possible the number of non-Catholics be limited to not more than 25 per cent of the total enrollment.

The Training of Our High-School Faculty¹

JAMES A. KING, S. J.

If the principal of each Jesuit high school, in addition to his general academic and philosophical background, were a doctor in education with a major in administration, and if each Jesuit member of his staff could offer evidence of a *bona fide* master's major in his teaching or administrative field, and could qualify by reason of his professional (teacher's) training for certification by his state board of education, or regional accrediting agency, a discussion of "high-school faculty training as a factor in the attainment of Jesuit educational objectives" would need to concern itself only with the training of teachers in service. But not all Jesuit principals and staffs have graduate majors and credentials.

Not long ago—in 1936—certain fairly representative Jesuit high schools were offered the opportunity to compare themselves with numerous other high schools throughout the country, ranging from the best to the worst. In this study—the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards—on self-presented evidence the staffs of our Jesuit high schools seemed to suffer in comparison with others by reason of inadequate preparation. The adequacy of *academic* preparation was rated on a five-point scale: 1 being very poor and 5 being very good. The staff rating in San Francisco was 2.4; in Philadelphia and Jersey City 2.9; and in Prairie du Chien 3.1. This is to say that our western and eastern staffs ranked in the lowest 30 per cent of the five thousand teachers in the two hundred cooperating schools, and the middle west ranked in the middle 40 per cent.

Consider this rating in terms of credit hours completed, for example, in English and mathematics. In English, a rating of 2 is given a teacher with 40 to 48 hours including secondary school work. If we subtract 24 hours for high-school English, 17 to 24 hours will remain to represent college work. English teachers, therefore, with a rating of 2 would have 5 to 12 hours of upper division college English as preparation for teaching. In mathematics, when we have made average reductions for high-school work, a teacher in the lowest 30 per cent of the group, having a

¹ Paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 14, 1939.

rating of 2, would have 9 to 17 total college hours, i. e. 0 to 5 upper division hours of preparation for teaching. The middle 40 per cent of the teachers reporting showed in English from 13 to 28 hours of upper division work, and in mathematics from 6 to 13 hours. This is better, and begins to be near what the average city system now requires as a minimum from its candidates for certification. It may be interesting by way of comparison to state that the top 10 per cent of teachers participating in the study show 43 or more upper division and graduate hours in English, and 30 or more upper division or graduate hours in mathematics.

Some will regard it as unfortunate that the record of this study shows our staffs as generally inferior in *academic preparation*. The schools of the Jesuit Educational Association make the startling percentile rank of 37; an average lower than that of any of the national regional associations which range from the percentile rank of 45 for the Northwest to 64 for the Middle States. Expected, of course, but no more justified, I think, would be our poor showing under the head of 'adequacy of *professional preparation*.' Here the staff averages for San Francisco, Philadelphia, and Jersey City are each in the lowest 10 per cent of the schools, and the rating hovers again around 2 on the five-point scale. Prairie du Chien leads the Jesuit schools with a percentile rank of 46 and rates 3 on the five-point scale. The amount of professional training claimed by the average teacher participating in the study ranged from 18 to 29 hours (the minimum professional requirement for a secondary credential); our average teacher claimed rather less than 17 hours. Here again the percentile average for the schools of the Jesuit Educational Association—standing at the remarkable low of 15—trails all regional association averages which range from 23 for New England to 60 for the Northwest and Central. Though these statistics regarding the academic and professional preparation of our teachers, like any other statistics, can be partially explained away, there should still remain a stimulating residue definitely calling for improvement.

Another phase of high-school faculty training, the more important to the school administrator because it is more under his control, is the training of teachers in service. It would be unfair for schoolmen to complain of the inadequacy of teacher preparation if they are neglecting their own opportunities and obligations to contribute year by year to the intellectual growth and administrative efficiency of their faculty. For a faculty may come equipped with the finest academic and professional preparation, and still grow stale and languish in service for lack of proper stimulation. There is a helpful book on *Improving Instruction* by Briggs of Columbia (Macmillan, 1938). Perhaps you have read it; if not, I should like to recommend it. It offers some new ideas and recalls many known but

unused means of stimulating professional effectiveness. It stresses the obligation of the principal to do responsible supervision and tells him how; it gives hints for stimulating teachers in personal conferences, for enlivening teachers' meetings through planning, for increasing institute meetings and lectures, for promoting directed reading, demonstration teaching, the visiting of other schools, and so on. As we all know, these are the means of so thoroughly enthusing teachers with their work that a desire of self-improvement prompts them to accept gracefully or even to seek opportunities for summer courses in their professional and academic fields. It is doubtful whether the average teaching priest has really improved in proportion to his years of teaching experience, and has kept that zestful eagerness to grow and advance so characteristic of younger lay teachers desirous of a raise. A person with ten years of conscientious teaching experience under competent guidance, with periodic opportunities for new courses in summer school, should be able to meet any outside competition, and should be able to present a superior record even on paper.

Many excuses are offered as to why this is not always so: the burdens of religious life; the variety of occupations; more and larger classes. Some of this is very true; but in this connection it is interesting to note that as reported for the Committee on Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards our schools rank quite high in comparison with others when the number of pupils per teacher is considered. Our four schools are all above the 65th percentile and our average is considerably above that of the highest regional association. The same is true regarding the teacher load. Relatively speaking, we might say that the teachers at San Francisco, Philadelphia, and Jersey City should be given more work, ranking as they do at the 85th, 94th, and 96th percentile respectively. The teachers at Campion, in comparison, work hard at the 37th percentile. A strange fact is that in spite of their long hours Campion leads our other three schools—says the report—in reading and in authorship.

But statistics and excuses aside, the training of our faculties in service is a means of annually improving the efficiency of our staff. It is a way of compensating, to some extent, for deficiencies in teacher preparation, it is a way of keeping a staff fresh, vigorous, alert.

We are aware that our schools are not lagging dreadfully or in danger of losing their fine reputations in their respective localities. We realize that very well, with a percentile rank of 65 in the grand total of the cooperative study—the average of the Jesuit Educational Association was above that of any regional association from New England to California; and we are all proud of the fact. But this superiority was not due to our staff preparation or training in service. Hence, if we wish to advance, here is something for us to work on.

Recognition by the Association of American Universities¹

THURBER M. SMITH, S. J.

In 1900 the organization known as the Association of American Universities was founded for the express purpose of "considering matters of common interest to graduate study." Its constitution was adopted February 28, 1900.

