

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

VOL. VI, No. 1

JUNE 1943

POSTWAR PLANNING FOR JESUIT EDUCATION

I. THE HIGH SCHOOLS

II. THE COLLEGES

III. THE GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL
SCHOOLS

THE PRELECTION APPLIED TO HISTORY
AND MATHEMATICS

For Private Circulation

LIBERAL EDUCATION PASSES A TEST

"There appears to be a general feeling that liberal education—the humanities, non-technical, non-vocational education—has, contrary to what is being widely said, vindicated itself. The boys who drop in to talk with their old teachers while on leave or furlough, and those who write to them from camps and foreign stations mostly praise what they had of the liberal arts and lament that they did not have more. If they were granted another chance, they usually say, they would make sure to study literature, philosophy, the classics, the basic sciences, and most of all, history. They wish they had more understanding of the world they grew up in—of the United States and its place and function in the modern world. They wish they had paid more attention to what they call international affairs and to the ethical and social contents of cultures. They wish—up in the Arctic Circle and down in the South Pacific and in the bare board barracks of a hundred camps—they wish they had given themselves more resources of private satisfaction, had developed more ability to analyze and discriminate and appraise. This, say the professors of liberal arts, is what they have been talking about all along. It is a very favorable omen . . ."

(Bernard De Voto, in *Harper's*, 186:648, May 1943, reporting a recent tour of the colleges of the country.)

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

June 1943

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL COMMENT: THE SYMPOSIUM ON POSTWAR PLANNING FOR JESUIT EDUCATION	
<i>Allan P. Farrell, S. J.</i>	5
POSTWAR PLANNING FOR JESUIT EDUCATION: THE HIGH SCHOOLS	7
POSTWAR PLANNING FOR JESUIT EDUCATION: THE COLLEGES	19
POSTWAR PLANNING FOR JESUIT EDUCATION: THE GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS	37
JESUIT ALUMNI IN THE WAR	42
NOTES ON JESUIT TEACHING PROCEDURES: II. THE PRELECTION APPLIED TO HISTORY. III. THE PRELECTION IN MATHEMATICS.	
<i>Allan P. Farrell, S. J.</i>	44
CHECK LIST OF SIGNIFICANT BOOKS	53
CORRESPONDENCE	
<i>James J. Daly, S. J., John J. McMahon, S. J.</i>	57
NEWS FROM THE FIELD	60

The JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S. J.

Managing Editor

ALLAN P. FARRELL, S. J.

Associate Editors

RICHARD F. GRADY, S. J.

CHARLES M. O'HARA, S. J.

JAMES A. KING, S. J.

WILLIAM M. WELLER, S. J.

VINCENT DE P. O'BRIEN, S. J.

JAMES F. WHELAN, S. J.

BERNARD J. WUELLNER, S. J.

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

HUGH M. DUCE, S. J.

California Province

MATTHEW J. FITZSIMONS, S. J.

Maryland-New York Province

MARK A. GAFFNEY, S. J.

Oregon Province

WILLIAM J. MCGUCKEN, S. J.

Missouri Province

JULIAN L. MALINE, S. J.

Chicago Province

JOSEPH J. ROONEY, S. J.

Maryland-New York Province

ARTHUR J. SHEEHAN, S. J.

New England Province

ANDREW C. SMITH, S. J.

New Orleans Province

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE MANAGING EDITOR

45 EAST 78TH STREET

NEW YORK, N. Y.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

The Symposium on Postwar Planning for Jesuit Education

In the March number of the *QUARTERLY*, Father Edward B. Rooney, executive director of the J. E. A., discussed in his Editorial Comment the subject of "Postwar Planning for Education." It was the purpose of the editorial to interest Jesuit schools and colleges in planning wisely now for the period following the war. Because of the importance of the topic, an invitation was sent to a group of our teachers and administrators to contribute their views on the problems and issues that will face Jesuit education in the postwar era of reconstruction. Thirty-six contributions were received. Fourteen came from the high schools and twenty-two from the colleges and universities. All seven provinces of the Assistancy were represented. The editors of the *QUARTERLY* are sincerely appreciative of the cordial cooperation which this fine response betokens. They are the more grateful because so many were willing to add to their already heavy burdens that of preparing a thoughtful answer to the question proposed for consideration.

In the pages that follow both a summary of and representative quotations from these contributions are presented.

The complete list of contributors is here given:

- Father Joseph F. Beglan, professor of philosophy, Canisius College, Buffalo
Father Remi J. Belleperche, professor of philosophy, John Carroll University, Cleveland
Father Edward B. Bunn, president, Loyola College, Baltimore
Father Philip H. Burkett, librarian, St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, New York
Father Lloyd R. Burns, professor of Latin, St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco
Father Charles J. Deane, secretary general, Fordham University, New York
Father W. Patrick Donnelly, principal, Jesuit High School, New Orleans
Father Peter M. Dunne, professor of history, University of San Francisco
Father Arthur J. Evans, principal, Rockhurst High School, Kansas City, Missouri
Father M. J. Fitzsimons, general prefect of studies for colleges, Maryland-New York Province
Father John J. Foley, principal, Marquette University High School, Milwaukee
Father John Forster, rector, Jesuit Novitiate, Sheridan, Oregon
Father Hunter Guthrie, chairman of the graduate division of philosophy, Fordham University
Father John J. Higgins, dean, Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri
Father John J. Hooper, headmaster, Brooklyn Preparatory School, Brooklyn, New York
Father Bernard S. Karst, principal, Regis High School, Denver

- Father J. Vincent Kelly, dean of freshmen, Loyola University, Chicago
Father John LaFarge, executive editor, *America*, New York City
Mr. George V. McCabe, theologian, Weston College, Massachusetts
Father John F. McCormick, professor of philosophy, Loyola University, Chicago
Father Christopher McDonnell, principal, Seattle Preparatory School, Seattle, Washington
Mr. Richard D. McGloin, theologian, St. Mary's College, Kansas
Father A. Patrick Madgett, chairman of the department of religion, Xavier University, Cincinnati
Father James F. Maguire, rector, St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati
Father Joseph R. N. Maxwell, president, College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Massachusetts
Father Bakewell Morrison, chairman of the department of religion, St. Louis University
Father Joseph C. Mulhern, rector-principal, Jesuit High School, Dallas, Texas
Father Albert H. Poetker, executive dean, University of Detroit
Father Joseph J. Rooney, general prefect of studies for high schools, Maryland-New York Province
Father Percy A. Roy, president, Loyola University, New Orleans
Father Charles E. Schrader, chairman of the graduate division, University of Detroit
Father W. Eugene Shiels, associate editor, *America*, New York City
Father Joseph A. Slaterry, professor of English, Woodstock College
Father Andrew C. Smith, general prefect of studies, New Orleans Province, and dean of Spring Hill College
Father Louis J. Twomey, principal, Jesuit High School, Tampa, Florida
Father Bernard J. Wuellner, chairman of the department of philosophy, University of Detroit

ALLAN P. FARRELL, S. J.

Postwar Planning for Jesuit Education: The High Schools

I. REVIEW OF PAST PERFORMANCE

The contributors who discussed postwar planning for Jesuit high schools were on the whole convinced that the demands of the war have shown both the value and the effectiveness of our type of secondary-school education. This conviction they based on several considerations. First, military leaders have stressed as qualities most needed in our fighting men precisely those which are chiefly insisted on in our schools—respect for authority, amenability to discipline, acquisition of intellectual and moral habits. Secondly, large numbers of our high-school alumni have announced themselves as enthusiastic propagandists of our training, which “so well fitted them for the requirements of military life.” Finally, there is an accumulation of evidence on the success of our high-school alumni in placement tests for officer training and advanced technical programs. It was pointed out, too, that this evidence has more than usual validity in that the ordinary as well as the more able students achieved notable success in these tests. Several of the contributors suggested that a study of the results attained by our students in the recent Army and Navy tests for high-school seniors (A-12 and V-12), in comparison with the results attained by students in other schools, public and private, would provide a further valuable index of the quality of our educational performance.

Some excerpts from the papers submitted to the symposium will illustrate the trend of comment on this point.

Father McDonnell, principal of Seattle Preparatory School, stated:

It seems to me that the lessons of permanent value which this war has taught us in respect to our high schools is one of satisfaction. I do not mean that we should be completely satisfied, but I think we should feel pleased that our boys have done so well. I have it on firsthand information that many of our boys who have been inducted into military service have passed excellent examinations and have been given fine opportunities. On my desk are letters from lads who quit school partially through discouragement and partially through nervousness, and they all tell me that the army placement examinations were easy, and that they could not understand how so many of the public-school boys did so poorly.

Father Donnelly, principal of Jesuit High School, New Orleans, draws the same conclusion:

Reports coming back from graduates of Jesuit high schools and from the boys themselves, visiting schools on furlough, testify to the value of the type of educa-

tion they received under Jesuit auspices as well as to the number of rungs higher that education placed them above the boy not similarly circumstanced. Taken by and large, the record of the graduates of Jesuit schools in the armed forces is in itself a high tribute to the training the Jesuit system imparts. The products of Jesuit education have learned how to work hard and well, live rightfully, fight courageously, and die manfully.

The comment of Father Foley, principal of Marquette University High School, Milwaukee, is in a similar vein. He writes:

It appears, from available information, that the graduate of the classical course in our high schools has adapted himself competently to military service. Practically all officer candidates have come from such graduates, and, according to the comments of men in training, the rigors of required study in the classical course have been beneficial for the intensive preofficer course.

But despite this general feeling of satisfaction with our high-school performance, expressed in these several quotations, contributors to the symposium were not blind to certain defects which they believe have prevented the fullest realization of our educational aims. There was, however, neither common agreement nor common emphasis on particular defects. Some were mentioned only once; a few were mentioned many times, and were likewise given prominence in proposals for reconstruction after the war. It is to these latter that special attention should be paid.

It was remarked, in the first place, that the physical side of our education has been perhaps too much underemphasized. Too often only the athletes have participated in physical fitness programs. In some places, it is true, intramural sports have been properly developed. But even then it has not been possible to include or interest the majority of students in this type of exercise. Consequently it seems a duty to find a solution to this problem which has a bearing on the intellectual demands our education makes on all our students. Scarcely less important is the need to provide in our schools for periodic physical examinations for all students, so that proper remedial measures can be applied in time to cure or lessen physical defects and health handicaps.

A weakening of the teaching tradition is a second fault noticed by several of the contributors. The blame for this was laid by some to insufficient academic training and preparation of teachers; the result being that the teacher has been unable to offer his students that prime motivation and inspiration which flows naturally from his own mastery of and enthusiasm for what he teaches. In the opinion of others the fault is due to ignorance of sound teaching procedures. Still others believe that the explanation lies in the lack of adequate and sympathetic supervision of young teachers by those charged with this duty. Emphasizing the fact that education is primarily a matter of *contact* between teacher and pupil, Father John J. Hooper, of Brooklyn Preparatory School, looks back to earlier days

when, he says, our teachers "went out of their way to meet, know, and understand each of their students, succeeding so well that history attests to the consequent effectiveness of their classroom labors." Restore this tradition where it has been lost; remember that Jesuit influence in forming intellectual and moral habits and in preparing the individual for Catholic leadership is to be achieved no less by contact, guidance, atmosphere, and example than by teaching, and you will remove the complaint that our teaching is not as effective as it should be.

Somewhat connected with the effectiveness of our teaching is the question of the superior student. A number of the contributors expressed the conviction that we must in the future give more time and attention to the eager and intellectually able boy, who not infrequently in the past has been swallowed up by the mass of the mediocre. But though the problem was raised, no one offered help in solving it. Perhaps a rereading of the article "Jesuits Train Leaders . . .," in the March number of the *QUARTERLY*, will stimulate discussion of this often-mentioned but little-debated issue.

A final critical observation on our past performance came from Father Mulhern, of Jesuit High, Dallas, who thinks that perhaps we have not always presented clear-cut objectives in individual subjects and have not given a sufficiently clear definition of progressive objectives to be attained by students in successive stages of the high-school training. In the old *Ratio* these goals are carefully and plainly stated. The multiplicity of subjects makes this more difficult today, and, as Father Mulhern suggests, it must be done with the help of syllabi. A practical difficulty, he adds, is the experience that the same algebra teacher cannot teach the same amount of algebra, in say 1A and 1B, for any length of time.

II. PREVIEW OF RECONSTRUCTION

The expression of general satisfaction with our past high-school performance, recorded in the previous section, is reflected in the views of the contributors on plans for reconstruction. For while definite proposals are made for modifications in regard to curricula, techniques, and methods, the majority opinion nevertheless holds fast to the aims and principles that have always governed our educational apostolate. Thus, Father Karst, principal of Regis High School, Denver, prefaces his comments by saying that "most of the lessons taught by the emergency concern detail of method rather than redefinition of objectives." And Father Burns, of St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco, begins and ends his remarks with the personal conviction "that our standards have fitted in with the past, are fitting in with the present, and will continue to fit in with the future." Father Joseph Rooney, high-school prefect for the Maryland-New York Province, lays down the premise that the youth of today have never had

the chance to witness normal times, and he makes this into a sort of *a fortiori* argument for our offering them, when stability is restored, a normal, that is, our time-tested and conservative program of education.

In the opinion of Father Mulhern, of Jesuit High School, Dallas, the emergency training programs have little to offer us in the way of new or better educational procedures or aims. The objectives and principles operative in these programs are aimed solely at obtaining quick development of one or another mainly mechanical skill. Ours has been a different aim and it should remain so. "I think," he writes, "that we have learned during the past two years that inculcating respect for authority, amenability to discipline, and training of character are valid primary objectives of a secondary-school program. Consequently we should adhere to all of those mostly intangible things in our tradition which tend toward development of these qualities. We have learned also that our solid subjects—languages, mathematics, and science, not to mention the mastery of fundamental skills and the mental training that comes from the formal study of such subjects—have been insisted on by most of the educational directors of the armed forces, and thus are acknowledged to be valuable in time of emergency as well as in normal times."

It seems clear, then, that there is no general trend toward radical reconstruction of our high-school system. Nevertheless, one of the contributors, Father John Forster, rector of the novitiate of the Oregon Province, strongly urges the need to reconstruct the educational ladder both in its general make-up and in its particular form in our Jesuit system. He would have the present Jesuit high school rebuilt and if need be renamed. "The new Jesuit high school," he says, "should reach down to the life age of the present upper two grammar grades, and reach up to the life age of the present two lower college years. Graduation would then be at about nineteen."

What kind of school would Father Forster construct? He gives us the following blueprint. "Make this school out and out *university* preparatory, i. e., preparatory to professional and graduate work. Give it a strong framework of Latin, English, history, mathematics, and philosophy, plus a minimum of descriptive science. Let it be our ideal to make this school a liberal arts school in the strict sense of the word. Call it the university preparatory, or the humanistic high school (since it would be humanistic), and thus also distinguish it from the present high-school system which is both in fact and in aim almost entirely terminal. Let it exist side by side with the high school that is meant for the masses anyway. Let promotion within the school and from it be at any time on the basis of merit and by examination. Free it forever from the cumber of credits. Have it award a well-merited A. B. at the end of its course. This type of school should

thrive in large cities, where it is possible to be selective on account of numbers. Entrance would be by examination in the fundamental three R's, whether the candidate has finished the grammar school or not. It would be a school to develop leaders."

