

# Jesuit Educational Quarterly

---

VOLUME III

NUMBER 3

---



---

DECEMBER 1940

---

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.

### *Associate Editors*

CAROL L. BERNHARDT, S. J.

JAMES A. KING, S. J.

MAURICE G. FLAHERTY, S. J.

JOSEPH C. MULHERN, S. J.

RICHARD F. GRADY, 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.

*Maryland-New York Province*

HUGH C. DUCE, S. J.

*California Province*

MATTHEW J. FITZSIMONS, S. J.

*Maryland-New York Province*

JOHN S. FORSTER, S. J.

*Oregon Province*

WILLIAM J. MCGUCKEN, S. J.

*Missouri Province*

JULIAN L. MALINE, S. J.

*Chicago Province*

ARTHUR J. SHEEHAN, S. J.

*New England Province*

ANDREW C. SMITH, S. J.

*New Orleans Province*

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

55 EAST 84TH STREET

NEW YORK, NEW YORK



# Jesuit Educational Quarterly

## December 1940

---

### CONTENTS

FOUR HUNDRED YEARS OF JESUIT EDUCATION <i>Allan P. Farrell, S. J.</i> . . . . .	117
JESUIT EDUCATION OF THE FUTURE <i>Robert I. Gannon, S. J.</i> . . . . .	128
MORE WRITERS FROM OUR COLLEGES: COMMENTS AND OPINIONS . . . . .	134
CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND CATHOLIC WRITERS <i>James J. Daly, S. J.</i> . . . . .	134
WHY AREN'T OUR WRITERS WRITING? <i>J. Gerard Mears, S. J.</i> . . . . .	137
MISTAKEN IDEAS OF LITERATURE <i>Richard H. Perkinson</i> . . . . .	141
WHERE OUR WRITERS ARE TODAY <i>Francis X. Connolly</i> . . . . .	146
SCHOLARS AND WRITERS <i>Joseph P. Desmond</i> . . . . .	149
JESUIT EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY <i>Gerard F. Yates, S. J.</i> . . . . .	152
THE FRENCH CANADIAN JESUIT COLLEGE <i>Malachi J. Donnelly, S. J.</i> . . . . .	159
BROADENING HORIZONS . . . . .	161
THE STUDY OF ENGLISH IN JESUIT AND PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES <i>Joseph A. Slattery, S. J.</i> . . . . .	161
FORMAL TRAINING FOR JESUIT LIBRARIANS: A REPLY <i>Andrew L. Bouwhuis, S. J.</i> . . . . .	168
NEWS FROM THE FIELD . . . . .	170
NATIONAL STATISTICS OF JESUIT EDUCATION . . . . .	174
CONTRIBUTORS . . . . .	176





# Four Hundred Years of Jesuit Education\*

ALLAN P. FARRELL, S. J.

It is but proper that I should at once express, in the name of the Jesuit schools and universities, cordial appreciation to this Association for its signal recognition of the fourth centenary of the founding of the Society of Jesus. Your gracious act is a significant token of academic fellowship, which diffuses strength and vitality to different and even diverse units laboring in a great common cause. It may also betoken a kindly reluctance to accept the verdict of the generality of historians of education, who are wont, as if inscribing a *hic iacet*, to apostrophize the Jesuit schools, to quote one of the historians, as "once so celebrated and so powerful, and still existing in great numbers, though little remains of their original importance; so I prefer to speak of them as things of the past."

It is for Father Gannon, president of ninety-nine year old Fordham, to meet the challenge to the present and future role, the fifth century, of Jesuit education. I shall dare the less dangerous task of chronicling the past four centuries, indulging, if you will permit it and if I may do so without arrogance, in what Milton called a little pardonable self-esteem grounded on just and right. If at times I seem to speak an apology for certain deeds wrought or views expressed by the Jesuits of past centuries, this will be accepted, I hope, as a filial attempt to present them in focus to a present-day audience.

The span of four hundred years extends from 1540 to 1940. September 27 marks the day on which in 1540 Pope Paul III approved the Society of Jesus, which you know more commonly as the Jesuit order, or simply as the Jesuits. But for the real beginnings of Jesuit history we must project ourselves to a period six years earlier. The year is 1534. Ignatius of Loyola, a Spaniard, once a Knight at the Spanish court, then a soldier, now a student at Paris at the age of forty-three, has just completed successfully the public act called the *Inceptio*, and on March 14, 1534, was acclaimed Master of Arts of the University of Paris. Gathering together this same year six of his fellow-students at the university, he proposed to them the founding of a religious institute to convert the Turks to Christianity. A

---

\* A paper delivered at the 54th annual convention of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools at Atlantic City, New Jersey, November 23, 1940.



certain splendid audacity which characterized the genius of Ignatius of Loyola was manifested in this proposal. The scene of labor was to be the Holy Land; the task to compass by pacific means what the Crusades had failed to compass by force of arms. The Paris students accepted the bold challenge, and so this band of seven, augmented within a year by three more volunteers, constituted the founding fathers of the Society of Jesus. But since the Turks, under their Sultan, Suleiman II, were waging a war of aggression in Europe at the time, the original plan for their conversion had to be abandoned. Consequently the charter which Pope Paul III gave the new religious institute in 1540 defined its functions in quite different and much wider terms: "To labor for the advancement of souls in Christian life and learning, and for the spread of the Christian faith by public preaching and the ministry of God's word, by spiritual exercises and works of charity, more particularly by grounding boys and unlettered persons in Christianity."

Of formal educational work there was no mention in the charter. But two facts may be considered, I think, prophetic of the part in education which the Jesuits were soon to play. The first fact is that the ten founding fathers were all schoolmen, all university-trained, and possessed of the master of arts degree from the University of Paris, which conferred on them the *ius ubique docendi*. The further fact is that almost at the moment the Jesuit order came into existence, the influences of the humanistic revival and of the religious revolt conspired to raise issues, both academic and religious, that profoundly affected educational thinking and educational practice. As a consequence, new schools were being founded everywhere, and existing schools were being reorganized. It is not strange then that the Jesuit band soon found itself besieged with urgent invitations to enter the educational field, nor that in the end some of the invitations were accepted. One of the earliest of these was addressed to Ignatius of Loyola by the councillors of the city of Messina in Sicily. It bore the date of December 19, 1547. Besides its historical importance, the earnest tone of the document and its solicitous pledge of a *quid pro quo* give it a peculiarly human interest. In translation the letter runs, in part, as follows:

Very Reverend Sir:

Being informed that in the Congregation of religious of the name of Jesus, which is under the direction of Your Reverence, there are persons of learning and of virtue, who by knowledge and apostolic ministry make themselves of great use in the Christian state, this city wishes very much to have some of your subjects to teach, preach, and produce the same fruit which has resulted from their labors wherever they have resided. . . . Our request is that you send us five masters to teach theology, the arts, rhetoric, and grammar, and another five to pursue their studies and give assistance in works of Christian zeal. The city will supply them with food, clothing, and a residence



suitably furnished. And in order to execute our request in proper form, the citizens of Messina have considered it in council and given it their unanimous sanction, to which is added that of His Excellency, the Viceroy. . . . The better to forward our desire, we have asked His Excellency, the Viceroy, to commend it to Your Reverence. On our part we petition you to grant it; and in sending these teachers and religious, you may rest assured that we shall accept them as fathers and brothers, nor shall we in any way be found wanting in fulfilling the promises we have made above.

It was under such favorable auguries that Jesuit educational history began. Within three months the personnel requested by the municipality of Messina was on its way to inaugurate the first Jesuit school for the education of youth. Its classes convened on April 24, 1548. A second school was opened in Sicily the following year, at Palermo; and thirty-five more schools were started in the next six years in eight European countries: Sicily, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Germany, France, Bohemia, and Austria. At the end of twenty-five years the schools numbered one hundred and fifty, and almost exactly fifty years after the dedication of the first school at Messina, the Jesuits were conducting two hundred and forty-five educational institutions, not alone in Europe, but in India, Japan, Cuba, Mexico, and the Philippines as well. It is probable that history provides no similar instance of such a phenomenal educational expansion achieved by a single organization. The phenomenon becomes more striking if we remember that, at a conservative estimate, at least half of these two hundred and forty-five schools had both secondary and collegiate departments, and about fifteen of them had besides a university status. Nor were the enrollments in these schools insignificant. Very few of them had less than five hundred students, a considerable number had enrollments of more than a thousand, and not a few were near the two thousand mark. Among the latter, for instance, were the schools at Evora, Coimbra, and Lisbon in Portugal; at Billom and Paris in France; at Mayence and Cologne in Germany; at Milan, Brescia, and Rome in Italy.

But an immediate academic problem attended the success of these early educational ventures. How could uniformly high standards be maintained in so many and such widely scattered schools? The problem was solved temporarily by the creation of the office of superintendent of Jesuit schools. This office was, I think, not only a totally new departure in educational administration at the time, but probably also unique in character, inasmuch as it was international in scope and jurisdiction. For the function of the superintendent was to travel from country to country in Europe, and to visit the existing Jesuit schools, organize and unify curricula, adjust personnel problems, plan further expansion of educational facilities, and deal with municipal, state, and ecclesiastical authorities. It is no exaggeration to say that it was chiefly owing to this office, and of course to the type of



men placed in it, that the internal development of the early Jesuit schools was able to keep pace with their rapid extension.

This does not mean that an academic program was lacking. Rather it means that the educational pattern framed at Messina on the model of the Jesuits' *alma mater*, the University of Paris, was being tested in practice and under supervision in hundreds of classrooms in many different European centers. The ultimate aim was to fashion a comprehensive educational code. Essential principles had to be fixed permanently. Yet, since the code was projected, not for Italy or Germany or France, but for all Jesuit schools in all countries, sufficient flexibility was needed to suit sharply contrasting national traits and traditions. It took fifteen years—1584 to 1599—to round out the task. The men of the time who undertook it handed down to Jesuits of all times, and to the great body of educators, an amazing example of cooperation, of self-criticism that was unsparing in analysis of weaknesses in the standards and practices of the Jesuit schools, and of competent and prolonged educational testing and experimentation in respect to curriculum, administrative policies, and pedagogical techniques. The result was the publication of the *RATIO ATQUE INSTITUTIO STUDIORUM SOCIETATIS IESU*, or The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education. It was a CODE because it formulated a systematic body of educational principles and practices shaped to an educational philosophy; it was a CODE OF LIBERAL EDUCATION because the core of its curriculum for undergraduate training were the liberal arts. Since 1599 this code has been the official guide manual of Jesuit education. This assertion has provoked more than one thumping indictment from those who view tradition as a sort of *monstrum nulla virtute redemptum*. Notwithstanding, one may rightly claim a certain virtue for a sane conservatism in education, for maintaining contact with the ages as well as with the age. For real development does not mean leaving things behind, as on a road, but rather drawing life from them, as from a root. It is in this sense that the original Jesuit code has never been left behind. And three things in particular have remained of it, from which life has been drawn and improvement achieved: first, a philosophy; secondly, a set of principles, and lastly, a basic methodology.

To take the educational principles first. They were present in the code more by strong inference than by any formal enunciation, being, so to speak, embedded in the several rules and directions covering organization, curriculum, and pedagogical techniques. Their practical importance lay in establishing and fortifying a conscious unity of ends and means in the educative process, which the Jesuit founders regarded as particularly necessary for an educational system as widespread and as international as theirs. Contemporary documents indicate that many of these principles were



looked upon and opposed four centuries ago as startling innovations. Now they are for the most part but commonplaces of pedagogical procedure. Consequently, it will suffice merely to enumerate the more significant of them.

1. The principle of subordinating subjects of secondary importance to those of prime importance.
2. The principle of clearly organizing successive objectives to be attained by the student.
3. The principle of measuring academic advancement of the student, not by time, but by achievement.
4. The principle of affording ample opportunity to the student by way of repetition to organize in his own mind the knowledge he has thus far gained.
5. The principle of stimulating at every stage development of the power of written and oral expression.
6. The principle of using discussion and objection and, within limits, emulation, as capital means of guarding against an attitude of passivity and mere absorption of classified information.
7. The principle of fostering the relationship of teacher to student as that of individual to individual, of man to man, lest education become a law without influence, a system without personality.

The second distinctive feature of the Jesuit educational code, its basic methodology, grew out of a conviction of the paramount importance of the teacher. For it was taken as axiomatic that in leading the student to the rivers of knowledge, though you could not always get him to drink of their waters, you could at least make him thirsty. And so the teacher's function in the Jesuit system was "to create the mental situation and to stimulate the immanent activity of the student." The framers of the Jesuit code, however, were not blind to the difficulty of the teaching art, nor to the fact that not many have the essential endowment of the great teacher, the gift of inspiration. Hence they laid down a teaching technique which they believed would lead the teacher by successive steps to create the mental situation and stimulate the immanent activity of the student. The technique was called the *Praelectio*, which meant a *preview*, conducted by teacher and students together, of every type of class assignment. The aim of the preview was to arouse interest in the subject matter of the assignment, to direct the attention of the students to its more important phases, to put it in its proper setting or context, to point out problems to be considered or investigated for class discussion. The preview was not a lecture, though on occasion the teacher would find it profitable to give briefly the background of an author or event or poem or problem; but his prime task was to motivate, orient, put the student in mental contact with the new subject matter, prepare him to gain from the out-of-class study not only intellectual content (knowledge, information), but also



intellectual method—the way to grapple with an assignment or problem, how to explore its reaches, and master its significant details; in a word, how to study effectively. This preview, I should like to repeat, was not a lecture, but a preface, a prelude to study; hence it was relatively brief, suggestive more than exhaustive, a kind of Socratic dialogue between teacher and class, the teacher playing the role of Socrates and bringing the powers of the class to converge on the subject matter under consideration. There would follow in the next class quiz, discussion, explanation. The aim finally was organization, correlation, mastery. There is an affinity between this Jesuit mastery formula and Professor Henry C. Morrison's process of pre-test, teach, test, adapt procedure, teach and test again to the point of actual learning. In the Jesuit process the preview took the place of pre-test; their aim, however, is almost identical. Said the New England farmer to Emerson after reading the works of Plato, "That Mr. Plato had a great many of my ideas." The Jesuits on reading Professor Morrison would perhaps rather say, "The traditional is sometimes modern, very modern; and the modern often has its roots in the past."

