

FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM  
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE JAN 15 1944  
PRIVATE ROOM

# Jesuit Educational Quarterly

—▶ JANUARY 1944 ◀—

FATHER WILLIAM J. McGUCKEN

1889-1943

NATIONAL ENROLLMENT STATISTICS

THE TEACHING OF HIGH-SCHOOL MATHEMATICS

*William C. Doyle, S. J.*

AMENDING THE LIBERAL COLLEGE

*Robert C. Hartnett, S. J.*

JESUIT COLLEGE EDUCATION AFTER THE WAR

*Joseph A. Walsh, S. J.*

—▶ VOL. VI, No. 3 ◀—

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

## Contributors

FATHER BAKEWELL MORRISON is head of the department of religion, St. Louis University, and author of half a dozen textbooks of college religion, the latest of which is reviewed in this number of the QUARTERLY.

FATHER ROBERT C. HARTNETT took his A. B. at Loyola University, Chicago, and his M. A. (classics, English) at St. Louis. After teaching English at the University of Detroit for three years, he went to England for theology, and then taught religion and sociology at Xavier University before undertaking graduate studies in political science at Fordham.

Now studying theology at St. Mary's, Kansas, MR. M. JOSEPH COSTELLOE taught at Marquette. He holds the M. A. in English from St. Louis University.

FATHER WILLIAM J. SMITH, director of the Crown Heights School for Catholic Workmen, Brooklyn, also edits that vigorous and ably written Catholic labor weekly, the *Crown Heights Comment*. He is chairman of the I. S. O. Committee on Industrial Relations.

A Ph. D. in mathematics from St. Louis University, FATHER WILLIAM C. DOYLE has had considerable experience in teaching both high-school and college classes in mathematics. He also has had notable success in training high-school teachers of mathematics.

FATHER CHARLES M. O'HARA, who writes our annual survey of enrollments, holds the Ph. D. degree in education from Marquette University, where he is now teaching. Previously he was instructor in education and director of the Corporate Colleges at St. Louis University.

After teaching for twelve years in the juniorate at Milford, Ohio, FATHER JOSEPH A. WALSH (M. A. honors, Cambridge University) spent a "sabbatical" year teaching classics at John Carroll University. He is now dean of the juniorate, Milford.

The book reviewers in this number are FATHER GERARD SMITH (Toronto Ph. D. in philosophy), a member of the graduate department of philosophy, Marquette University; FATHER A. PATRICK MADGETT, formerly head of the department of religion at University of Detroit and Xavier University, who is on sabbatical leave this year for writing; FATHER ROBERT C. HARTNETT at Fordham University; FATHER BERNARD J. WUELLNER, of the graduate department of philosophy, Loyola University, Chicago.

# Jesuit Educational Quarterly

January 1944

---

## CONTENTS

FATHER WILLIAM J. MCGUCKEN, 1889-1943 . . . . .	133
FATHER JOHN F. MCCORMICK, 1874-1943 . . . . .	136
NATIONAL ENROLLMENT STATISTICS . . . . .	<i>Insert</i>
AMENDING THE LIBERAL COLLEGE	
<i>Robert C. Hartnett, S. J.</i> . . . . .	137
THE ANTHOLOGY FOR THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL	
<i>M. Joseph Costelloe, S. J.</i> . . . . .	148
A DEGREE IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS	
<i>William J. Smith, S. J.</i> . . . . .	155
THE TEACHING OF HIGH-SCHOOL MATHEMATICS	
<i>William C. Doyle, S. J.</i> . . . . .	159
JESUIT COLLEGE EDUCATION AFTER THE WAR	
<i>Joseph A. Walsh, S. J.</i> . . . . .	163
BOOKS	
<i>Christianity and Classical Culture</i> , by Charles Norris Cochrane (Reviewed by Gerard Smith, S. J.) . . . . .	174
<i>In Touch with God</i> , by Bakewell Morrison, S. J. (Re- viewed by A. Patrick Madgett, S. J.) . . . . .	175
<i>The Philosophy of American Education</i> , by John T. Wahlquist (Reviewed by Robert C. Hartnett, S. J.) . . . . .	176
<i>Universities Look for Unity: An Essay on the Respon-     sibilities of the Mind to Civilization in War and     Peace</i> , by John Ulric Nef (Reviewed by Bernard J. Wuellner, S. J.) . . . . .	181
NOTICES OF BOOKS . . . . .	182
CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .	184
NEWS FROM THE FIELD . . . . .	191

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:

EDWARD B. BUNN, S. J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
JOHN F. DOUGHERTY, S. J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
HUGH M. DUCE, S. J.	<i>California Province</i>
MATTHEW J. FITZSIMONS, S. J.	<i>New York Province</i>
JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S. J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
† WILLIAM J. MCGUCKEN, S. J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
JULIAN L. MALINE, S. J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JOSEPH J. ROONEY, S. J.	<i>New York Province</i>
ARTHUR J. SHEEHAN, S. J.	<i>New England Province</i>
ANDREW C. SMITH, S. J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

---

\* Serving in the armed forces, chaplains corps.

† Died November 5, 1943.

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE MANAGING EDITOR

45 EAST 78TH STREET  
NEW YORK 21, N. Y.

# *Father William J. McGucken*

## *1889-1943*

Father McGucken's death at Loyola University, Chicago, the night of November 4, 1943 came as a shock to the Jesuit Educational Association of which he was so valued a member. He had left the hospital in St. Louis to attend the meeting of the Executive Committee at Loyola. This heroic effort proved too much for his failing strength.

His long and intimate connection with the educational work of his own Province and of the Assistancy as a whole merits special recognition. Particularly wholehearted was the interest he had in the pioneer efforts of the Jesuit Educational Association and of the QUARTERLY. A member of almost every important committee of the J. E. A., his expert hand helped to shape not alone its Constitution and its Statutes for Colleges and Universities, but to formulate as well its long-range plan for development. As each issue of the QUARTERLY appeared he would find the time to send a note of encouragement and stimulating comment; his own contributions to it were marked alike by his characteristic brilliance and by the solidity of his educational thinking, which was ever militantly Catholic and Jesuit. Broad and progressive as he was in his views on academic matters, and widely acquainted with the experiments of modern schools of thought, he was nevertheless thoroughly uncompromising in maintaining and applying the Catholic philosophy of education in every discussion of change or reform that affected our schools.

The editors of the QUARTERLY record here their sense of irreparable loss, but cherish the memory of a great Jesuit.

We print below two tributes to Father McGucken—one written by Father Bakewell Morrison, an associate and close friend of his at St. Louis University, the other by members of the Executive Committee of the Jesuit Educational Association. All who were privileged to know Father McGucken will find in these tributes a sincere if inadequate expression of their own sentiments.

### I

Father William J. McGucken was a Jesuit's Jesuit. A man who loved people and loved his own people the most might be the best characterization that could be given of Father McGucken. In his love for his own people, all the magnificent loyalty appeared that really was in his blood

and was so a part of him that anything he ever did must be judged in the light of it.

In a very single-minded way Father McGucken deeply and personally loved Jesus Christ. He "put on the mind which was in Christ Jesus" and used the eyes of Christ that he might look through them at the people about him. He never was ruthless, even when he felt that he must be firm. He never believed in pushing harder than the stuff with which he pushed was able to stand strain. With personal ideals of scholarship that were serene and lofty, he knew how to capitalize on the enthusiasm, on the good will, on the capacities that he encountered in the men with whom he worked and whom it was his business to assign to work.

I can readily imagine some bruised soul reading that paragraph and "sniffing." But I still think that, if Father McGucken left some along his path who were licking their wounds, the reason was not personal on his side; a surgeon has to understand the pleas for surcease from suffering—from suffering which he has started on its beneficent way because it is the beginning of healing!