"In the smaller cities," Father Forster continues, "where there is room for only one Catholic high school and where we have assumed this responsibility, we should have two distinct courses, one humanistic, the other terminal. Competent laymen should be employed to teach the terminal subjects."

And what of the present colleges? Father Forster believes that "they should either develop into universities or else step down to this new type of liberal arts school. Our universities should be composed of a group of professional schools and a graduate school, if numbers warrant it. Entrance to the university would be by examination rather than by certificate, and graduation should be on the basis of a comprehensive examination rather than on the basis of accumulation of credits."

This question of rearranging the educational ladder received much less attention from the contributors to the symposium than was expected. Several of the college contributors mentioned it in passing. For instance, Father Burkett, for many years a college teacher, expressed approval of a possible shortening of the college curriculum to three years and of the elementary-school curriculum to six years. But he is convinced that, because the high school terminates education for so many, it should retain its present status. Father Smith, of Spring Hill College, felt that in order to strengthen our position in the educational field we may be forced to return to our former scheme of general education: three years of academic classes, followed by three years of college. And Father M. J. Fitzsimons, college prefect of studies for the Maryland-New York Province, defended the four-year Catholic college. Referring to President Hutchins' proposed division of the college by terminating general education at the sophomore level with an A. B. degree, he observes that "against this plan the secular college has no defense of its four-year program except that of maturation of the student and opportunity for *more* subject matter. On the other hand, the idea of the four-year Catholic college in the liberal arts tradition is based on a unity of humanistic and philosophical disciplines. The Catholic college alone, therefore, has a defense of intrinsic unity."

Of the high-school contributors, only two, in addition to Father Forster, referred to the question at all. Father Maguire, rector of St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati, briefly commented on the consequences of certain proposals for Jesuit high schools. "A much-discussed reorganization," he writes, "would allot but three years to the high-school course. In such an eventuality it is clear that the Jesuit high school, which at present generally

achieves little beyond the subsistence level, would be starved out of existence unless extensive changes were effected in administrative, curricular, faculty, and student personnel policies."

Much more detailed is the discussion of the question by Mr. Richard McGloin, a theologian at St. Marys, Kansas, who argues from the premise that "the education of the youth of the United States must be done in the American way." He maintains that European education in general, as well as the schemes proposed by many educators in the United States, assume that man is endowed with mainly physical functions, just as Mr. Hutchins seems to assume that he is dealing with pure intellects. "Such theories," he says, "are limited, and hence the results of the education based on them cannot help falling far short of the better aim recognized long ago by Plato, when he said that 'a good education is one which gives to the body and soul all the beauty and all the perfection of which they are capable.' " His arguments against shortening the educational ladder begin with the fact that mass education in the United States seems destined to remain permanent. On this account it must be considered apart from other systems. Now, mass education means a fairly early termination of education for the majority. Therefore, eight years of elementary school and four years of high school should for this reason, as well as for reasons of proper physical and psychological growth, be retained. He believes that there is waste in the elementary school, but that it is waste over such "brain-resting subjects as millinery, cooking, carpentry, and leather work." "If, however, proper attention is given to the real business of education throughout eight years of grade school and four years of high school, if children are taught studious habits by means of supervised study, if the subjects are maintained in our schools which long years of experience and reason dictate should be kept for the intellectual development of youth, if a mastery of the subjects is demanded by conscientious and interested teachers, there will be no complaint that the time is too long."

In conclusion, Mr. McGloin reverts to the American ideal and to mass education in particular, which he believes is based on our way of life. And this way of life demands fully formed and strong characters. Such characters must be the product of our education. "America has succeeded in accelerating every other phase of life, often to its own disadvantage. We can but hope that in the formation of the younger generation, America's future citizens, care will be taken to give a complete and natural training."

Connected, at least indirectly, with educational reorganization as it might affect the Jesuit high school is the standing question of vocational education. Several of the contributors commented on this subject, and all the comments were unfavorable to the introduction either of a vocational curriculum or vocational courses in our high schools. Father Evans, prin-

principal of Rockhurst High School, considers such courses to be, "briefly and definitely, beneath our educational dignity." In the opinion of Father Karst, principal of Regis High School, Denver, "dilution of Jesuit curricula to the point of introducing vocational courses hardly seems consonant with our peculiar educational function to train leaders." Father McDonnell, principal of Seattle Preparatory School, thinks that vocational curricula and courses should be left to other Catholic high schools.

But although this unanimous veto was given to making vocational subjects a part of our high-school course, the view was also taken that it would be worth while to consider the possibility of providing an outlet for vocational interests of students through extracurricular activities. This would indeed be a gain in view of the fact that not infrequently purely social or athletic interests are absorbed in these activities in their present status. The experience of Father Foley, principal of Marquette University High School, may be quoted as typical of what others have experienced as a result of the war emergency. "The physics teacher," he says, "using mission-gained ingenuity, constructed a Morse code laboratory. Sixty of the eighty seniors voluntarily spend two or three periods a week in practice. Four seniors are participating in the N. Y. A. program at the Milwaukee Vocational School." Father Foley thinks that these selected instances of caring for vocational interests out of class time may be suggestive of what can be done in this regard when considering plans for the future.

Vocationalism and classicism are usually not thought of as allies; but in educational discussions more often than not they appear side by side, if only by a sort of association of irritants. For the vocationally minded are, in our schools at least, faced with the unpleasant Latin essential, and the enthusiasts for the classics often feel that it is the vocational bent of students that keeps the classics on the defensive and makes them seem out of date, unpractical, and a sheer waste of time. Be that as it may, no free-for-all debate on Jesuit education can hope to bar the "classical issue" from entering the lists. The debate will have to be limited to Latin; for Greek, alas!, has almost lost its battle, despite the fact that, if we except the *Aeneid*, it is the only language that has a worth-while literature adapted to youth. Now, the Latin issue has three phases: the first is whether we should waive the Latin requirement in high school altogether for some students—for the few, namely, who may be bright but who lack a gift for language study. Most if not all are agreed on a negative view to such a proposal. The second phase is whether the requirement of four years of Latin for all high-school students should not be mitigated. In most parts of the Assistancy this has already been done. Several contributors, located in areas where the requirement is still the law in our high schools, strongly

urged the impossibility of keeping the requirement and maintaining standards (or students) at the same time. It is generally agreed that Latin should be retained as an essential in the first two years of high school, but that a certain proportion of students—those, namely, who show only poor or failing grades in freshman and sophomore courses—be allowed to drop Latin after the second year. It is argued that not by Latin alone or essentially is a boy humanized and Christianized and educated. One of the contributors asks: "In this day of hurried lives, commercial and industrial pursuits, may we not question whether the classical mode of education, as we give it now, is the one best suited to the students of today? May we not, at least, consider definite modifications?" Again he asks: "Is it really Ignatian to say to prospective students, 'either take our course, or go some other place'?" There is the worry too, on the part of some, that by keeping so strict a classical requirement we are excluding a large class of individuals from our schools who have the capacity for real leadership.

The third phase of this issue was introduced in the question quoted above—"the classical mode of education *as we give it now*." Mr. George McCabe, a theologian at Weston College, has commented on this phase. "When the *Ratio* of 1832 appeared," he says, "courses in mathematics and physics were strengthened; chemistry and astronomy were added to the curriculum. The vernacular was raised from a minor to a major subject. The daily schedule was now to include history, geography, and elementary mathematics. Yet, in an effort to insure the preeminence of the classics, the new edition retained practically verbatim the same scope of work in the classics that the *Ratio* of 1599 had outlined." He believes that here is the root of much of our difficulty in handling the classics. The Society of the past had the time, double ours, to build the solid and indispensable foundation in grammar. Although the *Ratio* put the ideal at teaching the sublime in the classics, we have been reduced to the necessity of teaching grammar right through sophomore college.

To solve the problem, he says, one of two alternatives must be chosen. "First, and preferably, change the high-school schedules to allow more time for fundamentals. Secondly, have our high schools without exception retain the Henle Latin series. Our colleges would then have to adapt their entrance requirements to that level, and commence freshman Latin where Henle left off."

A second problem is one of method. Mr. McCabe is convinced that a false method of teaching the classics has become almost a tradition with us. The *Ratio* has been misinterpreted into saying that in the prelection the teacher's task is chiefly, if not exclusively, that of translating the assigned passage for the students. If the main lines of the Society's pedagogy are followed intelligently and correctly, even the problem of covering funda-

mentals in the relatively short time allowed will be partially solved.

In concluding this survey of opinion on planning for our high schools, it will be worth while to quote certain further suggestions made by contributors. On the important point of motivation, which some think we have neglected too much, Father Deane of Fordham University says: "We shall never advance our classical course until we convince parents and students (the students through the parents also) that through this curriculum can be given the best possible education." Father Twomey, of Jesuit High School, Tampa, poses the problem of preparing our students for the peculiarly difficult times in which they are living. "Undoubtedly this generation of high-school youth," he says, "is being thrown up against far grimmer realities than any other generation of recent or even remote memory. Unprepared for the almost overwhelming shocks they have received, many of them, according to my observation, are badly confused psychologically, spiritually, and mentally. In happier times we could condition our boys in accordance with their maturing characters. But no such leisurely course is open to us now. We must strive to get them ready after high school for responsibilities they would normally have to assume only after college. It seems to me, therefore, our obvious duty to intensify our religious training in such a way as to convince the boys that spiritual security is the only kind worthy of the name. Secondly, we must insist with increased emphasis on a strict but manly adherence to our disciplinary code, which in a Jesuit's perspective means teaching our boys to do hard things, not because they are hard, but because they are in line of duty and a practical implementing of Christian self-control."

Two papers, those submitted by Father James Maguire, rector of St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati, and by Father Arthur Evans, principal of Rockhurst High School, are here printed *in extenso*. The one views our problems in a special light, the other comments on several aspects of postwar planning for our high schools.

I

Educational Realism

JAMES F. MAGUIRE, S. J.

This contribution is an office desk view of the postwar Jesuit secondary-school curriculum. It may, therefore, be quite limited, but from that point one can perform the difficult feat of scanning the educational horizon while keeping an alert eye on the monthly statements.

Experience with the acceleration of secondary and collegiate education for the duration may possibly reduce to practice prewar sentiment in favor

of revamping the 8-4-4 pattern of education. A much-discussed reorganization would allot but three years to the high-school course. In such an eventuality it is clear that the Jesuit high school, which at present generally achieves little beyond the subsistence level, would be starved out of existence unless extensive changes were effected in administrative, curricular, faculty, and student personnel policies.

But even in the assumption that the four year high-school course continues after the war, any realistic curricular planning must answer the twin problems of the smaller average family of today and tomorrow and the abnormal tax burden that will then be carried by all. The middle-class families from which we have in the past recruited so large a part of our enrollment will be seriously affected. And unless the postwar years are marked by an unprecedented prosperity, many parents will be financially in no position to send their sons to Jesuit schools.

It would seem then that our high-school administrators should exercise extreme caution in multiplying curricular offerings, since ill-advised enrichment of the curriculum may spell eventual impoverishment of the school. For if the faculty, and the clerical and maintenance staff of the school, are to continue to enjoy a balanced diet a necessary condition thereto is the balanced budget.

To the Jesuit educator this financial imperative of a minimum number of subjects is not particularly unpalatable in as much as the less extensive curriculum better harmonizes with his views of the proper educational fare to be offered his pupils. However, in the postwar alternatives presented above, budget considerations might require the enrollment of an increasingly large number of students who are allergic to the solid intellectual foods we prefer to dispense. Such a situation would seem to demand an enriched (and more expensive) curriculum—expanded beyond the present classical, scientific, and general curricula.

The dilemma can be resolved if we are willing to correct a seeming inconsistency in our present educational practice. When a sophomore in our schools has proved that he cannot advance rapidly enough in the classical curriculum he is shunted into a course that will make less serious demands on him. Throughout his last two years of high school he enjoys a liberal number (not by any chance to be confused with the education of the same label) of "horizon broadening" subjects. The Greek students have a word for it—"fresh-air courses." Even the solids of the upperclass years—mathematics, science, and English—are largely reduced to a liquid or even more rarefied state for his consumption. For while it is felt that he must see all the prescribed matter of these solid courses, it is thought quite sufficient that he see it in a glass darkly.

Conceding that some subject offerings are dictated by the requirements

of specific college courses, might it not be asked whether the more general assumption underlying our present practice of the classical, scientific, and general (English) courses has ever been solidly established? Are the least capable students in Jesuit schools properly subjected to a non-Jesuit type of education—an intellectual excursion that substitutes 'world-view' offerings in place of the traditional subjects that emphasize thoroughness and mastery? Because mastery of the prescribed matter of a syllabus, geared to the average student, is quite beyond these pupils, can one rightly assume that they are incapable of a thorough grasp of a much smaller segment of that syllabus?

The purpose of our present upperclass practice of homogeneous grouping of the subaverage pupils in the general or English curriculum suggests one possible solution to the problem of restricted curriculum offerings despite a larger enrollment of less-favored students. If the homogeneous grouping of the duller students were merely advanced two years, for example, to the second month of their freshman year, they could travel at a more leisurely pace the straight way that leads to thorough mastery of subjects. And if Latin, English, mathematics, science, and history are the paths that lead our brighter students to the educational peaks, possibly these less-favored pupils need not be denied the view from that same mount despite the fact that their ascent must be by slower stages.

II

An Educational Credo

ARTHUR J. EVANS, S. J.

Physical education has, I believe, justified its place in our schools. It should be kept as a permanent fixture, with formal classes two to five times a week. The intramural program, then, should be adjusted so as to synchronize and harmonize with the seasonal features of physical education. The dangers of monotony should be anticipated. The same system of development and sport technique ought to prevail throughout the various groups, reaching its highest expression and degree of proficiency in the representative school teams, which should be continued (for student morale and advertising purposes) as long as the immediate area furnishes worthy competition. Class leagues and intramural sports could substitute for the present lightweight and midget representative teams. Coaching facilities might in that way be spread to better advantage.

I feel that, in general, teaching and the profession of the classroom, not extracurricular activities, come first with faculty members. My personal preference has always been for *class* teachers, for the first two years

at least. The seniors can profit by branch teaching, but I question this for the lower groups. They need someone to teach them simple methods of study in all the branches, someone to create in them a common class spirit and set of ideals, a desire to improve intellectually, someone to evaluate and interrelate the various branches of our course and show how they supplement one another, someone to begin quietly to foster vocations. Comparing the old method of class teachers (of my student and teaching days) with the present branch-instructor setup, I will not concede that, in the lower groups, the present arrangement is an improvement. However, as long as the grading agencies insist on specialized backgrounds for high-school teachers we can do little to bring about a return to the good old days.