The initial membership consisted of fourteen institutions and the constitution provided that "other institutions may be admitted, at the annual conference, on the invitation of the Executive Committee, indorsed by a three-fourths vote of the members of the Association."

In November 1913 the attention of the Association was called, in a special report, to the limitation by German universities of their recognition of bachelors' degrees from American institutions *to those who were members of the A. A. U.* The Association recommended to the ministries of education of Prussia and other German states that "recognition be accorded not only the Bachelors' degrees conferred by the members of this Association, but also the degrees of those other American colleges and universities which are on the accepted list of the Carnegie Foundation or which are certified by this Foundation as of equivalent standing but excluded from its accepted list for other than educational reasons." A list of these colleges and universities was appended. This is apparently the origin of the accrediting activities of the Association. In the list there are I believe only two Catholic institutions: Catholic University of America, one of the original members, and Fordham University.

It was resolved in 1914 that the Association of American Universities discuss with the United States Commissioner of Education and representatives of other bodies selected by him the advisability of classifying colleges and in cooperating in the preparing of a classified list.

In 1917 there again appears an accepted list of the Carnegie Foundation. This includes a number of Catholic institutions but still only one Jesuit institution, namely, Fordham University. These additions apparently were made as a result of applications from colleges requesting

¹ Paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., April 15, 1939.

inspection by the Association with a view of adding them to the list adopted in connection with the report of 1913.

In 1922 there appeared a list of colleges and universities approved by the Association as a part of the report of the Committee on Classification. In this list the three following categories are used:

1. Universities of Complex Organization, Usually with Graduate Schools and Certain Professional and Technological Schools. (The list included member institutions marked by an asterisk.)
2. Technological Institutions.
3. Colleges Primarily Organized with Undergraduate Curricula Leading to the A. B. or B. S. in Some Cases with Strong Technological Divisions, and Occasionally a Strong Professional School.

In the third category Fordham University appears as the single representative of Jesuit institutions.

In 1923 the Committee on Classification of Universities and Colleges reported that the number of institutions applying for inclusion in the list of colleges and universities approved by the A. A. U. had increased very rapidly. It indicated too that the procedure in adding to this list which it originally took from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching had never been very satisfactory. It formulated therefore a new program of action under four headings. The pertinent ones included:

1. The principle of Visitation or Inspection of Institutions applying for recognition by the Association.
2. The fixing of an inspection fee of \$100 (now \$150) to be paid by each applicant.

The Committee on Classification was empowered to add to the approved list of colleges such as should upon inspection be found to be worthy and add such colleges to the list without waiting for a meeting of the Association.

The approved list was published annually as a part of the report of the Committee on Classification which in 1924 began the practice of including also a memorandum of procedure for seeking approval of the Association.

At last we find two Jesuit institutions, Saint Louis University (1929) and Marquette University (1931), appearing on the accepted list under the category of "Universities of Complex Organization, Usually with Graduate Schools and Certain Professional and Technological Schools." Other Jesuit institutions, namely, Boston College, Fordham University, Georgetown University, and Holy Cross College had been added gradually to the accepted list under the category of colleges.

For the first time in 1932 we find that the category of Universities

of Complex Organization is subdivided into *Members* of the Association and *Other Institutions*. In the 'Other Institutions' are included Marquette and Saint Louis universities.

In the Report of the Committee on Classification of Universities and Colleges in 1935, is the following statement: "Dean Payne [Fernandus Payne of the University of Indiana] made the additional statement that the Committee favored dropping the heading 'complex organization' and merging this list with that of the colleges." He further stated, "that some of the institutions now listed under 'technological institutions' are moving more and more towards the Liberal Arts program and should be included with the colleges. General approval of this plan was expressed." The list published that year is headed as follows: "List of Approved Colleges, Universities, and Technological Institutions Whose Qualified Graduates Are Admitted to Graduate Schools of the Association of American Universities." In this list are included Marquette University and Saint Louis University as well as the other non-member institutions formerly put under the category of universities of complex organization and also those listed before under the category of colleges.

The Thirty-Eighth Conference (1937), which is the last one available, lists the following Jesuit schools: Boston College, Fordham University, Georgetown University, Holy Cross College, Marquette University, Saint Louis University in the same manner as in 1935 and 1936.

It would appear therefore, at least from the manner of listing, that the various grades of recognition and approval are now reduced to two: that for members and for non-members. The question at once arises: what *specific* approval if any is given to *graduate* work.

As far as member institutions are concerned there appears to be little difficulty since the constitution indicates that the Association "was founded for the purpose of considering matters of common interest relating to graduate study and research" and states moreover that its membership is "composed of institutions on the North American continent engaged in giving advanced or graduate instruction."

For non-member institutions there were for several years, at least apparently, certain differentiations in approval as indicated, for example, not only in the discussions at conferences but in the various headings used in the successive lists from 1922 to 1935.

Just how the measure of approval of graduate schools should be interpreted has, as you probably know, been the subject of controversy even among the members of the Association.

At any rate the A. A. U. in 1935 apparently attempted to settle the controversy in what I submit was a rather arbitrary and inequitable fashion, eliminating all differentiation between "Universities of Complex

Organization" and "Colleges," refraining from mentioning graduate schools under the heading "Accepted List," and apparently defining 'approval' at least implicitly as meaning merely "acceptability of qualified graduates for admission to graduate schools of the Association of American Universities." Strenuous objections to this procedure were made and the question has not as yet been satisfactorily settled.

In 1937 the Committee on Classification reported that 330 American institutions were offering graduate work, 55 of them up to the doctorate, and moreover, that of these 330 only 153 were on the list of the A. A. U. In view of this fact it was proposed that the Association undertake the appraisal of graduate work. A special committee was appointed for this purpose and instructed to report at the Fortieth Conference in 1938 whose Proceedings are not yet available. Whether or not this action was motivated by the plans of the American Council on Education, the United States Bureau of Education, and the regional agencies, particularly the North Central, I am unable to say. Although I have not as yet seen a copy of the Journal for 1938 I am informed that this committee recommended a study of graduate facilities on a departmental basis in the institutions offering graduate work, including members of the Association.

At least one practical question of course is this: Should Jesuit schools ambition, (a) approval, (b) membership in this Association.

I think in general that the attitude of most institutions, at least those on the collegiate level, towards approval of the Association is one of appreciation of its value and importance. It is sought in addition to approval by regional associations in spite of the high inspection fee and not infrequently it is acknowledged in catalogues and even in special communications when it is received. The requirements are set forth in the Journal of the Association in a "Memorandum of Procedure for Approval" which is usually a part of the annual report of the Committee on Classification.