I think I can illustrate pointedly my judgment that Father McGucken was heart and soul in love with the Society—but rationally, even when headlong. If he heard of a learned presentation of Catholic doctrine or of one of the fairly frequent symposia on Catholic things in which a Jesuit was not numbered among the personnel, he was hurt, stung, and stimulated. He was stimulated to remedy as far as lay in his own power, whether through his personal performance or through his influential direction, a situation where it was possible to discount or to overlook or simply not to find Jesuits whose eminence compelled an invitation!

He took the idea of Ignatius, "*id quod volo*," and made it the beginning and the end of his personal efforts with the younger members of the Society with whom he dealt uninterruptedly for the last twelve years of his life in the Society. He wanted to inspire them to intellectual achievement through showing them with uttermost and searching—scathing, perhaps at times—candor and honesty of mind that the love of Jesus Christ, which burned by right more fiercely in the heart of a Jesuit, called for honesty, clarity, grasp of principle on the part of those who serve Him because they love Him.

His influence was large just as his laugh was infectious. He laughed most heartily in the recreation room. He loved to deal with his brethren because they were his friends. And his charity to the sick was astonishingly thorough and completely inconspicuous. He always had time to drop everything to help another. In his own last and depressing mile, when his strength was not up to the calls of his straining spirit, he felt the supreme privilege of assisting another gallant lover of Jesus Christ in saying Mass.

He served and assisted Father Raymond Corrigan in the last Masses he was able to say because of the assistance of Father McGucken. And the Mass was the all absorbing "devotion," as it was the root and branch of his spiritual valor. He taught the Mass with insistence. He spoke of the Mass with ardor. He loved the Mass and he understood the Mass. His apostolic works—retreats, confessions, conferences dealing directly with the guidance of souls or pastoral problems—were few. His Faith and his love taught him that "the Mass matters." He centered his whole spiritual life, as honest and as thorough and as principled as was the man, about the Mass. He was—"that there I may also end"—a Jesuit's Jesuit!

## II

Father McGucken's sudden death, in our very midst, at Loyola University, Chicago, on the night of Thursday, November 4, deprived the Executive Committee, the Missouri Province, and the entire American Assistancy of an able, devoted, and beloved Jesuit. It deprived Catholic education of a foremost and thoroughly representative leader. His death "in action" was a symbol of all his years of generous and unflagging activity in the cause of Catholic education.

The breadth of Father McGucken's educational apostolate was extraordinary. Not only was he an outstanding figure in national Catholic educational meetings and associations, but he was also recognized by secular educators and secular organizations, national and regional, as perhaps the ablest spokesman for the Catholic viewpoint. He exerted an equally powerful influence in both Catholic and non-Catholic circles by his many publications, in particular by his *The Catholic Way in Education*, which is an authentic epitome of his own Catholic way of thinking and of educating.

But for all his brilliant success as a public figure in education, a work much nearer to Father McGucken's heart was that of advising and directing the preparation of young teachers. While the teachers of the Missouri Province were the first to enjoy his wise and understanding counsel, it was no less generously given to young Jesuits from all the provinces of the Assistancy who came in contact with him. Members of the diocesan clergy and of teaching congregations of sisters and brothers will gratefully testify to the benefits that they too received from Father McGucken's friendly interest and capable guidance.

Since 1935 Father McGucken devoted a large share of his time and energies to the work of the Jesuit Educational Association. His fellow members of the Executive Committee, who were privileged to be associated with him, know that his generosity was truly phenomenal, and that his wide interests, his incisive and brilliant mind, his unfailing good humor and selflessness gave a unique quality to all their discussions, to every task

undertaken, to every decision arrived at. His death therefore touches them very closely. Their sense of loss is tempered only by the conviction that the impress of his qualities will endure in their work and in the work of the Association. The most adequate expression of appreciation will be the devoted remembrance of him in the Masses and prayers of all the members of the Association. QUI FORTIS VIR MAGNANIMUS AMICISSIMUS REQUIESCAT IN PACE.

## *Father John F. McCormick* *1874-1943*

Another noted Jesuit died last summer: Father John F. McCormick, July 14, 1943. Formerly president of Creighton University, Father McCormick spent the past nineteen years as professor of philosophy and head of the department, first at Marquette, then at Loyola, Chicago. Though he was the author of textbooks, of a published Aquinas Lecture, and of many articles in philosophical periodicals, Father McCormick's fame nevertheless rests especially on the influence he radiated through and from the classroom. How many times he helped students plan the ten years after their graduation from college! And these students had the admirable gift of gratitude. On his sixty-fifth birthday a group of them presented him with a printed volume of essays they had written in his honor, *Jesuit Thinkers of the Renaissance* (Marquette University Press, 1939). This year a volume was in preparation to honor his seventieth birthday. It is now being published as a memorial in successive issues of the *New Scholasticism*, October 1943, January and April 1944; later it will appear in book form. The Christmas-week meeting of the American Catholic Philosophical Association has been dedicated to him for his long years of active service in that organization.



# Enrollment, 1943-1944, Jesuit Colleges and Universities

	Liberal Arts	Commerce		Dentistry	Divinity	Education, University College, Etc.	Engineering	Graduate	Journalism	Law		Medicine	Medical Technology	Nursing	Pharmacy	Military Miscellaneous <sup>3</sup>	Civil Miscellaneous	Totals		Extension	E.S.M.W.T.	Other "No Tuition"	Grand Totals	"Army, Navy, Etc." <sup>2</sup>
		Day	Night							Day	Night							Full-time	Full-time and Part-time					
Boston College	474	77			145			278	2	52						431		983	1,459	328	62		1,849	432
Canisius College	259					321		78						107		350		601	1,115	128			1,243	<sup>1</sup>
Creighton University	143	34		106		121		29	17	19		257		211	28	537		1,448	1,502				1,502	278 <sup>1</sup>
University of Detroit	660	136	233	94			334	69		22	46					400		1,251	1,994	70			2,064	463
Fordham University	539		82		63	1,000		860		48	162				76	686		1,775	3,516	104			3,620	688
Georgetown University	321			198				78		25	112	316		99		1,300	132	2,411	2,581				2,581	1,764
Gonzaga University	232						172	20			33		1			292		714	750				750	289
Holy Cross College	879							3										882	882				882	620
John Carroll University	499							3										490	502				502	378
Loyola, Baltimore	308																	308	308				308	
Loyola, Chicago	269		289	313	106	751		408			4	314		736			417	2,146	3,607				3,607	500
Loyola, Los Angeles	51						27				64					248		326	390				390	251
Loyola, New Orleans	437	33	162	161		34			5	3	31		89		39		60	609	1,054		186		1,240	131
Marquette University	712	124	133	262			704	205	125	44		358	29	315		95	69	2,827	3,175		295	52	3,522	1,110
Regis College	354																	352	354				354	300
Rockhurst College	108															400		496	508			150	658	<sup>1</sup>
St. Joseph's College	184																	139	184				184	
St. Louis University	415	65	249	295	189	603		457				474		262		525		2,530	3,534	2,080	550	71	6,235	1,070
St. Peter's College	158													9				163	167				167	
University of San Francisco	152	26	34							11	30					415		598	668				668	400
University of Santa Clara	98	10					40									372		520	520				520	372
University of Scranton	270	6	25													100		279	401				401	
Seattle College	438	29					42						15	521			140	1,056	1,185	3			1,188	
Spring Hill College	144													118		200		426	462				462	<sup>1</sup>
Xavier University	610		269													500		704	1,379				1,379	23 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Totals, 1943-1944</b>	<b>8,714</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>1,476</b>	<b>1,429</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>2,830</b>	<b>1,319</b>	<b>2,488</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>1,719</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>2,378</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>6,851</b>	<b>818</b>	<b>24,034</b>	<b>32,197</b>	<b>2,713</b>	<b>1,093</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>36,276</b>	

<sup>1</sup>Army or Navy Air Force in addition.

<sup>2</sup>Figures taken from *School and Society* table, December 25, 1943, and placed here merely for purposes of record. They are already included in the totals.