Greater stress should be placed on clearness and accuracy of English expression, the ability to express one's ideas both adequately and forcibly. I am not in favor of any radical change because, if public education has modified itself to any great extent (for the war effort), we shall of necessity be the last bulwark of cultural education and leadership. The war years will have emphasized the utilitarian (science, mathematics), even in our schools. But the less we have to adjust our programs to return to curricula "distinctively Jesuit in principle," the sooner we can take the cultural lead in the postwar world. Where facilities permitted its *easy* accomplishment, homogeneous grouping might speed up the training of the exceptionally bright, to allow these boys to graduate in three years, gaining sixteen qualitative, rather than sixteen quantitative, units of credit. Thus they could get into the arena of Catholic leadership all the sooner.

I am in favor of several diverse curricula—classical, scientific, general—to meet various grades of intelligence, and to keep the greatest number of boys in Catholic schools. If some school is so fortunately situated as to be able to fill its capacity with capable classical students, that is heaven! The other courses have always been tolerated merely to stabilize enrollment, not as desirable objectives.

We should not enter into the field of vocational curricula. We have a distinctive domain in high-school education, which will not be occupied and controlled unless we do it. Other Catholic high schools can easily handle vocational courses. They will include such curricula whether we do or not. These courses are, briefly and definitely, beneath our educational dignity.

Postwar Planning for Jesuit Education: The Colleges

I. REVIEW OF PAST PERFORMANCE

That the general aims of our education will be valid in the future as in the past is stressed by the contributors. Their comments, however, recognize the need of viewing critically certain weaknesses of our past performance, principally a vagueness of aims and consequent misdirection of efforts leading to haphazard and often unsatisfactory results. Such self-criticism, which is a sign of a healthy organism, should not be dismissed lightly. Hence, it will be well to state in some detail the major weaknesses singled out by contributors.

Father Charles E. Schrader, chairman of the graduate division, University of Detroit, comments on the fact that there is "a startling lack of liberal-minded individuals in both public and private life in spite of the large numbers that have during the past decade or two filtered through our liberal arts colleges." "The root of the difficulty," he believes, "can be reached by considering three questions: (1) Do we really know what we are trying to do with and through the liberal arts program? (2) If we do, is the curriculum shaped to attain this end? (3) If it is, do the teaching procedures and mental attitudes of the teaching and administrative staffs make it possible of attainment?"

He believes that "the answer to all three questions is No—despite the fact that our college bulletins carry one or more paragraphs under the heading of *objectives*; despite the fact that we have a multiplicity of *must* courses; and despite the fact that administration and teachers generally 'mean well.' "

"In regard to the first indictment," he says, "let me illustrate with but one modern characteristic of our liberal arts colleges. We have, for instance, the A. B., the Ph. B., and the B. S. degrees. Are they all liberal arts degrees? If so, why the multiplicity? If not, what are they doing in the liberal arts college? The second indictment emerges from this same problem. The A. B. degree is differentiated from the Ph. B. chiefly by the inclusion in the former of Latin. Is this because we believe other subjects to be less valuable for their liberalizing contribution to the mind than Latin? Or is it because we believe that it is more liberalizing for the student to have a smattering of many subjects than to have a deeper and better integrated knowledge of fewer? However, in the supposition that

our objective is perfectly clear, at least to ourselves, and that our curriculum is beyond reproach, the third indictment still faces us. Its force is evident if we consider for but a moment precisely what we believe to be the integrating principle of our program. Teaching procedure generally and student approach invariably have combined to foster what is often called the compartmentalized mind. Too often both teacher and student manifest no appreciation of the fact that the various subjects of the curriculum are, or should be, interrelated."

Father Schrader then offers an approach to this wanted interrelation of subjects. As a fuller development of this point has been promised for a future issue of the *QUARTERLY*, its mention here will suffice. In conclusion he states: "To insure proper returns for the student, a comprehensive examination should be given at the end of the senior year of the liberal arts and not merely in the field of the student's major. That does not mean, however, that I would advocate the abolition of the common practice of allowing each student to major in the department of his choice. That could still be done, and yet the assurance of a liberal arts training would be guaranteed. Naturally such an examination would be conducted by a board composed of professors from the various departments. In other words, knowledge of the liberal arts should be made the basis of a liberal arts degree instead of a certain number of arts courses considered only quantitatively."

A second weakness—ineffective teaching—draws this sharp comment from the head of the department of history in one of our universities: "In what follows, I do not generalize, but refer only to what has come under my notice. The Jesuit tradition of 'great teaching' has indeed been impaired, not so much by dispersion of effort as by lack of interest and hard work in the acquisition of scholarship and in the forceful presentation of the truths which Catholic learning can impart."

The teaching of college religion is cited as a case in point. "Recall the strong article in the *Queen's Work* of several years ago. Undergraduates have complained to me about the weakness of our courses in religion. Sometimes they are made 'snap courses'—just routine stuff in which nobody ever fails. I have supplied twice for teachers who have been taken sick. I saw in what a slipshod manner these classes were being managed. One teacher gave practically every student an A or a B, and taught his class as if the thing were a joke, wisecracking and entertaining, but not driving home 'the rationalism of Catholicism.' So far as I have been able to notice, most of our students go through four years of college religion and are not required to read and report on a single book outside the text. The impression is given that it is the same old stuff of high school, textbookish, dry, and impractical. I once proctored a final examination in re-

ligion. It was supposed to be a two-hour test. Some were finished in half an hour; all before the hour! In one institution no meeting of the teachers of religion had been called for years, and neither the dean nor the president did anything about it. The head of the department (a very pleasant fellow) simply went gaily and blithely on, without organization and without concern, while there was no policy or consistency, and while some or many of the department were teaching their courses wretchedly indeed. And so in this field, at least, there has been a lack of 'great teaching.' "

It may be thought that this criticism is too severe or is valid only in one or another locality. Nevertheless, a teacher of religion in college for many years and head of the department, Father A. P. Madgett, makes a somewhat similar appraisal of our performance in teaching religion. "Our own thoughtful students," he says, "recognize and justly criticize, often with bitterness in their disappointment, the failure of high schools and colleges to give them as vital a presentation of religion in their budding manhood as they received in elementary schools, where new catechetical methods and effective use of the liturgy have given them their first glimpse of possibilities for a man wholly Christian—radiating Christ's influence in all human activity because he has the spirit of Christ. A mere digest of the religion teacher's digest of his professor's digest of systematic theology will never achieve this aim. It has failed notably, in some cases tragically. Let us recognize the fact and prepare to remedy it."

The remedy which Father Madgett proposes is not so much an improvement in teaching technique as a clear conception of the place of religion in the curriculum and the preparation of a unified program for the four college years. Before quoting his comments in this regard, the more general topic, namely the quality of our teaching, should be concluded. Two main causes for the decline of the teaching tradition are offered by Father Higgins, dean of Rockhurst College:

"The first is poor administration. That is, there has not been sufficient and careful supervision of teaching; nor have proper techniques and procedures been insisted upon. A revival of Ignatian efficiency and Ignatian obedience would help much to improve the quality of instruction in our schools. The second cause is that professors do not have enough time to prepare their classes and to correct daily exercises and weekly tests. Interference comes from too many extracurricular activities, or too heavy teaching or student load, or too many distractions of their own making, such as being spiritual counselors to women." All in all, he concludes, "teachers in both high schools and colleges could stand to make a retreat or attend a 'revival' on Jesuit education, so that they would go into the classroom with the conviction that they are doing something of permanent value by instructing youth. We have altogether too many anemic Jesuit teachers in

our schools, physically and even supernaturally anemic, and anemic in that for which they should have strong convictions."

II. PREVIEW OF RECONSTRUCTION

The suggestions looking toward reconstruction will be found to be neither novel nor revolutionary. Rather the contributors recommend a re-emphasis in certain areas or in certain procedures which they believe will remedy weaknesses of the past and bring our educational efforts to a higher and more constant standard of achievement.

In order to present the views of the contributors in an orderly way, they are collected under pertinent headings.

A. *Lessons the War Has Taught Us.*

Father McCormick, professor of philosophy, Loyola University, Chicago, asks for the "intelligent planning for a truly humanizing education." "Historically," he says, "Christianity has proved itself the great humanizing influence on human life. And that would seem to suggest that we need first of all a renewal of Christian influence in life and in education as a preparation for life. Christianity humanizes because it makes man divine. For human life is so high a thing that it cannot be lived on a truly human level unless it is lived in the strength of the divine life imparted to it. It would seem to be entirely obvious, then, that education after the war is not going to be any more successful than education before the war in making man human, unless it is permeated with the influence of Christian teaching and practice. Historically, too, and in the role of instruments, the arts have played the greatest part in humanizing man. They humanize because they are distinctively human. Their place in the education of the future would seem to be preordained by the need man will have to be made human again after having been keyed to the dehumanized requirements of total war."

Father Deane, of Fordham University, believes that as "the war demanded strong bodies and well-trained minds, the postwar period will demand no less. . . . The first can be obtained by a well-organized, simple program of physical training for all. Competitive sports, like all competitive activities, will always be for the few. Scholarship will not be impaired by extracurricular activities if they are kept in bounds. Of particular value are public speaking, dramatics, music, literary groups. Their planned programs will impart balance, initiative, organization, social and business habits."

It is the conviction of Father Bunn, president of Loyola College, Baltimore, that a valuable lesson taught by the war emergency "is more thorough teaching and study of the fundamental disciplines, such as mathematics, Latin, English, and history. This involves the time given to

these subjects as well as harder application on the part of the student. We must face the fact that the only training value of any one of these subjects is measured by the degree of proficiency which a student attains in mastering them. The goal of our educational system is not adaptation of the student to his environment, but rather the development of all his powers by which he can help to create the right environment."

Other lessons which Father Bunn thinks the war has taught educators are that physical-fitness exercises definitely increase the efficiency of students in their application to study, that with the physical exercises a course in mental, physical, and social hygiene should be given to all students, and that more time should be included in the school year than heretofore, with a consequent reduction in both high-school and college years.

B. Need to Revitalize the Liberal Arts Tradition.

When Father Maxwell, president of Holy Cross, calls for a vigorous restatement of liberal arts aims and means, he has in mind, no doubt, the task assigned to the special commission of the Association of American Colleges, of which he is a member. He writes that "a restatement of the aims of liberal education and of the means by which those aims can be achieved will do much to save the day and to rescue a splendid tradition of education." To reinforce his contention that liberal arts colleges themselves must take the lead in revitalizing the liberal tradition, he quotes an address delivered at the Tercentenary of Harvard by the late President Lawrence Lowell: "If I read history aright, institutions have rarely been killed while they were alive. They commit suicide, or die from lack of vigor, and then the adversary comes and buries them. So long as an institution conduces to human welfare, so long as a university gives to youth a strong active intellectual life, so long as its scholarship does not degenerate into pedantry, nothing can prevent it from going on to greater prosperity."

Father Higgins, of Rockhurst College, believes there is need to revitalize especially the A. B. curriculum to the extent, first that its objectives are stated very clearly and in some detail; second, that these objectives are thoroughly understood by the administration, the faculty, and the students; third, that the administration is actively engaged in seeing to it that these objectives are attained by those who are to be considered products of the school and candidates for degrees; fourth, that such specific means are taken to 'implement' the objectives as instruction concerning daily quizzes, weekly tests, the preparation and procedures for comprehensive examinations, and a workable method of checking whether members of the staff observe administrative regulations; fifth, that in stating the objectives of the A. B. curriculum, administrators do not hesitate to be as much to the point and as simple as C. H. Ward was when he defined the

objective of freshman high-school English as "the ability to write a decent sentence."

C. Provision for Abler Students.

Several contributors expressed the view that in the future our colleges should do more to stimulate to full capacity the talents of the more able students. Father Beglan, professor of philosophy, Canisius College, suggests honors courses as a suitable means for this purpose. He says: "Every teacher knows that the pace of the ordinary classroom instruction is slowed to the capacity of the mediocre student. The brilliant and the near-brilliant can assimilate the materials in much less time than their slower-witted classmates. As a result they are never stimulated by the classroom materials to their best efforts, and, unless they meet with some teacher who will encourage them to explore new fields by their own efforts, they inevitably fall to the dead level of mediocrity."

"For some time," he continues, "it seemed to this writer that the establishment in our colleges of an 'honors course,' something worthy of the name, would be the answer to this problem. Segregate the promising students from freshman to senior in 'honors sections'; set them to read and study the 'great books'; discuss with them the universal problems of life; integrate the arts and sciences with the unifying principles of philosophy and religion; teach them to think and talk and act as Catholic scholars. And behold, you have Catholic leaders."

Having said so much, Father Beglan pauses to weigh the implications of his proposal. "All this," he says, "seems pretty much in the abstract, and as we come to work out our proposal in the concrete, many questions force themselves on our attention. Would such segregation of the intellectual sheep from the goats have the danger of developing intellectual snobbery in the former and deadening forever whatever ambition for scholarship the latter may possess? Again, may not the intellectually mediocre student have qualities of leadership, moral and social, which should admit him to the companionship of the elite, while his lack of brilliancy condemns him to the company of the leaderless mass? Finally, how will such an 'honors course' be practically managed within the college? These and many other questions of practical import seem to make it advisable to stop and ponder all the related problems before finally committing ourselves to a definite program of studies for developing adequate leadership in the cream of the crop. Much testing is needed in the light of educational experience, Jesuit and non-Jesuit, to determine the best means of reaching the goal. To this writer the objective is eminently clear, the means only appears in doubt."

D. Evaluation Procedures.

Recent discussion of postwar education by committees of the Associa-

tion of American Colleges and the American Council on Education makes clear a change of attitude, more critical than formerly, toward the hard and fast regulations heretofore governing admission and graduation of college students. Agreement on this point was expressed by a number of contributors to the symposium. Father Roy, president of Loyola University of the South, believes that now is the time for Jesuit institutions to take the lead in freeing the colleges from purely mechanical criteria. The problem, however, is that faculties have been raised on credits and have in turn raised their students on credits. A solution may be found in the offer of the U. S. Armed Forces Institute "to send to any educational institution upon request a 'Competence Profile' of any individual who has been discharged from the armed forces and who has taken various controlled tests given by the Institute. This competence profile will indicate general intellectual development and the knowledge and skill acquired in specific fields of learning. It will be of no importance to the Institute when or how this competence was achieved, nor how long it took to achieve it."

Since all the regional accrediting associations have endorsed the Institute's program in principle, it is Father Roy's hope that Jesuit schools will study it carefully and follow its obvious invitation to find a way of measuring intellectual achievement intellectually.