The last and most significant feature of the Jesuit code was its statement of educational purposes. Every education that is not merely instruction teaches a philosophy, if not avowedly, then by suggestion, by implication, by atmosphere. The type of philosophy taught will reflect the view held as to the nature of man, the subject of education. Now, Jesuit, like Catholic, education has always had a philosophy, and the philosophy has always been professedly Christian. It reflects the belief that man was created, redeemed, and hallowed by God; that his end is God; that therefore he must learn to live in terms of God, according to God's purposes or will, if he is to achieve his destiny. In applying this philosophy to their schools, the Jesuits never relied mainly on religious instruction, and so they did not crowd their curriculum with religious and moral subjects. In fact, the hours devoted to special religious instruction were few. Rather their philosophy pervaded the schools like an atmosphere, and communicated itself, directly and indirectly, by teaching, contact, guidance, and example. Such a forthright communication of an educational philosophy will no doubt seem to many to smack of indoctrination. But it is to be remarked that the subtle difference between education and indoctrination had not been detected when the Jesuit founding fathers wrote their philosophy of education four centuries ago, any more than it had when two centuries later the American founding fathers laid down for all future generations of Americans the forthright philosophy of government that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. However, no one, I take it, will suppose that in Jesuit classrooms



these past centuries whenever Vincenzo or Henri or plain Bill raised a question or propounded a doubt they were invariably met with the dogmatic reply that God had created them, and they were God's men, and that was all there was to it. More often, I am of the opinion, would have been found in practice what Gilbert Chesterton called "the ancient Christian custom of arguing each other's heads off and shouting each other down for the glory of reason and truth." God's purposes were undoubtedly points of orientation for both teacher and taught, and contacts connecting every part of education with every other part, so as to lead to the formulation of a comprehensive and consistent view of life. But this view of life, it must be insisted, was presented and communicated, not forced or imposed. For though the Jesuits deeply revered divine revelation, they never belittled the high functions of human reason. And it is in this particular regard that historians of education, particularly American historians, miss a profound point—in fact, the whole point—about Jesuit education. They are wont to describe its amazing successes, to cite and quote tributes to the high quality of the instruction given in the Jesuit schools, to acknowledge that many of the best Protestant families of Europe would send their children to no other schools—and then they interject the adverbative *but* with crashing emphasis. *But*, effectiveness and excellence of organization and teaching notwithstanding, the main aim of the Jesuit schools was "to proselytize for the Church rather than to liberalize"; they "repressed the development of individuality"; "they did not aim at developing all the faculties of their pupils, but merely the receptive and reproductive faculties," and so their schools and their education, though the best, were the worst. Some of the historians, having got so far, seem to sense the inconsistency, the patent illogicality of their characterization of Jesuit education. Consequently, they add a footnote in small print: "They have produced, however, many great men." Great men, yes. Gaston Boissier has said that the Jesuit schools largely made possible the great centuries of literature in France. The beadrill of distinguished names in French literature and science of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, beginning with Corneille, Moliere, Buffon, Descartes, Bossuet, Voltaire too (and Racine almost alone excepted), reads like a select roster of the Jesuit colleges of France. One Jesuit professor of the College of Louis-le-Grand in Paris lived to see nineteen of his former students inducted into the French Academy. In other countries, too, noted writers and scholars stepped from the Jesuit schools, as it were, into the hall of fame. Among them were Goldoni, Tasso, Muratori, Canova, Cassini, and Calderon. Great names, yes. But were they men with suppressed individualities; men whose receptive and reproductive faculties alone were cultivated; men proselytized rather than liberalized? The capital point missed is that the



Jesuits knew full well that in order to be a Christian, one first must be a man. Their aim, then, has always been the development of all the powers of the individual; the making of a man was their object in every case. Sometimes they failed to form the Christian; but not on that account did they cease trying to liberalize, to humanize, to form the man. The remark often made that the Jesuits have always been essentially missionaries, whether in or out of the classroom, is obviously true. They could not, considering the purpose of their existence as a religious body, rest satisfied with any other general result than the formation of the true and perfect Christian. But even in the strictly missionary field, their invariable rule for four hundred years has been to open schools at the first opportunity and to give those schools a liberal curriculum, so as to form men in order to form Christians. What Carlyle said of his father, that he was religious with the consent of all his faculties, precisely that the Jesuits wished their students to be—religious, Christians, with the consent of all their faculties. In this view, education is a means to the attainment of a religious purpose. In every practical system, education is never regarded as an end in itself. It subserves other purposes: now the state, now democratic living, now the social order. Much less, then, is it a derogation of education's high estate to make it minister to religion.

So much for an attempt to verify for you not only the label but also the contents of the Jesuit *Ratio Studiorum*, or Code of Liberal Education. When it was officially promulgated and put into effect in 1599, there were 245 Jesuit schools. Statistics published at stated intervals thereafter show that the number of schools at the end of the first Jesuit century, 1640, was approximately 500; and at the end of the second century, 700. More than half of these schools had both secondary and collegiate departments, and at the close of the second century, in addition to the 700 schools for the education of youth, the Jesuits were conducting 175 normal schools for the training of their own teachers, and theological seminaries for the training of ecclesiastical students. This was in all probability the height of Jesuit educational activity. In 1773, with the suppression of the order, most of the schools were either closed or fell into other hands. The result was that when educational work was resumed in 1814, the order had at most twelve schools: five in White Russia, four in the Kingdom of the Sicilies, one in the United States (Georgetown), and a few more in France. The foundations had again to be laid, and the laborious task of building taken up anew. Nor were the auguries of 1814 as favorable as those of 1548. Notwithstanding, at the end of 136 years, in this the quadricentennial year, the Society of Jesus is conducting 436 schools, enrolling more than 140,000 pupils.

Jesuit education in the United States dates from 1789, the founding



year of Georgetown University. Next oldest is St. Louis University, founded in 1818. Two other schools, Spring Hill College, Alabama, and Xavier University, Cincinnati, have passed the century mark. Fordham commemorates its centennial next year, and Holy Cross in 1943. Two other member colleges of this Association have a certain antiquity. They are Loyola College of Baltimore and St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia. Both date from 1852. Santa Clara and San Francisco universities on the Pacific Coast were founded in 1855. American Jesuits are at the present time in charge of thirty-four secondary schools and twenty-four colleges and universities in the United States, with a total enrollment of 60,576. Besides, they have schools in India, Baghdad, the Philippines, Jamaica, British Honduras, and China. In the United States they have eleven law schools approved by the American Bar Association, nine schools of business administration, seven graduate schools, seven schools of dentistry, five class A medical schools, four schools of social work, and four engineering schools.

What in sum is the contribution of four hundred years of Jesuit education? And what part of the contribution has more than an antiquarian interest for the modern educator?

The first contribution, it seems to me, is this: The Jesuits, like the English, have shown a peculiarly resolute, you may call it stubborn, determination not to capitulate to the opposition; not to give up even when opponents have burned and pillaged their property, taken away their license to teach as a corporate body, vilified their name, and misrepresented their purposes. London is in danger of being destroyed; the Society of Jesus has faced that danger many times during its four hundred years. Once it was destroyed; it built itself up again from almost nothing. That is a contribution of high moral courage. It should be very real to a generation that with the rest of the world faces the threat, if not at once of material destruction, then of the destruction of its rights, particularly its corporate right to perpetuate its own free form of government.

The second contribution was the massive work of carrying the light of Western learning into the farthest corners of the world. History has graciously applauded this contribution, and has noted likewise that its effect was not only conversion to Christianity by missionary endeavor, but also a conversion to civilization by educational enterprise.

Thirdly, the Jesuits have offered the example of four hundred years of dedication to "the drudgery of unrelieved pedagogy." There cannot but be something impressive in the spectacle of hosts of men laboring year after year to teach unnumbered thousands of ordinary people the ways of knowledge and the knowledge of God, while they themselves remained for the most part unknown, almost anonymous, and unmarked in history.



There have been in these Jesuit centuries brilliant men, intellectuals and scholars in every age; but no small portion of their abilities was consecrated to the toilsome trade of the teacher, many of the books they conceived written only on the minds of their pupils, and their achievements inscribed in a corporate rather than a personal record.

Fourth, the Jesuits have educated for four hundred years, not the sons of wealth, but in the main the sons of the poor, of the people, and during three hundred years gave a free education to all.

Fifth, the Jesuits were perhaps the first to recognize the need of a special preparation for effective educational work. That contribution is now merely history. What is of present interest is that they have never made the mistake of thinking that a few or even many education courses could substitute for a liberal education or warrant granting the license to teach. The Jesuit founders were all masters of arts of Paris. This meant that they had a liberal education. The tradition was handed down unbroken. It is the first step in the special preparation for educational work; then follow educational theory, procedures, and techniques.

What I offer as the sixth Jesuit contribution will, I fear, be labelled obscurantism by those who think of progress in terms of leaving things behind. For the Jesuits have never left the humanities behind. To do so would have seemed to them like leaving behind one's home, and that the home of the human spirit. In the beginning, of course, they incorporated the classical languages and literatures into the curriculum because they were the staple subjects of the day, but they kept them in the curriculum for four hundred years because they were convinced, first, that because youth should be Christianized, they first must be made human, made spiritual; and secondly, that an intimate contact with classical culture gives a true, inward, almost experimental knowledge of that which is human and spiritual.

The final contribution is this: that the Jesuits have never ceased offering their students what President Cowley of Hamilton College, in an address delivered at the University of Rochester just a month ago today, declared to be the most pressing need of our time: not alone the training of the mind, but the shaping of the student's spirit, the cultivation of his religious sense and his sense of values. The Jesuit contribution has gone beyond this, I suggest, in realizing that all these things—spirit, religion, morals, sense of values, man himself—are meaningless and delusive without God.

In conclusion, may I say that the work of the Society of Jesus in education is not itself so much worthy of commendation. Rather deserving of encomium is the educative mission of the Catholic Church, of which the Jesuit order is but a small and comparatively recent part. The Church has



perennially fulfilled her appointed task of going forth and teaching the truth. The work the Jesuits have done in four hundred years, the Dominicans and Franciscans have been doing likewise, if in a different manner, for eight hundred years, and the Benedictines and Augustinians before them for thirteen hundred years. What each and all have done is but a fraction of the total which the Church, incorporating and inspiring all, has done since Christ established it to keep the knowledge of God among men.



# Jesuit Education of the Future

ROBERT I. GANNON, S. J.

When I found that there was no escape from the honor of addressing you this morning, I asked that the authorities assign me a subject on which the audience had even less information than I had. They answered that that would be possible only if the audience were composed exclusively of college presidents. So the next best thing was a seance of crystal gazing in which we could all have our feet well off the ground. "What will the Jesuit education of the future be?" proved to be an excellent question for such an occasion, because the proper approach to an answer that might apply in even a single country, presupposes a few such simple questions as these: How long will the present war last? Who, if anyone, is going to win it? Are we, perhaps, going to take a hand ourselves? If so, will our own form of government remain unchanged? Even if it does, shall we have a Secretary of Education? Will she be known as the Secretary of Propaganda, or will she simply be such in fact? How long will private institutions be allowed to grant degrees? How long will they be tax exempt? How long will they be able, in any case, to pay the grocer? It is all pretty foggy of course except on the supposition that our form of government in the United States will change eventually to the Russian or the German model. Only in that case can we be relatively definite in predicting the future of Jesuit education in America. For then will it most certainly be one with Nineveh and Tyre. Come the revolution, we Jesuits are prepared to dangle from 5,000 telegraph poles, beginning with the rock-bound coast of Maine. We may dangle Jesuitically, in a clever diabolical manner that no one ever expected, but the breathing is sure to be awkward and in any case the *Ratio Studiorum* will be done for until, of course, we return again, as we always do. (It would be un-American to say that we have been thrown out of better countries than this. But no one can deny that we have had a lot of practice!)

Suppose, however, that democracy not only endures, but triumphs, that education is able to resist strangulation at the hands of the Federal Government, a strangulation that has been threatening for nearly twenty years; suppose that the public comes to realize the immense debt this country owes to private institutions and the irreparable loss that would be suffered if all the small colleges of liberal arts were to be crushed. In other

---

\* An address delivered at the 54th annual convention of Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools at Atlantic City, New Jersey, November 23, 1940.



words, suppose that the next sixty years turn out to be something like the last. What can we predict with any amount of confidence? Only such things as may be called essential to our ideals.

As Abraham Flexner once said, "Subjects change, problems change, activities change, but ideas and qualities abide." In the course of our four hundred years, we have ourselves seen many changes in subject matter, or more accurately perhaps, changes in the emphasis placed on various subjects in the curriculum. The vernacular, for example, was not entirely ignored, even in the sixteenth century, and the physical and social sciences were all familiar, in a way, to a boy attending a Jesuit college in the time of Henry of Navarre. For even then, in his study of the classics, he went far beyond the problems of grammar and strove for a grasp of the varied content found in the old historians, scientists, and statesmen. To a still greater extent, in his study of systematic philosophy was he concerned with questions now relegated not only to sociology and government, but to physics, biology, and chemistry. Yet the emphasis now placed on modern languages, and the social and physical sciences, to say nothing of the de-emphasis evident with regard to Latin and Greek and philosophy would certainly have amazed the Very Reverend Father Claudius Aquaviva. So, too, would the complexity of our problems in preparing students for modern life. It is a far cry from the days when university graduates were expected merely to be teachers, statesmen, gentlemen of leisure, or clerics. The value of the old classical training for such was fairly obvious. Their financial and political problems were different too. It was one thing to receive a foundation of so many golden ducats from the Duke of Gandia or the municipality of Hildesheim, so that one could operate in tranquillity as a free school, and quite another to begin in a log cabin and live on one's wits. The presidents of our older institutions were saintly and scholarly men who left a tremendous impression on their two or three hundred pupils. Now we have to find the type that can stay out late and wake up cheerful, eat rich food and keep the old figure down, shake hands like a Rotarian, pass the tambourine, and preserve the King's peace among some four hundred and fifty faculty members. Similar changes may be anticipated for the future in subject emphasis, social problems, and activities. Professional schools will of course as in the past, change most radically, being concerned chiefly with changeable elements, new discoveries, and skills. But these we mention only in passing, because there is nothing distinctly Jesuit in even our own schools of engineering and medicine. Our college of liberal arts, however, will certainly change the least. For its principal purpose, the training of the intellect and will, its principal subjects Divine and human nature, and its principal instruments, literature and philosophy, will always be essential in any civilized country



at any time. I should not be surprised (though this of course is shameless crystal gazing) if the numbers in our liberal arts were drastically reduced before my golden jubilee. Neither should I be a bit displeased. For like all other American institutions, we have our own proportion of spoiled house painters working for an arts degree. I expect, however, to see a time when only those will take up the liberal arts who can profit by them, and trade schools and professional schools in abundance will look after the other boys and girls. For the shadow of vocationalism, the constant demand for *ad hoc* training which comes today from so many parents and students and which more than anything else has caused a loss of confidence in our traditional college course, would vanish if schools with irreconcilable purposes existed side by side, frankly different, without any effort at compromise, the large ones teaching their students how to make a living, the small ones how to live a full, rich, intellectual life. It is true that most of the students who will thus be able undisturbed to give their hours to Aristotle and Sophocles will have to learn eventually how to make a living, too, since these schools will be too small and few to absorb all their own graduates as teachers. For them, however, vocationalism will wait on culture and be in the nature of graduate work, the time element being remedied by getting our students through their undergraduate studies at eighteen and nineteen years of age—an end devoutly to be wished, and not impossible.