<sup>3</sup>Not included in columns to the left.

# Enrollment, 1943-1944, Jesuit High Schools

	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	Fourth Year	Special	Totals	Totals 1942-1943	Increase
Bellarmino College Preparatory, San Jose..	136	111	95	62	...	404	331	73
Bellarmino High School, Tacoma.....	88	80	55	50	...	273	270	3
Boston College High School.....	476	293	221	180	...	1,170	972	198
Brooklyn Preparatory School.....	228	188	142	76	...	634	568	66
Campion.....	171	127	109	80	...	487	488	-1
Canisius High School, Buffalo.....	261	180	106	83	1	631	538	93
Cheverus Classical High School, Portland.	100	77	56	39	...	272	250	22
Cranwell Preparatory School.....	30	34	23	32	11 <sup>1</sup>	130	139	-9
Creighton University High School.....	147	131	110	92	...	480	458	22
University of Detroit High School.....	326	208	167	131	...	832	719	113
Fairfield College Preparatory.....	188	141	53	27	...	409	318	91
Fordham Preparatory School.....	190	164	141	124	...	619	593	26
Georgetown Preparatory School.....	49	44	30	27	49 <sup>2</sup>	199	115	84
Gonzaga High School, Spokane.....	114	109	83	70	...	376	435	-59
Gonzaga High School, Washington, D. C.	275	170	122	94	...	661	560	101
Jesuit High School, Dallas.....	64	62	42	17	...	185	193	-8
Jesuit High School, New Orleans.....	283	174	143	144	...	744	717	27
Jesuit High School, Tampa.....	60	61	36	30	...	187	196	-9
Loyola Academy, Chicago.....	216	157 <sup>3</sup>	141 <sup>4</sup>	131	...	645	577	68
Loyola High School, Baltimore.....	176	140	102	113	...	531	490	41
Loyola High School, Los Angeles.....	262	292	174	129	3	860	820	40
Loyola School, New York.....	13	4	7	6	61 <sup>5</sup>	91	28	63
Marquette High School, Yakima.....	42	32	18	18	...	110	119	-9
Marquette University High School, Milwaukee.....	270	181	155	134	...	740	625	115
Regis High School, Denver.....	109	86	79	54	...	328	281	47
Regis High School, New York.....	130	125	117	136	...	508	544	-36
Rockhurst High School.....	91	61	64	46	...	262	260	2
St. Ignatius High School, Chicago.....	294	232	217	129	...	872	837	35
St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland.....	301	211	155	134	1	802	725	77
St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco..	241	198	163	176	1	779	776	3
St. John's High School, Shreveport.....	34	29	12	14	96 <sup>6</sup>	185	150	35
St. Joseph's College High School, Philadelphia.....	221	178	205	168	2	774	797	-23
St. Louis University High School.....	229	191	192	153	...	765	744	21
St. Peter's College High School, Jersey City.	316	210	198	139	...	863	812	51
St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati.....	285	201	166	107	...	759	680	79
Seattle Preparatory School, Seattle.....	94	101	84	45	...	324	317	7
Xavier High School, New York.....	317	298	227	108	...	950	908	42
<b>TOTALS 1943-1944.....</b>	<b>6,827</b>	<b>5,281</b>	<b>4,210</b>	<b>3,298</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>19,841</b>		<b>1,491</b>
<b>TOTALS 1942-1943.....</b>	<b>5,931</b>	<b>4,795</b>	<b>4,086</b>	<b>3,523</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>18,350</b>	<b>18,350</b>	<b>1,441</b>
<b>INCREASE.....</b>	<b>896</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>-225</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>1,491</b>		<b>50</b>

<sup>1</sup>Postgraduate 2; eighth grade 9.

<sup>2</sup>Seventh grade 18; eighth grade 31.

<sup>3</sup>Including 34 students in second year of three-year accelerated course.

<sup>4</sup>Including 31 students in last year of three-year accelerated course.

<sup>5</sup>Including 61 students from the fourth to the eighth grade inclusive.

<sup>6</sup>Including seventh grade 38, eighth grade 58.

# Freshmen

	Arts		Engineering		Commerce		Totals		Decrease
	1943-44	1942-43	1943-44	1942-43	1943-44	1942-43	1943-44	1942-43	
Boston College	257	515			58	113	315	628	313
Canisius College	99	254					99	254	155
Creighton University	85	243			20	108	105	351	246
University of Detroit	182	275	122	313	75	136	379	724	345
Fordman University	214	482			32	116	246	598	352
Georgetown University	121	135					121	135	14
Gonzaga University	46	110	60	84			106	194	88
Holy Cross College	74	397					74	397	323
John Carroll University	37	245					37	245	208
Loyola, Baltimore	130	153					130	153	23
Loyola, Chicago	102	213				14	102	227	125
Loyola, Los Angeles	5	76	27	46		40	32	162	130
Loyola, New Orleans	151	153			8	45	159	198	39
Marquette University	254	430	217	300	52	113	523	843	320
Regis College	24	113					24	113	89
Rockhurst College	72	130					72	130	58
St. Joseph's College	55	145					55	145	90
St. Louis University	442	467			39	97	481	564	83
St. Peter's College	82	130					82	130	48
University of San Francisco	31	110	33	68	19	101	83	279	196
University of Santa Clara	30	66	23	66	7	49	60	181	121
University of Scranton	69	115	26	20	6	35	101	170	69
Seattle College	312	256					312	256	+56
Spring Hill College	29	80					29	80	51
Xavier University	110	308					110	308	198
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3,013</b>	<b>5,601</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>897</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>967</b>	<b>3,837</b>	<b>7,465</b>	<b>3,628</b>

# Amending the Liberal College

ROBERT C. HARTNETT, S. J.

If six or eight veteran Jesuit educators express agreement on a point of educational policy, "let no dog bark" disapproval. Perhaps through over-kindness, that many have judged these *memoranda* on the postwar liberal college worth publishing. The author is ready to acquiesce and face the consequences.

To my mind, we Jesuits are committed to a definite philosophy of education and also, though less firmly, to certain well-described techniques of instruction. But we are not equally committed to any fixed curriculum.

We are committed to the great purpose of preparing Catholic youth to take their place in the civic, social, intellectual, and religious life of the society of which they are members. What is the best set of studies by which to prepare them has not been revealed.

If our past practice affords any guide to Jesuit wisdom, we seem to have understood the advisability of adapting our educational instruments to the needs and demands of our students wherever they lived. All Jesuits the world over have done this, remembering that *tempora mutantur, nos et mutamur in illis*. I am chiefly interested in discovering in what direction we American Jesuits might profitably amend our present liberal college system in accordance with the demands of postwar American society. The changes suggested incline largely in the direction of *simplification*.

What meaning do I attach to "liberal education" as an ideal? Newman suits me pretty well on that. A liberal education, I think, should "free" a man from the immaturity of youth and from the pitfalls and bad habits into which the weakness of our nature inclines us. It should clear and plow up and plant the field of his nature so that his natural aptitudes for understanding what is true and appreciating what is good and beautiful can operate, naturally and habitually. It should make him satisfactorily vocal. It should teach him to understand himself and other men, individually and socially, in both the natural and supernatural context in which God and human events have placed him. It should teach him to understand both what mankind *should be*, and what it *is* and *has been*. It should "humanize," that is, bring to its proper perfection, the *total personality* of a man, not merely his mind. I will only add, to clarify my point of view, that the task of humanizing a total personality begins with infancy and stretches through the long course of adolescence; and I heartily concur with Newman's view that the interplay of the right sort of young per-

sonalities on each other may do more to ripen a young person than the books he reads or the courses he takes.

Finally, this paper aims only to open discussion along the lines it takes. When the wisdom of others has sifted the wheat from the chaff, let us hope that a much improved program will emerge.