Not all the contributors, however, would lend support to Father Roy's views. Some acknowledge that at times they chafe under the rather arbitrary admission and graduation procedures, but they nevertheless wish to be sure that substitute criteria will not be so subjective and unstable as to lack any real value. It is the opinion of Father Dunne, of the University of San Francisco, that not a few of our institutions are already too easy-going in admitting students to college, and that personal considerations and subjective judgments even now exert too great an influence on admission officials. Flexible norms of evaluating student achievement would demand a type of administrator who is altogether rare, one, namely, who would be purely impersonal in his judgments and guided in applying them by scrupulous academic integrity.

E. The Program of Religion.

Any contemplated reorganization of our curriculum must take into view the need of strengthening the program of religion. Several contributors have stressed this point. "With the present widespread criticism of defects and failures in the American educational system," writes Father Madgett, of Xavier University, Cincinnati, "we have the opportunity of taking the lead ourselves in an integrated program which produces the intellectual and moral qualities that the world, and our country in particular, need so badly." Not merely greater emphasis on religion is needed, nor merely "defensive" instruction in catechetically convenient and dog-

matically accurate statements of doctrine. But we need, he states, "to make vital in every phase of human activity a *wholly Christian way of life*, in thought, in sentiment, in action."

In his opinion, "the religion program must be given a place of actual, not merely theoretical, importance. Its framework is laid out in the encyclical on the *Christian Education of Youth*. First, philosophy must be so integrated with religion that the complementary character of faith and reason will directly appear. Second, history, literature, science should be taught, not as purely autonomous fields of thought, but as autonomous in the *method* proper to each, *integrated in reality*, because no field of human science can be properly grasped and appreciated until its relations to all others has been grasped, especially its relations to the supreme science of God, which throws light on them all. Third, religion must be taught as a way of life, not as a mere intellectual ornament with a spiritual content. This means that it must take *its inspiration from Christ*, by a more intimate knowledge of His life and teachings as He Himself presented them; by a deeper knowledge of the priestly work of Christ as Redeemer; by a thorough understanding of the spirit of Christ, slowly achieving victory in individual souls through His Mystical Body; and by a full realization of the social mission of Christ. Finally, the purposefulness of our teaching has always to be kept in mind: realization through contemplation and meditation, till the student sees that his study of Christ and His work must blossom forth in himself."

Such a program of religion, Father Madgett concludes, has been conceived and worked out tentatively by Father John Courtney Murray and has been in operation at Georgetown University and Loyola College, Baltimore. The results, even with the plan still in the experimental stages, have been satisfying and have elicited favorable comments from outside observers. It is well worth the consideration of all who are interested in this work.

F. *Preprofessional and Vocational Courses.*

Although much has been said about the superiority of the liberal arts training, it is a fact that a large number, if not the majority, of our college students are and have been in strictly preprofessional courses. Perhaps college administrators must shoulder some of the blame in permitting an overemphasis on these courses. Many of them have not made clear to students that the traditional studies of the liberal arts curriculum are a solid basis for professional avocations, as history will prove. Many, too, are culpable in not having resisted or guided the desires of parents and students for a so-called "practical college education."

Be this as it may, Father J. V. Kelly, dean of freshmen, Loyola University, Chicago, has observed over a period of years that students in these

preprofessional curricula, especially after freshman year, show an interest and effort in their particular studies which amount to a real devotion. "These students," he has experienced, "show the effect of such sustained interest and effort in a noticeable growth of character and a rather adult attitude toward discipline, sacrifice, and the whole large matter of religion and life—developments, by the way, which should be found preeminently among our liberal arts students and are too often regrettably missing among them. Of course, I have also observed a deplorable lack of interest in the cultural and a pronounced absence of cultural attainment in many preprofessional and vocational students. I have even met with the queer phenomenon of a vocational student acquiring high excellence in his major field of study and in philosophy, together with progressive illiteracy."

In concluding his comments, Father Kelly makes the pointed observation that "if we are to make the preprofessional and vocational training offered in our colleges into genuine Jesuit education, and if we are to make our liberal arts training into the topflight Jesuit education it proposes to be, it will involve a very complex process, with manifold influences at work from various sources. But it may be that the long, difficult process can wisely begin with the teachers of preprofessional subjects and teachers of the liberal arts telling one another forthrightly what the other does well or ill. Perhaps the process can then advance to the stage where students of biology and chemistry will always be noticeably literate and liberal arts classes will never mean uncomfortable repose for bodies weary after the dancing of the night before. This might lead, then, to the attainment of the goal of providing education and culture for all the students in Jesuit colleges, at least for everyone according to his capacity."

G. Realistic Summaries.

Lest postwar planning for education become too idealistic, we are reminded that as educators we Jesuits are not as independent of our secular neighbors and competitors as we would like to be and probably should be. "For good or ill, we tend to shape our product according to the current model." Accordingly, Father Andrew C. Smith, general prefect of studies of the New Orleans Province, lists three problems arising from the war that will have to be faced realistically.

"First is the fact that people will be increasingly unwilling or unable to meet the costs of private education. As the war drags on, more and more young men will receive high-school and college training at government expense in both private and state institutions. The precedent will be hard to disestablish.

"In the second place, the importance of technical training for ever larger numbers will have become axiomatic. This pattern, imposed by the Army, will be canonized by the victory to which it leads. Then too the

public works program and the exploitation of new inventions now being planned as part of the postwar adjustment of employment will create a new demand for widespread technical training. It will take more than a self-convinced, well-meaning committee of liberal arts educators to stem the tide that is running toward the applied sciences.

"Thirdly, experience from the war will have proved that the educational ladder can and should be shortened, and that this can be done without serious detriment to sound academic progress. Some form of acceleration will also be with us to stay. This will affect both high school and college."

Father Smith is convinced that to cope with these three tendencies, without sacrificing any of our essential ideals, will demand educational statesmanship of a high order. "Here and now," he continues, "I can only venture to suggest the directions which our solution should take.

"First of all, in concert with other private and especially Catholic institutions we must see to it that our constituents continue to receive their full share of whatever public aid is given to both secondary and higher education. One good result of the war may be the setting up of precedents in this direction.

"Then, too, professional studies in our universities should be broadened to include more attention to engineering in all its phases. The future map of the J. E. A. will have to show engineering schools in every part of the Assistancy, as well as a general redistribution of our professional-school strength.

"Lastly, to strengthen our position in education we must be ready to make reasonable adjustments both in time-schedule and curriculum pattern."

A somewhat different but equally realistic approach to postwar planning is suggested by Father M. J. Fitzsimons, general prefect of studies for colleges, Maryland-New York Province. He believes that "in the lull occasioned by the war, we can well set our house in order. We have a Jesuit blueprint and program for this in the *Instructio* promulgated nine years ago for the American Assistancy. There is some basis for the impression that, owing to various circumstances, this important document has suffered something of an eclipse in the period since it was promulgated." Father Fitzsimons therefore sketches briefly its historical setting.

"To report on our educational institutions, a commission of six Fathers was appointed by Father General Ledochowski on December 8, 1930, 'in his serious concern lest our failure to raise our universities, colleges, and high schools to the highest possible standards, should result in eliminating us from the educational field, thus destroying an instrument so rich in possibilities for the salvation of souls.' The purpose of the Commission

was summarized under four headings: (1) The endeavor to secure united purpose and concerted action in our educational work in the United States; (2) to inquire into the standing of our institutions of higher learning as compared with secular colleges and universities; (3) to make a study of national and regional associations; (4) to suggest a plan whereby the present and future teachers in our schools might secure necessary academic degrees.

"After two years' work the Commission presented its report and on August 15, 1934, the *Instructio* was promulgated. It comprised three sections: I. De Cooperatione inter Provincias et de Directione in singulis Provinciis; II. De institutione alumnorum, de professoribus ac de Universitatum, Collegiorum et Scholarum Altarum regimine; III. De Magistrorum praeparatione."

What has been accomplished since the publication of the *Instructio* and what remains to be done, Father Fitzsimons summarizes in these terms.

"The prescriptions of the first section on united purpose and concerted action have been fulfilled with notably successful results. The second part contains detailed directions for achieving standards comparable with the best in the country. The fact that only seven of twenty-five Jesuit colleges are among the institutions approved by the Association of American Universities shows the wisdom of this directive. It was designed to destroy what has been called the 'they and we' complex in the educational field, with its implied opposition. If educational agencies, national or regional, have been guilty of impositions harmful to independent institutions, it can be traced in great part to a lack of intelligent and courageous Catholic direction within the legislating organizations. We cannot effect such direction or opposition until we first cooperate with these associations in permanent relationship and friendly spirit. This process could be called 'infiltration,' but that word connotes opposition. Rather we must share the responsibility of directing education by participation in the efforts of these groups. Jesuits have made great progress in such relations.

"Within the structure of Jesuit education delineated by the *Instructio*, various developments in education can be evaluated, assimilated, or rejected. We may hold no brief for Dr. Mortimer Adler as an educator, but it would be interesting to know to what extent we can refute his criticism of Catholic education by an appeal to our practice. He writes: 'The Catholic educator, who knows [the fundamental truths of education in his philosophy of man] often violates them in practice by educational methods which (1) put a premium on verbal memory instead of intellectual habit, (2) proceed as if the teacher were the only active cause of learning, and as if the learner could be entirely passive, (3) neglect or wrongly subordinate the liberal arts to a supposed mastery of subject matter, (4) try

to do the impossible—namely, give the students a genuine possession of the truth without ever really perplexing them first by the problems or issues which the truth resolves; perplexity which requires a vital experience of error and not the easy dismissal of dummy opponents who have been made into straw men for quick demolition.' "

So far Dr. Adler. It is Father Fitzsimons' conviction that the best way to invalidate such criticism is by a clear formulation, under the directives of the *Instructio*, of a distinctively Jesuit educational plan for our schools in America.

In conclusion, he comments on the third and last section of the *Instructio* which, in perhaps consciously climactic order, treats of the preparation of teachers. "Without this provision," he states, "the plans of the two former sections would be but a house constructed of sand. No matter what educational level is considered, the principle remains true: 'as the teacher, so the school.' We need not minimize the difficulties in fulfilling this aim. Not only must we prepare a Jesuit for the apostolic life of the priesthood, a sufficient life's work in itself; but within that vocation we must add the apostolate of education, and on coldly practical grounds enable a teacher to be prepared adequately to meet the complex obligations of his profession.

"In all postwar planning for Jesuit education, then, we have in the *Instructio* a program and a blueprint. It remains to appreciate its possibilities and revive our interest in its salutary provisions."

As a conclusion to this extensive survey of Jesuit opinion on future plans for our Jesuit colleges, the following contributions are printed somewhat at length. They may serve as a summary of many of the ideas and comments so far expressed. Each is a unified view of future problems and their solutions, and as such will be welcomed for its satisfactory grasp of the situation and stimulating analysis of it.

Father A. H. Poetker, of the University of Detroit, enters a caution against wishful thinking in replanning postwar education. Problems are not going to change greatly in character. The prime requisite, both during and after the war, is the quality of adaptability, tempered by a changeless philosophy, "to meet changing needs in a changing world."

Viewing education from outside, as it were, and independently of academic details, Father John LaFarge, executive editor of *America*, stresses the 'life-value' of Catholic education, and the serious responsibility resting upon the educated Catholic of showing the world of men 'how to live.' To do so, he must first himself have learned how to live.

Although Father Wuellner, of the University of Detroit, outlines a program of reconstruction, he does not envisage a reorganization of education. Rather he would have us rebuild on the principles and procedures

we already have, in order to make effective in our work their full potentialities.

I

Reorganization Overemphasized

A. H. POETKER, S. J.

One proposal which I believe is being overemphasized in the thinking of some educators is the matter of *reorganization*. Some speak of it as a cure-all for our sins, mistakes, and shortcomings. A principal argument advanced for it is that it would shorten the period of formal education by a year or two. This is a laudable objective, but I think the saving should be made in the grades rather than on the secondary or college level. If the shortening is accomplished by crowding a year and a half of academic work into a calendar year and going to school continuously, it should be called acceleration rather than reorganization, and few educators will consider this type of arrangement desirable as a permanent policy. It makes too many students work beyond their capacity. It is practical and acceptable during and because of the war emergency, but after the war our human nature will find no such adequate incentive for continued intensity of effort without some diverting mental activity.

The shortening that is accomplished in many of the Army's specialized training programs may similarly be a necessary expedient of wartime but it should not be the deliberate choice of the educator under less critical conditions. The *ad hoc* nature of these courses is their chief characteristic. They are mainly concerned with applications of laws, principles, and theories and not with the discovery of them, the critical examination of them, or the proof of their validity. Mathematics is regarded as a tool rather than as a mental discipline. English is considered solely as a medium of expression, not as a literature storing the wisdom of centuries. The vocational aspect takes precedence over the liberal aspect of knowledge for its own sake or as the basis of a cultural life.

Hence we think the arguments for reorganization that are based on the desire to shorten the period usually devoted to the secondary and college levels are of very doubtful value. In gaining one desirable objective others just as desirable are sacrificed. Besides, in any shortening of the program we must see to it that the student is not brought to advanced college work before he has the required personal and social maturity.

The proponents of reorganization criticize the four-year college as an "educational hybrid." It is so branded because the first two years are usually concerned with general education and the last two with more specialized intensive and professional education. As if there were any opposition be-

tween these supplementary objectives! The truly educated man needs both, and there is no reason why the college should not be concerned with both, or even why the student should not pursue both together. The present trend in engineering education is to introduce some general and cultural courses into every stage of the curriculum.

Jesuit educators are naturally concerned about the fortunes of liberal education. We seemed to be fighting something of a losing battle for liberal education even before the advent of the war. The pull of utilitarianism was all too strong on our students. The war training has necessitated further departure from liberal education. There will be similar pressures in the postwar period. But it is my contention that this question of liberal education is not bound up with reorganization. It is not a shifting of names we need or a new distribution of units; rather it is a change in the content and method of our teaching. It is up to the educators to revitalize the liberal arts program. Too often in the past it has been made unliberal by lifeless, hackneyed, straight-jacket methods of presentation. On the other hand, many a teacher in highly specialized or professional courses imparts to his students a spirit of idealism, culture, and appreciation that is the very soul of liberal education. Content alone will never make an education liberal.

While we encourage in every way possible the liberal education which is to fit men to live the 'good life,' we may not wholly ignore in that education the things that will fit them to make a living. When education beyond the grades was the privilege of the few it was logical to give those few a complete liberal arts training. But now that education through two years or more of college seems to be the democratic privilege of every boy and girl, it must of necessity include more of the vocational, the semi-professional, and the professional. This holds both for high-school and college levels. Our Catholic system has missed an opportunity in not establishing vocational high schools which provide the proper curricula for thousands of our Catholic children. Religion and morality, high character and the proper outlook on life can be taught as effectively in a vocational high school as in a college preparatory curriculum. Presupposing a proper foundation in the student and a well-selected faculty, a "true and perfect Christian" can be formed as successfully in the professional and technical units of our universities as in the liberal arts college. If we remember the primary objective of all our education we will be more liberal in our attitude to specialized education.

II

Note on Postwar Jesuit Education

JOHN LAFARGE, S. J.