Having thus solved the modern problem of vocationalism by reserving the liberal arts for those who are fit for them, let us imagine ourselves a board of inspectors visiting a Jesuit college in the year of our Lord 2000. The first room we enter, presided over by a middle-aged Father who will have been born about 1960, is doing the *Pro Marcello*, reading the Latin with emotion, analyzing the power of the speech, trying to transfer some of its beauty into English. Next door, a somewhat smaller group will be getting ready to produce *Antigone*, arguing about the difficult meter of the choruses. For our persistence in defending the ancient classics is not vestigial; it is not a mere habit that was formed in a simpler time when people had less to learn and much more leisure. It is a matter of dispassionate conviction arising from arguments which will probably be as valid in the year 2000 as they are at present. Then, as now, it will be desirable to know some other civilization with familiarity in order that we may better know our own. Then, as now, the splendor, depth, and completeness of Greece and Rome will be more impressive than that of China, Carthage, or Victorian England, not to mention Rooseveltian America or the worm-eaten Europe of the twentieth century. They will always have, moreover, immensely greater value than any other civilization as being two of the principal fountain heads of modern life. Then, as now, the sympathetic



understanding of another civilization will involve a knowledge of its language. And when you add the further advantage in the present instance that these languages are themselves so beautifully and so logically developed that their mastery tends to form invaluable habits of the intellect, you can readily understand why Jesuit colleges of liberal arts have no intention of abandoning Latin and Greek. The same is even more true of systematic philosophy. Sixty years from now our students will still be learning to think, not in bunches, but in an orderly process that turns all the stones and picks up loose threads as it goes. They will still be learning to analyze, a rare enough thing even now in this age of synthesis. They will still be welding together more through philosophy than any other means all their literature and their social and physical sciences; welding them into a definite interpretation of their own experience and of the world in which they will be living at that time. Science, will, as always, have its place. But it will be a place definitely subordinate to literature and philosophy. For we can anticipate nothing that will change our conviction with regard to the end of the liberal arts. While we remain what we are, we can never regard that end as the accumulation of facts or skills. We shall always be content to train the attitudes of our students, to let others train their hands. We shall never try to evaluate an ode of Horace in terms of dollars and cents. We shall always be absorbed in the thrilling task of enriching the taste, sharpening the intellect, and strengthening the will of future leaders of men. We have consistently resisted a dozen will-of-the-wisps through three generations of American floundering. We are not likely to follow any new ones in the next sixty years. The most influential of the present crop whose spirit has permeated every state of the Union with socialism, pragmatism, and exaggerated experimentalism, has left us happily unscathed. We esteem the individual too highly to be thorough-going socialists. We are too devoted to principles which we regard as eternal to be entirely pragmatic. We are too impressed by the accumulated wisdom of the human race, by that treasure of experience to which each generation adds its small deposit of true gold, ever to have our schools ignore the past and start again as though no one else had ever lived before us. Sixty years from now, we shall still strive to honor the individual, to honor eternal principles and traditions but above all, to honor God, who is the reason for honoring all the rest.

Therefore, of this one fact we are more certain than of all the other predictions about our future schools that have gone before, Jesuit education in the year of our Lord 2000 will still be definitely anti-naturalistic. It will be strong in its opposition to a system in which to quote de Hovre "mental life is reduced to psychology, psychology to physiology, physiology to biology and biology to mechanism," in which "concepts become per-



cepts, ideas become images or representations, intelligence becomes a function of the brain, the soul is reduced to matter, will is identified with instinct, freedom yields place to determinism." In which, to put it briefly, man is reduced to nature. You can be equally sure that all the symptoms and signs of naturalism will be absent, too. Relativity, with its fuzzy thinking about universal truth. Psychologism, with its desire to dissect human nature as one would the brain cells of a frog. Scorn of tradition, which makes everything old, seem absurd. Scientism, which accepts the laboratory as the only source of truth. Methodicism, with its worship of "how" at the expense of "what." Scepticism, which worships the pursuit of truth, rather than truth itself. Bibliolatry, which worships mere production for its own sake; which rates a teacher solely by the number of books he may have published.

Perhaps the rejection of all this will not be as individualizing in the year 2000 as it is today. Perhaps this naturalism, with its easy and empty catch phrases may be as extinct as the white rhinoceros in another sixty years. Certainly American educators of today are not as openly enthusiastic about it as they were three generations ago. At that time, you may remember, it was popularized by Comte in philosophy, by Darwin in science, by Spencer in education, and by Zola and Balzac in literature. It was so terrifically modern and so scientific in 1850, it was so easy to grasp and explained so much: "Nature is the source of all, all is explained by nature." My dear, it was as simple and as smart as stepping into a horse car. Then, too, it was so optimistic. All one had to do to be happy was to live in tune with nature. You know, clouds and rocks and things? Then, too, it had the distinct advantage of flattering the private judgment and doing away with the troublesome Ten Commandments. Unfortunately, however, the intervening century has emphasized the inadequacy of such a point of view, and now educators say they have abandoned naturalism. They haven't. They have abandoned only its name. All the derivative aberrations we mentioned above, beginning with Relativity and ending with Bibliolatry are still flourishing in American universities. It is still true that science is the main instrument of our national education, that it is still dehumanizing our schools, that it is still crowding out our liberal arts. As Max Scheler wrote in *Person und Sache*, "There is no point perhaps in which modern minds are more in accord than on this one, namely, that nature and machinery, things which man should control, have come to dominate man more and more, that *things* are becoming more powerful, more beautiful, more noble, that *man* is becoming smaller and more insignificant, a mere cog in the machine he has built." Sixty years from now, we Jesuits shall be still specializing in human nature. The tide may be with us or against us. It varies in different generations. We shall be just



as interested as ever in man's importance, man's absolute and relative importance. We shall still be absorbed in problems that center on the double role he plays as creature and lord of creation because when we cease to consider this, the starting point of all our education, we shall no longer be ourselves; our education will be something else.

In one way, therefore, our future is wholly unpredictable. Sixty years from now we may be just a picturesque chapter in the history of education, a phenomenon of the Renaissance that lasted into the bloody and barbarous twentieth century. If, however, the human race muddles through its difficulties and normal life returns, if the Jesuits are still conducting liberal arts colleges in a free United States, they will be following a rejuvenated, streamlined, but still quite recognizable *Ratio Studiorum*.



# More Writers from Our Colleges: Comments and Opinions

NOTE: To the December 1939 number of the *JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY*, Father Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., contributed a provocative article on the dearth of writers among graduates of Catholic colleges, with the title, "More Writers from Our Colleges?" The question has so many and far-reaching implications that we asked for comments on it from two Jesuits, long experienced in the field of college teaching and from three laymen, themselves products of Jesuit education and who are, moreover, teachers in Jesuit colleges. Their generous response is most gratifying and provides much fruitful reflection. It is hoped that further comments will be forthcoming from our readers.

In his article, Father Parsons had gallantly remarked, "A discussion arising from these statements will probably prove to have been the most useful aspect of the present paper."

Readers are referred to his article, which said, in brief,—Our Catholic colleges turn out dozens of young men every year, who can write as well as anybody now writing. The question comes down to this: not, why do we not turn out writers? but, why do our writers not write? . . . It is not a simple problem, but very complex. One difficulty is economic. Another, the general lack of literary tradition in families from which our students come. A third, the Catholic book field has not been of high critical standard. This has been greatly improved and the non-Catholic market is open to Catholic writers. To take advantage of the latter, our authors must speak to the American people in an accent they will understand. The colleges can be of help here, correcting methods of teaching where it is necessary and stimulating the student to think for himself.

## Catholic Colleges and Catholic Writers

These reflections, which occurred to me while reading the excellent article of Father Parsons on the poor productivity of writers in Catholic colleges, are not, I believe, contradictory of any of his observations. I think I agree substantially with most of what he has said. I wish merely to indicate certain directions in which further discussion might proceed.

By writers, Father Parsons means the authors of "best sellers and critical successes," creative writers. It is not clear just how far a college is obliged by its general purpose to go in the making of such writers. A college should aim to make its students read, no easy task, and write correctly in the manner of educated persons, a still harder task. Most colleges, secular as well as Catholic, are accomplishing much if they can fulfill this twofold office. If they did that much, nearly everyone would be satisfied. The secular colleges find it just as hard to do as Catholic colleges. I sup-



pose somewhere in this general purpose provision should be made for the exceptional lad with a creative turn. Ordinarily, he does not fit easily into the categories of educational machinery.

I have not investigated the academic provenance of our creative writers. Many of them speak in great disrespect of their schools, acknowledging no debt to them. Many never went to college. Is Harvard, or any similar college, particularly notable for the number of contemporary creative writers it has fostered? Perhaps. If so, I would suspect an elasticity of curriculum which was patient of the eccentricities of creative talent. It might not be a bad idea to introduce some of that elasticity into Catholic colleges.

Has anyone drawn up a more or less exhaustive list of prominent writers in modern literature and journalism whose last contact with Catholicism was had in Catholic schools? Names that occur to me are Conan Doyle, Sir Alfred Austin, Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, Lafcadio Hearn, James Joyce, Oliver Gogarty, George Sterling, Eugene O'Neill, Durant. Nearly every large newspaper in the country has among its staff or notable contributors men who went to Catholic colleges.

While I am ready to agree that Catholic colleges should produce more writers, I suggest that a greater problem is how to do something which will keep them Catholic after they leave us. If all the Voltaires and Molières were to remain steadfast in their faith, Catholic colleges might be able to point with pride. The literary temperament is usually volatile and particularly susceptible to the bland seductions of that part of the world where religion looks pale, uninviting, and unprofitable. The bright literary lads have a prying curiosity that outstrips their intellectual and moral development, and they are indefatigable in satisfying it by poring over all the books most destructive of a religious spirit. They acquire a vast amount of unseasonable knowledge which wrecks their souls and makes them contemptuous of their teachers. Most teachers, who can discern the first fissures of collapse, almost inevitable, are relieved, or, at least, not bitterly disappointed, when they discover none of these precocious youngsters in their classes.

It is not easy to see how the lads should be indulged in a larger latitude of independence outside of morals and religion. It is precisely in those two domains that the restless literary temper on its first awakening is most impatient of control. As for encouraging intellectual independence beyond the bare Catholic confines, I can form no definite concept of what is meant. In general, I am inclined to believe that the modern young mind stands in no need of this encouragement.

Father Parsons declares that our writers should have a Catholic accent. That is true; otherwise, they are of no use as light-bearers. But he adds



there must be something more behind the Catholic voice than there is at present. (That something is, of course, the creative power primarily—as in Francis Thompson.) He thinks Catholic writers are likely to assume a certain foreign outlook that segregates them from the public and makes them somewhat unintelligible and remote by the use of what is equivalent to a strange dialect. And he thinks this is owing to unnecessary inhibitions acquired in the Catholic college.

He is quite right, it seems to me, in suggesting that we identify ourselves more with the American mind. I cannot see how this identity can be brought about better than by saturating ourselves with our literature, our history, and our social life. I suspect that Catholic writers who make no headway with the public are simply ill-equipped as writers. Belloc and Chesterton, besides the creative touch, have no other quality behind their Catholic voice than an alert sense of what has happened and what is happening in the world. I do not think that the proper accent depends upon anything else, least of all, upon a freedom of speech in the discussion of moral problems and in ultra-realistic delineations of life. If our creative writers can do as well as Dickens and Thackeray and Anthony Trollope, the public will be satisfied. I do not think the public at large has much sympathy with the silly solecism that the great Victorians are prudish.

We may have too many inhibitions in our colleges. Are there more inhibitions in a Catholic college than in a Catholic convent school? Louise Imogen Guiney, Agnes Repplier, Katharine Tynan, Mary Colum, Elizabeth Jordan, Edith O'Shaughnessy, Helen Walker Homan, Mary Perkins, Bertita Harding, Mrs. Belloc-Lowndes, Blanche Kelly, all went to Catholic convent schools.

A certain degree of docility is the necessary condition of receptivity in acquiring knowledge and skill. A fresh and unusual way of seeing and representing the commonplace is the secret of the creative writer. This kind of independence few teachers will not encourage. And it is a kind of independence which suits youthful minds; much better than the kind which teaches grandma how to suck an egg.

Catholic periodicals in this country might be of assistance in attaching more importance to purely literary subjects unconnected with vital issues of the day. I have the *Month* for September 1940 before me. Bombs were raining on London; one of them is reported to have landed on the Manresa Press where the *Month* is printed. We should expect something approaching hysteria in its pages. It contains one article on the Sirens of Ulysses, one on the letters of William Cowper, one on the monastic order in England, one on the author of "Vathek," William Beckford, and one on re-reading St. John. There is one article of contemporary interest. If



this is trifling with grim realities, perhaps we should discard literature altogether as an anachronism in these menacing days.

JAMES J. DALY, S. J.

## Why Aren't Our Writers Writing?

The question must arise in the reader's mind as it has in the writer's, whether anything new or helpful can come out of further speculation and discussion on the old question, "why do not our colleges produce more writers?" The very fact that the question arises so often shows that we are disturbed by this lack of authors among our graduates and are anxious to supply any deficiency and adopt any means to stimulate activity in this most important field.

Of course, if writers are born and not made, the whole subject is as futile as to wonder why our graduates do not have more triplets in their families. It would merely mean that the law of averages had not come to our colleges as yet. Such a view, however, is hardly tenable. The craftsmanship of words can be taught; the selling of the wares of one's intellect and imagination can be facilitated; enthusiasm for authorship can be inculcated. Writers can be made.

Jesuit education, with its emphasis on literature and expression, should produce writers in abundance. But while we have an honorable representation in the other professions, the sad fact is that we do not produce producers of books. Any attempt to enumerate a respectable number of nationally-known authors who are graduates of our schools, ends in embarrassment and chagrin. Where are the novelists, dramatists, poets, critics, magazine writers, commentators, editors, columnists, script and scenario writers, in numbers sufficient to bolster our sincere conviction that Jesuit education is as effective today in producing intellectual leaders, as it was in the past? We have a few, to be sure, but the number is so small that we must ask ourselves honestly whether or not the fault lies in our educational methods.

A realistic view of the literary sterility of our graduates convinces us that something is wrong somewhere. Scholarship begets books; intellectual vitality is reproductive. Hostile critics can make out a damaging indictment against our education on this score. If our education is vital and productive, why do we not have an articulate and finished group of writers in the secular field to bear testimony to the adequacy and effectiveness of our training?

In the face of this discouraging consideration, there is a fact which, while it deepens the mystery, "comforts while it mocks." This writer cannot offer any conclusive solutions to the problem of increasing authorship



among our graduates, but he can testify to the fact that, when they are graduated, our student writers equal, and in many cases, surpass, the writers of other colleges and universities. This confident assertion is made after ten years of contact with student publications, involving necessarily a rather thorough acquaintance with the literary capabilities of our writers and, through exchanges, of the writers of other larger secular colleges and universities.

The faculty adviser of a college publication is not inclined by his task to become an effusive enthusiast. Long perusal of student manuscripts tends to jaundice his outlook and beats him down to a dour objectivity. But the most positive factual comment I can bring to this discussion is that, when they are graduated from college, a satisfactory proportion of our students can write well enough to give reasonable promise of future authorship, and a few have already attained professional proficiency. If our education were deficient in teaching *how to write*, this would not be so.

Because of this conviction—that the real problem lies in the years *after* graduation—it seems that Father Parsons expressed the problem most accurately: "the question comes down to this," he writes, "not, why do we not turn out writers? but, why do our writers not write?"

In any attempt to explain this situation, the economic solution is a favorite one. Our graduates do not write because, as a class, they are faced with the immediate necessity of earning a living. Those who could write are kept from literary activity by the stifling exigency of selling automobile tires or learning medicine, law, or theology. When they have attained a position where leisure is possible, the old urge and facility have gone.

There may be some validity to this view, but I do not think the explanation is adequate. Floorwalkers and doctors, office slaves and bartenders, tramps and executives, have become figures of literary prominence. An executive who wrote short stories on the side, recently retired from business to devote himself entirely to writing and found that he wrote less in otiose leisure than he had in the hurly-burly of business. Many writers who have attained fame were not endowed with leisure or surroundings congenial to literary creation. Those things came after poverty and discouragement had done all they could to crush the spark.

Another phase of this economic explanation, however, probably has something to do with the lack of writers among our own graduates, compared with the alumni of, let us say, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Williams. By far the greater portion of our students were the sons or grandsons of immigrants. From them they have received a legacy of Faith and good blood—but not culture.