1. *The college should be discussed in conjunction with our high-school programs.*

(a) My idea is that the high school should be almost completely humanistic and literary—say Latin; Greek and/or French, German, Spanish; English; mathematics through trigonometry; some history; some science. Ideally it might be fine to dip high school down one year into the grade-school age and make the course five years.

(b) Wherever there are several non-Jesuit Catholic high schools in the same place, it should be possible for us to conduct a rather unique Jesuit high school. The only reason for making concessions to easier courses seems to be financial. If this advantage could be foregone, we would reap other (educational) advantages.

(c) If our high schools are strongly literary and classical, our colleges will have at least a core of students who will have had a real classical education even though they take no classics in college. And some of our high-school graduates should be expected to take the classical course in college.

2. *Our colleges should aim at a deeper and hence less scattered program for each group of students.*

(a) The day of "general" education, in the sense of providing instruction *de omni scibili*, is over.

Each subject of study has been *developed* so much that a "general" course in any one of them has become relatively more and more superficial; and

The *number* of subjects of study or of "sciences" has been proliferated to a point where it is physically impossible to study them all in four years, without being hopelessly "bird's-eye viewish."

E. g. An introductory course in biology barely touches the surface today. We have physics, chemistry, biology, experimental psychology, geology, astronomy, and anthropology among the "natural" sciences; and sociology, economics, and political science among the social sciences. Does anyone pretend that it is possible to gain a "gentleman's knowledge" of all these subjects ancillary to a literary education without making our students "little walking encyclopedias" (of the *Junior Britannica* mentality at that)? This is precisely what Father General Martin warned us against doing.

(b) Our students will have to compete, in professional and graduate schools and everywhere, with students from secular colleges who have received more specialized preparation for the work they are doing.

(c) We have probably become too antivocational in our view of college education anyway. We seem to have misinterpreted Newman's *Idea of a University*, which did not insist that only the most general and "useless" subjects could induce a liberal habit of mind. Newman set the goal but not the means of a liberal education, and even suggested that medicine could be taught liberally.

*Economically*, it is *impossible* for most Catholics to send their boys to college for four years without providing them with some more proximate preparation for their life's work than a "general education." At least, they are firmly convinced that they cannot afford it.

(d) Actually, we have accommodated our educational administration to contemporary American needs. Large numbers of our college students *do* take semivocational subjects—either the B. S. in natural sciences in preparation for medicine and dentistry, or the B. S. in economics and accounting in preparation for business.

We have failed to accommodate our educational theory to our practice. Hence our college curricula are somewhat makeshift, such courses being imposed by alien forces on a substratum of our own choosing.

The result is that we are carrying on both shoulders. A great many of our colleges admittedly are not giving what they consider a "general education" and are not giving well-integrated programs based on any other ideal. The prevocational and the cultural ideals are in conflict. It seems possible to reconcile them, but not if the cultural and the "general" are considered synonymous.

My contention is that a less general and more pointed program can be cultural and preprofessional at the same time, by being deeper and bringing the minds of the students to a sharper edge, and by appealing to deep-down *interests* of the students.

3. *It is impractical to try to make all students take the same program on the ground that it is the "best" curriculum for giving a liberal education.*

(a) This is a fundamental issue. One may admit, if one so believes, that *in the abstract* an all-out classical program would give the best promise of "liberalizing" the minds and entire personalities of our students.

It seems wrong to *assume* that this proposition is true. Strong arguments can be offered in its favor, but the bigotry of some who espouse the classics is a strong argument against their classical training as "liberalizing" the mind.

The classics may offer the best cultural program in the abstract, and yet *the way the classics have been taught by us in America* may not be.

(b) Even if, as I personally am inclined to believe, a college program based on the classics deserves to be ranked as unquestionably superior to

any other program in the abstract, we are faced with circumstances beyond our control which in the concrete deprive the program based on the classics of such superiority.

The *economic status* of our students is undoubtedly one such circumstance. A classical education is an advantage which perhaps most of them cannot afford, or are at least absolutely persuaded they cannot afford. Does not experience prove that we have had to accede to the decision of students and parents on this score? They are supporting our colleges by paying tuition. Some of the parents have themselves had classical training. If they judge that their boys cannot afford the time *at the college level* for classical pursuits, we can hardly ignore their convictions and decisions. *De facto*, we have made the adjustment to modern needs which they demand.

Secondly, a Jesuit college usually has the responsibility of serving as *the Catholic college of the place*. The situation is unlike that of our high schools, which can afford in many places to preserve a unique type of training, because boys who do not want that type of training can get a Catholic secondary education of the type they want elsewhere in the same locality. Our colleges, however, have a much heavier responsibility. They must try to accommodate as many applicants as they can without letting down the barriers too far. They know that if they refuse Catholic boys because the boys do not want to study the classics, they are sending Catholic boys to secular schools. We must draw the line somewhere, it is true. But it is hardly defensible to say that in the America of today we must draw it around a narrow classical curriculum. Actually, we have not done that. We have introduced nonclassical programs in answer to a serious and pressing need. We have responded, as every educational and indeed every other social institution must respond, to the irresistible pounding of social forces on our walls.

Thirdly, for a variety of reasons, large numbers of fine, intelligent American Catholic boys are *not interested* in a classical education in college. Here we must exercise a sense of proportion, of course. The boys are not interested in anything that means hard work, unless someone succeeds in making them interested. Up to a point, too, they can be benefited by a subject in which they are not particularly interested. True. But if our colleges cater to fairly large numbers (as they probably will and should), who will question the wisdom of not making all or most college students major or minor in the fields for which they have the most violent distaste? If it is hard enough to interest many of them in any real intellectual pursuit, why make our task next to impossible by starting with the program they hate most? Education is a two-way affair, and we must meet our students halfway. This seems to be very sound psychology, and by and

large we have adopted it in practice. We had no choice. Every system of education that was ever in vogue did the same thing. The *Ratio Studiorum* is a monumental accommodation to what was good in the preferences and tastes of educated people in its day. We must do the same.

Lastly, we must give an *American* Catholic education. The cultural value of certain kinds of learning is partly dependent on social acceptance. There is a wisdom in the better elements of the social group, in the cultural *élite*, which gives value to this or that type of cultural acquisition. This changes from time to time, as the range of possible acquisitions increases. We must give boys a chance to prepare themselves to meet the standards set by educated Americans for work in the learned professions, in teaching, in business, in journalism, in social work, etc. It is possible to take a supercilious attitude towards modern America, but it will get us nowhere. We are the ones who will be left high and dry if we do not get in the swim, without, of course, sacrificing anything essential that we can save.

4. *These considerations indicate a new and simplified type of college program as better suited to our circumstances than the other "general" program.*

(a) The college curriculum should offer several different programs consisting of not over *four or five subjects*, and should concentrate on about *two*.

- e. g. HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY, with religion and some English.
- or CLASSICS (Latin and Greek), with philosophy, religion.
- or CHEMISTRY AND BIOLOGY (or PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICS), with religion, philosophy, German.
- or ENGLISH AND FRENCH (or GERMAN, SPANISH) with religion and philosophy.
- or SOCIAL SCIENCES (economics, sociology, political science in various combinations, sometimes with history), and religion and philosophy.
- or PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY, with religion, English, or a foreign language, even Latin.

(b) This could be calculated as a *three-year program*. If we still have a four-year college system after the war, the first year could be devoted either to making up the deficiencies of high schooling or to rounding out the secondary training in languages and mathematics and history.

(c) It would involve some *telescoping of philosophy* and some *combining of philosophy and religion*. This might be done somewhat as follows:

Logic should be begun early, and the whole program in philosophy for those not majoring in it should be finished before the final year or at least the final semester. Philosophy should be a tool with which to attack problems in the field of specialization in the last year. The order of

studies in the Society seems much better than that in the colleges, where religion comes first, then all sorts of other studies, then philosophy.