The young people who grow up in the world immediately after the war will, in all probability, find it difficult to maintain their spiritual and cultural balance. We are moving into an era in which men will be more rigidly classified, where careers will be much less independent and will be determined by forces which, if we are not wary, will be largely out of our control.

It seems to me, therefore, that much stress will need to be laid upon the *attitude* to be taken by our young people to the new circumstances in which they will find themselves. I should like to emphasize particularly, as contribution to an attitude of mind which will make them worthy products of our Jesuit education, *a consciousness of the part they shall have to play as leaders*—spiritually and intellectually—in the coming era.

1. Our education in recent years, particularly under the inspiration of the Sodality movement, has been tending to give our young men some inkling of this leadership they should properly exercise. But so far it has only been an inkling. Far too much the stress has been traditionally placed upon the idea of finding for themselves a place in a world whose maxims, customs, and opportunities have already been laid out for them. They have grown up under the idea that their visible mark of a successful response to our education has been to achieve eminence in one of the well-defined professions or careers. We have pointed with pride to the fact that a Jesuit alumnus, too, may rise to be a leader in the professional, the business, the political world; but a leader only in the sense that a certain recognition is publicly accorded him, not that he himself has had a profound influence in transforming the field of his chosen activity by the vigor and communication of his own spiritual ideals.

His spiritual excellence has been rather in preserving himself from certain contaminations, not in making himself a driving force to win others to a positive ideal of his own. There are, of course, some splendid exceptions, but they still remain rather exceptions than the rule.

2. I have in mind two elements in education which seem to me to contribute especially to that all-important spirit of leadership.

The first of these is the grasp of the spiritual leadership itself, in an objective sense, which is to be communicated or exercised. This means, in other words, the clear grasp of a *positive ideal in that field or area* where we will most be able to exercise a tremendous leadership as Catholics; viz., through the fact that we alone (if we fully grasp the truth) possess what

all the world is now longing for, an adequate and rounded picture of man and of human living itself. We have an unparalleled opportunity to show men what it means really to *live*; and no period is more suited in which to show people how to live than an epoch when the whole world is crushed and saddened by the horrible shadow of death.

We are not going to influence this postwar world by arguing with it (though we need to have our rational arguments fully at our disposal, and to hold our ground as defenders of the validity of human reason itself). We are not going to influence it by being supermen, and our schools are not going to produce supermen. We shall produce a few miracles in that line, as we have always done, but that is not and cannot be our staple; and the world is pretty well fed up with supermen, anyhow. But we will exert an incredible influence by showing in our own lives—not inarticulately, nor yet argumentatively, but interpreting intelligently our deeds by our words—*how to live*. But to show others how to live we must first ourselves have learned to live; and this means an immense amount of laborious thought to be given to the construction of a rounded, properly balanced spiritual, cultural, disciplined, completely human yet supernaturally transformed ideal of human living for our young people, which will compel by its presentation of the charity, the holiness, and the justice of Jesus Christ in the daily experience of the Catholic layman.

3. The other great contribution to the effectiveness of our leadership will be the growth in our young people's minds of the sense of a *world society*, not as internationalizing and emasculating their patriotic allegiance, nor as a Utopian construction, but as a *reality* of the world in which we now exist. They must learn, in other words, the vastness and resonances of the great theatre upon which they are called to play their spiritual part. This means, therefore, that their spiritual ideal cannot be learned as something isolated, but as something shared with Catholic youth of all the Americas, and of all the world. I am not suggesting these as formal courses, but as an emphasis and point of view pervading all our teaching. There will be no world made safe for Catholicism. But there will be a world in which Catholicism, illustrated in our young, can overcome distrust and be seen as the one thing in the present distress which can save man for himself and for God.

III

A Program of Reconstruction

BERNARD J. WUELLNER, S. J.

This contribution can be put under four headings:

I. *What lessons is the war teaching us educators?*

1. Not the need of the American way of life, but of the Catholic way of life. This Catholic way of life requires a Catholic mind, a Catholic heart, a Catholic social life, and a Catholic perseverance. These in turn require thorough Catholic training.

2. Liberal education is not respected, not merely because it is not pragmatic but because it has been too confused with an easy way of youth and is scorned because of illiberal and extracurricular excesses that are popularly regarded as college life.

3. Liberal education without some training for a life vocation is insufficient, just as vocational training without liberal education is empty.

4. The important place of women in modern society. They ought then gain a correspondingly important place in universities.

II. *What opportunities does the postwar period open up to us?*

1. The colleges must be leaders of the mental, moral, social adjustment of that period. They can do little about the economic adjustment.

2. Catholic colleges will have to take a more truly Catholic and more truly American attitude to the presence of women students and professors; and they must reflect a Catholic attitude toward the Negro.

3. There should be greater openings for adult education, in noncredit programs, and this in liberal fields. This opportunity probably should make it, after the day liberal arts course, the chief center of our educational efforts.

4. There may be a demand for a double-degree program, perhaps of five years. This program would have a three-year base of liberal arts, and a two-year superstructure of engineering, business, or some other vocation.

5. The interest in adjustment and reorganization gives us the chance:
a. to restore the teachers as the keymen in the college and university;
b. to eliminate our confusions in goals, attitudes, and those means which we classify as administrative and curricular.

It encourages one to think that these last two tasks can be undertaken now, at once, before the war is finished. Hence,

III. *The task of training first-class teachers for colleges and universities must be undertaken as the first practical step to a successful postwar program.*

1. Teachers, not administrators, are the causes of living educational

results. No school is as good as its administrators, but no school can be better than its teachers. The teachers are THE problem.

2. Jesuit teachers also need a clear, vivid philosophy of teaching. They need not only knowledge and specific knowledge of their subject, but they need training in *teaching habits*. These include technique in and out of the classroom, enthusiasm, interest in students as well as in the subject taught, energy, up-to-date-ness.

3. The lay faculty must also be trained in Jesuit pedagogical ideals and practices.

4. All administrative officers of the university, except the treasurer perhaps, should regularly do some teaching. Their exclusive devotion to administration weakens the teaching staff immensely and blinds them to real student needs.

5. One or two of the best men on the staff should be made deans of instruction.

6. Only the best teachers should be employed in philosophy and religion classes in which the Catholic way of life is chiefly imparted.

7. The whole tone of the content and method of instruction must be apostolic and constructive. All selfish, ungenerous, merely lay, and critical attitudes need perpetual banishment.

IV. *We can begin now to cure our confusions.*

This confusion or disorder appears in wrong objectives, in excessive objectives, in a disordered sense of the proportionate value of our various objectives, in the conflict between curricular and extracurricular activities, in the stress on information more than on habits, in disunity caused by too much organization of administration, in ineptness of means, in failure to look first to the intellectual and spiritual good of the students, in endless compromises on issues that concern not variable means but inflexible ends. This, however, is an immediate administrative problem, and therefore I grow silent.

Postwar Planning for Jesuit Education: The Graduate and Professional Schools

In the letter inviting contributions to the symposium, a number of trial balloons were sent up to help locate the prevailing currents of Jesuit opinion. For instance, the question was asked: "How can the Catholic influence and emphasis in our graduate and professional schools be increased so as to give greater justification for maintaining them?" A plain and forthright question! And from one of the contributors, Father Bakewell Morrison, of St. Louis University, it evoked a plain and forthright answer.

By way of introduction, Father Morrison wonders a little at the pessimistic tone of the query. "Your question," he says, "is phrased in the mood, if not in the language, of discouragement; your question seems to imply that the justification for maintaining them is doubtful, or, at least, not too well thought of by the one who phrased the question. Your very query condemns." He maintains his direct attack in what may be called, in Platonic language, the ironic or destructive stage of his refutation of the charge implied in the question. "I take it as a fact," he says, "that Jesuits do not seem universally to approve of our having such schools. I think that the mind-slant of many and many a Jesuit toward the graduate and professional schools of our universities is bad; and that, because it is bad, the schools themselves suffer." Two types of Jesuits seem to be members of the opposition. The first he characterizes thus:

"It may be unfair even to hint that the Jesuit who has not too close and personal an acquaintance with our graduate and professional schools is one of those who in their own minds do not favor, do not believe in, do not—I speak with bated breath—have themselves a 'higher education.' Is it not possible that some Jesuits are themselves not 'educated'? By 'educated' in this context I mean interested in, sympathetic to, absorbed by studies that are deep, that are taxing, that *are* really scholarly." The second type, perhaps not clearly differentiated from the first, "thinks grudgingly (and with little information) of what is done, of the *money* that is spent in our efforts to meet or to reach up to the scholarly competition of educators about us. Some Jesuits are engaged so overwhelmingly in active duties that they may mistake industry for the end-all and be-all;

may judge that only in administering Sacraments, dealing with people, being busy with "vital" problems, does one fulfill the Society's objectives. But Ignatius wished to reach the *elite*. In brief, had we more men truly scholarly, we would not feel called on to justify our efforts to produce scholars!"

Father Morrison's practical conclusion to this part of his defense of our graduate and professional schools is to ask that the Society at large be better informed about them. And from his own experience he supplies the information.

"The Catholic emphasis and influence in our graduate and professional schools," he asserts, "is mighty Catholic. I teach with Catholic truth as my subject matter. I do not find opposition to that truth. I do find that the non-Catholics are normally impressed by the presentation of Catholic truth, and that the Catholics are finely helped. I find that non-Catholics profit by knowing, at first hand and as clearly as I can make them know, what it is that a Catholic believes and why he believes it. I find that non-Catholics experience the astonishment they are entitled to feel when they discover—a thing they would not be likely to do in any other place—that Catholics are taught to use their intelligence, are required to use their intelligence, that Catholicism is a religion that survives most healthily and most nearly after the mind of its Founder when Catholics do use their intelligence.

"I do not feel for one minute," he concludes, "that our emphasis and influence are merely negative: I mean that I do not for one minute admit that we simply see to it that rot, nonsense, wrong ideas are *not* taught. We do much better than that. Triumphantly in our measure we attempt to vindicate for the Church the heritage she has by right but not always in fact—the rich, cultural, humane meaning of education, and the rich, cultural, humane, and worth-while point of view on life, on values, on God, on Christ."

Another contributor, Father Joseph A. Slattery of Woodstock College, takes the worth of our graduate work for granted, and offers a suggestion for the consideration of graduate departments of English. He writes: "When our graduate schools resume full activity after the war, the English departments might do well to concentrate on those writings of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance which impinge on matters in the field of religion or philosophy. That such works have been neglected or grotesquely misinterpreted until the very recent past is too obvious for comment. The treatment which St. Thomas More receives in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* is a familiar instance."

Father Slattery feels that work in this field must be pursued in *Catholic* graduate schools. For although non-Catholic universities seem to be awak-

ening to the opportunities offered in this unexploited field, they can hardly be expected to do the work adequately. "The equipment of their scholars is inevitably limited. It is inadequate to the full and easy comprehension of the backgrounds of asceticism and devotion, scholastic theology and philosophy, patrology and liturgy essential to the interpretation of most works created in the atmosphere of the Catholic civilization which began to pass away during the Renaissance. The names of the scholars who have been pioneers in the reinterpretation of this material—Phillimore, Chambers, Reed, Young, White, Wells, Robinson, Coulton, Coffman—may make this statement seem to have the air of an empty boast. But it is not so. The question is one of a clearer and wider vision, a fuller sympathy with the complex elements of a spiritual tradition, not of a special literary or historical knowledge, and here the formed Jesuit may, without delusion, be conscious of superiority."

The fruits of our participation, and, if possible, our leadership in this field, Father Slattery thinks, "would be an increased respect for Catholic culture among American scholars, a much-desired enhancement of the prestige of our universities, and in good time, let us hope, a tacit acknowledgment in the textbooks of some of the errors of the past. More immediately, our teaching on the undergraduate level would be stimulated by contact with a vital advancement of learning. Moreover, we would be immunized from such notions as that Chaucer was a disaffected Catholic; that Wycliffe's style was ahead of his age; that *Piers Plowman* is an incoherent tract, interesting as a social document; that St. Thomas More was a liberal in his youth and a bigot in his old age; that Protestantism somehow liberated the English genius and brought about the 'Elizabethan Period.' In this we will be doing something to form the future by revealing the creative potency of Catholic culture in the past."

The third, and final, contribution that concerns itself with our graduate and professional education was written by Father Hunter Guthrie of Fordham University. He distinguishes in the first place the aims of the Catholic from those of the secular university, and then recommends a four-point program for making Jesuit graduate and professional schools more Catholic. In this latter phase, his views may seem to clash with those of Father Morrison. There may, however, be more than a little agreement between the two. At most there is a difference of emphasis. It seems clear that Father Guthrie would not question the value of our graduate and professional work, nor would Father Morrison deny that there are in it certain imperfections which can be remedied. Father Guthrie's paper follows.

Catholic Emphasis and Influence in Our Graduate and Professional Schools

HUNTER GUTHRIE, S. J.

The radical difference between the Catholic and the secular university consists in their divergent aims. Though both strive to impart the arts, sciences, and professions; the former conceives education as a means to something nobler, the latter considers education a self-sufficient end.

The secular university judges its task completed when it has taught the student the courses he has chosen to follow. How he will use that knowledge, to what purpose the graduate will ultimately dedicate his arts or sciences, does not intrinsically concern the secular university. As secular, the university *de jure* recognizes no ulterior goal, certainly no goal of a higher order, to which the student should dedicate his education. The late President Lowell of Harvard illustrates this in his definition of the university as "a society or guild of scholars, associated together for preserving, imparting, increasing, and enjoying knowledge." That is the error of secularism, and, it may be said in passing, that is one of the capital errors of the day: complete dissociation of human activity from any ultimate goal.

The Catholic university, on the other hand, is dedicated to the twofold purpose of imparting an education and impressing the student with a sense of the instrumentality of his learning. This second purpose it accomplishes in four ways. (1) It gives the student a clear conception of order or hierarchy by explaining the relations of nature to grace, of reason to faith, of knowledge to charity. (2) It cultivates a sense of values, which will make him acutely aware of the primacy of the eternal over the temporal, of the spiritual over the corporeal, of truth over the pragmatic, and of virtue over the expedient. (3) It fosters the teleological attitude, which has been lost for centuries in secular spheres. This means that his life be habitually controlled by the desire of attaining his final destiny. (4) These three, when properly understood and practiced, will give him a sense—entirely absent today—of integration. That is to say, the Catholic student will begin to understand the divine economy of one supernatural order. He will no longer divide his life between two planes, spending most of the week operating in the natural order guided by ethics and, then, for an hour or so on Sunday, transposing himself to the supernatural order, where he is directed by the precepts learned in his courses on religion. Rather, he will learn that every deliberate act of his daily life bears a relation to, and takes its ultimate significance from, the elevated destiny to which God gratuitously ordained him.

In no field of Catholic education has this Christian ideal been more

neglected, yet, at the same time, in no field is it likely to bear more abundant fruit than in our graduate and professional schools. With no Catholic tradition to guide us in these realms of education we have accepted the current secular norms. In the hope of introducing the Catholic ideal to these branches of our universities the following suggestions are offered.