There is no procedure by way of application from individual institutions for admission to *membership*. The process is inaugurated by nomination by a member institution at one of the annual conferences. If the nomination is approved it is followed by investigation by the membership committee. The constitution states that admission to membership is at the annual conference on the invitation of the Executive Committee indorsed by a three-fourths vote of the members of the Association. As far as I can discover there are no official statements concerning the qualifications required for membership.

Intellectual and Spiritual Stimulation of Students¹

D. A. KEANE, S. J.

Today the problem of motivating our students to accept what we are dedicated to give them seems to be as great or even greater than the problem of improving or altering our curriculum. The fact that education in the United States has been drifting away from the classical curriculum, and attention and emphasis centered on vocational courses, practical sciences, and studies which are predominantly informational, places us in the position of those who "*cantant extra chorum.*"

What, then, can we do to overcome the prejudices our students may have toward our standard curriculum? How can we arouse in them an interest in study, a desire to learn, and, instead of laboring to force into them what they do not want, how can we convert them into wanting what we are best prepared to give?

In regard to intellectual stimulation:

1. Appeal strongly to the senses and the imagination as a means of appealing strongly to the mind. Youth today lives in a world whose keynote is sense impression. Hence, the need in teaching to use analogy, illustration, devices by which eye, ear, and sense imagination are enlisted; to use the blackboard for diagraming, picturizing, visualizing.

2. Arouse in the students a desire to do things themselves. There is danger in doing too much for the student. Some teachers do most of the student's thinking, dictate the answers, solve his problems. They cannot stimulate him in this way.

3. The stimulus of success is potent as an influence not only for the immediate but also for the remoter future. Hence, the teacher's need to cultivate the art of helping individuals to succeed in school work.

4. Make use of the extrinsic stimulus of reward. The spirit of competition has always appealed to youth. Contests within the classroom, between classes, with a prize to the winner, awaken interest and dispel apathy.

5. Frequent testing, together with prompt correction and public listing of grades, has proved to be a very valuable asset in stimulating students to

¹ Summary of a paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 14, 1939.

gain a mastery of their subject matter and implicitly has been a stimulant to the intellectual processes of the student.

6. There is need to provide the relatively small group of superior students in any class with incentives to develop themselves in proportion to their talents. These incentives can be given through literary academies, modeled on those described in the *Ratio Studiorum*.

7. Perhaps the most important factor in intellectual stimulation is the teacher himself. The imaginative teacher who teaches with enthusiasm, who keeps his class active, who correlates new ideas with known facts, who remembers while he is teaching Latin or English or mathematics or religion that he is not dealing with pure intellects but for the most part with creatures of sense, with imaginations and emotions, will clothe his subject matter with color and warmth, with originality and freshness of approach, and strive to make his textbook characters laugh and cry, strain and groan, exult and rejoice.

As regards spiritual stimulation:

1. The present-day environment in which our students live, dominated by the sensationalism of the newspaper and the cheap and often vulgar appeal of the radio programs, tends to have a neutralizing effect on our religious training of students.

2. Consequently, one immediate objective of spiritual stimulation is to find ways of putting God and spiritual things in the forefront of the minds of our students and of keeping them there. But thoughts of God and spiritual things will not stay in the mind merely because they are spoken of. Such spiritual activities, then, should be promoted in the school as will help to bring the remembrance, the love and esteem of God and of spiritual things into the daily lives of students.

3. The Sodality of Our Lady, with its meetings, special devotions, and organized group discussions, will aid greatly in providing spiritual activity and spiritual interest.

4. Administrators and teachers must also work toward creating a fine spiritual atmosphere in the school. This will be accomplished in many ways: by providing in the library an attractive and well-chosen section on Catholic literature, lives of the saints, etc., and by acquainting the boys with this special section; by the use of bulletin boards to interest students in Catholic action, Catholic activities, good books, devotions, etc.; by providing a priest counselor for the students; by tactful classroom reminders of spiritual things, such as frequent Holy Communion, special devotions, the Sodality.

Recruiting a Desirable Student Body¹

JOHN F. CONNOLLY, S. J.

All Jesuits have definite ideas concerning the desirable development of numbers in the student body. Parallel with this increase we wish for improvement in student excellence. Yet if we were to forget our respective ideals regarding quality and bend every effort toward the numerical ideal, our schools in a short time would resemble C. C. C. camps. On the other hand if we should disregard numbers and do nothing toward recruiting, but concentrate only on the quality ideal, then shortly our faculties would outnumber our student bodies. That would be a sad state of affairs, at least financially.

Both ideals are best approached gradually. As the school approaches the attainable quantity ideal, so it should approach the never attainable quality ideal. And the larger the number of freshmen admitted, the surer and quicker will be the satisfactory result in quality. In numbers there is choice.

The means available to us for recruiting are faculty members, students, and alumni. All of these can sell the public our schools, our curricula, our philosophy, our religious training. We want no hirelings, educational carpetbaggers, high-pressure salesmen. What we need is a love and zeal for our institutions in our representatives, who will then consider it a duty and an honor to contact individual students and groups of prospective students and carry to them the gospel of Catholic education.

Faculty apostleship has been carried on successfully by some of our colleges and universities, especially during the summer months when planned programs of contact work are followed. Most Catholic schools willingly give lists of their graduating seniors and evaluations of character and academic rating of the individuals concerned. Public high schools will furnish the same data if the proper persons are known and approached. Many public high schools hold a 'Vocation Week' near the end of the term. It is worth our while to see that we are invited to attend and do our part in faculty apostleship.

The very best agents we can send forth are our own students. Usually

¹ Summary of a paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 15, 1939.

they are filled with the real missionary spirit that is motivated by a deep love for their school.

Our alumni should be similarly effective. Somehow they have come to be associated with recruiting athletes, and therein lies some doubt as to their efficiency in recruiting academic strength. Their letters to the school too frequently plead with us to overlook scholastic requirements on behalf of a star half-back. Rarely do they beg for some concession, even financial, for a straight 'A' student. Yet they can be educated not to take it amiss if one of their prospects is turned down for scholastic reasons. This education can be done through the official school publication, the alumni magazine, and especially through high type academic presentations sponsored by the student body. If they see what the present-day students are capable of doing, they will seek only the best in their missionary work. Many schools send out blanks to the alumni for the listing of likely prospects, who will later on be contacted by the alumni themselves or by faculty members.