Brains, keen wit, ambition, and personality have survived hard times and persecution. These qualities have taken them to the top in many professions; but the full growth of a literary personality seems to come to term only after some generations of education and at least moderate affluence and refinement. A nature compounded of sensitive observation, subjective interpretation of life, and imaginative and emotional awareness, is a hot-house plant. It does not thrive on physical struggle and necessitous living. Even when it appears in the midst of poverty, one can usually look for, and find, a hereditary background of books and art and high conversation; of sensitive and intellectual natures. The ancestors of most of the Catholic youth of this country—through no fault of their own—were not able to supply this nurture. This handicap is rapidly disappearing. The generation of our students which is now coming to maturity, has, in many cases, this background.

The writers in our colleges today show consistent and striking improvement over the literary output of the Jesuit collegians of the past. The tone is lighter, crisper, more sophisticated but less weighted with ponderous rhetoric—less spangled with borrowed learning, less redolent of the student lamp and less festooned with artificial asphodel. The current writing has much more maturity and penetration and readability. A comparison between the magazines of our colleges today and the yellowing pages of their forerunners, will show solid grounds for the hope that our writers are finding themselves and will be heard from very soon.

Can it be, then, that we are doing all we can to promote authorship and that we need only to wait until it emerges? We can hardly hold this optimistic view until we do as much for aspirants for authorship as we do for pre-legal, pre-medical, and pre-business students.

There may still be some confusion as to whether the aim of the general English courses is toward appreciation or creation; but for those students who have literary ability and inclination there should be more courses in advanced creative writing, the aim of which is professional. It is true that there are many courses in the technique and practice of the essay, the short story, and the one-act play but frequently they are merely amateur "composition" classes and lack a serious professional atmosphere. These courses should be in direct preparation for writing for publication with all seriousness—not mere dabbling in *belle lettres* as a pleasant hobby for a gentleman.

The biology student, dissecting his rabbit in the laboratory, can picture himself as a surgeon at the operating table but the English student has no such realistic stimulus for future accomplishment. While scientific students are prepared in the fundamentals of their business in a way that leads as directly as possible to earning a living and brings them into



contact with experts in their field, the English students are kept on a definitely academic plane. They do not know how to prepare copy or correct proof and have not the faintest idea how to go about selling an article. They are not treated as potential authors. There is a gap between them and the writing profession as wide as that between a child playing soldier and the United States Army.

The college magazines and newspapers fill this need to some extent and have started some on successful careers, but this training in the practical side of writing is limited to a very few.

Some may say that such practical training in technique and procedure is of very little importance compared with that mysterious gift of creative imagination, which makes a writer. It is true that the important thing is mastery of words that laugh and cry and intellectual receptivity to the wonders of life and the world: but many a person who has this gift never writes because of the lack of familiarity with the processes of getting into print.

Realizing that writing is a craft, which has its tools, its fashions, its markets, and trade secrets—and not a sort of mystical vocation—we could be much more realistic and helpful in preparing the literary craftsman for his trade. The difficulties facing the young writer who would make a profession of writing are grim and forbidding, but they are no greater for our students than for anyone else, except in moral responsibility.

There is in our colleges, too often, an inferiority complex on the matter of writing for publication. The idea of writing a book or even a magazine article seems as remote and awe-inspiring as climbing the Matterhorn. Everything possible should be done to remove this lack of assurance. Many of our graduates have something to say and the ability to say it well, but they are kept from authorship by lack of confidence. Secular colleges impart this assurance and literary extroversion more than do ours, but perhaps this lack of assurance is another handicap that is rapidly vanishing. Our colleges in the past were the magnificent efforts of a struggling minority. In them sons of poor men had the opportunity to regain, in humble brick buildings, the long lost wealth of scholarship their ancestors had forfeited for things of greater worth. Now those courageous beginnings have grown into imposing institutions. The gap between the proud secular universities and these little "seminaries" has grown less, and a more articulate and self-confident alumni will soon be winning a larger share of national recognition.

One other possible feature of our education which may stifle somewhat the creative urge in our students was touched on by Father Parsons, in his excellent article. In a discussion of this subject it should be considered seriously. Do we carry over from the courses in religion and



philosophy a dogmatism and spirit of regimentation which tends to submerge individuality and imagination? From "thinking the same thing with the Apostle" in matters of faith and morals do we tend to a sort of classicism of viewpoint in ordinary matters, which runs, as classicism does, to a distrust of the new, the individualistic, the informal, even in such indifferent matters as style and personal taste in the affairs of secular life?

Again, in our effort to impart a thoroughly Catholic foundation in the short years of training, perhaps we do not pay enough attention to opening the minds and imaginations of the students to the wonders of the world and of life, or sufficiently encourage original thinking in the indifferent affairs of life. The primary end of our education is, of course, religious and moral but the vast majority of our students are destined for life in the world and not the cloister. It would be definitely undesirable if we brought a distinctly clerical viewpoint into the secular portion of our curriculum. Religion belongs to all of life—but not the clerical viewpoint. It would certainly militate against our hope of giving authors to the world if we allowed clerical inhibitions to color our training. Then we would be like nervous hens who hatched ducklings and then tried to keep them from the water. We want, rather, articulate Catholics who are thorough Catholics but can speak in the accents of the world and make the world like and buy what they write.

In what better way could we help to clear up the sullied waters of contemporary literature and bring to the world the sanity and wholesomeness of the Catholic view of all of life? Our graduates, as writers, can reach a public which we can never reach, and we should do everything possible not only to train them in the craftsmanship of the written word, but to help them to break into the difficult but richly rewarding profession of writing.

Training and encouraging writers for the secular field is not to ignore Catholic literature. In the roll call of outstanding lay writers of Catholic books, how many of them have not first won a public the hard way—in the open field of competition in secular letters?

J. GERARD MEARS, S. J.

## Mistaken Ideas of Literature

In his penetrating article, "More Writers from Our Colleges?" Father Parsons records frankly the disagreeable fact that Catholic colleges turn out few writers. If they are at fault, it is not impossible that those hardy few, for whom Father Parsons is well qualified to speak, are writers in spite of the colleges, just as there are Catholic authors who have no de-



grees. The point, however, is that by comparison with the norm of the non-Catholic colleges, the Catholic should produce many competent, and certainly a few first-rate writers.

## I

Father Parsons' explanation are well-considered and they deserve study and development. Here, keeping in mind the norm of other colleges, I propose to look at the probable effect on those students who might become writers of some prevalent and, I believe, mistaken ideas of literature. Bacon might have classified these with his *Idola Fori*: for the assumptions that imaginative literature does not justify itself as a field of serious work, that it is romantic personalism which may be spun out of the natural resources of the inspired but unorientated mind, or that it is a dependency of philosophy, or is simply rhetoric, are notions that "insinuate themselves into the understanding."

The idea that literature cannot sustain itself as a province of study and of creative work without confusion with another branch of serious learning, is a particularly indigenous and a fundamental fallacy, comparable only with the popular notion that theology is not a science. I believe that neither apprehensions about *ars gratia artis*, nor the circumstance that sometimes our educational thinking goes back to a time when undeveloped vernacular literatures as such found no important place in the curriculum, will really account for this idea. It provides the theory or justification for the attitudes that imaginative literature itself is not to be taken seriously, and that at best it may well serve as a vehicle for polemicism, for the propagation of philosophic or dogmatic truths. This is not a question, as Father Parsons makes clear, of literature being Catholic, though that is a common defense, but of there being literature at all, in the accepted sense. For it is something of a paradox that several successful novels, enthusiastically received by Catholics, were written by authors who were, in the happy phrase of a colleague, "in the tradition," while those novels produced by authors in the very core of that tradition have too often disappointed. With the former certainly, something like apostolic zeal is replaced (not through an act of will) by a greater feeling for the independent province of literature. For the Catholic writer literature itself is often too unsubstantial, or profane, to be anything but purposefully moralistic, or sacred; these contiguous aspects I will look at below.

## II

If literature is not self-sustaining and itself a field of serious study, it will receive appropriate treatment in the student's program and in the classroom. As for the former, it is impossible for a student to acquire a true, a thorough, and a professional knowledge of the field to which he



hopes to contribute, when he majors in another subject. He will simply not have the time; a commensurate study of literature in the college is a four-year task. The latter, the treatment of literature in the classroom resulting from the theory of insufficiency, merits further consideration.

Professional artists, writers, musicians, or painters, who contribute to the arts, are in the position of having to know their art itself, that is, its examples or monuments, as well as its craftsmanship, or the technique of their profession. If the first requirement demands time and a broad knowledge, the second calls for careful study. The college program rightly, I think, does not generally recognize the course in creative writing, but supposes the student learns about his craft from its examples. It has, however, unfortunately admitted into the program the other extreme from the strictly technical course, an extreme which naturally follows from the concept of literature noted above, the course in loose, unintelligent, chiefly emotional reading. This seems to rest immediately on the romantic theory of poetry that the student, like Southey's "Uneducated Poets," needs only the stimulus of the beautiful to set his muse to singing. Its apologists greatly fear the deadening effects on genius of careful and analytical study of the monuments.

If the thorough understanding of, let us say, a great dramatist's craftsmanship, which comes only from careful study, does somehow kill appreciation, the lover of literature has failed a sound test. For the tests of literature, like its rewards, are high. Of course the method including such an approach becomes deadly in the college when it is used by the uninspired and uninspiring instructor whose instincts are those of the artisan. Rightly employed, it presupposes much from the instructor—enthusiasm, as well as specialized and continuous study. But when he lacks the former qualification, for our purposes he is no better than the applauded and genial, but poorly informed instructor who takes refuge in the emotional reading, or, in that last resort of untutored minds, the smart but empty lecture. The suspicion is not altogether unwarranted that sometimes this type of instructor, who gives his class an impressionistic essay of a stunning performance, may well be a creative artist in more or less permanent abeyance—who failed somehow to make the grade. Teaching itself should be, by aim and by design, a type of creative work, as it is with Socrates, but it should also retain its natural character and its purpose of teaching. The preparation to be diverted or amused is too generally the only one brought to the literature classroom. If literature is not a province worthy of serious study, naturally the assignment to the teaching of English of the frustrated creative artist, or even of the holder of a degree in philosophy or in law, does not seem very unreasonable.

Above I noted the supposed disadvantageous effect on talent of serious



study. The defense of the lyrical method is commonly that it stimulates enthusiasm and appreciation. This deserves a moment's attention, for I can grant the former in a partial and insufficient way, but not the latter in any true sense. Now the graduate instructor's idea and treatment of literature, contrary to some current opinions, does not differ *toto caelo* from the concept and method that should obtain in the colleges, but rather in emphasis and intensity. Since his aim is to further the understanding and so to deepen the enjoyment of literature, he should be able simply to assume that graduate students already possess the enthusiasm and appreciation which is the acknowledged goal of a college course. If he does, generally he will err grievously, and his erring can scarcely be called human, for he has every right to his assumption. He discovers early, of course, that he cannot suppose a common capacity for an intellectual reading which he might develop, and this leads me to a final point.

### III

If literature is not an independent province, and is not presented as a field of serious study, the undergraduate will not only fail to grasp its content and its technique, but he will secure little knowledge of or respect for its peculiar intellectual character. This deficiency encourages him when he comes himself to write, to fall back on, and to use whole-heartedly the one field of ideas he is familiar with, his philosophy, or specifically, his Catholicism. The notion that imaginative literature is, or should be in its intellectual character, an extension or a popular dependency of the realm of philosophy, not only confuses literature with real life, but leads to the indiscriminate application of the proper moral judgment as a norm. I hardly need point out that if we want poetic justice, we must forgo great tragedy. Father Parsons apparently has this general situation in mind when he urges that we must "cease extending our theological infallibility, where it is in place, to other purely secular or philosophical fields where it has no place." A strong inducement towards this interpretation of literature obviously is the presence of elements that are opposed to good morality. An indifference for the effect which literature aims to produce, which may be highly spiritual but not immediately identifiable with the result of a moral judgment, is here at fault. Perhaps more blameworthy is the reluctance to face the pertinent problem seriously and frankly, as François Mauriac does in his *God and Mammon*.

I turn aside a moment to notice two specific results of this disinclination to see literature as an expression of man's ideas and ideals. One may be exemplified by the tendency to interpret a Shakespearian tragedy on strict moral principles, which means confusion with a mediaeval morality play. A great tragedy like *Macbeth* then offers a very minor, as well as a



completely distorted and spurious, spiritual value, since its hero is seen, not as a noble character who commits a tragic mistake, but, by identifying sin with sinner, as a personification of one or more of the Deadly Sins. The other, eschewing the intellectual aspect entirely, makes literature simply the material for arid rhetorical study. This desiccative specialization, which has its proper proportion and useful place in the high school or freshman English, often gives Catholic imaginative literature the peculiar character of a studied, artificial, but empty kind of smartness—like the cloak of magnificent rhetoric of decadent metaphysical or neo-classical poetry which covers a puny, shrivelled body. It is easy to mistake the purpose for burlesque.

What the writer creates who is untutored in the nature of literature and who falls back on his Catholicism, is a work of perhaps doubtful art which clearly stands apart from the general literary traditions. It may be thoroughly Catholic, and as stirring as Newman's Tract XC, and just as definite in its implications; but is it also, let us say, a great novel, in the accepted sense? It appears rather to be a novel Laokoon unnoticed by Irving Babbitt, coldly calculated to satisfy with a vengeance the religious function which the dissident Arnold assigns literature. I am not implying that the writer give up or ignore either his philosophy or moral truths; this he cannot do, and great literature proves that he need not. But he has not digested and adjusted himself to the traditions of the field of literature. Indeed, like his work, he stands aside from the traditions in the sense of the "they" and the "us" which Father Parsons notices, and he does not talk to the American people "in an accent which it will understand."

It is here that the necessary broad intensive reading program, which should thoroughly acquaint the student with literary traditions and should form the more important part of a course, is specifically at fault. If this were rigorously emphasized, the student's capacity for independent thinking would be challenged and developed. For the classroom is then set within this program, not as the place for impressionism or gratuitous dogmatism, but where the competent instructor, qualified by special training in his particular field, guides and arbitrates the discussion which should result. I use "should" by design, for when circumstances have made some small progress in this direction possible, the defeatist attitude may readily lead to the acquiescence in a fruitless compromise with expectancy and immemorial usage: "Hath not old custom made this life more sweet?" The capacity for criticism like Father Parsons' is a sign of sound intellectual health; but collective courage is another matter.

RICHARD H. PERKINSON



## Where Our Writers Are Today

To answer the question why writers from Catholic colleges do not achieve national success is to catch the greased pig of faculty conventions. As long ago as the 1870's Catholic teachers and editors were deploring the fact that their graduates found no opportunity to steal time from their professions or their business to devote to literature. All the justifications now advanced for the impoverished state of Catholic literature were advanced then. It was said, with more justice than harsher critics will allow, that when a Catholic college graduate wrote or thought in a Catholic way, he was banned from the usual avenues to literary success. Few graduates of St. Francis Xavier, Georgetown, or Fordham received literary cadetships as readers, subeditors, reviewers, or contributors, reserved at Harpers, Scribners, and other publishers for deserving sons of Old Nassau or Eli Yale. And since the better Catholic graduates were (and are) more inclined to orthodoxy than to compromise or apostasy they gravitated to congenial jobs in the Catholic magazine and publishing field, where, from lack of competition, failure of a responsive and critical audience, and from disassociation with new trends of national thought and style, they did indeed fall into that desuetude aptly described as innocuous.