(1) An annual retreat should be given to the lay students in these schools.

(2) An annual retreat should be given and made obligatory for the lay professors who teach in these schools. If the proper retreat-master is selected, one familiar with the problems of Catholic education and the urgent need of recapturing our Catholic tradition, there would be few means more efficacious in reaching the end here proposed.

(3) The executive director of the J. E. A. should appoint a committee for each department of our graduate and professional schools. These committees, composed of competent Jesuits, should either revise the syllabus of each department, so that it be more Catholic in scope and tone, or suggest means of introducing the Catholic ideal where such a change is impossible. Some suggestions on both these points follow.

A. Changes in curricula.—*Philosophy*. The relations of philosophy to theology and to the arts and sciences deserve more attention in the light of recent discussions; the philosophy of the Fathers should be treated in greater detail. *Classics*. The Fathers give valuable content in addition to form that is often not too far removed from the classical standard. *English*. Greater effort should be devoted to unearthing Catholic authors and illustrating principles from them. *Romance languages*. A treasure of Catholic literature lies untouched. *History*. The role of the Church in the formation, transmission, and development of all that we know as culture and most that we know as science is neglected. Are Catholic historians too scientific to acknowledge divine Providence? *Social sciences*. A virgin field for the Catholic thinker; justice and charity must be defined and wedded with the aid of revelation. *Experimental psychology*. Still lost in *vana curiositas*, it has failed to gear itself to Catholic thought.

B. Method.—While mathematics and the sciences, with the possible exception of biology, cannot be Christianized, morality and Christian doctrine can be richly illustrated in these subjects. Some of the laws of physics and chemistry, for example, portray to a mathematical nicety one or another of the cardinal virtues. The cultural values of the sciences have rarely been given the attention or emphasis they merit.

Jesuit Alumni in the War

This *third* report from the schools, on the participation of their alumni in the military winning of the war, is very little in advance of the second report, which itself was only a short step ahead of the first. Scarcely fifty per cent of the schools have taken the trouble to keep the Central Office of the J. E. A. informed of revised figures. And so quite a number of the high schools especially (and some of the colleges) are represented by the same statistics they originally reported and have never since corrected.

ALUMNI IN SERVICE—COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

	Alumni-in- service	Fatalities	Missing	Decora- tions
Boston College	2,500	14	9	17
Canisius College	482	4	0	3
Creighton University	1,252	12	10	8
University of Detroit	1,912	19	0	1
Fordham University	3,602	24	4	7
Georgetown University	3,500	18	2	1
Gonzaga University	525	4	3	0
Holy Cross College	2,009	4	2	7
John Carroll University	623	6	2	0
Loyola of Baltimore	607	2	0	1
Loyola University, Chicago	1,600	11	6	0
Loyola University, Los Angeles	650	6	3	5
Loyola University, New Orleans	861	11	3	0
Marquette University	2,479	15	8	9
Regis College	392	1	0	0
Rockhurst College	1,500	7	2	6
St. Joseph's College	669	5	3	6
St. Louis University	1,126	9	0	0
St. Peter's College	530	0	0	2
University of San Francisco	1,850	22	1	2
University of Santa Clara	725	9	0	1
Seattle College	108	1	0	0
Spring Hill College	550	9	1	2
Xavier University	555	6	2	0
Totals	30,607	219	61	78

ALUMNI IN SERVICE—HIGH SCHOOLS

	Alumni-in- service	Fatalities	Missing	Decora- tions
Bellarmino College Preparatory	325	4	0	0
Bellarmino High School, Tacoma	216	3	0	0
Boston College High School	1,125	5	1	8
Brooklyn Preparatory School	505	2	1	3
Campion	273	5	3	6
Canisius High School	236	0	0	0
Cranwell Preparatory School	24	0	0	0
Creighton University High School	260	3	2	0
University of Detroit High School	275	2	0	0
Fordham Preparatory School	403	3	0	0
Georgetown Preparatory School	125	0	0	0
Gonzaga High School, Spokane	406	10	0	0
Gonzaga High School, Washington ...	237	0	0	1
Jesuit High School, New Orleans	151	0	0	0
Jesuit High School, Tampa	200	2	0	1
Loyola Academy, Chicago	374	3	1	0
Loyola High School, Baltimore	280	3	1	0
Loyola High School, Los Angeles	295	5	3	0
Loyola School, New York	90	1	0	0
Marquette High School, Yakima	112	1	0	1
Marquette University High School	684	0	0	2
Regis High School, Denver	287	1	0	0
Regis High School, New York	415	4	0	0
Rockhurst High School	240	1	0	0
St. Ignatius High School, Chicago	550	4	3	0
St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland ..	250	2	0	0
St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco	825	9	3	3
St. John's High School, Shreveport ...	105	0	0	0
St. Joseph's College High School, Phil..	295	1	0	2
St. Louis University High School	615	1	1	1
St. Peter's College High School	450	3	1	1
St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati ...	199	2	0	0
Seattle Preparatory	275	3	1	0
Xavier High School, New York	400	2	2	0
Totals	11,502	85	23	29

NOTES ON JESUIT TEACHING PROCEDURES

ALLAN P. FARRELL, S. J.

II. THE PRELECTION APPLIED TO HISTORY

A. *History in the Ratio Studiorum.*

(1) History was not given the status of a separate subject in the curriculum of the *Ratio* prior to the edition of 1832. However, historical background, especially from ancient history, was imparted through the study of the ancient classics and as a supplement to this study.¹ Besides, Father Horace Torsellini's *Epitome* of history, published in 1598, was introduced into most of the Jesuit schools either as a supplementary textbook or as a work of reference.

(2) In the *Ratio* of 1832 there are two principal references to history as a separate subject. The first is contained in the eighth rule of the prefect of lower studies, paragraph eleven: "Historiam, geographiam, matheos elementa, et si qua alia in his scholis tradi solent, consulto Provinciali ita distribuat [Praefectus] ut unusquisque Magister materiam sibi assignatam rite et commode possit absolvere." The second reference, in the first rule for the distribution of prizes, indicates that a prize was to be offered for proficiency in historical knowledge.²

B. *Prolegomena on History Suggested by Expert Teachers.*

(1) Since history is supposed to be "the study of man in society from his beginnings to the present day," the teacher should bear in mind that man's life in society embraces not only political and economic areas, but cultural, social, and religious as well.

(2) Begin the teaching of any course in history with a comprehensive historical outline, in order to give breadth to its study and a "frame of reference" for the particular epoch or field of history under consideration.

¹ The *Constitutions*, Part IV, Chapter XIII, A, define the humanities as embracing, besides grammar, what pertains to rhetoric, poetry, and history. An appendix to the *Ratio* of 1591, "De Historiae Explanatione in Classe Rhetoricae" (given in Corcoran, *Renatae Litterae*, pp. 279-80), clearly shows that ancient historians were to be studied not merely as writers but also as historians. On history in the *Ratio*, see Farrell, *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education*, pp. 247-51.

² A debatable question might be the place of history in the Jesuit high-school curriculum today. Should ancient, medieval, modern, and American history be included? Are high-school students mature enough to achieve worthwhile objectives in history? Does not so much history displace essential emphasis on language? Does it not tend to lessen interest in the college study of history where more profit can be derived? If so much history is needed in high school because many students terminate education with high school, would not the argument apply also to philosophy, sociology, etc.? The debate is of course apart from the purpose of these notes on teaching.

(3) Insist throughout that the student build for himself a strong framework of essential *dates*, important *names* ("History is the essence of innumerable biographies"—Thomas Carlyle), and major *events*. There should be no overemphasis on these items. Lord Acton rightly believed that "history should not be a burden on the memory, but an illumination of the soul." Nevertheless, dates, names, and events are the framework needed for understanding, interpreting, and drawing conclusions.

(4) Use visual helps—pictures, maps, etc. A proper use of geography and physiography is an aid to interest as well as necessary for an adequate understanding of history.

(5) Orient the teaching of history from the revolutionary *Anno Domini*. All history teachers who must use a non-Catholic textbook should have at hand for consultation a Catholic text or Catholic sources. This will prevent ever assuming that the Church ceased to be a force after 1517.

(6) Keep as an eternal objective the investigation of *why* as well as *how* historical events happened.

C. *A First Day's Prelection in History.*

(1) Set the objectives of the course. Make them clear—1, 2, 3. Make them so understandable that any person of ordinary intelligence should be able to grasp them.³ Dictate these objectives to the class.

(2) Summarize in about a dozen sentences the content of the textbook or course.⁴ And dictate this to the class also. For instance, American history course: "(1) English colonists (Protestant for the most part) settled along the Atlantic coast, 1607- , while the French (Catholics) occupied Canada and the Mississippi Valley, 1608- . (2) A long series of wars between these two countries (1689-1763) ended in English victory. France lost its territory in America. (3) . . ."

(3) Pick out the few really important divisions of the study at hand, and give the class a brief but connected view of them. In American history, for example, the main lines are: (a) Colonies—roots of American history; Indians; Spain, France, England; (b) American independence—Revolutionary War, Constitution, War of 1812; (c) the Civil War; (d) modern America. European history, 1500-1832, has five big topics: the so-called Renaissance; the Protestant Revolt; the so-called Enlightenment; the French Revolution; its immediate aftermath.

Such a thumbnail outline of main headings will be filled in gradually as the course advances. Subheads will complete the outline. Hence students

³ It would be an enlightening experiment to test with parents and students how much of the frequently high-sounding description of aims, methods, and standards in our school catalogues and syllabi they really understand.

⁴ Should a teacher think that this procedure is a waste of time or just silly, let him probe his thinking by experiencing the difficulty of the task and its fruitfulness for himself and the class.

will have a summary of the whole subject matter in a dozen sentences and in a graphic outline. If these main ideas are made to stand out in the course, and are reviewed and interrelated, the teacher will find that students (even after the lapse of months!) can recall and discuss them.

(4) If time remains after completing the three steps described above, it will be profitable for the teacher to give the class a specimen of his mastery of and enthusiasm for the subject matter of the course, by summarizing highlights, indicating problems worth the students' attention, and making connections with contemporary thought, life, events, issues.

(5) The approach to a new course or period in history may be varied by giving the students a *pretest* to find out what knowledge, interest, opinions they have of the subject matter they are about to study. This pretest may be mimeographed or conducted orally. Careful preparation of questions is needed in order to prevent vague and confused answers. The test should also be brief and as challenging as possible. It will then arouse curiosity and sharpen interest in the course.

D. *The Daily History Prelection.*

It may be used for:

(1) Motivating interest, by (a) setting sharply defined objectives for each study assignment; (b) dramatizing the main situation in the assigned lesson; (c) indicating problems to be answered through the assignment; (d) connecting a new phase with antecedent phases; (e) reading from the text an especially dramatic or challenging passage, such, for example, as that in Father S. K. Wilson's *American History*, page 357, which dramatizes Lincoln's return to the White House, after his inauguration on March 4, 1861, to face alone one of the gravest crises in our history.

(2) Showing students how to get to the *core* of a chapter or period of history. For this they must be taught to differentiate *big ideas* from supporting facts or merely incidental material. It is idle to have students put down in schematic form the topic sentences of a chapter; they can readily copy this from published outlines. The art is to resolve the chapter into its more significant ideas.

(3) Commenting on unusual words and on words and phrases that have a technical or emotional connotation, in order to make sure that students have clear concepts of important terms and consecrated phrases. Instances in point are such words as Renaissance, humanism, capitalism, mercantilism, fascism as applied to different countries, communism; such terms as the separation of Church and State; the difference in the Civil-War period between nullification and secession.

(4) Teaching the art of tracing cause and effect; *why* and *how* something happened. A simple illustration is found in American history. In the Mexican War northerners and southerners fought side by side; in 1861

they were divided, ready to shed one another's blood. What happened between 1848 and 1861 to bring about this change?

(5) Teaching also the art of unifying and integrating the study of related periods of history. A plain example is the connection between the so-called Renaissance and the Protestant Revolt. Often the latter is introduced by a complicated series of "causes," among which the influences of the Renaissance are barely mentioned. A more natural and effective introduction would be to interrelate the two periods or movements. Maturer students should be brought to shoulder weightier tasks; for instance, to differentiate the direct from the indirect effects of the industrial revolution on art, literature, religion; to unify the fourteen chapters of Hayes' *Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe*, Volume I, around the five leading ideas of the period, namely, the Renaissance, the Protestant Revolt, the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, and the immediate aftermath of the Revolution.

(6) Identifying and clothing with flesh the chief actors or characters of a period. Names as well as dates and events must be given a substantial form. Students can be taught, for example, how to draw up a graphic *dramatis personae*, ordered according to importance and characterized according to personal qualities and actions.⁵

(7) Locating on a map key places, states, etc., that are essential to an understanding of the text. This is of particular value when less known areas are being discussed—for example, the Balkan States; or when geographical divisions are in question, such as the Partition of Poland.

(8) Assigning and connecting with the text illuminating collateral reading: for instance, Washington's inaugural and farewell addresses, the Webster-Hayne debate, the Lincoln-Douglas debate, the U. S. Constitution, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in relation to the Civil War, Burke's speeches, Gilbert and Sullivan's opera *Patience*, which brilliantly satirizes the shallow aestheticism of Mallarmé, Wilde, and their followers. This type of collateral reading, together with such biographies as those by Belloc of the leading figures of the Protestant Revolt and French Revolution, will have for high-school and undergraduate college students far more appeal and effect than any amount of thumbing through the works of authoritative secondary sources.

(9) Assigning along the way problems to be answered, issues to be decided, relationships with the present to be established, historical principles to be set against an author's conclusions. These things may be too

⁵ A stimulating review of an historical epoch or movement can be centered on important names or dates or events. It can give the student that 'new view' of old matter which is a prime factor in effective repetition.

difficult for expert handling by the students, but they offer a challenge to mental effort and frequently quicken interest.

Note: The reader will of course be aware that not all of these various uses of the prelection can be carried into effect in any one class. Nor can even one of them be thoroughly explored in the prelection period alone. What is set in motion by the prelection must be kept in motion and speeded up during the class recitation that follows. However, such basic functions of the prelection as motivating interest, defining terms, and distinguishing principal from subordinate ideas, need to be exercised, at least with a new class, almost daily.