'High School Day' at our university has brought many students to us. On that day a noon luncheon is served to the visitors and student entertainment is provided. The president of the university speaks, as do the deans, giving prospective students reasons for continuing their education in a Catholic college. They then have a chance to check up on what they admire in our schools, our outside activities, our public programs and athletic management, and especially the spiritual reputation that attracts the right students to us.

Successful recruiting includes the selective process, the scanning of entrance pleas and units, the entrance examinations themselves, pre-registration guidance, and physical examinations. These tests give us much valuable guidance.

One hindrance to recruiting is our Latin requirement for the arts degree. Might we not offer a two-fold Bachelor of Arts degree, one classical to keep an honored place for classics, the other not requiring classical study? We now offer a two-fold science degree, a rather inconsistent procedure. A change in this direction would be helpful in recruiting a desirable student body.

Importance of High-School Teaching as an Academic and Apostolic Career¹

THOMAS L. MATTHEWS, S. J.

A career means a life work to which we have devoted ourselves. One who chooses high-school teaching as a career devotes all his energy, physical, mental, and spiritual, to the work of the secondary classroom. It is academic. Daily, monthly, yearly, it means intellectual self-improvement of the teacher so that he may present to his pupils the ideas and ideals proper to high school. Those proficient in the medical or legal profession are proficient because of constant practice and constant study. So the teacher must study day after day, and he must practice himself in the very work he exacts of his pupils. He will master the memory tasks he assigns, work the problems, write the 'imitations,' hunt the historical lore.

The teacher must impart not only words and ideas but he must inspire ideals. In reading the students need help so that they can learn to love good books. These must be chosen carefully, and for this the teacher must read them. And he must know the lives of their authors, their trials and hardships, so that he can show the boys the ideal of laboring incessantly under trial. And a sense of justice must be imparted in the manner of conducting classes, avoiding favoritism, giving each alike his due.

Supernatural ideals must be nurtured. To be the truly apostolic teacher, one must be a spiritual man himself, and he must inculcate spiritual living. Sad to say this phase of our teaching as Jesuits is passed over too lightly by many and neglected by some. We hear the cry, "I am not the student counselor." True, but every one is a religious, a Jesuit, and standing as such in the midst of the boys our most important work should be that of the religious teacher.

This should present no difficulties to us. For years we have been trained in the spiritual life. The practice and the value of mental prayer are no secret to us. The sacrament of Christ's body and blood is our daily

¹ Summary of a paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 14, 1939.

source of strength. Small sacrifices and mortifications have brought us closer to Christ. Monthly conferences from an older and holier generation encourage and instruct us. Truly our life is very spiritual, yet we often hear it said: "I am not the religion teacher. That is not my work." Yet it is our work, and no matter what we teach we are the apostles of others, of all others no matter what be their walk of life.

How accomplish this? One of Ours whose career was high-school teaching made it a daily practice to ask the boys: "How many of you went to Mass today? How many of you received Holy Communion today?" September showed little, but by December practically half the class were every day attending Mass and receiving Communion. The custom came to be nearly universal in his class before the end of the year. He took one minute from class each day to say: "Boys, say one Hail Mary today for the grace of a vocation." For many the prayer resulted in admission to the Society. Teaching for him was an apostolic as well as an academic career.

Our daily classes begin with a prayer, explained at the beginning of the year to the students by their teacher. And the teacher knows the power of visits to the chapel. One rector told the boys it was the heart of the school, of its spiritual, intellectual, and moral life. The apostolic teacher will urge his students to frequent visits, particularly to Sodality meetings.

And so it goes. We have endless chances to teach our boys the Catholic life of prayer and the sacraments, to teach them and to inspire them to the practice. If we make the effort, we "shall shine as stars for all eternity."

Inter-Faculty Relations¹

RICHARD F. GRADY, S. J.

A certain Catholic gentleman, interested but not engaged in Catholic education, recently remarked that to all appearances the Jesuits were no longer educators so much as engaged in the business of education. He explained his remark by pointing to the preponderance of lay professors in the various departments and schools of the university in question. It is time for us to recognize our dependence on lay faculty members and to formulate and adopt a policy toward them.

The present position of laymen on the staffs of Jesuit colleges and universities is not enviable. They do not belong to the corporation which controls and administers the school, whereas every Jesuit feels that he is a stockholder in, if not one of the vice presidents of the corporation. The Jesuit staff member believes that he has, by virtue of his years of preparation in the Society, a more or less infused understanding of and competence in what he refers to as "our system of education." He appeals on occasion to the *Ratio Studiorum*, though frequently enough he has never done that document the honor of more than a very casual perusal. The layman, on the other hand, is considered to be lacking in that intimate acquaintance with Jesuit pedagogical tradition which we consider necessary.

Furthermore, the Jesuit on the faculty is sure of a job, or at least of maintenance in keeping with his dignity and position. He may be unemployed, or not very actively employed, or in some cases even unemployable; but he never has to face in fear the economic distress consequent upon unemployment; he will always be supported. But the lay member of the faculty depends on his job for his bed, bread, and raiment, for the support not only of himself but of his family. Because he is in a sense a hireling, he is often victimized. He may be overburdened with class work, not merely in lecture or laboratory hours, but also in pupil hours. He may be expected to devote a considerable amount of his out-of-class time to extra-curricular activities or quasi-administrative work. He will likely be called upon to carry the major portion of the burden of proctoring in examinations. If he criticizes the curriculum or the administration, particularly in open meetings, he will in all probability be put down as anti-clerical. He is often made to feel that he must first find out the mind of the ad-

¹ Summary of an address given at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 15, 1939.

ministration on any matter upon which he may be asked to comment. His contract, frequently no more than a verbal agreement, or, if written, couched in the most vague terms, may be abrogated on short notice. His rank may remain static year after year, while he sees younger, less experienced and less prepared men preferred before him simply because they are Jesuits. And, above all, he must always fear the day when his services will no longer be required because there is a Jesuit to replace him.

There is need not only to acknowledge the fact that a chasm frequently separates the lay from the religious members of our faculties, but also to take steps to bridge or fill in the chasm. Otherwise we shall continue to foster a spirit of anti-clericalism among our lay faculty members, and do irreparable hurt to our own effectiveness as educators.

The following suggestions are offered as a means of overcoming or at least of minimizing the difficulties attending inter-faculty relations.