Today the question seems even more pertinent and an answer more urgent. The pioneering need to provide clergymen, doctors, lawyers, and enlightened men of business is less pressing. Excuses and justifications, once valid, are now extenuating pleas. Since 1930 many colleges have been equipped with most of the educational apparatus of secular universities; faculties and student bodies have been more conscious of the necessity to communicate their ideas to the rest of the world. In the academic journals Catholic college faculties have begun to speak. New Catholic reviews have been established and old ones expanded. Through the prominence of Continental Catholic authors and English converts the Catholic position has received more attention and elicited more intelligent comment from non-Catholic sources than ever before. Catholic graduates from secular colleges have won distinction in the fields of history and fiction. But the Catholic college graduate hasn't written the kind of book which for various reasons can be called successful. Why not?

More fundamental to the present discussion than the question "why can't Catholic college writers write?" is, "who are the Catholic writers who might have developed into writers but failed to do so?" There is no mystery about the failure of the majority of the students of any American college to write well. They simply can't or won't. Most of them shouldn't. But there is a mystery in the failure of brilliant undergraduates to fulfill their early promise. What has become of the men who impressed the most



sceptical and impartial critics with their ability to rival or surpass the products of prominent secular colleges? If we find clues to this failure most of the other difficulties solve themselves.

No one has made the investigation necessary to evaluate facts required to answer the above question. A large-scale investigation is still premature, since the majority of Catholic schools date their emergence from the disastrous World War period somewhere between 1926-1930. But if it is impossible to conclude, one may at least venture an opinion based upon reasonably accurate information on the careers of fifteen representative Catholic undergraduate writers who were contemporaries a few years ago. I have selected names at random and have omitted those whose work or position would readily identify them.

These men, with the exception of one who did not complete his college course, distinguished themselves in four Eastern Jesuit colleges (not the graduate or law schools) as editors of campus publications, as prominent contributors or as winners of literary prizes. What happened to them?

A went to law school, became a professor of law. He took an M. A. in politics as well and edits a technical law journal. B also became a lawyer and, although a busy and successful man, writes occasional essays on legal philosophy. C teaches English in a college and is in the last stages of a Ph. D. at Columbia. D has written a great deal of fine verse which will probably be published in book form. He is a constant contributor to Catholic reviews and has published over fifteen short stories, several of them in monthly magazines like *Cosmopolitan*. In the meantime he has taken an M. A., lectured widely and participated in the activities of several learned societies. E, a prodigy, is a congenital student and has a Ph. D. in semitics from one of the most severe schools in the country. F left school in his first or second year, worked on pulp magazines and advanced to the "slicks." Last year he wrote and sold twelve stories at top prices. After G has pattered about various jobs for several years, he wrote a short story for *The Saturday Evening Post* which brought him quick recognition. Now he is envied by many for his income as well as for his style. H has a Ph. D., teaches at a college, and is fighting his way back to normal prose. I has written an indifferent novel and multitudes of short stories, and articles for every magazine except *The Saturday Evening Post*. J is now, at thirty, a dean of men in a large high school, has written several textbooks, is writing several more, and is editor of an educational journal. K, head of his department at a college, is finishing a Ph. D. thesis already requested for publication by a learned society. In addition he has edited a series of readings, written a short book and several articles. L is on the staff of a true confession magazine. He has written decent poetry on his



own time. M has two A. B.'s, two M. A.'s, and a Ph. D. from a reputable state university. N took a brilliant doctorate at Harvard and has been an able teacher and administrator ever since. O took an M. A. and is writing a book on modern literature. Three or four essays have already been published.

This list tells its own story. The majority of potential writers from four Eastern Jesuit liberal arts colleges seem to be in, or just out of, graduate school. They are attending Columbia, Harvard, Wisconsin, and Hopkins in increasing numbers. They return to teach fairly advanced courses in colleges and graduate schools. Dedicated to scholarship and anxious to add to the prestige of their universities, they are writing, editing, and translating for technical journals. Their successors in the colleges are following the same path. Ten of the best prospective writers from the last three graduating classes at Fordham have gone to graduate school. Only four of the fifteen graduates previously mentioned have attempted to become professional writers. As far as I know they have not met any positive obstacles to their success. Of course it is true that agents are chary of books which "smell of incense." They are not prejudiced; they are merely persuaded that Catholics do not read. Our professional writers have every chance to succeed as writers provided they do not emphasize their Catholic ideals.

If graduate school is a good training ground for the prospective writer we may reasonably expect a greater literary contribution from Catholic college graduates. Whether that contribution will have either popular appeal or Catholic character remains to be seen. It seems safe to predict that the flow of the Catholic undergraduate writers to the graduate school will not stimulate *creative* writing however much it may tend to develop the general fund of information available to Catholics and more numerous contacts with non-Catholic thinkers.

Some Catholic educators may deplore the rush to the Ph. D. as a symptom of overemphasis and a portent of dull things to come. Perhaps they are right. But the rush corresponds to a real need in Catholic life, just as the early collegiate foundations fulfilled the real need for an educated ministry. When the work of instructing, informing, and stimulating generations of students in the realities, rather than in the shapes of Catholicism, has been completed, the need for a popular, creative literature will rise without the hovering attentions of critics and well-wishers.

FRANCIS X. CONNOLLY



## Scholars and Writers

I can add nothing new to what Father Parsons has written in his shrewd analysis of this problem, but I should like to try to enlarge on the last point he makes, that is:

if they (our graduates) do not have something to write about, something that is their very own, and not an echo of some teacher's ideas, then our Catholic colleges will continue to turn out writers who do not write.

Father Parsons is suggesting here, I think, another question, a larger one, and one to which we must find an answer before we begin to turn out more writers. That question is: why do not our Catholic colleges turn out more scholars? By scholars I mean simply men who continue the study of a subject to which they have been introduced in college and become qualified to make some contribution to that subject.

There is not very much we can do about the economic problems or about the family background of our students, but, if there are weaknesses in our system which, prescind from these other factors, prevent our colleges from developing scholars, we should face them squarely and try to find a remedy. The first and most obvious of these is the fact that very few of our teachers are scholars who write. I am not suggesting that the yardstick of productivity should be applied in our colleges but only that we cannot expect more from the pupil than from the master. Our teachers should be scholars in the subject they teach, at least in the sense in which I am using the term. They are well enough read to give instruction, certainly, but are they so well versed as to feel that they can compete on anything like even terms with teachers in the secular schools who have concentrated their attention for many years on one subject?

It is true, too, I think, that our teachers, like our students, have not been brought up in a tradition of scholarship. Few of them come from the homes of scholars. Their teachers, too, were not specialists and did not write. And most important, the schools in which they studied relied entirely on the teacher-textbook method of instruction. Witness the neglect of our libraries until the last few years!

This is a glaring weakness—if we mean to turn out scholars—this lack of good example, but more significant, if less obvious, is the fact that we have not been greatly concerned with making scholars of our students. If we had been, our teaching would long ago have been adapted to that purpose. There are isolated efforts which can be urged against the statement, but, by and large, it is only lately that our teachers have thought of the future of their students in terms of anything but the professions and "business." Has not our ideal graduate always been the successful



professional man, who is a good Catholic, equipped with a well-trained mind?

The state of our Catholic graduate schools up to the last few years, excepting for purely professional courses, is the clearest indication of our attitude. Their present improved condition may be attributed to the need of teachers for higher degrees and the pressure of accrediting agencies rather than to any great desire on our part to develop scholars.

I feel, too, that the lack of a purpose to produce scholars is reflected in our teaching and in our curriculum. We must be prepared to make some changes in our program and in our teaching because there are weaknesses in both which make them unfavorable to the development of scholars.

The most important of these has been indicated: we fail to give our students enough to think about. We are concerned too much with training the student to think and too little with providing him material on which to use his critical faculty. The best illustration of this failure is to be found, I think, in our English classes. Most of our students, from my observation, when they have finished their courses in poetry and rhetoric have acquired only a set of principles. They know amazingly little about English literature; they show little desire to read the great books in our language. I am afraid that to many the standards by which we judge a work of art have become more important than the work itself.

I think this fault runs through most of our courses. The student rarely seems to get to the point where he becomes so interested in any one subject that he wants to go further on his own. Perhaps we make him take too many courses. Or is the difficulty that our teachers do not take the individual subject seriously enough? Do they feel that each course is not important so much in itself as in its function as part of a system of training? If we are looking for scholars, the teacher's attitude must be quite different: he must believe that in each class he teaches there may be men who will want to go further in that one field and that to them this one subject may become more important than all the others together.

Another patent weakness has been our lack of adequate library facilities. I shall not make too much of this point because such a great deal has been done in the last few years to improve our libraries. Their poor condition was not nearly so important in itself as in the attitude of mind it indicated. We have not had books because we did not really want our students to read. Now that we have decided that the students should read, I am sure we will get for them well-stocked and well-administered libraries. When I was in college, it was possible to go through the four years without reading a single book—and many did. Happily, things are on the mend, and, if we continue this new emphasis on books and read-



ing, we shall have certainly more readers. And scholars must first be readers.

Father Parsons has made the point that we must foster "the habit of individual thought toward the ordinary things of life," and that brings me to what I think is another defect. It is the last one I shall mention and it is simply this: our colleges differ too little from high schools in their general attitude toward the student. If we want our students to act like men and to think like men, we must (even though it will often take a great effort) treat them as men. If we want them to have opinions of their own, we must respect their opinions—no matter how silly they seem to us. It is only so that we can foster the idea in the student that out of *his* thinking may come something of value.

JOSEPH P. DESMOND



# Jesuit Education and Democracy

GERARD F. YATES, S. J.

To the distant rumble of bomb explosions in Britain and along the French coasts, thoughtful people everywhere are re-examining their heritage of political ideas and institutions. The press constantly reports discussions on what science, industry, the schools, the churches can do for democracy. It is all a little frantic, perhaps; but that such soul-searching should take place is inevitable in this grave hour of history. And it may not be without profit to consider what contribution our own educational system may make to the strengthening and defense of American democracy.

I suppose we can agree that the aim of Jesuit education may be described, partially at least, as mental awareness and moral strength. Catholic education in general proceeds from a very clear and definite doctrine of human nature, founded in revelation; and to such a doctrine it can never be false. But the institutions and techniques of Catholic education are subject to change. Thus, as the various fields of knowledge have been more fully explored, and as various branches of learning have been differentiated, curricula have been enlarged, enriched—some would say, over-stuffed—in the attempt to place before the student a well-balanced, if admittedly incomplete, picture of the cosmos of which he is a part. Similarly, research and years of accumulated experience have improved and facilitated the work of both teacher and student. Surely the American Jesuit college of today is very different from its European prototype of a few centuries ago. I am not arguing that what is new is of necessity superior, and still less that our present system cannot be improved on, even with our present resources. The point is that our organization of today has evolved and developed, just as our whole world has evolved and developed; that as the social patterns of successive generations have changed, our educational system has been and must necessarily be responsive to new intellectual and social developments. To do otherwise would be to fail in our main endeavor—the moral and intellectual preparation of men for a fruitful life in the actual world.

But with all the changes in curriculum and technique, the Jesuit ideal remains the same. The chapel is still the heart of the college. The doctrine of human nature is abiding, the spirit of our teaching is unchanged; and these things are what make our work meaningful. Fundamentally, the old and the new are the same, as are the acorn and the oak; and it can fairly be said that we have kept faith with the past and are keeping faith with



the present. Hence the serious view we must take of our professional responsibility in facing today's problems in the organization of society.

Now, if institutionalized education within the same philosophical system has changed in the sense described above, so too has government, and more particularly, democracy. Man has always had government, because he has always needed it. But the City-State of ancient Greece and the great national "Service-State" of today are as different as a trireme and a transatlantic clipper. Changes and developments in science, philosophy, law, technology, language, geographical discovery, mechanical invention, all have played a part in the growth of governmental institutions, and have necessarily affected political thought.

For political thought cannot be static. While at its best it is no mere rationalization of a temporary *status quo*, one of its most important functions is to explain a given political order to those who live under it and are parts of it. As new developments in science, say, or industry affect organized life in society, the political thinker must undertake new attempts at a synthesis which will harmonize the new forces and elements with those that preceded them, interpreting and providing for legitimate human needs and aspirations as they arise. For example, political parties and labor unions were developments quite unforeseen by the democratic theorists of the late eighteenth century, but both are highly important elements in contemporary society—so important, indeed, that their forcible extinction was thought to be necessary in totalitarian states, the several Master Parties being rather more like palace guards than parties in the conventional sense.

At the same time, political theory, if it is to be of any real significance, must repose on a theory of human nature. When you are planning a house, or studying a house already built, it makes all the difference to your conclusions about it whether the house is meant for a man or for a dog. As Professor Ross Hoffmann has finely said:<sup>1</sup> "First things come first, and back of all politics and sociology there lie philosophy and religion." And so the Catholic political thinker, like the Catholic educator, is capable of deeper and more intelligent and more meaningful social criticism than any other.

It is a mistake, however, to be content merely with stating first principles, or simply to echo, with little commentary and no development, the ideas of St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Robert Bellarmine, Francisco Suarez. The men for whom and about whom they wrote are fundamentally the same as the men of today; but the social organizations, then and now, are, for better or worse, different. It should be noticed, too, that Bellarmine, for example, was not content with a mere repetition of St. Thomas. In the

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Will to Freedom*, London, 1936. p. 68.



given situation, he could not have been. The conception of the Emperor as temporal head of one undivided Christendom had largely passed in Bellarmine's day; national states and kings were rising on every hand, each claiming complete sovereignty in his own domain. Bellarmine's problem was to legitimize reasonable claims to secular authority, and at the same time reasonably to defend the indirect power of the Pope in temporal matters. True, man still had the same origin and destiny, in society and out of it; true, authority still came from God; but actual society—the means to the end—was different from what it had been in the thirteenth century and before; and authority, divine in origin though it was, now manifested itself in ways that would have seemed strange indeed to the men of the Middle Ages.

Suarez, too, was alive to new problems. For example, in a paragraph that is big with consequences for our own time, he writes:<sup>2</sup>

. . . Though any one state, republic or kingdom be in itself a perfect community . . . nevertheless each of the states is also a member, in a certain sense, of the world. . . . *For none of these communities are ever sufficient unto themselves to such a degree that they do not require some mutual help, society or communication, either to their greater advantage or from moral necessity and need.* . . . For this reason therefore, they need some law whereby they may be directed and rightly ruled in this kind of communication and society.

Such a statement might have almost mystified students a few centuries earlier, when there was but one *Respublica Christiana*, when a barter economy based on self-sufficient villages, the feudal system, and an international culture bestowed by the Church made quite superfluous a plea for international law of the kind Suarez here seems to demand.<sup>3</sup>

Adjustments of the foregoing type are the problem of the Catholic political thinker today. The rate of social change has been tremendously accelerated in the last century and a half. It requires a strong effort of the imagination to picture a world in which the smoke of modern industry did not blacken the sky, in which a voyage to Europe was a matter of weeks or months, and even a trip to the county seat was an adventure. Even those who have witnessed the coming of the automobile, the airplane, and the radio are now so accustomed to them that one is startled at seeing a photograph of a national highway of 1912, with all its ruts and mud, and

<sup>2</sup> De Legibus ac de Deo Legislatore, lib. II, cap. 19, par. 9. Italics inserted.