The traditional treatises will have to be rearranged. The whole of philosophy might be taught in three or four compendious courses: "The Philosophy of Knowledge" (logic and a little epistemology for all), "The Philosophy of Man" (combining the essentials of psychology and general ethics), "The Philosophy of God" (theodicy with enough general metaphysics for the purpose). For scientists, perhaps "The Philosophy of Nature" (cosmology) could be worked in somehow.

Dogmatic theology will have to be taught explicitly. Moral (e. g. Father Healy's *Moral Guidance*) could be combined with special ethics. Perhaps the course in "The Philosophy of Man" running through three semesters could take this in. That might add up to:

Logic	3 semester hours
Philosophy of Man	12 semester hours
Philosophy of God	3 semester hours (with essentials of general metaphysics)
	—
	18 semester hours
Dogma	8 semester hours
	—
	26 semester hours

*The social encyclicals must be taught.*<sup>1</sup> This is a heavy assignment, but essential. In the Chicago Province seniors take a two-hour course in *Casti Connubii* and another in *Quadragesimo Anno*. Perhaps study groups might be better, but for credit. It would be necessary, I think, to supplement theory with practice. We must introduce our students into Catholic Action while in college. Cf. Sodality, Legion of Mary, etc.

Philosophy and religion (including the encyclicals) would total 30 semester hours. This would amount to about one and two-thirds semesters, nearly a whole year. This seems to be neither too little nor too much, either in a four- or three-year course.

In addition, in the fields of specialization it may be possible to offer a course in each on the specifically Catholic problems involved. This has been done; e. g., in evolution (from the point of view of Catholic doctrine) for biology majors.

(d) In the fields of concentration, the aim must be to *get beyond the textbook stage* and make the students more resourceful. Let them brush up against the real problems. Let them find out how history gets written, what the real problems are in government (by getting all wrapped up in a problem or two), etc. The *complexity* of these fields, as well as the principles running through them and the simplified versions adapted to con-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *I. S. O. Bulletin*, November 1943, p. 29 and p. 31.



venient presentation, should be taught. Students should gain a sympathetic insight into the work of leaders in the field by reading their productions, articles, reviews. Where problems are confusing we should not mind allowing the students to become confused, so long as we do not leave them in this state at the end of the course. They should be taught to understand that what is of its own nature abstruse cannot be presented as simple; what is in itself obscure cannot be made clear; what is complicated cannot be reduced to obvious elements.

(e) The students should be made *resourceful and self-reliant*. They should learn how to use library facilities without having everything mapped out for them. They should be given a topic to investigate and told to *get results* on it by finding out for themselves what materials exist and by going wherever necessary within easy reach to get these materials. If our schools have not produced writers and scholars, the reason may be largely that our students have never been made curious to find things out for themselves, have not been taught how to uncover interesting phases of human knowledge, and to present them in acceptable form. That we have woefully failed in this is self-evident.

5. *The fields of concentration should be taught liberally.* For example:

(a) In regard to *reading assignments*, students should be made to acquaint themselves with "great books." For all studying humanistic subjects, for instance, care should be taken to acquaint them in some way with the contributions of the Greeks and Romans as well as more recent peoples. They can be taught to read some Herodotus and Thucydides in history courses, some Plato and Aristotle and Lucretius in philosophy, some Greek and Roman writers in literature courses. A little of this will insure that they are not untutored in the contributions of ancient culture.

(b) In all courses, they should be taught *to read* with understanding, and even to *read aloud*; to *write* clearly; to *speak*. Not all students can be well trained in these skills in all courses. But if every teacher did what he could to provide opportunities here and there, in the whole program, the students would be given a fair amount of practice. Special programs could be got up for this purpose—reading and discussion of papers; round-tables; debates.

(c) Great stress should be put on the *writing of well-organized term papers*. This is in addition to acquiring skill in investigating materials. Students must be taught to outline their papers, to provide clear introductions, effective building up of their subject, clear transitions, internal summaries, and concise conclusions. They should learn how to improve their *style*, and, from the start, how to write bibliographies and footnote references properly. Three years of vigilance will give them the *habits* that mean all the difference between slipshod and careful workmanship.

This imposes heavy responsibilities upon Jesuit and lay teachers. At present Jesuit priests enter graduate schools without knowing how to write term papers. Our own courses must be brought up to date first. *Nemo dat. . . .*

6. *Subjects not covered in a student's program but considered important should be covered by reading assignments.*

(a) *American history* might be such a subject. Students could be required to read several books; e. g., James Truslow Adams' *The Epic of America*, Harry Thurston Peck's *Twenty Years of the Republic*, Lord Charnwood's *Abraham Lincoln*, or other books of this type. (Some of these are now available in cheap editions so the student could easily acquire his own copy.) A volume like Father Shiels' compendium of the history of the West might be very suitable for general history. Examinations would be given covering the assigned reading, which might be done in the summer or at any time convenient for the student.

(b) The same policy could be applied to other fields. At least the better students should make the acquaintance of outstanding writers, especially Catholics, by reading something of Belloc's, Chesterton's, Dawson's, Gilson's, Lippmann's. Perhaps a *dozen* books should be required reading for all students outside of all class or major and minor program assignments. The books assigned need not, of course, be the same for all. They should be adapted to the needs and abilities of students, and might vary all the way from Belloc's light essays and Father Scott's apologetics to Gilson, Maritain, and Karl Adam. The principle underlying this reading (which could include science as well as literature and history) is this: *we need not introduce a whole course in a subject just because we believe students should have some knowledge of it.*

We must also admit, of course, that many students will have to be graduated with much less understanding of some fields than we should desire. This is inevitable. Much more important than providing a course in a subject is creating intellectual curiosity about it and the habit of relying on oneself to make up one's deficiencies. Our great failure so far has been in providing a *minimum* of as much as we could and in creating the impression that this minimum sufficed without a student's supplementing it on his own initiative and on his own time.

(c) In regard to some subjects, we should *systematize and exploit nonclassroom means of education*. Take our *liturgy*. Our students should learn how to use a missal, and learn about the vestments and the inner meaning of the Holy Sacrifice by *participation*. Let seven-minute instructions be given weekly for a semester or a year on the Mass, and let the students acquire *habits* of liturgical worship through constant practice. As things stand our religious instructions to students are hit-or-miss.

7. Probably we should foster the system of having all our students plan on taking one year (at least) of "professional" study after college. This would relieve the college curriculum of obviously *ad hoc* courses like accounting, marketing, transportation, banking, etc., which now deprive the B. S. in Commerce and Finance of its liberal character. The same is true of journalism. This fourth year (if we can cut the college down to three) might be especially needed by many pre dental and premedical students, or be desired by them. (Premedical studies, I realize, form a very special problem.)

(a) If we could relieve the three-year course of such incumbrances, we could make a college education mean something liberally. Students could be encouraged and perhaps induced to take a less vocational view of the three-year course, knowing that they would have the fourth year in which to take "practical" subjects. A premedical student, for instance, might be persuaded to try to get a liberal education in the three-year program; e. g., by participating in student activities, knowing that he would have a solid year to devote himself to biology and chemistry exclusively, without having any philosophy or religion to study.

Dartmouth College had the system of giving an A. B. to students who spent the first three years on liberal subjects and the fourth on vocational subjects. Some schools in the Midwest allowed students to transfer from the A. B. course to the law school for their fourth year and get their degree after first-year law. Medical students took their B. S. after a year or two of medicine.

(b) I would prefer separating the college course entirely from this year of professional or vocational work. The college should stand free as a *liberal and intermediate institution* between the high school and the professional or graduate school. The *ad hoc* courses should be pushed out into the postcollege period as social work has been, and as business administration has been at Harvard. If the college can be cut to three years, a year will be left for this purpose *for all*, and it should become the accepted thing that graduates spend one year (at least) in *ad hoc* training for their careers in insurance, banking, salesmanship, etc. An alternative would be evening school for two years. Diplomas could be awarded.

Where a college does not offer these specialized courses, the students can take them elsewhere, probably with great profit. We would not be competing with them where we are badly disadvantaged.