1. Develop an effective rating-salary-tenure plan, satisfactory to both parties.

2. Hold general faculty meetings, open to both groups, regularly. At these meetings free expression of opinion on policies and programs should be stimulated and in no way penalized.

3. Organize monthly departmental meetings and insist on faithful attendance by all members of the department. In such meetings, of course, the lay members should have equal voice with the religious.

4. Include laymen in the general work of organization and administration. Put them on committees—for admission, guidance, curriculum, catalogue, examinations—side by side with the religious.

5. Let the dean hold conferences with individual laymen, as occasion presents itself. His purpose should be to inquire into their interests, ambitions, needs, and sincerely endeavor to assist them by providing opportunities for research, for study, and for personal advancement.

6. Make a serious effort to initiate both the lay and Jesuit staff into the real meaning and function of the *Ratio Studiorum* and the Jesuit tradition in education.

In brief, the best solution of the problem of inter-faculty relations is to take the laymen into the family—as adopted children, perhaps, but certainly as part of the family.

Faculty Stability in Our High Schools¹

NICHOLAS H. MANN, S. J.

In Article 13 of his *Instructio* to the American Assistancy, Very Reverend Father General warns superiors against frequent change of officials and teachers in our schools. Our purpose in education is not merely to teach subject matter; it is to train and prepare youth for life—this life and the next. Permanence of teaching staff is essential to the achievement of this purpose. And since there is a necessary turn-over each year of scholastic teachers, permanence must chiefly be looked for in the priest members of the staff. Experience has taught us that the influence we wish to exert over the youth whom we educate will be but passing and often ineffective if our graduates remember their alma mater only in a general and impersonal way. They should remember definite teachers to whom they know they can return for a friendly visit, for encouragement, and for advice.

Besides, is it not perhaps true that some of our schools would not be experiencing the financial difficulties they are having at present had members of the faculty kept in better touch with alumni? The alumni naturally lose interest in their alma mater when they no longer know any of the fathers on the faculty.

A similar service that alumni can render to their school—the recruiting of students—would be done more readily and more widely if they were in touch with some member of the faculty whom they had known at school and to whom they could send prospective students and their parents for an interview. In fact, the whole question of alumni loyalty is intimately bound up with permanence of faculty. While it is true that alumni enjoy meeting their former classmates at alumni gatherings, it is also true that they want to meet some of their former teachers. After all, they occasionally meet former classmates in the business or professional or social world, where they do not find former teachers. Not less potent might be the influence of faculty stability on relationships with the parish clergy.

What is it then that prevents faculty stability in our schools? A num-

¹ Summary of a paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 14, 1939.

ber of things. Chiefly, however, these four: promotion of faculty members to administrative positions in other institutions, retirements due to age, domestic difficulties, and lack of self-sacrifice (loss of interest in teaching, in the school, etc.) in one form or another on the part of individual members of the faculty.

Remedies may be suggested. Some are being applied. For example, it is evidently the superior's duty to do all he can to make his faculty contented and to keep them interested in their work and in the school. Hence he cannot afford to neglect the social aspect of community life; he can at times arrange a suitable vacation for his teachers; he can encourage them to attend conventions occasionally that might interest them, and to take a course or teach in a summer school. Fathers should be placed in charge of important extra-curricular activities, with scholastics to assist them, wherever possible.

Training of the College Faculty¹

JOSEPH R. N. MAXWELL, S. J.

The Society would have her members be men of learning; *insignes*, is her way of expressing it. Re-echoing this idea, Very Reverend Father General in Article 14 of the *Instructio* urges superiors to be assiduous in fostering a love of genuine learning among their subjects and in assisting them in the acquisition of higher academic degrees.

In November 1937, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools issued a set of principles and standards for accrediting institutions of higher learning. The third paragraph of this manifesto reads in part as follows: "The formal education of the staff is of first importance. . . . The major instructional responsibilities must be mainly in the hands of thoroughly educated and experienced instructors. This means ordinarily nothing less than the doctor's degree or its genuine equivalent. Evidence of intellectual alertness will be sought and account taken of the scholarly productiveness of the faculty and the participation of its members in the activities of learned societies."

Therefore, account will be had of the faculty under three heads especially: training, productiveness, participation in the activities of learned organizations.

The Society, with the reputation of centuries behind her, must measure up to and surpass the standards that are set. The vital rôle in this is the teacher's. Teachers must keep abreast of progress in their fields. The reception of graduate degrees does not conclude their academic preparation. Sometimes it is said, with more than a little truth, that the difference between a self-educated man and one that has had a formal education is that the former never stops in his quest for self-improvement, while the latter feels that he has reached the end of his academic tether with the conferring of his degree.

Not a sufficient number of Jesuits have as yet acquired the doctor's degree to permit our colleges even to appoint Jesuit faculty members as department heads. In many instances laymen occupy this position. The situation is far from ideal. It is embarrassing for older and more experienced teachers to take obscure positions in their departments because of a lack of special academic preparation. Some, who have reduced good

¹ Summary of a paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 15, 1939.

teaching to the acquisition of an interesting method, feel that their talents are being overlooked and so resort to an attitude of defeatism. The ideal Jesuit college is one in which all the major positions are held by Jesuits fully qualified by training, experience, interest, and industry to fill such positions.

The lack of the doctor's degree is a handicap; yet the opportunity for self-improvement is always at hand. Administrators should cooperate with staff members who seek to improve their academic standing and preparation. Improvement may be sought from competent lectures offered in one's field, from university courses during the year and especially in the summer, and from planned and persevering reading in one's own and allied fields. Unless a teacher is a devoted reader himself, and is thoroughly acquainted with the literature of his subject, he cannot properly direct and inspire students to acquire the reading background that is an essential part of their college education. The training of the staff in standards and techniques of graduate work is the more necessary today because larger numbers of our students aspire to undertake graduate work after acquiring the bachelor's degree, and only trained teachers will be able to select and form the type of student graduate schools look for and want.

Productiveness on the part of the staff is, of course, excellent advertising for the school. Jesuit colleges indeed emphasize the teaching ability of their faculty, and rightly so. Good teachers are more important than an army of good writers who cannot teach. At the same time, it is by no means contrary to our traditions to possess both. It must also be noted that the man who is going to be the good teacher is the one who will never allow himself to become convinced that his training is finished. He must always meet the challenge of new ideas; he must be open-minded enough to know that he can learn from contact with other educators in learned gatherings, and that a little research in his field, and the publication of that research, far from diminishing his effectiveness in the classroom, will fit him the better to carry on his apostolate of teaching and inspiring students.