<sup>3</sup> I do not mean, obviously, that the Middle Ages were not conscious of what we might call international law. St. Thomas is full of meaty reflections on peace and war; the notion of "Jus Gentium" was inherited from Roman times. But in the passage quoted, Suarez seems to be thinking about law as between equal and independent states—a concept unknown to the Middle Ages. And "Jus Gentium" seems to mean "a body of rights belonging to all peoples, whatever the accidents of their birth, which should be respected, in their mutual relations." Cf. Eppstein, *The Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations*, London, 1935. p. 259.



amused and alarmed by a snapshot of an early "airship"—a nightmare contraption of wings and bicycle wheels. Yet all these things and many more have changed the pattern and the matrix of our social lives. The Political Revolution did not come alone; the Industrial Revolution was superimposed on it. It was still true that the purpose of civil government was to provide for the peace and security of those who lived under it; but the content of these general concepts had to be analyzed anew, with reference to problems—the growth of an urban proletariat, for example—which earlier generations were not called upon to face, and in terms of new channels of authority, new governmental institutions and processes. The age of "Social Politics," to use the happy phrase of Professor Carlton Hayes,<sup>4</sup> had arrived. For the Political Revolution cast off various old political ties, and various social disabilities; it was, if you will, a somewhat negative movement, emphasizing "freedom from." Later in the process, in consequence of democratization and industrialism, a positive demand makes itself felt, emphasizing greater participation, not only in the governmental process but in economic advantages, calling for positive services from the state—benefits such as unemployment insurance, standards of wages and hours, old age pensions and the like. To describe the movement would be to tell, among other things, the history of de Mun and the Social Catholics in France and elsewhere on the Continent, of Manning and the pre-1914 Liberal Party in England, and—much later—of the New Deal in this country, not to mention, *ex altera parte*, socialism in its many forms.

Now all this may seem remote from the problem set before us at the outset, namely, what contribution our Jesuit educational system in this country can make to democracy. I do not think, however, that we have wandered too far afield. For our problem, as I see it, is two-fold: it is, first of all, to hand on to our students, in definite and vivid terms, such a doctrine of human nature as will provide them with something basic to all their political thought, and something partaking of the nature of an absolute to which they can refer democratic doctrine. And secondly, it is to play our part, as teachers, students, writers, in interpreting the needs of our time with the aid of our age-old and immutable philosophical concepts. For both tasks, understanding of the origins of our pressing social problems is absolutely vital.

Some contemporary writers and some university professors and presidents are experiencing an uncomfortable intellectual draft as they awake to find a large proportion of young men and women, well formed in scepticism and disillusionment by their very teachers, no longer actively believe in any values, and that if these young people cling with a certain

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *British Social Politics*, New York, 1913.



instinct to a belief in democracy, this belief, lacking a radical basis in logic and human nature, is not likely to survive sudden, violent shocks. The situation has been admirably though perhaps too pessimistically described by Professor Mortimer Adler.<sup>5</sup> There are plenty of people who base their belief in democracy, very sincerely and very completely, on a theory of natural rights. Theirs is a fair working theory so far as it goes, and it may provide them with a more or less permanent philosophical abode. But there are almost inevitable contradictions which will beat at its windows. And when you say, "yes, but on what do you base natural rights?" the discussion becomes viciously circular.

Catholic educators do not labor under such disabilities. Their doctrine of natural rights can be traced back to verities that are pre-political, that are bound up with ethics and with theology. They do not need to plead for "*faith* in the democratic process"; they do not view democracy as a particular set of *mores*, which, in a given cultural frame of reference (blessed phrase!) enjoy a temporary vogue and a somewhat dubious respectability. But they should endeavor to communicate to their students a reasoned, vital enthusiasm for responsible representative government according to just law and reasonable interpretation of the Constitution, as that form which is most in harmony with individual dignity and social responsibility in our historical setting.

Catholic educators will be realistic; yet they shall not betray themselves and their students by hard-boiled, disillusioned cynicism about political facts—which logically ends in the overthrow of democracy and perhaps in a "revolution of nihilism." They cannot afford to shrug their shoulders at political corruption, because, forsooth, it has "always existed," and anyway, doesn't the "machine" give handouts to the poor and tear up the clergy's traffic tickets? Mr. Charles Michelson, publicity director for the Democratic National Committee, has recently given us a splendid example both of a type of political *mores* and of the cynical attitude we must combat. In an article released to the daily press by the North American Newspaper Alliance agency, dated Washington, November 11, 1940, Mr. Michelson offers a "critique by a publicity engineer of the technique and strategy of . . . the battle for Wendell Willkie." Speaking of the choice of Mr. Willkie as candidate for the Presidency, he writes:

I do not know that anybody could have beaten such a popular idol as Franklin D. Roosevelt, but I have in mind the type which would have had a much better chance than Mr. Willkie. He should have been a bland person, with some wealth, inherited possibly, and a record of public service—governor of a state, perhaps, or a judge, or even the head of a conspicuous philan-

<sup>5</sup> "This Pre-War Generation," *Harper's Magazine*, October 1940.



thropic organization, with a war record to take away the taint of stuffed-shirtism. *A human bromide? Certainly; that's what the occasion demanded.*<sup>6</sup>

Whether or not Mr. Michelson is spoofing his foes, the same attitude is to be found in many political treatises by serious scholars, and I submit that the logical consequences of such statements are more dangerous to democracy than Mr. Earl Browder's noisiest rallies.

On the other hand, and at the opposite extreme, we will carefully refrain from identifying any form of governmental institutions with "Catholicism," bearing in mind the precisions of every pope since Leo XIII as to the compatibility of the Church with any form of civil society which recognizes the rights of God and the Church. Nor will we be deluded into thinking that Christianity is, to quote Mr. Christopher Dawson,<sup>7</sup> "like a patent medicine that is warranted to cure all diseases." The same author continues:<sup>8</sup>

Christianity offers no short cuts to economic prosperity or social stability. A century ago there was a tendency to treat Christianity as a kind of social sedative that kept the lower classes obedient and industrious, and the consequence was the Marxian denunciation of religion as the opium of the poor. And if today we treat Christianity as a social tonic that will cure economic depression and social unrest and make everybody happy, we shall only ensure disillusionment and reaction. *It is impossible to create a Christian social order ab extra by the application of a few ready-made principles or by introducing legislative reforms.*

Furthermore, just because we are by second nature so conscious and respectful of order and hierarchy in truth, we shall be very careful not to withdraw prematurely to the higher ground of abstract principle, and content ourselves with being philosophers, leaving what are called the social sciences to stew in their own thin intellectual juices. Those sciences—politics, economics, sociology—need precisely what we have to give them: an ethical bearing; but the trick can't be done without studious application to political, economic, and sociological facts, as they actually occur in our social setting. Some day, some of our graduates may make important contributions to social theory, to law, to public life, precisely because they are Catholic scholars. Let us remember that, as educators, we have a duty to society of preparing not just good citizens, but really capable leaders, in public life as well as in the Church and other vocations.

One last word. Our concern with democracy and its problems at home

<sup>6</sup> Italics inserted.—One may doubt whether this is a very good analysis even on Mr. Michelson's own premisses. After all, Mr. Willkie ran an excellent race; most commentators considered him the strongest possible candidate, and he attracted five million new votes to the ticket, while President Roosevelt lost half a million from his 1936 total.

<sup>7</sup> *Religion and the Modern State*, London, 1938. p. 121.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 121-22. Italics inserted.



should not distract our attention as Catholic educators from the larger problem of world organization. In this field perhaps more than elsewhere, Catholic scholarship in America faces a challenge. Is it not fair to say that Catholics, who ought to be universalists by habit of mind, and hence better qualified to apprehend the issues at stake, have been somewhat slow to contribute anything very substantial to the raging debates about international organization and law, the concept of neutrality, intervention, national self-determination, that fill the air about us? Here the ground is shaky indeed; ethical principles have still to be formulated and developed. But perhaps in this very domain, American Catholics may make their best contribution. The vigorous Catholic social thinkers of France, the Low Countries, the Germanies, have now been silenced;<sup>9</sup> perhaps we can try to fill their place.

Catholic—and Jesuit—education, then, has a contribution to make to democracy, and to the American way of life. It has its Christian-humanist tradition and philosophy of man with which to give true meaning and value to our democratic institutions. But it cannot confine itself solely to abstract statement, as though the social order were static. In a changing, growing world, ever more complex, it must continually enlarge and refine its doctrine to reach and to penetrate new human problems and situations created by external forces—“*omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete.*” In proclaiming what ought to be, Catholic education should never overlook what is: to do so would be to create an inadequate picture of the world, and risk untrue conclusions. But its view of what is will never obscure the beckoning summons of duty to that which ought to be, to those things which will create a better world for free yet responsible men.

---

<sup>9</sup> Everyone must know about such movements as the J. O. C., *Action Populaire*, etc. But Catholic thinkers in Europe were also greatly concerned about international problems. See, for example, the *Semaine Sociale de France* of 1926, the subject of which was “*La Vie Internationale*” (*Compte Rendu: La Chronique Sociale*, Lyon, 1926); also, the excellent “*Code de Morale Internationale*,” published by the *Union Internationale d’Etudes Sociales* of Malines, Paris, 1937, which was compiled by Father Albert Muller, S. J., of the faculty of the Institut St-Ignace of Antwerp, and later translated by the Catholic Social Guild, Oxford, 1938.



# The French Canadian Jesuit College

MALACHI J. DONNELLY, S. J.

In the general Prospectus of the Collège Sainte-Marie of Montreal, we read:

L'éducation, au sens profond de ce mot, consiste dans le développement complet et harmonieux de toutes les facultés. Ce n'est donc pas simplement instruction, science variée, étendue, même profonde, quoique la science soit nécessaire, comme instrument, dans tout système d'éducation. Le but de l'éducation est la culture de l'esprit, la formation de la conscience et du cœur.

Let us see how, and if, such a goal is attained. The business of matriculation is quite simple. The student is given a list of books. He buys them, looks at his schedule, comes to class. Electives are unheard of. The course formulated by the *Préfet des Études* of the Province is followed with exactness.

The Collège is above all a unit. The first four years, corresponding roughly to our high school, are: *Éléments Latins*, *Syntaxe*, *Méthode*, and *Versification*. It is quite common for boys to enter at twelve years of age. For those who are judged not sufficiently prepared to begin the first year of the course, there is the *Cours préparatoire*. In the regular course (from which there are no exceptions), Greek begins in second year. Besides the ordinary rough fare of history, Latin, Greek, and mathematics, an attempt is made to give the student a good reading knowledge of English and fair facility in practical conversation. Nowhere is found the honey-coated pill, nowhere a substitute for hard work. Great stress is placed upon composition and language analysis. The *devoir*, a written composition in French, Latin, or Greek, is a daily duty. As a result, the student, after four years of this so-called gerund grinding, knows his grammar. For him subject, predicate, modifiers are not mere words; they are structural sections of an all-important scaffolding that he must erect, if he is to build an edifice in written language that will accurately and, to a degree, elegantly express his personal thoughts and aspirations.

The last four years of the College are the equivalent of our college arts course. The first two years, *Belles Lettres* and *Rhétorique*, are devoted exclusively to literature, composition, and profound language analysis. The last two years, *Philosophie*, are devoted to a thorough study of scholastic philosophy and requisite science.



If there is one outstanding difference between the curriculum of the French college and that of our arts college, it lies in the constant insistence upon the idea of *multum*, rather than *multa*. In *Rhétorique* stress is laid upon correct writing, before elegant writing is attempted and the correct way must be learned—there is no alternative. Again, in literature the great classic types of French literature are studied. Before reading Henri Ghéon, the student is taught to appreciate Racine, Corneille, and Molière. Once he has learned to appreciate the universal classics, he may be allowed access to more modern literature. In *Philosophie* emphasis is placed upon analysis of concepts, not upon mere definitions. It is not sufficient that the student philosopher be able to recite glibly: "Omne quod movetur, ab alio movetur; omne agens agit propter finem; nihil agit, nisi in quantum est in actu"—and a score of other *clichés*. Rather, he is made to prove these philosophical passwords, and that to the hilt. Then he must come to see their bearing in the great philosophical structure that is Thomism.

For eight solid years, a unified course offers the student hard intellectual fare. In the French college, each year looks towards and prepares for the following; every step, every subject is harmonized with the whole. As a result, the graduate leaves college equipped with a trained mind that is, in the words of Bishop Francis C. Kelly, himself a graduate of a Canadian college, a veritable power-house. At a first meeting, one may think the *Canadien* very provincial in his outlook. It is true that his horizon is narrower than that of the graduate in the United States. He may know fewer facts. Yet he knows much more, for his is a *knowledge*, not a mere awareness of facts. It is the time-honored difference between *intelligere* and *scire*. The graduate from the French Canadian college thinks logically, sees relations between the part and the whole, judges the particular in the light of, and in its bearing on, the universal field of reality. He is an educated man.

In the Canadian college, as I have indicated, there is not the problem of major and minor subjects. Consequently, during the last two years of college, the student has ample time for the study of philosophy. On the contrary, in our own colleges in the United States, the student is forced by requirements to spend much time on his major and the inevitable thesis. He is thus overburdened with subjects. The French student, far from being *débordé*, pursues his philosophical course with that leisure that is essential to its proper mastery. In brief, the curriculum of the modern French Canadian Jesuit college is quite the same as was our own before 1914.

Jesuit education, if it is to mean anything at all, means more than a way of teaching. It is closely linked, even as matter with form, with a definite course of studies. Leave out the traditional Jesuit subject matter and the best Jesuit methods will be woefully inadequate.



# BROADENING HORIZONS

---

## The Study of English in Jesuit and Public High Schools in the Middle Atlantic States

JOSEPH A. SLATTERY, S. J.

The purpose of this paper is to present a parallel between the High School English Syllabus at present in use in the Maryland-New York Province and the type of curriculum generally followed in the public high schools of the same area. In arriving at an idea of this typical curriculum, a certain amount of selection was inevitable, seeing that some variation is found between state and state. However, as the scope of the paper is restricted to general objectives and basic principles of organization, it is hoped that a fair picture of current conditions will be attained. There will be a minimum of comment and appraisal of the relative merits of our own system and that of our neighbors. The purpose is to present a parallel, not a comparison.

### I. GENERAL OBJECTIVES

The aim of English studies in our high schools may be gathered from the general objectives declared by the Jesuit Principals' Institute in July 1940. "Specifically as a secondary school, the Jesuit High School strives to teach adolescent boys to think intelligently and wisely, . . . to promote character education, . . . physical health, . . . proper social attitudes and habits, . . . an intelligent appreciation of beauty, . . . to develop in its pupils respect for the past, . . . the humanistic habit of mind, . . . habits of orderly thinking, . . . competency in the arts of expression. As an American secondary school the Jesuit High School strives to develop pupils who appreciate that the American way of life is based on the sound principle that man has received from God inalienable rights which the state has not given and cannot take away, . . . who will participate actively and conscientiously in the government of our country, . . . who will contribute to the formation of wise public policies and to the solution of public problems."

The general aim of public schools in the same area may be taken as fairly put forth in an *English Course for the High Schools of Newark*. "The school of today," this syllabus declares, "must use subject matter . . . as one of several available means towards two great purposes: the fullest possible development of the boy and girl, physically, mentally and morally; the widest possible preparation of young people to take an honorable part in planning, building and enjoying a new life worthy of the America of



tomorrow. The value of material must be judged by the extent to which it can be made to contribute to these two main purposes of the school of today."