8. An effort should be made systematically to interest all students in good drama, good music, and other cultural opportunities. They should be invited to hear readings of poetry by artists.

(a) The object here is to try extracurricularly to bring refining influences to bear upon all students, and to inspire them with cultivated tastes.

Chemists should learn that "it is the thing to do" to go to and enjoy a good play or concert. Cf. Herbart's idea of education, which (if memory serves) stressed the role of *interests*.

(b) These interests can be combined with social opportunities; i. e., our boys and Catholic girls of Catholic colleges can be induced to attend together.

9. *By the way of recapitalation, these are the principles underlying this program:*

(a) The curriculum in college must adapt itself, within limits, to local needs and demands.

(b) Students will develop further if they devote themselves to subjects they are really interested in.

(c) The mind can be better liberalized by studying fewer subjects more deeply than more subjects superficially. *Non multa, sed multum*.

(d) These fewer subjects can reasonably bear some moderately close relation to the career a student is preparing for; that is, a liberal education need not be made up of "useless" subjects.

(e) We can make fairly sure that the boys over whose education we have more complete control get a broad humanistic training in high school; some of them will prefer the humanities as fields of concentration in college; some will take the classics.

(f) Simplifying and shortening the college course would help to re-instate the liberal college in its natural function of being intermediate between high school and purely professional, vocational, or graduate training; the college could be freed of *ad hoc* courses if the college course were made three years and a fourth year made available for such *ad hoc* courses.

(g) What is essential in religion and philosophy, and what all students need and can profit from, can be taught in somewhat less time than it now is if economy is used in these subjects by teaching only what is really important and (in some cases) teaching it at a bit faster rate. With a simplified curriculum this should be possible.

(h) What a program lacks in specific courses it can make up, perhaps with great advantage, if *all teachers in all courses* build up a public opinion in favor of, for example, cultured expression, the actual use of foreign languages, and cultured interests generally. The whole spirit of a school, its extracurricular life, must be toned up to increase student initiative in acquiring what makes for refinement.

NOTE ON LATIN. The problem is this: will not the suggested three-year college course, which makes no Latin requirement for the A. B., run counter to the Society's and indeed the Church's mind (cf. *The Christian Education of Youth*)?

(a) As a minimum requirement, the college could insist on four years of high-school Latin as an entrance requirement for the A. B. course. Those who have less would have to make it up. Otherwise they would get a Ph. B. or whatever other degree is available. (In this connection it should become the accepted thing that with a shortened course we should be insistent about making up deficiencies. Perhaps many students would have to spend one semester in college in such work. This might be recouped by summer work.) Such a minimum requirement would back up our high-school Latin requirement.

(b) If necessary, perhaps one year of Latin could be required in college. If it is, the students' knowledge of Latin should be put to work; e. g., in philosophy courses (at least for majors).

NOTE ON HONORS. The three-year course would fit in well with an honors program, with comprehensive examinations, etc. This would put the responsibility of providing a liberal education largely in the hands of the major and minor departments, where it should be. Today that responsibility is too scattered.

#### CONCLUSION

Obviously, such a college would require a well-prepared Jesuit faculty. Possibly each province could try the program first in its best staffed college, and only gradually establish it elsewhere.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The following references to past articles in the *QUARTERLY* dealing with the arts college may be welcome:

George D. Bull, S. J. "Present Tendencies in Our Educational System." I:5-13, June 1938.

Charles M. O'Hara, S. J. "An Integrated Curriculum for the Catholic College Today." I:23-29, June 1938.

W. Eugene Shiels, S. J. "Toward a Liberal College." II:71-77, September 1939.

"Postwar Planning for Jesuit Education: The Colleges." VI:19-36, June 1943.

Thurston Davis, S. J. "Blueprint for a College." VI:74-82, October 1943.

# The Anthology for the Catholic School

M. JOSEPH COSTELLOE, S. J.

What is the "small error" in Mr. Earley's theory of literature which leads him to conclude that "the 'Nativity Ode' of Milton is a hodge-podge of Christianity and pagan mythology . . . the 'Skylark' of Percy Shelley is drivel . . . Tennyson's modern counterpart is Irving Berlin"?<sup>1</sup> Father Daly in his letter in the June 1943 *QUARTERLY* has contented himself with correcting a point of fact and some of the conclusions to which Mr. Earley has come, without attempting to evaluate the principles which Mr. Earley laid down as a Catholic norm for literature.<sup>2</sup> With Father Daly I must confess that the principles are not too clear to me. Whether I have interpreted them correctly or not may be questioned. The conclusions which have been reached by Mr. Earley would certainly seem to indicate that there is something wrong higher up.

All the errors of literary criticism come from either a misconception of the nature and function of literature or from preconceived notions as to the proper expression to be used in portraying poetical ideas. Mr. Earley's fondness for Gerard Manley Hopkins and Eric Gill would probably place him among the "moderns" with regard to artistic forms. But the advantages or disadvantages of various modes of expression are of far less serious consequence than a misconception of poetry itself, the confusing of poetry with dialectic, with history, with systems of morality, or even with Catholicism. To identify virtue with knowledge, or education with virtue, or physics with metaphysics, or the nature of art with the use which man makes of it, is always unfortunate. Unless each art, each science has its own particular aim, which is in turn subordinate to the primary end of all creation, there will always be a pandemonium of opinion and conjecture.

## TWO ASSUMPTIONS

The first error under which Mr. Earley seems to me to be laboring is a common error of the humanists. Plato-wise, they subordinate literature to the instruction of youth in dogma or morality. But if with Plato we put the primary end of literature in the moral order and "are guided by the

---

<sup>1</sup> Stephen B. Earley, S. J. "Toward a Catholic Anthology of Literature," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, V:187, January 1943.

<sup>2</sup> James J. Daly, S. J., in a letter to the Editor. *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, VI:57-58, June 1943.

poets, for they are our fathers, as it were, and conductors in wisdom,"<sup>3</sup> the result naturally will be that with Plato we must reject much literature because it fails in this arbitrarily imposed task. Because the final end of all creation is the knowledge and love of God, too frequently it is unconsciously assumed that the primary end of literature must be identified with it. Working under this assumption, it is an easy task to find fault with an anthology of literature compiled from slightly different premises. Mr. Earley takes to task the editors of the *Prose and Poetry Series* for not compiling a satisfactory Catholic anthology of literature—a thing which in itself may be of questionable value as an educational instrument—but he fails to consider accurately the task to which the editors set themselves at the beginning: *an anthology of literature for Catholic schools*.

The second assumption of Mr. Earley's essay is perhaps a bit more tangible, and it is the obvious conclusion of trying to prove that "Catholic literature" should be the basis of literary studies in a Catholic school. It is the identifying of natural with supernatural truths. In referring to the study of the pagan classics of Greece and Rome by the medievalists, Mr. Earley remarks that "from these classics they selected the things that were in accord with natural (and Catholic) truth, rejecting the rest as illiterate."<sup>4</sup> A similar conclusion drawn from this same premise is that, "since practically all of English poetry was written away from Catholic influence, very much of it is second-rate."<sup>5</sup>

To say that "all truth—even natural truth—was Catholic"<sup>6</sup> is simply begging the question. If we overemphasize the Catholicism of our schools we shall undoubtedly end up with the petition of Erasmus, "St. Socrates, pray for us!" Before going to that extreme we may well ask ourselves what we are teaching in our schools. The physics class is certainly more than a gathering to promote interest in proofs for the existence of God. The chemistry class is not a course in teleology. And in like manner, the classes in English literature have another end in view beside that of being an apologetic for Catholic or even natural truths. If literature has no independent value of its own, the logical conclusion is to substitute St. Augustine for Virgil, St. Basil for Xenophon, and A'Kempis for *The House of the Seven Gables*.

#### A DEFENSE OF POETRY

What is here said of poetry may be applied to all the fine arts, for their end is the same—aesthetic pleasure.