The Classical Curriculum in the High School¹

HARTFORD F. BRUCKER, S. J.

Though the traditional Jesuit ideal in secondary-school education is a cultural curriculum, it is common today to find listed in Jesuit high-school catalogues a variety of curricula, including the classical, the modern language, the English, the scientific, and so forth.

No matter how well intentioned these various offerings may be, and no matter how expedient it may seem to afford a variety of courses suited to the different abilities and interests of the students, the presence of these several curricula, each good in itself, not only creates confusion in the mind of the student to whom our Jesuit objectives should be perfectly clear, but also so obscures our ideal in fact, that the very variety leads the student to conclude that he is to fit himself now for a very definite work in life.

Is it possible for us to conclude with any degree of certainty a boy's vocation in life at the age at which he is called upon to make a selection of courses in high school? One thing, however, can be done. We can make provision that a boy's vocation is not hindered or made impossible of realization. Accordingly a cultural course will admit of mathematics, science, and history, together with a language in a degree adequate enough to prepare the student for the particular field which he may wish to cultivate in college.

Perhaps the scientific course is not so strongly scientific as to merit such a distinction, nor the English course so distinctively English. Nevertheless, both these courses effectively tend to lead the student away from the very ideal which makes a Jesuit school distinctive, namely, the cultural, with Latin and Greek as principal tools.

The current reasons offered for a diversity of curricula are the inadvisability of forcing a classical curriculum on the majority, the need of preparing students for particular fields, and the fear of decreased enrolments if our curriculum is too rigid or narrow.

However, experience has shown that success can be achieved in maintaining our classical program by a little courage, by the expenditure of a

¹ Summary of a paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 14, 1939.

little time in explaining patiently the object and advantages of the classical course, and by a definite and sufficiently uncompromising administrative policy. It must be taken for granted that if choice of curricula is left entirely or mainly to the students, they will not in appreciable numbers select the classical, not from any genuine dislike of the classics, but rather from an unwillingness to exercise memory, master details, labor for the exact word or phrase in order to express the idiom, and from discouragement attendant upon slow results laboriously achieved.

A technique for 'selling' the classical curriculum to students may be suggested. Sow the tradition in the school that the classical course is the distinctive and proper course for as many as may show themselves capable of following it advantageously. Set down a clear policy that all students except the evidently unfit must take Latin for four years. Select for Greek only those who in first-year high maintain a general average of approximately 85 per cent. Talk to the first-year students about the value and advantages of the classical curriculum. Find time to have a conference with students toward the end of the year, particularly with first-year students who will be eligible to begin Greek the following year, and with the second-year students who may need advice and encouragement to continue the classical program.

In conclusion, not all the difficulties in the way of vindicating and making effective the classical curriculum can be overcome. Nevertheless, much can be done by the administration to approach the ideal of the Society: (1) by holding up the cultural course as the ideal course for the Jesuit student; (2) by providing the other subjects in that degree which will enable the student to pursue other fields of interest, without, however, giving the appearance of encouraging specialization or vocationalism; (3) by letting it be known that, apart from exceptional circumstances, the selection of the classical curriculum over the practical is the accepted policy of the school.

The A. B. Curriculum¹

JOHN E. GRATTAN, S. J.

Four reasons why we do not adequately attain our objectives in the A. B. curriculum are our own hazy notions of the objectives themselves, a lack of properly trained professors, a lack of properly educated high-school graduates, and an overcrowded curriculum.

As to the objectives themselves, there is indefiniteness particularly as to what subjects should go into the A. B. curriculum, what relative emphasis each subject should have, and what peculiar contribution each should make toward the attainment of the total objective. A great deal of our education is fragmentary. There is need of long-range planning, of judicious experimentation, providing at the same time effective means of measuring results. Only then can we make decisions as to changes, needed coordination, planned sequences.

The training of our Jesuit professors in teaching methods should be as broad as possible. Our scholastics should know the methods traditional to the Society; they should know other methods as well. For example, some professors make effective use of the backgrounds and 'realia' of the classics. Our teachers need to learn the classroom procedures and techniques that will enable them to 'sell' the ancient classics to their pupils. Too often our college students do not know just why they are studying the Latin and Greek classics. Is it not possible to make these subjects as appealing as history or government or economics?

The problem of inadequately educated high-school graduates arises not so much from their lack of ability as from their lack of high-school achievement. Most have not been taught how to study or shown the reasonableness of working hard in high school in order to profit by a college education. It is noticeable that costly preparatory schools seem to have greater success in this matter than do our own high schools. The explanation would seem to be that there are fewer pupils in the classes of the expensive preparatory schools. Too many graduates from our own high schools come to college poorly prepared in modern languages and in English, and without having read the books which average high-school pupils read as a necessary background for college literature classes.

¹ Summary of a paper read at the meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, Georgetown University, April 15, 1939.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

The QUARTERLY joins with the Jesuit institutions of the United States, and with the whole American collegiate and university world, in offering its sincerest congratulations to Georgetown University on its sesquicentennial. The Jesuit Educational Association cordially seconds and adopts unanimously the resolution drafted by the Committee on Resolutions of the N. C. E. A. at its Washington convention in April: "We take this occasion to salute Georgetown University soon to celebrate the 150th year of its existence as one of the most potent educational forces in American scholastic history. The first Catholic institution of higher learning to be established in this country, its record has been noble and glorious. We know that what has gone before is but a promise of even greater things to come." A facsimile of the invitation to its sesquicentennial which Georgetown sent to the Jesuit Educational Association forms a frontispiece to this issue of the QUARTERLY.

It is with a sense of profound loss that we record here the death of Father George D. Bull, one of our associate editors and a stimulating contributor to the QUARTERLY. The loss to Fordham University and to Jesuit and Catholic education is incalculable. Jesuits everywhere who knew Father Bull or heard of his splendid work will join with us in offering a fervent prayer for his soul. May he rest in peace!

New chapters of Alpha Sigma Nu, the national Jesuit honor society, were established at John Carroll University, Cleveland on April 23; at Boston College on April 24; at Gonzaga University, Spokane, on April 29; at Xavier University, Cincinnati, on April 30. National headquarters of Alpha Sigma Nu reports that chapters are also being formed, probably in May, at Loyola of Los Angeles, Seattle College, and St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia. With the addition of these chapters the total will run to fourteen. It is hoped that within another year all the Jesuit colleges of the United States will have chapters of this distinctively Jesuit honor society.