The more philosophic approach and definiteness of conclusion apparent in the Jesuit statement is, I think, characteristic of our whole system.

## II. AIMS IN THE STUDY OF ENGLISH COMPOSITION

The Maryland-New York Syllabus states that "the purpose of the course in English Composition is to teach the pupil to express himself in clear, orderly and effective language both in writing and speaking. Note that this purpose has nothing to do with the development of a literary style in the narrow sense of this word; one object is to enable the pupil to use his native language for the practical purposes of life. It is a mistake to turn out adepts in imaginative and fanciful expression who are unable to narrate with accuracy and precision the simplest incidents, or to state in unaffected language such opinions as they may have. Clarity, directness and simplicity, without artificial embellishments, are the qualities to be cultivated." The New York State Syllabus declares, "The aim of composition work, whether oral or written is to help boys and girls to discover things that they will want to say, and then to enable them to say these things as well as possible. The teacher of composition must possess, first of all, the faculty of revealing to his pupils the interest that lies in their own mental stores, however slight or commonplace these may be, and next, skill in enlarging and enriching the mental lives of his pupils. . . . The pupil who discovers that he can write an acceptable and interesting composition with no material beyond that furnished by the round of his daily activities will have less trouble with inhibition thereafter. Through this discovery he can be led into closer observation of what he sees, keener awareness of life about him. . . . The attempt to say what he has seen or thought will sharpen vision and clarify reflection."

Both of these passages apparently stem from the famous distinction laid down in Walter Pater's essay on *Style* between writing as a useful art—"The skillful communication of fact"—and writing as a fine art—"The communication with distinguished skill of sense of fact." The latter is commonly known as creative writing and the first impression left by the two passages cited might be that creative writing is regarded as beyond the scope of high-school instruction. That this is not the case will be seen in the Jesuit syllabus where "Development of the Imagination" and exercises in elegance or "Interest" are prescribed in third year. Again the New York syllabus, like that of most of the public high schools in the country today, derives directly from *An Experience Curriculum in English* compiled by the National Council of Teachers of English. This curriculum



recognizes creative expression even of poetic experience as one of the normal exercises of high-school composition. Both systems it would seem, simply recognize the fact that adolescents are generally more alive to the external events than to internal states and will be called upon to use their powers of expression for the utilitarian purposes of daily life more often than for the record of aesthetic experiences.

### III. ORGANIZATION OF THE COURSE IN COMPOSITION

In the Maryland-New York Syllabus composition is based on study and practice of the five forms of discourse: narration, description, exposition, argumentation, and persuasion. Narration and description are taken in first year; narration, description, and exposition in second year; narration, description, exposition, and argumentation in third year; all the forms in fourth year. Although each year after the first thus contains a recapitulation of the matter seen in the previous class there is no necessary monotony in the curriculum since in each class the approach and emphasis is varied according to the element in the process of expression which is singled out for detailed study.

Thus in first year the element studied is that of integration. The pupil is made to realize that every composition has a natural introduction, body, and conclusion. In second year he studies rhetorical development and the structural principles involved in every literary work: unity, coherence, and proportion or emphasis. In the third year he endeavors to grasp the essential qualities of style: clearness, force, and elegance. In fourth year he advances to a critical appreciation of the literary truths which he has hitherto learned as practice rules only.

In public high schools the composition courses are organized about the interests of adolescence. It is assumed that boys and girls are interested in adventure, in sports and games, in their environment at home and school, in pets, hobbies, personalities, inventions, trades, and professions, in the social and political organization of their country, in the men who have shaped history or advanced knowledge, in the wonders of nature, in personal conduct and religion. About these and similar foci of interest a triple strand of experience is woven. The first is that of observation or sense impression—the actual sight and sound of things which enter the lives of the pupils. The second strand is that of imagination. This may be either the residuum of images left in the mind after a book has been read, a lecture heard, or the like, or it may be the result of association which brings to the surface of consciousness similar or contrasted ideas. The third strand is that of reflection. This occurs when the mind introduces a rational connection between perceptions, discerns their order and significance and so relates experience to the ends of life.



The high-school curriculum, then, selecting such adolescent interests as are most congruous to the stage of development of each class endeavors to awaken the pupil to a realization of his actual and possible experiences within the focus of that interest. Such realization in the lower grades will be chiefly directed to fuller and more vivid observations of concrete events and realities, but will progress in the upper grades to imaginative illustration and idealization and finally to intellectual comprehension, differentiation, and analysis and synthesis.

It would seem at first sight that this approach to the study of composition is irreconcilably opposed to that laid down in our syllabus. It starts with the assumption that all experience is unique and will find its own form of expression. We begin with the postulate that there are certain definite functions of expression and that every experience will fall under one or more of them. In practice, however, the differences are not so wide nor so clear cut. *The Experience Curriculum*, for example, recognizes that "the pupils should be familiar with simple patterns which they can adopt or adapt for their own purposes. Probably the best means to bring about possession of such patterns without obsession by them is to read much good literature and to give the patterns there employed a moderate amount of attention. For some children attempts to imitate these patterns will prepare the way for self-expression." Similarly our syllabus insists that the exploration of experience must precede the actual attempt to write in any form of discourse, the purpose being to emphasize the fact that the pupil's mind is very like that of other men and that the processes by which great authors have succeeded in communicating their thoughts and feelings are likely to prove efficacious when the pupil attempts a similar feat. In both systems, then, there is a dependence on literary models as well as upon the instinctive faculty of self-expression. The difference of approach or point of view is striking and that of emphasis may be equally great. But it is not necessarily so. It is possible that two practical and realistic teachers working under different theories may find themselves employing very similar techniques.

#### IV. AIMS IN THE STUDY OF LITERATURE

The Maryland-New York Syllabus defines its purpose in the study of literature as that of teaching the boy to read *intelligently* and thus enrich his intellectual life by helping him to understand the experiences conveyed through literature and to read *appreciatively* and thus to enrich his imaginative life, his emotional life, and his power of aesthetic response. This aesthetic purpose will be served in studying the prose authors by inquiring how the author illustrates the principles of composition, that is, how he makes his experience communicable to others. It will be served in studying



poetry by the gradual development of taste as the pupil learns to realize the possible appeal of the poem to himself. An incidental result of the study of prescribed books will be an acquaintance with a large number of literary types.

For a statement of objectives recognized in public high schools we may take as typical the following from *Suggestions for Developing Courses of Study in Literature for Secondary Schools*, a bulletin issued by the State of Pennsylvania: "Contributions which a study of literature should make to the realization of the aims of secondary education are:

"1. To provide enjoyment and enrichment of personality through extensive reading in the broad field of literature.

"2. To develop literary sensibilities through guidance of emotional responses and through training of the imagination.

"3. To establish literary standards through evaluation of the literature read.

"4. To develop insight into life through ethical judgments based on experience in literature and life.

"5. To develop a consciousness of changing social responsibilities through the application of literature to life."

A few paragraphs later we meet an explanation and defense of the first objective enumerated. "Extensive reading affords not less knowledge than the older method but more. The extensive method may be characterized as the rapid reading of a comparatively large amount of literature with general comments and discussions in class; the intensive, as the detailed, analytical study of the minimum of literature required by many of the older courses of study. The extensive reading program suggested has been selected to show life—past and present, near and far, in its many aspects."

This passage brings up an inevitable discussion of the relative importance of form and of content in literary study. Here we find the Maryland-New York Syllabus both moderate and explicit. "The study of literature does not mean the study of notes, allusions, figures of speech, meaning of words, but rather it means the reading of good books just as they are read (or should be read) in actual life, with only this difference that the process in the class room is less spontaneous and more painstaking because the pupil must be taught. Therefore it is important to avoid the two extremes of merely going through the work with no adequate comprehension of its message and of entering into minute and exhaustive details that dull the interest and obscure the understanding." The Pennsylvania Bulletin continues, ". . . a detailed factual analysis and technical study may have the effect of creating a dislike for literature. For such pupils as plan to go on in the field of letters there may be some justification for such an analysis, and in no case should an individual pupil who wishes to make a detailed study of literary techniques be discouraged in his efforts. If, on



the other hand, a pupil is required to master all the facts concerning a piece of literature on his first contact with it, the whole spirit of the art may be lost. . . . The improvement of recreational taste through literature is an important contribution of the teacher of English to contemporary American civilization."

The Maryland-New York Syllabus then goes on to speak directly of content. "As in daily life, so in the class room, the content of a book (what is said) is the first and chief concern. . . . The content of the piece should receive more attention than has been customary, not only because it is more interesting than technical details, but also because it bears directly on the two objectives of literary study, the knowledge of good books and the opening of the windows of the pupil's soul to the ideal scenes and emotions in the writings of great authors."

An objection may be considered here. The *Ratio Studiorum* in a well-known passage insists that *eruditio* be reduced to the minimum in our prelections. Now in certain Jesuit writers one will find under *eruditio* discussion of the content, that is, of the thoughts and the experiences, the indications of personal standards and preferences explicit or suggested by the author. It might appear, then, that the above-quoted passage from our syllabus is out of harmony with our official pedagogy. Without any pretence at authority in this matter of scholarship the answer may be suggested that *eruditio* properly so called applies to the details of scientific and historical lore so often necessary to grasp the meaning of the text and that content is rather the total experience which the author has managed to convey and which often cannot be appreciated by the pupil unless the teacher elucidates it by comparison or contrast or expresses it in terms of modern values or even on occasion shows its pertinence to the pupil's individual life.

#### V. ORGANIZATION OF THE COURSE IN LITERATURE

In public high schools the study of literature is arranged about two poles of influence. The first of these is the hierarchy of adolescent interests spoken of in Section III of this paper. The second is the study of types—the actual literary forms which have been evolved in European literature. This may be illustrated from the Pennsylvania Bulletin last quoted, which suggests the following four-year course:

First Year—Enjoying plot in adventure and historical novels, discovering the qualities of good citizenship by reading biography and fiction, learning to appreciate a long narrative poem, observing our social democracy by reading biographies and essays, watching characters under stress in a full-length play.

Second Year—Enjoying different kinds of humor by reading poetry and fiction, increasing sensitivity to romance and fancy, getting acquainted



with famous literary characters in novels and plays, meeting famous people through biography, studying the relation between literature and life by reading essays on various aspects of literary culture, enjoying scientific writing as literature.

Third Year—Becoming acquainted with current periodicals, appreciating modern poetry, studying different types of literature, some famous American authors, revelation of life through the novel and drama, contrasting oratory and logic.

Fourth Year—Making friends with English authors by reading biographies and autobiographical pieces, emotional and ethical experience in literature as found in novels, plays, and poems, seeing life in perspective, appraising contemporary life, cultivating international understandings.

#### CONCLUSION

The Maryland-New York Syllabus, as we have seen, is based on the progressive study of the five forms of discourse. This is true of literature as well as of composition. Literary types are studied incidentally, as the actuation or result in historical circumstances, of the various psychological processes involved in the act of expression. The point seems to call for elucidation. The forms of discourse are based upon varying attitudes to reality, or better perhaps on variance in function. Thus narration is the recounting of an action. It is the effort to transfer to another mind the details of an event which are stored in the memory or the imagination of the writer. Description is a similar effort to transfer the details of an object or a scene in such a way as to build up a more or less definite and vivid image in the mind of the reader. Exposition conveys the articulated analysis, the constituent elements, and the pertinent associations of a concept. Argumentation and persuasion are likewise obviously differentiated by their respective functions.

Now function is of course much more than a principle of logical differentiation. It is a determining and modifying factor throughout the whole process of expression. This may be illustrated by a comparison with architecture. Function, of course, determines the primary distinction of buildings into homes, industrial plants, theatres, and the like, and it determines also, within the limits set by natural and economic laws, the choice of material and the concrete application of structural principles. On the other hand, the determination of the actual style of, let us say, a parish church, whether it shall be Romanesque or Gothic or Renaissance is largely the accident of time and space, and in our own country, even of whim. Now the literary type is closely analogous to the architectural style and the syllabus which concentrates upon type will deal largely with the local and the historical rather than with the essential determinants of literature. The study of function on the other hand, emphasizes what is essential and specifically human in literature. It reveals the mind of the



artist in action. It is an excellent way to teach a pupil to know his own mind and how to use it. And that is what every system of education purports to be doing.

## Formal Training for Jesuit Librarians: A Reply

With one fundamental proposition in Father J. F. Cantillon's article, *JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY*, September 1940, I am in hearty agreement, that usually formal library school training should be an essential part of every Jesuit librarian's preparation. The equivalent can be obtained, of course, by the long, hard, very expensive, and too often discouraging way, the trial and error method of unsupervised experience. A third way would be an internship in a large, well-equipped, professionally staffed, top-notch Jesuit library, where adequate planning and supervision would prevent the intern from wasting his time. The supervising librarian would probably find it cheaper to pay the student's expenses in a library school.

One of two completely different situations may face a Jesuit librarian. He may be in charge of a high school or small college library with students as his only assistants. The Jesuit will have a wide variety of technical work, which should be done expertly. If he is not well trained, his library will usually be just another in the long list of catastrophes of which we should be heartily ashamed. No amount of common sense or ability to get along with people or knowledge of subject matter will save his library. The other situation would be something like mine, where lack of technical training has not been a handicap; he would employ competent, well-trained, technical librarians. This Jesuit's principal duties would be concerned with book selection, library management, relations between faculty and library, student use of the library, and so on. Even in this case, however, fundamental decisions have to be made. Formal library school training cannot create judgment, prudence, wisdom, but it can be an asset in enabling a man endowed with these qualities to establish proper procedures.

At Columbia, Father Cantillon did not take the courses in classification and cataloguing. His previous experience enabled him to pass the examination. The majority of us would have profited by such a course. A person who can write legibly, add and subtract, may possibly become an excellent accountant, but for the most part, we should prefer in that field one with technical training.

Father Cantillon judges library school teachers to have slight cultural background because as a group they lack Doctor's or Master's degrees. On that principle, up to about twenty years ago, American Jesuits as a group were a very uncultured lot.

Condemnation of courses because they are taught by women seems



strange. There may be statistics to show a higher percentage of incompetent women teachers than men. We know that such men are not scarce. Among women, Miss Isadore Mudge, Miss Margaret Mann, Miss M. Sears, Dr. Little, to mention four out of many of similar calibre in the field of library science, are quite competent to teach not only the ordinary run of students in the library school but even Jesuits—to borrow a strange distinction made in Father Cantillon's article.

I agree with the proposal made in the last paragraph, that Jesuits who have advanced degrees be sent to a good library school for courses in essential procedures such as cataloguing and classification, bibliography and reference, book selection, fundamentals and principles of library organization and management, as well as history of books and printing. This total of eighteen to twenty-one credits would be all that is required in technical courses, v. g. at the University of Michigan. The other hours may be spent in any department of the university. It should not be too difficult to profit from that advantage.

I agree, too, in general with the qualifications for a librarian stated in the article. It might not be necessary to add to the specifications energy, patience, and a sense of the value of money.

A full year in library school may be somewhat painful to a man of mature cultural development, but it would have at least this benefit that it would make him familiar with a well run, adequate library. One of our present difficulties is that we do not have a tradition of good library service. We have not been accustomed to it in our training and we do not expect or demand it when we teach. Too often, even if it is available, we manage without it. More general familiarity with good libraries will put us in the position of demanding and using good libraries or of rejecting them as unnecessary for our immediate purpose. We would not be indifferent.