III. THE PRELECTION IN MATHEMATICS¹

A. *Mathematics in the Ratio Studiorum.*

(1) The *Ratio* of 1586 enumerated and exalted the multiple advantages of mathematical studies, outlined a full program of mathematics, and made provision for advanced study by those who showed special talent and interest.² The 1599 *Ratio*, taking the benefits of mathematics for granted, prescribed a full year's course for all students in the second year of the Arts curriculum. Classes were to be held daily. The specially talented were to be given an opportunity for specialization.³ In the 1832 edition even more emphasis was put on mathematics. The subject matter to be covered was more clearly defined; repetitions were to be conducted at least every second week; and several times in the year a public academy in mathematics was to be held.⁴

(2) Nevertheless the *Ratio* did not give a place to mathematics in the curriculum of the lower (high-school) studies.⁵ The reason is plainly stated by the Fathers of 1586. In their view, the mathematical disciplines were to be associated with the sciences—*illarum praesidio caeterae quoque scientiae indigent admodum*—and the sciences belonged in the Arts course. It is to be remembered that in the time of the old *Ratio* the average pupil in a Jesuit school began the humanistic course at about ten or eleven years of age, and completed it at fifteen or sixteen. During this time he concentrated on the classical languages and their auxiliary subjects. Then

¹ I am indebted to a number of experienced teachers of the California Province for their collaboration in preparing these notes.

² For the *Ratio* of 1586 see Pachtler, *Ratio Studiorum et Institutiones Scholasticae Societatis Iesu*, II, 141-43. The Fathers of 1586 conclude: "Conandum igitur est, ut sicut facultates caeterae, ita et Mathematicae in Nostris Gymnasiis florent, ut hinc etiam Nostri fiant magis idonei ad variis Ecclesiae commodis inserviendum, cum praesertim non parum indecore careamus Professoribus, qui rerum Mathematicarum lectionem tam multis, tam praeclaris usibus exoptatam habere possint."

³ Cf. *Ratio* of 1599, rule 20 of the Provincial and the Rules for the Professor of Mathematics (Pachtler, *op. cit.*, II, 256, 348).

⁴ The prescriptions of 1832 are also in Pachtler, *op. cit.*, II, 256, 348-49.

⁵ There were exceptions, however. In Poland, for instance, the Jesuit colleges obtained permission to teach mathematics in the grammar classes. Cf. article by Father Bednarski in *Archivum Historicum Soc. Iesu*, II, 205, July-December 1933.

at about the age of fifteen or sixteen he passed to the Arts course to give his undivided attention to mathematics, philosophy, and science. Thus there was no belittling of mathematics or science; but they had their own appointed place in the academic organization. In a different academic organization, such as we have today, mathematics and the sciences still go hand in hand.

B. *A First Day's Prelection in Geometry.*

(1) *Statement of Objectives:* Primarily this course in geometry should assist in the mental training of the student by inculcating habits of strict logical reasoning, of orderly procedure, and of neatness. However, the course will also recognize the need the student has of facts which may be of practical value in pursuing other branches of learning and advanced courses in mathematics.

(2) *Usefulness of Geometry:* (a) for surveying, engineering, physics, chemistry, architecture, designing; (b) for national defense; (c) for a gentleman's knowledge of such things as angles, triangles, rectangles, circles; (d) for order and accurateness; (e) for cultivation of moral habits through the spirit of persevering hard work required in mathematical learning; (f) for mind training; e. g., a mathematical problem, given in English, must be translated into geometric language, worked out in this medium, and the final results translated into English; a theorem in geometry may be compared to a thesis in philosophy.

It will depend on the ingenuity of the teacher to expand and illustrate these several objectives and advantages of the study of geometry.

(3) An historical approach may be used with profit, particularly if the class has already studied some phases of high-school mathematics. This will consist in tracing the historical evolution of the several branches of mathematics and especially the evolution of one branch from another.⁶ For example:

(a) *Arithmetic*, i. e., computation with numbers, which started with counting, is limited to the simple operations of addition, subtraction, division, multiplication, fractions, decimals. Something could be said of our number system (Arabic) as developed by Phoenician commerce, a great advance over the cumbersome Roman notation. Arithmetic is quite restricted in scope. Certain types of problems cannot be solved except by algebraic methods. Necessity therefore gave birth to algebra.

(b) *Algebra* introduced the use of the unknown "x," the equation, and the idea of transposition and exponents.

(c) *Geometry* was advanced, chiefly in a practical way, by the Egyp-

⁶ Teachers may find *Mathematics for the Millions*, by Hogben, useful in supplying interesting and illustrative anecdotes, despite its unscholarliness, bigotry, and materialistic views.

tians, who used it in surveying the valley of the Nile. The Greeks were theoretical and not experimental in their approach. Geometry too showed its limitations. So by combining algebra and geometry, thus introducing the function of angles, trigonometry was born.

(d) *Trigonometry* is used in surveying, navigation, and astronomy, and it has many applications in the physical sciences. An interesting comment can be made on the origin of the "Ship's Log." Before books of logarithms were common, navigators computed the logarithms when plotting their position at sea in some sort of copy book. Gradually too they noted down certain events of the voyage in this book. Later, when books of logarithms were published, mariners continued to keep a record of their voyage, their daily position, and other interesting particulars. This record retains to this day the name of the "Ship's Log."

(e) *Analytic geometry*. Descartes applied algebraic methods to the solution of geometric problems, and *vice versa*, expressing algebraic terms and expressions by geometric figures, e. g., straight lines and curves, on what we now call graphs. This branch of mathematics is the stepping stone to calculus and higher mathematics. It is to higher mathematics what logic is to philosophy.

(f) *Calculus*, "the mathematician's most powerful tool," is a study of variable quantities, combining algebra, geometry, trigonometry, and analytics. A typical problem in calculus, however, is almost nine-tenths algebra.

In tracing the historical development of mathematics, the teacher should bring out the fact that each successive stage or branch in mathematics is more efficient and concise in solving problems. He should also briefly illustrate each stage of development.

(4) A practical introduction to the textbook may be substituted for, or supplement, the historical approach. If the teacher can give a clear and graphic conspectus of the several types of problems that will be dealt with in the course, this will suffice for a first day's prelection. Such a conspectus should begin with a short description of the bearing of arithmetic and algebra on geometry.

(5) A jump *in medias res* is possibly the best prelection for a class in, say, fourth year of high school. The teacher might open the class thus: "Good morning, boys! I am glad to see you after the vacation. We have a great deal of work to do. So I will explain the first problem; you will work the next thirty."

C. *A First Day's Prelection in Algebra.*

After a few preliminaries of introduction, the teacher might conduct a review test in arithmetic. Its purpose would be threefold: to discover

how much elementary mathematics the students know (a boy who cannot do simple arithmetic will find algebra very difficult); to help the students recall their grade-school arithmetic; to present in a somewhat novel way information about the school. The following problems may be suggested. The student is to work the problem and state its type.

(1) If there are 250 boys in the first year at St. Stanislaus, 171 in second year, 183 in third year, and a total of 841, how many are there in the senior class?

(2) If you wish to divide these 841 into classrooms of 35 each, how many classrooms will be required?

(3) If it cost Thomas 25 cents a day for lunch, 14 cents for carfare, and 10 cents for incidentals, how much would he spend in twenty-one days?

(4) If St. Stanislaus won twelve and lost three games last year, and if St. John's won sixteen and lost eight, how did the two schools compare? (Hint: ratio and proportion).

(5) If the school property is 120 yards long and 69 feet wide, what is its area?

(6) If 35 per cent of the student body attended Mass every day during Lent, what would be the actual number of students attending Mass?

(7) How many students would the school have if its present numbers were doubled? tripled? squared? How many would there be if we only had the square root of our actual enrollment?

(8) If 24 per cent of the students engage in debating activities, 42 per cent in sports, and 33 per cent in other forms of extracurricular activities, how many, in round numbers, take part in school functions?

D. *The Daily Prelection in Algebra.*

(1) Granted that an *adequate* explanation of type problems is given by the teacher, the shorter this explanation is the better. For it is the teaching of experience that *desk* repetition of the prelection in high-school mathematics is more fruitful than oral quiz or discussion. Hence as soon as the teacher completes his explanation of type problems, the students should be put to work on some of the problems at their desks; the teacher meanwhile should walk about observing progress, giving individual help when needed, and calling general attention to common difficulties or mistakes he has noticed.

(2) Ordinarily each new process in algebra builds upon what has gone before. Therefore the teacher should, in his prelection, make the transition by summarizing the previous step and connecting the new with it. For instance, from the applications of Axiom I and Axiom II (on adding and subtracting equals to and from equals), he would make a transition to transposition, which is a short method of applying Axioms I and II to the solution of equations. Two or three types of equations would then be explained, and the students would be given a certain amount of time for working at the problems.

(3) Shortly before the end of the period, problems for homework

will be assigned. The assignment may depend on how many problems the students have been able to solve at their desks.

(4) The emphasis laid on desk work need not prevent the teacher from conducting a brief oral repetition of the several steps in his explanation of type problems.

All competent teachers of mathematics stress the fact that there must be frequent written assignments. No other procedure pays in teaching mathematics. Boys will become interested through hard work in solving problems, provided that the teacher offers adequate *coaching* assistance by means of the prelection and by means of as much individual and group supervision in the classroom as may be possible.

Check List of Significant Books

The Cult of Uncertainty. By I. L. Kandel. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943. Pp. x, 129. \$1.50.

The author of this book has been professor of education for nearly thirty years at Teachers College, Columbia University. His special fields have been history of secondary education and comparative education in Europe and America. To make use of tags, he is an 'essentialist' in opposition to the experimentalists and the Progressives. The book is an expanded lecture to teachers, the fifteenth in the series of lectures to the Kappa Delta Pi, an honor society in education. It is a good account of what may now be called *prewar* education and an effort to suggest the future program. In fact it is a severe castigation of a dominant practice in primary, secondary, and higher education in the United States, by one who has been in close contact with it in the inner shrine of much pedagogical miasmata.

The cult of uncertainty, according to the author, is the confusion in educational theory; the refusal to accept any responsibility for a clear definition of values; for a clear statement of the purpose of education; for refusal to accept anything as "fixed-in-advanced," with an emphasis on change and on precariousness of life; a failure to inculcate faith in the ideals of democracy, at the heart of which stand tolerance and the recognition of the worth and dignity of the individual as a human being. Experimentalism as a philosophy is the basis for the pragmatic methods of modern progressive education, and as such is of the greatest bearing on both modern education and the future of democratic civilization.

The following quotations may give the reader something of the current trend in educational criticism:

Terms such as knowledge, intelligence, mind, subject-matter, values, interest, discipline, and effort are avoided in accordance with the theory that they are the consequences of the learning process itself, the interaction between the organism and the environment. . . . They are created by the activity involved in meeting a 'novelly unfolding situation' (pages 69-70).

The practical result of this interpretation of the philosophy of pragmatism has been to replace the orderly program of studies by learning situations which are to serve as stimuli to release the creative intelligence of the pupil. . . . The schools have been rid of 'dead stuff'; Latin . . . should follow Greek into the discard; mathematics is useless for most pupils; the study of history must give way to the study of social problems; English and science need to be 'remade' rather than rejected; and modern languages should be reserved for those who can profit by them. . . . The emphasis on freedom of the individual . . . has resulted in chaos, confusion, and uncertainty (pages 77-78).

Education must . . . be in touch with the requirements of everyday living; standards must be adapted to social changes; and there is no place for eternal verities.

The fact that the leaders of the American Revolution had with few exceptions been trained in the 'aristocratic' studies of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, history, and philosophy is forgotten or ignored. Today . . . education must be practical or within the immediate, everyday experience of the pupil, and geared to eternal flow of things and endless change (pages 42-43).

S. E. Morison, historian of Harvard University, is quoted as stating that the elective system was "the greatest crime of the century against American youth,—depriving him of his classical heritage" (page 47).

In Soviet Russia the efforts in education were directed to making a complete break with anything bourgeois until it was found, after fifteen years of trial to see 'how it worked, when tried' that the innovations had failed to cultivate the desirable objects of social allegiance. Discipline and examinations were restored; orderly curricula and courses of study . . . were promulgated; and there has been a return to the study of the classics of Russian literature (pages 101-02).

Two correctives are suggested for stopping any further destruction of education in America. The first is the proposal to raise and improve the status of teachers.

With an adequate preparation in general culture and professional preparation and enjoying a status as high as that of any other profession, there is at least some hope that teachers may become more critical of and less ready to accept every new slogan, every new device, every proposed change in educational fashions. . . . For the uncertainty and confusion in education are due to a large extent to the propagation of educational theories for which their advocates have no responsibility in practice (pages 28-29).

The second corrective is a return to "reason" and humanistic training.

The school . . . is an institution established and maintained by society to achieve certain ends, to transmit certain values (page 109). Education is the organized effort of society to insure the intellectual and moral discipline of youth (page 126).

All who have undertaken to define the meaning of liberal education have always emphasized the acquisition of knowledge, discipline, and intellectual training for 'the life of social duty' as Vittorino da Feltre wrote, since 'all are responsible for the personal influence which goes forth from us,' regardless of their particular vocations or professions (page 121).

Especially pertinent is the advice to the defenders of the humanistic tradition. Had they been concerned to develop public opinion for this tradition, "the public would have followed them as they now follow the experts in nutrition who advocate a balanced diet." Throughout the lecture the experimentalists are accused of destroying the foundations of democracy, which they attempt to identify with their laissez-faire educational system.

There is one annoying feature to the book. The author has allowed himself to be intimidated or beguiled by the *magni nominis umbra*. Dewey

is the high-priest of experimentalism, which Professor Kandel severely indicts. Yet he is quoted throughout with reverent esteem. His disciples have gone astray—not the oracle. This book is a plea for the traditional in education. Even the most liberal critics admit that Dewey is the determined opponent of “traditional education.”

The former lecture in the series (reviewed in the *QUARTERLY*, March 1943) was a violent diatribe against modern vagaries in education. This lecture continues the attack in a reserved and reasoned manner. How should one interpret this trend? Is it the beginning of reform?

M. J. FITZSIMONS, S. J.

The Catholic Writer's Magazine Market. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1942. Pp. 96. \$.75.

This 96-page guide, intended to help Catholic writers find markets for their manuscripts in Catholic magazines, was compiled by the St. Peter Canisius Writers' Guild of St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas, under the direction of the moderator, the Rev. Clarence R. McAuliffe, S. J., and was published during February by the Bruce Publishing Company at Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Of the 152 magazines treated, 67 pay regularly; 8 occasionally; 44 accept free-lance manuscripts without compensation; and 33 are closed to the free-lance writer. Each entry contains the name of the magazine, the name of the editor, the address, the frequency of publication, the purpose of the magazine, the kinds of manuscripts accepted with advice as to length, etc., the rate of payment, facts about notification of receipt of manuscripts and of acceptance and rejection, and any additional comments by the editors of the magazines.

The information was secured by questionnaire and the exact statements of editors are put down. Each editor approved the manuscript copy of his entry. Teachers who would like to stimulate their students to write for publication or who would like to publish some of their own stories and articles will find the *Catholic Writer's Magazine Market* a handy book.

C. R. M.

To an Unknown Country: Discovery and Exploration in English Literature: A Reading List. By F. X. Connolly and J. E. Tobin. New York: Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service Company, 1942. Pp. 56. \$.60.

This is not “just another reading list” for college (and post-college) readers. It is personal in its approach and in its choice of books. “What good books have had the widest appeal for college readers who, during

the last two decades, have asked for 'something interesting to read' " is basis for first approach and a generous list is added to illumine the past and the present and make the reader critical.