The very fact that poets like beggars are always with us must indicate

<sup>3</sup> Plato. *Lysis* 214a.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 183.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 187.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 183.

some natural tendency in man towards poetry. The angels have no need of art, for with a single intuition they grasp the intelligibility of the objects of their knowledge. Brutes, which have but sense perception, have no means of understanding a work of art; but man, who stands midway between the angel and the brute, finds in art a solace for the limitations of matter. Man longs for intuitive knowledge, but he has direct intuition of only that which is sensible, and where reason fails him or fails to satisfy him, he needs must sing a song unto himself.<sup>7</sup> Man's growth in knowledge in this life is a slow, arduous, and unending process. The poet is a man who has found a short cut to knowledge. He builds an intelligible world, lays down its laws and conditions, interprets for himself and for others the mystery of the universe, whether it be in relating the adventures of Snow White or of Oedipus. In a way, the poet is a broken-down philosopher; "he (man) asks for wisdom, and philosophy tries him; he seeks intuitive enjoyment, and the travail of body and mind generate only a concept, so that he has to find consolation in the *mimesis* of art, the contemplation of what is sensible."<sup>8</sup>

"Who can withhold the words he hath conceived?"<sup>9</sup> The question of Eliphaz the Themanite is surely applicable to the artist who finds in his poetic activity some faint reflection of the creative intellect of God. On the active side, the poet desires to express some universal truth which he himself has realized in a form that will be intelligible to others. And on the passive or receptive side, man finds in works of art truths already partially abstracted from the unintelligibility of matter. As a general rule the poet represents man not as he is but as he ought to be; his province is the realm of probability, which does not preclude that which has actually occurred.<sup>10</sup> Even these probable truths of poetry satisfy an essential longing of the human mind: "We desire to see all truth in a simple glance; and art shows us a great deal of truth in a simple glance."<sup>11</sup>

The art of poetry is one of the logical arts. It is similar to dialectic and rhetoric in being "inventive"; but unlike rhetoric, poetry does not aim at producing some effect in the practical will.<sup>12</sup> The end of poetry is not some external activity but internal and the highest form of internal activity—contemplation, the perfection of knowledge. The truth portrayed in a work of art is seen simply as a good of the intellect. We see the masterpiece and rejoice in it, but we do not care to use it.

<sup>7</sup> Plato. *Phaedo* 114d: χεῖ τὰ τοιαῦτα ὡσπερ ἐπάδειν ἑαυτῷ.

<sup>8</sup> M. C. D'Arcy, S. J. *Thomas Aquinas*. London: Ernest Benn, 1930, p. 68.

<sup>9</sup> *Job* 4:2.

<sup>10</sup> Aristotle. *Poetics* 1451b, 28-32.

<sup>11</sup> Albert J. Steiss. "Outline of a Philosophy of Art," *The Thomist*, II:41, January 1940.

<sup>12</sup> See Walter J. Ong, S. J. "The Province of Rhetoric and Poetic," *Modern Schoolman*, XIX:24-27, January 1942.



Between the necessary truths of philosophy and the contingent truths of history lie the probable truths of poetry. A writer in the *Modern Schoolman* has aptly described the difference between the philosophical and the poetical approach:

A philosophical treatise, like a poetical work, is directed to the speculative intellect. But in what way? The philosophical is concerned with the communication of something which has its existence independently of the words used to communicate it, and, while the poetic use of language communicates truth too, it is truth which does not exist in its totality as entirely independent of the language in which it is conveyed. The logical connections are made by the poet.<sup>13</sup>

To this might be added the advice of Aristotle that the poet should always prefer probable impossibilities to possible improbabilities.<sup>14</sup> This same critic has defined the provinces of poetry and history in a manner which is typically Greek: "The difference between a historian and a poet is . . . that one tells what happened and the other what might happen. For this reason poetry is something more philosophical and of a more serious nature than history, because poetry tends to give universal truths while history gives particular facts."<sup>15</sup>

Too often we consider the Middle Ages as a time of logic-chopping, when men loved argument for the sake of argument and cubbyholed their knowledge in the syllogism. Yet there was a poetry about the Middle Ages which extended even into the realms of philosophy and theology. This attitude of mind is shown in the frequent arguments from convenience or analogy which a medieval philosopher may include with his metaphysical or theological proofs. This liberty of mind has frequently disconcerted more literally minded scholastics of later generations. But such a procedure is not erroneous except for the reader who lets himself be led astray by his lack of imagination.<sup>16</sup> The mind has a capacity to know all being, and poetry in this life is but the urge of a rational nature attempting to plug up the *lacunae* in its knowledge. In the words of Pierre Rousselot: "The aspiration of the human mind to grasp the totality of things, no matter how, in the unity of a single idea, cannot be stifled."<sup>17</sup>

The poet is lord and master of all that he sees. He can portray with his poetic art all being, whether it be the adventures of the Three Bears

<sup>13</sup> Walter J. Ong, S. J. *Op. cit.*, p. 24-25.

<sup>14</sup> Aristotle. *Poetics* 1460a 19.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 1451b 1-9.

<sup>16</sup> "Poetica scientia est de his quae propter defectum veritatis non possunt a ratione capi; unde oportet quod quasi quibusdam similitudinibus seducatur: theologica autem est de his quae sunt supra rationem; et ideo modus symbolicus utrique communis est, cum neutra proportionetur." St. Thomas. *Prol. Sent.* c. 5, ad 3.

<sup>17</sup> Pierre Rousselot, S. J. *The Intellectualism of Saint Thomas*, translated by Father James E. O'Mahony, O. M. Cap. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1935. p. 148.

or of Prometheus. If we make a strict demarcation between art, which is directed to a particular end—aesthetic pleasure—and morality, which is directed towards the common end of all creation, there are grounds for admitting that there is no morality in art as such. But if we consider the whole man and the use which he makes of the arts, actions which are conducive to immorality can never be the subject matter of poetry. Vice portrayed as something admirable would seem to pervert the very end of art. That which is degrading and repugnant to reason cannot be the object of disinterested contemplation. The true poet would put some order into the world where it has not been before, but today that idea and ideal has been doubly rejected. External form is no longer considered as a necessary adjunct to artistic work, but much more serious is the frequent portrayal in novels and in movies of man no longer living the life of a man but of a brute.

Catholic truths have elevated, broadened, and intensified the poet's knowledge of man. Catholic literature will be that literature which has for its inspiration Catholic truths, or which simply portrays man as being influenced by these truths. Supernatural revelation has vastly extended the poetic field, and who can fail to notice the gulf between Sophocles and Shakespeare or between Virgil and Dante? But we must remember that these Catholic truths become poetically true, not by reason of their intrinsic merit, but by virtue of the use which the poets make of them. And since there have been few great Catholic poets in English literature, we must frequently be content with those who were not of the Faith.

#### WAYWARD POETS

Mr. Earley has suggested that "the Catholic critic must make himself acutely aware of philosophical patterns and be ready to reject the cunning patchworks of heresy that abound in our literature."<sup>18</sup> But frequently such criticism will be merely straining out the gnats. The poet is not writing philosophy nor formal heresy, but poetry. As well criticize Homer with Protagoras for using an imperative in addressing a deity: "Sing, goddess, . . ."; or Michelangelo for depicting in his *Last Judgment* angels without wings. Certainly the medievalists were great sinners in this regard: Dante places a sainted pope in hell; in the stained glass windows of Chartres the living are placed with the saints in heaven; and we have a survival of this poetic license in the *Dies Irae*: "Teste David cum Sibylla."