The *Instructio* specifies that Jesuit librarians are to have sufficient technical training and are to keep up-to-date in matters of library science. If a Jesuit is to make librarianship a career, a year is not too long for his training. For heads of other departments, we do not hesitate to require degrees, even though much more time is necessary.

ANDREW L. BOUWHUIS, S. J.



# NEWS FROM THE FIELD

---

In the March 1941 issue of the QUARTERLY, we plan to give an account of all the academic celebrations in the Assistancy in honor of the quadricentennial of the Society. Some accounts have been received and we hope to complete the list for description in the next number.

"American Institutions" is the name of a requirement at the University of San Francisco. A knowledge of the provisions and principles of the U. S. Constitution is required of all candidates for A. B. and B. S. degrees. Candidates must fulfill this requirement by an examination. The principles synopsis in "credo" form recently received considerable laudatory notice by a newspaper columnist, whose article appeared in one hundred and nineteen newspapers.

The Western Regional Unit of the N. C. E. A., College Division, will hold its annual meeting at the University of Santa Clara in December.

At the University of Detroit, religion classes for non-Catholics and the courses in philosophy seem to be the chief contributing factors in the increase in the number of converts each year. There were twelve converts last year in the three colleges on the uptown campus.

The University of Detroit was one of seven universities whose curriculum in chemical engineering was approved by the Engineers Council for Professional Development and the American Institute of Chemical Engineers in October of this year. Among others approved this year were California Institute of Technology, Johns Hopkins, Georgia School of Technology, and Syracuse University. The University of Detroit is the one Catholic school on the approved list. The Tau Beta Pi, the national engineering honor society, at its annual convention last month, granted chapter membership to the University of Detroit by unanimous vote of the delegates.

The School of Law of Loyola University, Chicago, has abolished all course examinations, and has substituted one written examination in June, covering the entire year's work. The system was applied to first-year students in 1939-1940 and will be extended to upper classes as this first-year class progresses.

*Social Work:* This year the School of Social Work, Loyola University, Chicago, is offering a program of courses to fit the needs of men and women engaged in public administration and labor economics. The university hopes to establish an Institute of Public Administration and Labor Economics. . . . The Social Science School at St. Joseph's, Philadelphia, enrolled five hundred. "The 45 occupations represented ranged from Bank



President to waitresses." . . . The new *Institute of Social Order* opened its headquarters in offices adjoining St. Francis Xavier Residence, New York. Father John P. Delaney is director and his associates are Father John C. Rawe (Missouri Province) and Father Louis J. Gallagher (New England Province). . . . Fourteen hundred priests, nuns, and lay leaders of all parts of the East and Canada attended the regional Summer School of Catholic Action, held at Fordham University under the auspices of the Sodality.

Canisius College instituted courses in psychology, ethics, and sociology for nurses in training at Meyer Memorial Hospital, formerly City Hospital of Buffalo, at the request of the hospital authorities.

Father John P. O'Sullivan, dean of Canisius College, is a member of Committee on Teacher Education of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York. At a four-day conference on teacher education at Cornell University in September, Father O'Sullivan was chairman of one of the General Sessions.

At the summer meeting of the trustees of the Corporation of the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, Massachusetts, Father John A. Frisch, was elected a member of the corporation. Father Frisch is professor of biology at Canisius, and has done research work at the Marine Laboratory each summer.

Two new dormitory buildings, St. Robert's Hall and Bishop's Hall, were dedicated by Archbishop Spellman in September. In the windows of Bishop's Hall are placed the coats-of-arms of Fordham's seventeen bishops.

Two elective courses in architecture are conducted at Loyola College, Baltimore: "History of Architecture" and "Ecclesiastical Architecture," by Mr. Lucian Gaudreau, president of the Maryland Society of Architects.

A notable variety of vocations is listed among last year's graduates of St. Peter's Preparatory, Jersey City—three candidates for diocesan preparatory seminary, two each for the Society and Redemptorists, and one each for Franciscans and Dominicans.

The role of colleges and universities in educating in democratic principles, and in promoting the national defense program, was discussed by presidents and representatives of forty-one institutions of higher learning, Friday, October 25, at a conference called by Rev. Harry B. Crimmins, S. J., president of St. Louis University. The conference which met at the university library was held in conjunction with the university celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the Society.

In summarizing the results of queries to forty-four leading colleges



and universities in the United States, Father Mallon said that "the most conspicuous conviction of the colleges seemed to be:

"1. There is a serious situation facing the United States, for the meeting of which the colleges have grave responsibilities to contribute their maximum and uniformly the colleges are eager to meet that responsibility.

"2. The best contribution the colleges can make is the continuance through normal processes of the development of intelligent citizens, placing somewhat more emphasis on the specific knowledge, convictions, and attitudes which make the desirable citizen.

"3. They should engage in new activities only insofar as they can accomplish additional tasks without impeding their main purposes."

*National Defense at Boston College:* In December forty-eight students will begin the navigation course (four hours a week for fifteen weeks); ten students in C. A. A. will begin the aeronautics course under the direction of Father John A. Tobin, who has received a students' pilot license.

Among the 1,198 students registered at Holy Cross College, there is a geographical representation from twenty-four states, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and British West Indies.

The physics department of Weston College continues its research in the field of magnetism. A magnetic station has been located on the college property by the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

*Press Release:* "The question of whether or not American higher education can attract students without football teams is partially answered by Loyola University (New Orleans)." The 1940 registration is the largest in the history of the university. The freshman class, which was expected to feel greatest effect, shows an eighteen per cent increase. Loyola dropped intercollegiate football last year.

Jesuit High School (New Orleans) has discontinued its alumni association and in its place organized the *Jesuit 500 Club*, for the development of a scholarship fund. The new organization of five hundred men, friends of the school and mostly alumni, will pay for one student each year and add \$1,000 yearly to the scholarship fund. It is hoped that this fund will eventually provide perpetual scholarships for an increasing number of students.

On October 27, in the Municipal Auditorium, Tampa, Jesuit High School (formerly Tampa High School but renamed in honor of the quadricentennial) presented a pageant on the history of the Rosary, entitled, *Cause of Our Joy*. The pageant was written and directed by Mr. E. A. Sheridan, S. J. Two thousand attended the performance, in which the Catholic youth of the city participated.



On October 18 ground was broken for the new building of the Greater Seattle College. Bishop O'Shaughnessy presided at the ceremony, and in his address stated ". . . here is an institution that is a bulwark against any subversive influence that may attack us. It stands foursquare for God and country."

*Publications:* The University of California Press has published *Pioneer Blackrobes on the West Coast* by Father Peter M. Dunne, professor of history, University of San Francisco. The book is dedicated to the Society on its fourth centenary. . . . Another volume similarly dedicated is *Theologia Fundamentalis* by Father Anthony C. Cotter, professor of theology, Weston College. Published in September, it is in use at West Baden, Woodstock, Weston, and Manila. A feature of the text is a chapter on practical apologetics or "convert-making." . . . *The Georgetown Law Journal* began its twenty-ninth year of publication this year. . . . A significant article appeared in October 1940 *Scientific Monthly* by Father John S. O'Connor, professor of physics at Woodstock College, entitled "A Scientific Approach to Religion." It was a challenging answer to a former article by Dr. K. T. Compton, "Religion in Scientific Era," which stated "Its (science) whole tendency is to emphasize the fundamentally spiritual character of religion as representing the highest ideals of mankind as opposed to theological rules, doctrines, and theories." . . . *Man of Spain* (Macmillan) by Joseph H. Fichter, of the New Orleans Province, was published in October. It is the only biography in English of Francisco Suarez. . . . Three lay professors of the classics department of Fordham College have edited *Cicero's Pro Archia*—Latin Text and Commentary (Fordham University Press). It is a valuable text for use in freshman Latin. . . . Catholic educators should not miss a recent publication, *Man and Modern Secularism* (Trinity Press, 704 Broadway, New York City). It contains the addresses delivered at the October 1939 convention of the National Catholic Alumni Federation in New York. The contents are divided into three parts: Religion in the Making of America and Secularism in the Unmaking of America; The Catholic Answer; Return to American Higher Catholic Education of Formal Teaching of Theology as a Science. Jesuit contributors to the volume are Fathers R. I. Gannon, E. B. Rooney, M. C. D'Arcy, W. Parsons, and J. C. Murray.

In the September QUARTERLY, Father Allan P. Farrell bade farewell as managing editor. We record here our deep gratitude for his splendid work. The QUARTERLY owes its development and progress to his energy and zeal. In preparing this number for the press, we realize how much labor he bestowed on it during his two years' direction. "Roses and regrets" to the former managing editor!



## Enrollment, 1940-1941, Jesuit High Schools

	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	Fourth Year	Special	Totals
Bellarmino College Preparatory, San Jose..	102	79	83	72		336
Bellarmino High School, Tacoma, Wash...	69	66	66	62		263
Boston College High School.....	290	219	180	163	23	875
Brooklyn Preparatory School.....	157	100	130	119		506
Campion, Prairie du Chien, Wis.....	130	111	120	90		451
Canisius High School, Buffalo.....	150	103	119	104		476
Cranwell Preparatory School.....	17	25	27	31		100
Creighton University High School.....	114	97	103	100		414
University of Detroit High School.....	194	147	133	109		583
Fordham Preparatory School.....	166	117	108	105		496
Georgetown Preparatory School.....	17	17	27	31		92
Gonzaga College H. S., Washington, D. C.	168	150	141	102		561
Gonzaga University High School, Spokane.	121	102	96	105		424
Jesuit High School, New Orleans.....	258	201	182	158		799
Loyola Academy, Chicago.....	155	148	108	112		523
Loyola High School, Baltimore.....	141	118	105	79		443
Loyola High School, Los Angeles.....	257	225	176	139		797
Loyola School, New York.....	13	6	9	5		33
Marquette High School, Yakima, Wash....	29	37	34	26		126
Marquette University H. S., Milwaukee...	149	116	137	113		515
Regis High School, Denver.....	60	59	84	59		262
Regis High School, New York.....	197	177	139	97		610
Rockhurst College High School.....	67	82	80	82		311
St. Ignatius High School, Chicago.....	191	215	160	100		666
St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland.....	211	181	169	120		681
St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco...	231	205	182	155		773
St. John's High School, Shreveport.....	37	27	21	43		128
St. Joseph's College H. S., Philadelphia...	265	204	186	155		810
St. Louis University High School.....	168	171	167	148		654
St. Peter's College High School.....	218	202	160	134	2	716
St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati.....	131	140	136	143		550
Seattle College High School.....	86	64	54	58		262
Tampa College High School.....	41	45	36	19		141
Xavier High School, New York.....	241	179	165	150		735
<b>TOTALS 1940-1941.....</b>	<b>4,841</b>	<b>4,125</b>	<b>3,813</b>	<b>3,288</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>16,112</b>
<b>TOTALS 1939-1940.....</b>	<b>4,580</b>	<b>4,227</b>	<b>3,619</b>	<b>3,094</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>15,555</b>
<b>INCREASE .....</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>-102</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>-10</b>	<b>557</b>



# Enrollment, 1940-1941, Jesuit Colleges and Universities

	Arts and Sciences	Adult Education <sup>1</sup>	Commerce (Business)	Dentistry	Divinity	Education	Engineering	Foreign Service	Graduate	Home Study	Journalism	Law	Medicine	Music	Nursing	Pharmacy	Social Work	Speech	TOTALS
Boston College	1,275	514	234						235			273					66		2,597
Canisius College	685	311							99						118				1,213
Creighton University	543	169	411	76					23	46	88	227			212	84			1,520
University of Detroit	971	887	410	107			854		134			130					427		3,493
Fordham University	1,445	567	577		1,133				897			811				146			6,003
Georgetown University	686			183				601	119			584	309		80				2,562
Gonzaga University	352	87					149		47			143		91	190				1,059
Holy Cross College	1,198																		1,198
John Carroll University	639	322							11										972
Loyola, Baltimore	410																		410
Loyola, Chicago	622	1,234	490	269	54				347	387		152	513 <sup>2</sup>		597		95		4,760
Loyola, Los Angeles	353	95	160									163							771
Loyola, New Orleans	637	928		154								83		113		75			1,990
Marquette University	904	70	784	230			612		432	189	225	407			313			32	4,198
Regis, Denver	229																		229
Rockhurst, Kansas City	330		326			238													894
St. Joseph's, Philadelphia	476																		476
St. Louis University	1,300	668	955	167	188	187			567		68	427			303				4,830
St. Peter's, Jersey City	405		260																665
University of San Francisco	423	276	276									96							1,071
University of Santa Clara	300		94		183		96												697
Seattle College	958	84																	1,042
Spring Hill College	362	205																	567
Xavier, Cincinnati	591	827																	1,418
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>16,094</b>	<b>7,244</b>	<b>4,977</b>	<b>1,186</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>1,558</b>	<b>1,711</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>2,911</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>2,840</b>	<b>1,883</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>1,813</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>44,637</b>

<sup>1</sup>Adult Education: All enrolled in late afternoon, evening, and Saturday courses on undergraduate level, whether for credit or not.

<sup>2</sup>Includes enrollment in Public Health—131.

<sup>3</sup>No summer-school figures.

Enrollment in Jesuit High Schools  
16,112  
Grand Total 60,749



# Contributors

The Fifty-fourth Annual Convention of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools named the program of its general morning session on November 23, 1940: In Recognition of the 400th Anniversary of the Founding of the Society of Jesus.

"Four Hundred Years of Jesuit Education"

Reverend Allan P. Farrell, S. J., Dean, Jesuit House of Studies,  
Milford, Ohio

"Jesuit Education of the Future"

Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J., President, Fordham University Provost. G. W. McCelland, University of Pennsylvania, president of the association, opened the session and requested Father Charles J. Deane, S. J., secretary-general of Fordham University, who is a member of the Executive Committee of the Association, to preside. Father Deane introduced the speakers to a large and appreciative audience.

A long list of articles and books bears the name of REVEREND JAMES J. DALY, S. J.; the Catholic press has long been indebted to his devoted and facile pen, and his recent volume *The Jesuit in Focus* (Bruce) was completed on his Golden Anniversary in the Society.

REVEREND J. GERARD MEARS, S. J., is associate editor of *America*, and for ten years was professor of English at Holy Cross College and faculty moderator of *The Purple*.

RICHARD H. PERKINSON, A. B. (St. Louis University), Ph. D. (Johns Hopkins), is a member of the department of English, Fordham Graduate School, and has published research articles in various journals.

FRANCIS X. CONNOLLY, A. B., Ph. D. (Fordham University), is professor of English at Fordham College and is a well-known contributor to *Thought*, *America*, *Spirit*, etc.

JOSEPH P. DESMOND, A. B. (Canisius College), M. A. (Harvard), A. B. L. S. (Michigan), is on the faculty of Canisius College.

A hearty welcome to the above contributors and we look forward to their future appearance in the pages of the QUARTERLY.

FATHER GERARD F. YATES, S. J., began his doctoral studies at the London School of Economics, and owing to the war, is continuing them at Yale University.

MR. MALACHI J. DONNELLY, S. J., is at present in theology at St. Mary's, Kansas.

FATHER JOSEPH A. SLATTERY, S. J., made his English studies at Cambridge University and for several years has been professor of English at Georgetown University and Woodstock College.

FATHER ANDREW L. BOUWHUIS, S. J., is librarian at Canisius College.