There are two sections—discovery and exploration—with a pleasant essay introducing each. Part I, Discovery, includes a set of readable and appealing books under the headings of poetry, drama, prose (essays, travel, biography, and history) religion, fiction. The Introduction says: "Books transform a human being into a human personality by endowing him with emotions proper to man: hope and love for his youthful spring, courage for his maturity, joy for beauty, disgust for ugliness, and wrath for evil." Part II is an ample list of critical and 'tool' works; literary criticism in the fields of poetry, prose, drama; books on language, reference books; and a chronological tour of English literature, with readings, bibliographies, criticism, for each period. A niggardly list on American literature is added—the only lament!

Silent libri inter arma. This may be a difficult time to offer the companionship of books to college students, but fortunate will be the college man who makes this reading list his own—in a double sense.

M. J. F.

The Great Prayer Now in Time of War. By James A. Kleist, S. J.
St. Louis: The Queen's Work, 1942. Pp. 64. \$.10.

This timely and devotional pamphlet contains a translation of the Ordinary of the Mass, and translations of the proper parts of the Mass for the Twentieth Sunday after Pentecost, of the Mass in Time of War, and of the Mass for Peace. Father Kleist has added to these a number of special Collects dealing with Divine Providence, and some liturgical comments and devotional reflections. The translations are exceptionally well done, as was to be expected of so competent a scholar as Father Kleist. Ours will find the booklet of interest to themselves and will want to be able to recommend it to others who need the encouraging and consoling public prayer of the Church in these crucial times.

A. P. F.

Correspondence

Dear Editor,

Why does Mr. Stephen Earley join the little group who cast stones at the Jesuits for not having appreciated Father Hopkins before non-Catholics took him up? I wonder what facts he has in mind in doing so. Father Hopkins was not regarded as impossible and barbaric by his fellow-Jesuits during his lifetime. The "literary Jesuits" recognized his genius. Otherwise, why did they carefully preserve his diary and correspondence after his death? There is plenty of evidence that his talents commanded their respect during his life. It is true the *Month* rejected "The Wreck of the Deutschland," but if there were any secular magazine of the time that might conceivably have accepted it, I would like to know the name of the magazine. I have not the slightest doubt the *Atlantic Monthly* would have rejected it any time before 1918 when the poet laureate of England used his high prestige to win favorable attention for Hopkins from non-Catholic critics. Bridges published the poems, with commentaries and glosses, in 1918, but a second edition was not called for until 1930. The vast non-Catholic public and its representative critics seemed to be rather slow in buying up the first edition.

The truth is, of course, that Bridges timed his publication of the poems perfectly, at a moment when new experiments in prosody were becoming a sort of rage. It is doubtful whether he could have found a publisher for them in 1890. Certainly the despicable Jesuits could not. Some of the leading English critics (non-Catholic) had seen specimens of them and were not impressed. They received only "uncomprehending astonishment" from Patmore. Even if the Jesuits rejected Hopkins, they could not well be blamed more than the non-Catholic world at large which waited nearly thirty years and needed a literary revolution and the prestige of high sponsorship to see the virtue of Hopkins as a poet.

The first biography and study of Hopkins to appear was by a Jesuit. The late Louise Imogen Guiney sent me a copy of the "Poems" when they appeared in England. I did not consider them barbarous, nor did the "literary Jesuits" to whom I showed them. In recent years, some of the younger Jesuits go to the opposite extreme and proclaim Hopkins to be a major poet. I wish his chances of ranking permanently as a major poet were as good as those of Tennyson whom Mr. Earley, following the modernist critics, ridicules. Father Hopkins, a sound critic, was more just.

I was interested in Mr. Earley's article in the January *QUARTERLY*.

I am not sure I have understood the principles he lays down for an ideal anthology: to me they were not quite clear, but they seemed to be most strict and austere. I think his anthology might be suitable to graduate students of literature. I should not care to use it as a textbook for college undergraduates, much less for high-school lads. Yet this is what Mr. Earley advocates. He says it is a serious defect in a recently published anthology for high schools that it has only nineteen authors representing the first 450 years of English literature and fifty-five for the next 130 years, and only one example of what modern critics would admit as distinctively "modern poetry." I would say this defect was a virtue in a high-school anthology. A wise teacher will temper the winds for the lambs fresh from the fold. I might have educated myself far beyond the "Sky-lark," but I would not deprive the young of the rich experience of feeling its simple lyric exaltation. I do not want to meet a young boy who declares that it is "drivel."

As for the distinctively modern poems, I imagine boys have a healthy instinct at odds with modernist poems. The world at present is thirsting for poems such as the first world war called forth, which will help to sustain it in its grievous hour. But the modernist poets have been too busy with their private little griefs and their idle experiments to care for the larger issues of life and human emotions. I agree with Mr. Earley that "we are all trying to make our age Christocentric." Was there ever an age in English literature when poets and critics were less Christocentric than the modernists?

Yours,

JAMES J. DALY, S. J.

Dear Editor:

The Jesuit Educational Association, it seems to me, would make a notable contribution to Jesuit education, if it could undertake and publish a survey of Jesuit libraries in this country. In 1926 the American Library Association made a survey of libraries in the United States. In more recent years the same organization was invited to submit a report on several university libraries, e. g., Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Mississippi. Raney's study of the libraries of the University of Chicago is rated one of the best in the field of library planning. The investigations of Randall, McCrum, Waples, and Branscombe, and the report of Bishop for the Carnegie Corporation shed much light on college library problems. From all accounts, the time and money expended on these projects was considered well spent. Accurate information on the nature and size of the collections, the character of the various library processes (purchasing, classi-

fying, cataloging, circulation), the qualifications of the staff, the use of the library by teachers and students, and especially the adequacy of the library budget furnished the necessary factual basis for a better understanding of library problems and a concerted effort to arrive at a satisfactory solution. Similar good results might be expected from a survey of Jesuit libraries, namely, improvement in the administration and educational effectiveness of our libraries.

Obviously the present is not the time for such a survey, but could not plans be made now to carry it out, once our ships have returned from all the desperate seas of the world with peace and victory?

REFERENCES

American Library Association. *Report on the survey of Indiana University Library for the Indiana University* . . . Chicago, American Library Association, 1940.

American Library Association. *A survey of libraries in the United States* . . . Chicago, American Library Association, 1926-1927. 4 v.

Bishop, W. Warner. *Carnegie Corporation and college libraries* . . . [N. Y.] Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1938.

Branscombe, B. Harvie. *Teaching with books: a study of college libraries* . . . Chicago, Association of American Colleges, American Library Association, 1940.

McCrum, B. P. *An estimate of standards for a college library* . . . rev. ed. Lexington, Va., Washington and Lee University, 1937.

Randall, W. C. *The college library*. Chicago, American Library Association, [c1932].

Raney, M. C. *The university libraries*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1933.

Waples, Douglas. *The library*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, [c1936]. (Evaluation of Higher Institutions, v. 4.)

JOHN J. MCMAHON, S. J.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

People. John Monroe, a senior of Marquette University High School, Milwaukee, won first place in the high-school division of the national Thomas Jefferson Bi-centennial Oratorical Contest, sponsored by the *New York Journal-American* and affiliated Hearst newspapers. The finals were held in New York. First prize consisted of a \$1,000 war bond, a palladium medal, and a trip to Washington. Runner-up in the college division was Peter F. Regan, of Fordham University. A student of Northwestern University took first prize in the college division.

Father Joseph R. N. Maxwell, president of Holy Cross College, was elected president of the Classical Association of New England for 1943-1944.

Father Andrew L. Bouwhuis, Canisius College librarian, is 1943-1944 president of the Catholic Library Association.

To celebrate Father John B. Esmaker's twenty-five years of teaching physics at St. Ignatius High School, Chicago, the alumni association gave a public banquet and the school was granted a holiday. Among those attending the banquet were fourteen of Father Esmaker's classmates of 1898.

The Order of Learning. Professor Mortimer J. Adler, in a much-discussed paper on "The Order of Learning," stated that "if we wish to avoid violating the basic Thomistic distinction between philosophy and theology, between the spheres of reason and faith, we must, in speaking of the philosophy of education, restrict ourselves to purely natural education, natural both as to ends and to means."

Most of us felt certain that Mr. Adler was wrong, and now Father Gerard M. Smith, of Marquette University, has given us conclusive proof in his paper on "Mr. Adler and the Order of Learning," printed in the *Proceedings and Addresses of the Thirty-Ninth Annual Meeting*, N. C. E. A., 1942, pp. 140-62.

Answering Mr. Adler's contention quoted above, Father Smith says: "Quite the contrary: if we wish to avoid violating Saint Thomas' distinction, we must *not* restrict ourselves to purely natural ends and means in speaking of the philosophy of education." Father Smith then establishes with great cogency the basis of the only true philosophy of education, which is Christian, Catholic, supernatural. His able presentation merits the widest possible publicity.

Periodical Articles. The *School Review* (A Journal of Secondary Education, University of Chicago) has three excellent articles in its June 1943 issue: (1) "A Misguided Attack on History-Teaching," by Ralph W. Tyler, pp. 319-22, which is a soundly reasoned criticism of the *New York Times* history test and subsequent pressure efforts to have Congress

legislate on history teaching; (2) "In Defense of Honors and Awards," by Roy C. Bryan, pp. 348-52, commenting piquantly on wholesale indictment of awards and honors in Wrinkle and Gilchrist, *Secondary Education for American Democracy* (1942); (3) "Increase in Knowledge of How to Study Resulting from a How-to-Study Course," by Salvatore DiMichael, of Fordham University. Conclusion of experiment is favorable to how-to-study courses as compared with study techniques taught in regular subject-matter classes. The question might be asked: Would the conclusion be the same if study techniques were taught in regular subject-matter classes *by a teacher properly using the prelection technique?*

Alumni in the War. The alumni of the new Jesuit University of Scranton cannot be claimed as Jesuit alumni. Nevertheless mention should be made here of the exceptionally fine contact Ours have kept with the former students of the school. A news bulletin is issued and sent at frequent intervals to all names on the lists of the university. The number of alumni in the service on May 15 was 910.

Several other schools issue a news bulletin for their alumni in the service. Two that come to the Central Office of the J. E. A. regularly (and are much appreciated) are the *Don Patrol* of the University of San Francisco and the *St. Ignatius Alumni* of St. Ignatius High School, Chicago.

Another evidence of interest in our alumni in uniform is the large number of "honor roll" editions of college and high-school publications that have appeared. Marquette University High School's was published in February. John Carroll University, Cleveland, and St. Ignatius High School, Chicago, enshrined their honor roll in an artistic brochure. In March the following school papers devoted an issue to alumni honor rolls: The *Pauw Wow* of St. Peter's College, Jersey City; the *Hawk* of St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia; the *Greyhound* of Loyola College, Baltimore. April editions were those of the *Marquette Tribune* of Marquette University, and the *Campionette* of Campion, Prairie du Chien. St. Louis University's *University News* carried its honor roll earlier in the year. The Boston College *Alumni News* has published substantial lists in each issue since last September, the *Holy Cross Alumnus* since its October issue, and the *Fordham Alumni Magazine* since September. St. Peter's High School *Prep* began recording its honor roll in the January issue.

The J. E. A. The Executive Committee of the J. E. A. held its spring meeting at St. Louis University from April 27 to 29. Father Edward B. Rooney presided. All the general prefects of studies and the assistant executive director, Father Farrell, were present.

Liberal Education. An unusual number of articles discussing liberal education have appeared in the magazines in recent months. Some of these have been noted and commented on in past numbers of the QUARTERLY.

Worth reading are: "The Place of the Humanities in a World at War," by John W. Dodds, dean of the School of Humanities, Stanford University, in *Vital Speeches*, 9:311-14, March 1, 1943; "Bring Back the Liberal Arts," by E. K. Rand, recently retired from the professorship of classics at Harvard, in the *Atlantic*, 171:79-85, June 1943; and Bernard De Voto's Easy Chair feature in *Harper's*, 186:645-48, May 1943. Similarly, the humanists have been awake to attacks launched by dissidents. For example, the pamphlet published by the Educational Policies Commission on "What the Schools Should Teach in Wartime" has received a number of merited castigations for its rejection of the classics in education; e. g., in a March issue of the *Classical Weekly* and in a forceful resolution passed by the Classical Association of New England, reported verbatim in *School and Society*, 57:429, April 17, 1943.

Report of Association of American Colleges. The A. A. C. published in the May issue of its *Bulletin* and separately in booklet form, the report of its Commission on Liberal Education. Father Joseph R. N. Maxwell, president of Holy Cross College, was a member of the Commission and Father Allan P. Farrell, assistant executive director of the J. E. A., a member of the committee that drafted the Report. After an introductory statement of purpose, the report is divided into four parts: I. The Postwar Situation; II. The Nature and Purpose of Liberal Education; III. Necessary Changes in Educational Procedure; IV. The Problem of the Teaching Personnel. Wide publicity has been given to the Report. Copies were mailed to the editors of the 1,894 daily newspapers in the United States, and to all newspaper columnists, radio commentators, magazine editors, and press associations of the country. Our college and university faculties should have the Report called to their attention, and would do well to discuss its main points and recommendations.

New Educational Books. The next issue of the QUARTERLY plans to carry reviews of a number of important educational publications. Among these will be a review, by Father Robert J. Henle, of Kotschnig's *Slaves Need No Leaders*; of Robert M. Hutchins' *Education for Freedom*, by Father Stephen F. McNamee; of Henry C. Morrison's *American Schools, A Critical Study of Our School System*, by Father Julian L. Maline; of I. B. Berkson's *Education Faces the Future*, and of new books, not yet published, by Professor Theodore M. Greene, of Princeton, and by Professor Mark Van Doren, of Columbia.

MOTIVATION

"It is no news to us [high-school teachers] that our pupils are not educated. The *Times* test happened to be a history test, but the results would have been the same had it been a test in English or mathematics or any other high-school subject. There are some poor teachers, of course. . . . Textbooks are dull. . . . But in my opinion there are other factors of much greater importance. Here are some of them:

"(1) The tremendous resistance which boys and girls of high-school age put up to the process of education. . . . Brought up on thrills and entertainment, they find even the best of teachers pretty dull stuff as compared with Hedy Lamarr or Robert Taylor. . . . They do not expect to learn, they expect to be learned. That is what all their experience has led them to expect.

"(2) The growth of 'extra-curricular activities' in many of our high schools has reached the point where the tail has swallowed the head. Sports, clubs, dances, teas, 'pep' sessions, programs, youth movements, and every conceivable kind of extra-curricular activity . . . now [take] three-fourths of the time and energy of pupils and teachers . . . before they can even begin to think of study and teaching.

"(3) The years between fifteen and twenty are the most difficult years in life. . . . Who cares about the dead past, when every fiber of one's body is tingling in a glorious present?"



From a letter in *Time*, May 10, 1943, by Helen H. Preston, Anderson High School, Anderson, Indiana.