The annual dinner of the Aristotelian Society of Marquette University, on May 14, was made the occasion by former Marquette students of Father John F. McCormick (Loyola University, Chicago) and their friends for honoring him as founder of the Aristotelian Society, and as scholar, teacher, and friend. The occasion was made notable by the presentation to the guest of honor of a volume of scholarly essays written by former pupils and published by the Marquette University Press. The title of the volume is *Jesuit Thinkers of the Renaissance*. Its sub-title reads:

"Essays presented to John F. McCormick, S. J. by his students on the occasion of the sixty-fifth anniversary of his birth."

On March 12, 1939 the deans and heads of the departments of philosophy of the California Province met in San Francisco under the chairmanship of Father Hugh M. Duce to determine a common minimum program of philosophy for the three universities of the province. Father Edward B. Rooney, the national secretary, was present at the meeting. A syllabus of philosophy is now being constructed for the purpose of outlining minimum standards and requirements in each branch of philosophy.

The Poetry Class of Wernersville for the second year in succession received the number one ranking in the Psychological Examination sponsored by the American Council on Education. This year 356 colleges reported the scores of 71,084 students. The full results are published in the *Educational Record* for April.

St. Stanislaus Seminary, Florissant, Missouri, makes use of modern equipment in the training of novices and juniors. Father Francis A. Preuss, the dean at Florissant, reports the purchase, after careful experimental tests, of RCA Victor Recording and Playback equipment for use in all departments of speech training. Periodic voice recordings will be made, not only for corrective study, but also to serve as records of progress and development.

WORC, the Worcester, Massachusetts broadcasting house of the Columbia network, has offered successive Saturday evenings from 8:00 to 8:45 for debates conducted by B. J. F., the debating society of Holy Cross College. The initial series is on the air from March 25 to May 20. Thirty-six debaters are discussing the following: CIO versus A. F. of L.; refugee immigration to the United States; governmental stimulation of business; capitalism versus socialism; married women working; democratic versus corporate state; Spain; humanist versus vocational courses in high schools; government control of munitions manufacture. The voting on the debates is done through audience mail, and if questions are received with the votes, they are answered at the beginning of the subsequent program. Following each main debate, there is a studio-audience forum. The studio audience seems to be growing in numbers and keenness, and the speakers have given a fair account of themselves during these testing sessions.

The first attempt at a formal pre-college guidance week at St. Louis University brought more than five hundred high-school seniors to the University. In the weeks prior to the program a battery of tests was given by University faculty members in those Catholic high schools of the area

which requested it. Only the seniors interested in college took the tests. These were corrected, percentile ranks figured on the basis of national norms, and the results made available for the general and vocational advisers when students came for conferences. During Guidance Week provision was made for giving the same battery of tests to students from other high schools. Each senior, whether he took the tests or not, was given an interview with an adviser about college ability and general college problems, and had an opportunity to talk over his possible choices with any of the thirteen vocational advisers representing college-grade vocational fields. These facilities were available on five successive afternoons. Comments from high-school principals and students indicate quite satisfactory results.

Loyola of Los Angeles has recently set up an experimental radio workshop. It will be used extensively for rehearsing plays to be broadcast, for studying new methods of radio production, sound, announcing, and choral reading. It will likewise serve as a center for voice-training in speech classes. Plans are being carried forward to have a line from the Loyola workshop to the network center in downtown Los Angeles, so that the four weekly programs which are now contributed by Loyola in different radio stations will be broadcast directly from the experimental workshop.

Another radio development took place this year at John Carroll University, Cleveland, under the direction of Father William F. Ryan. Broadcasting a weekly program for the first time in its history, John Carroll firmly established itself not only with the radio public of several states but also with the directors of Station WTAM in Cleveland, who have invited the University to present its weekly half-hour programs again next year. The programs of 1938-39 show a surprising diversity of character and content, including one-act plays, dramatic dialogues, round-table discussions, debates, talks by students and members of the faculty, departmental programs by the classical, English, and philosophical staffs. The final program of the year—on May 27—presented an extremely stimulating round-table discussion conducted by five liberal-arts seniors on college education in relation to business and professional life.

In a verse contest sponsored by the *Classical Outlook*, the monthly organ of the American Classical League, which was open to college and high-school students, Mr. J. Hudson Mitchell of Wernersville was adjudged a winner for his poem entitled "Graeciae Excubitor." Professor Lawler of Hunter College, chairman of the board of judges, wrote: "It is one of the finest things I have seen in a long time." The verse is published in the *Classical Outlook* for May.

During the first two weeks of June, Marquette University, Milwaukee, is conducting a campaign for a million dollars to be used for its Engineering School. A half-million is to be used for a new building, the other half-million for endowment.

Loyola University, Chicago, received some excellent educational publicity for having introduced a course in Effective Thinking, modelled on the University of Detroit's Mental Efficiency Clinic (cf. *QUARTERLY* for January 1939). A brief Associated Press dispatch was published all over the country. It caught the eye of members of the North American Newspaper Alliance, who asked their home office in New York for a more extended account of the course. The request was relayed to the *Chicago Daily News*, one of whose reporters, a former Loyola student, wrote a very accurate and attractive column under the caption: "Students Learn How to Think in Loyola Class." The article appeared in the *Chicago Daily News* and allied newspapers on March 10, 1939. Jesuit colleges interested in the Effective Thinking course (excellent freshman orientation and complement to formal logic!) can procure a complete set of the drills and directions from Rev. H. P. O'Neill, S. J., University of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan, for the price of a dollar.

The American Catholic Sociological Society is participating in the second National Catholic Social Action Conference in Cleveland, Ohio, June 13. The annual proceedings of the American Catholic Sociological Society are being distributed this month. Father Ralph Gallagher of Loyola University, Chicago, founder of the A. C. S. S. and its executive secretary, is editor of the proceedings.

The Chemists' Club of Loyola College, Baltimore, has completed ten years of successful life. During these years ninety-one lectures were offered to the members of the club. Only outstanding men of science are invited to participate. Among them have been Dr. Hugh S. Taylor, Princeton University; Dr. Joseph B. Nierderl, New York University; Dr. E. Emmet Reid, The Johns Hopkins University; Dr. Donald Cooney, Columbia University; Dr. Alexander O. Gettler, New York University; Dr. Herbert K. Alber, Biochemical Research Foundation of the Franklin Institute; Dr. G. E. F. Lundell, National Bureau of Standards. All these men gave their services without compensation; furthermore, not a single one who was asked to lecture for the club ever refused to participate.

Two other active clubs at Loyola College, Baltimore, are the Social Science Club, under the faculty direction of Father Joseph J. Ayd, and the John Gilmary Shea Academy of History, under the direction of Dr. Edward A. Doehler.

Father Charles A. Robinson, the Jesuit representative on the National

Committee on Education by Radio, who has contributed two interesting and valuable articles to the QUARTERLY, sent out to Jesuit administrators and radio directors a news bulletin under date of February 22. There is much useful information in that news bulletin. Since Father Robinson represents Jesuit interests on the National Committee, it would be well for those who are concerned in any way with radio work in our colleges and high schools to keep in touch with him and send him significant radio information and problems. Attention may be called here to Father Robinson's article, "Radio Program Standards," in the April 1939 issue of *Education by Radio*. Father Robinson's address is St. Louis University.

It would be ungracious not to express in the QUARTERLY the sincere gratitude of the entire Jesuit Educational Association to Georgetown University for its openhanded hospitality to the JEA convention delegates. The Jesuit meetings were memorable in many ways, but in no way quite as much as in the spontaneous cordiality and generosity of Father Rector, Father Arthur A. O'Leary; of Father Thomas J. Higgins, minister for the convention; of all the fathers and scholastics of the Georgetown community.

Attention is called to the excellent lists of Catholic books for college libraries being published in the *College Newsletter* of the Midwest Regional Unit, N. C. E. A. The March issue (Volume II, No. 3) listed books on education, religion, economics, and sociology; the May issue (Volume II, No. 4) lists books on history, philosophy, and classics and classical languages. The editor of the *College Newsletter* is Father S. K. Wilson, of Loyola University, Chicago.

APPOINTMENTS TO OFFICE IN LEARNED SOCIETIES

Father Percy A. Roy (Loyola of the South) elected president of the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities. He is the first Catholic priest to hold this office.

Father Robert I. Gannon (Fordham University) appointed for a three-year term on the governing board of the newly organized New York State Association of Colleges and Universities.

Father Edmund C. Horne (John Carroll University) elected vice president of the Ohio College Association.

Father Andrew C. Smith (Spring Hill College) elected vice president of the Alabama Association of Colleges and Universities.

Father Joseph P. Zuercher (Creighton University) elected president of the Nebraska Association of Church Colleges.

Father Julian L. Maline (General Prefect of Studies for High Schools, Chicago Province) elected secretary of the Secondary School Department of the N. C. E. A.; re-elected to Executive Board of the N. C. E. A.; re-

elected, for third year, advisory member of the Ohio State Committee of the North Central Association.

Father William J. McGucken (General Prefect of Studies, Missouri Province) appointed a member of the committee of the North Central Association to study the problem of accrediting.

Father Lawrence M. Barry (St. Ignatius High School, Chicago) re-elected chairman of the Central Regional Unit of the Secondary School Department, N. C. E. A.

Father Samuel K. Wilson (Loyola, Chicago) re-elected secretary of the College Section of the N. C. E. A.

Father Joseph C. Mulhern (Jesuit High, New Orleans) re-elected member of the Executive Committee of the Secondary School Department of the N. C. E. A.

Father Edward B. Rooney (National Secretary of the Jesuit Educational Association) elected second vice chairman of the American Council on Education.

Father James J. Lyons (University of San Francisco) member of the Executive Committee of the Pacific Coast Section of the American Student Health Association.

JESUIT SPEAKERS AT MEETINGS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

Father Stephen A. Mulcahy (Boston College) before the New England Classical Association at New London, Connecticut, March 31, 1939, on "The Function of Latin in the Secondary School."

Father James J. Mertz (Loyola University, Chicago) before the Chicago Classical Club, May 13, 1939, on "The Sarmatian Horace" (Father Matthias Casimir Sarbiewski, S. J.).

Father Wilfred M. Mallon (St. Louis University) before the Midwest Regional Unit of the N. C. E. A. at Chicago, Illinois, March 29, 1939, on "The Integration of the High School and the College."

Father Andrew L. Bouwhuis (Canisius College) before the College Department of the N. C. E. A., Washington, D. C., April 13, on "Cooperation of the College Section of the Catholic Library Association with the N. C. E. A."

Father Julian L. Maline (Milford Novitiate) before the Secondary School Department of the N. C. E. A., Washington, D. C., April 12, 1939, on "The Aims of the Catholic High School in Terms of Results."

Father Edward P. Dowling (*Queen's Work*) before the Secondary School Department of the N. C. E. A., Washington, D. C., April 13, 1939, on "The Catholic School Trains for Good Citizenship."

Father Raphael C. McCarthy (Marquette University) before the Parish School Department, N. C. E. A., Washington, D. C., April 13, 1939, on "The Problems of Adolescent Boys and Girls."

Contributors

FATHER JOHN LAFARGE: Associate editor of *America*; author of *Interracial Justice* and many pamphlet publications.

FATHER CHARLES M. O'HARA: Ph. D. in Education from Marquette; instructor in education at St. Louis University and regent of the School of Education and of the Corporate Colleges.

FATHER JAMES A. MCWILLIAMS: Head of Department of Philosophy, St. Louis University; author of *Cosmology*.

FATHER WILFRID PARSONS: Formerly editor of *America*; now dean of the Graduate School, Georgetown University.

FATHER AUSTIN G. SCHMIDT: Director of Loyola University Press.

FATHER WILLIAM S. BOWDERN: Rector of Campion, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin; formerly principal of St. Louis University High School.

FATHER ARTHUR A. O'LEARY: President of Georgetown University, and genial host of the J. E. A. convention.

FATHER JAMES A. KING: Principal of St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco.

FATHER THURBER M. SMITH: Dean of the Graduate School, St. Louis University.

FATHER D. A. KEANE: Principal of Boston College High School.

FATHER JOHN F. CONNOLLY: Dean of Loyola of Los Angeles.

FATHER THOMAS L. MATTHEWS: Teaches in Gonzaga High School, Washington, D. C.

FATHER RICHARD F. GRADY: Dean of Canisius College, Buffalo.

FATHER NICHOLAS H. MANN: Rector of St. Ignatius High School, Chicago.

FATHER JOSEPH R. N. MAXWELL: Dean of Boston College.

FATHER HARTFORD F. BRUCKER: Principal of Loyola Academy, Chicago; formerly rector of the University of Detroit High School.

FATHER JOHN E. GRATTAN: Dean of Arts, Georgetown University; formerly substitute secretary to the American Assistant in Rome.