Tennyson's *In Memoriam* may express some philosophical or theological heresies, but does it portray the true sorrow of a friend for one who has died in the full promise of life? If it does, it is to this extent poetically true. Shelley's *Skylark* may lead a literally minded critic to con-

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 184.

clude that he was a pantheist, and perhaps he was, but in reading this poem we are not so much interested in Shelley's pantheism as in his joy in the birds of the air and the lilies of the field as the symbols of his own joys and sorrows. St. Paul could quote Aratus to the Athenians,<sup>19</sup> and in like manner a Catholic teacher could make good use of Milton's *Ode on the Morning of Christ's Nativity* even if literally taken it is a "hodge-podge of Christianity and pagan mythology." But the ode is neither pagan nor Christian, it is simply the youthful scholar Milton with his birthday gift for the Savior—and would that there were more who could hymn such melodious praise!

Poets are as human as the rest of us—perhaps even more so—and frequently we must judge them not by what they actually said but by what they should have said, or what they wished to say and could not. Above all we must distinguish between accidental and essential errors. Better paint a doe with horns, says Aristotle, than paint it badly, for "the one is an error in poetic art," the other "a chance error in some other field."<sup>20</sup> If the aberrations of the poet are purely incidental to the truth which he is trying to portray, then we should not object to the artist's failures. Even these errors of fact or of judgment can be of use in the Catholic school, since the student meets in non-Catholic poets attitudes of mind which will be the common beliefs of the men with whom he must associate in later life. The accidental errors of the poets can serve as an antitoxin to the very real errors which he will see about him as soon as he has grown to man's estate.

#### THE ANTHOLOGIST

The compiler of any anthology will always be subject to criticism because, in the final analysis, his choice will be determined by his own training and appreciation of literature. But I doubt that the major difficulties for the Catholic anthologist to overcome will be "the foggy atmosphere of Protestant culture, and distilled Catholicism."<sup>21</sup> Rather he will be hampered by the material with which he must work and the mentality of those for whom he is editing the anthology. The fact that an anthologist would include three times as many authors for the last 130 years as for the preceding 450 may simply be due to the fact that numerically there have been three times as many authors in this period, and not to any obvious leaning upon nineteenth-century critics "who were somewhat partial to their own century and to their own particular brand of paganism."<sup>22</sup>

It is highly fashionable to damn the Victorians and the writers of the

<sup>19</sup> *Actus Apostolorum* 17, 28.

<sup>20</sup> Aristotle. *Poetics* 1460b 33.

<sup>21</sup> Stephen B. Earley, S. J. *Op. cit.*, p. 184.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 186.

last century in general. To a limited degree criticism of the immediate past is a good thing; otherwise there would be no such thing as progress. The Victorians had their faults, and perhaps the greatest of these faults is the fact that many of them had lost their faith in Christianity as a creed to be believed. Yet there were many also who with Carlyle and Macaulay have borne witness to the vigor of the Church. If the authors of the nineteenth century were in many respects naturalistic, they at least had not lost all sense of human values. It has been left for the writers of the twentieth century to become totally absorbed in problems of sex and abnormal psychology.

In the process of education it is not always possible to choose what is absolutely best, but we must choose what is best in a particular instance. Even if the editors of the *Prose and Poetry of England* have been partial to the more recent writers of English literature, what other authors than those already represented would be suitable for Catholic high-school students? The "rough-house" of many an English writer from Chaucer to the dramatists of the Restoration will exclude a good number of authors from this anthology. And I find it difficult to imagine high-school seniors giving their midnight hours to the writings of Philip Sidney, Roger Ascham, Thomas More, or Edmund Spenser. Not only is the language of these men so foreign to our present idiom that the students would have difficulty in understanding them, but the topics which they treated are usually beyond the depth of high-school students. "The knee is nearer than the shin," a Greek might say. While you yourself may prefer Sophocles to Euripides, you must concede that the latter has his merits, and you may hope that through him others may be converted to what is better. It is not for the anthologist resting on the summit of Parnassus to spurn those who are still making the arduous ascent.

#### CONCLUSION

Kant made the big mistake of destroying reason to save faith. We need not follow his example and subordinate poetry to Catholic dogma. All things that are true have their own place in the divine plan. Unless he wishes to destroy the truths of poetry, clear ideas about the nature and use of poetry are of the highest importance to the Catholic critic. For him fideism can be as disastrous as it is to the philosopher.

I cannot flatter myself so much as to believe that I have clarified in such a short compass the difficult problems of literature which are present at every turn. The trouble with criticism of any sort is that the critic waxes poetical rather than philosophical. And perhaps it is I, who thinking that I have been following the hard-headed Peripatetics of the Lyceum in the criticism of poetry, have wandered off with the barefoot Socrates to talk of poetry not as it is but as it ought to be.

# A Degree in Industrial Relations

WILLIAM J. SMITH, S. J.

This article, we have been told, is "revolutionary." So be it. We pass on the warning to the reader if such precaution be necessary. Better a revolution on paper than riots in Brooklyn and bombs bursting over Manhattan.

The "rebellion" consists of a suggestion for a more practical approach in a certain field of educational endeavor. At the I. S. O. meeting at West Baden the Committee on Industrial Relations recommended a new curriculum to prepare men for work along the lines of industrial relations. A new degree in the subject is envisioned. At present merely an outline of basic subjects is presented. Through study and discussion it is hoped that a balanced and well-rounded curriculum will result.

It is true that some of our colleges have made kindly gestures by inaugurating a partial program in regard to this matter. The contention of the committee, however, is that the importance of the subject demands a *full-time curriculum*. Particular emphasis is placed upon the imperative need of developing leaders in trade union activity in the light of the social encyclicals of the Church.

Let us be frank and realistic about the matter. It has been our experience that Jesuits engaged in formal education have, as a rule, too vague a concept and entirely too lethargic an attitude about what the Church rightfully expects of us by way of social action. Some still cling to fond memories of other days, many put their trust in theoretical formulas applicable in an ideal world; too few are vividly aware of the surging conflicts in the life about us and into which our students must enter as participants and combatants.

The America of today is a nation-wide battlefield. Conflicting forces clash in almost constant contact. Cultural and purely intellectual pursuits are a luxury, victims, if you will, in the crisis. The art and science of industrial relations cry out for thousands of capable adherents and administrators because in that field lies the production and the distribution of the goods of earth upon which every individual and institution is dependent for existence and well-being. Whether we like it or not, America is essentially an industrial nation and the majority of our people must perforce be involved in the doings of the industrial world. The waning influence of people of the professional class in American life is apparent. He who reads his daily paper can see that even in the headlines.

The rise in power, politically and otherwise, of the labor unions has been phenomenal. The reaction that may set in when war is over will never again place the workingman in a place of secondary importance in this country. He has experienced the thrill of what organized effort can produce and he will not be denied in the future as he has been in the past.

The side that is commonly called Labor is composed of millions and millions of men and women of every type and character. They are diverse in language, belief, ideology, education, talents, ideals. Yet they must be rounded up, brought together, unified into strong, efficient, active organizations to meet the power of wealth and position that has the constant tendency to deprive them of their elemental rights. They must be furnished with a type of leadership that can do battle with cunning Communists who would exploit them for their own ulterior purposes, a leadership that will not be swayed by the bribery and the fawning offers of unscrupulous employers, a leadership that will courageously stand up against the thug and the racketeer who has taken hold of certain sections of the movement, a leadership that knows *all* the answers and is trained to put them into practice. That is a man-size job and any young Catholic who tackles it will have his work cut out for him and plenty.

The first point we wish to make is this: The world of today is a rough, tough, stubborn old tyrant. It will yield leadership only to those who *can master its elements*. The men and women who today direct the destinies of the working people have had for the most part little opportunity to think formally about the cultural side of life. Those whose cause they champion and upon whom they depend for their own positions are, by force of circumstances, battling for their daily bread, for human conditions of employment, for the opportunity of raising their families in some kind of moderate respectability, the assurance of job security. Neither the officials nor the rank and file are going to inquire about the cultural content of the courses that some potential young worker-leader had at college. The aspirant to labor leadership is going to become one with the masses of the people; he will have to get a job that will enable him to work his way up in the union, and he will have to prove by actual prowess in the combat that he has "what it takes" to wrest control from those who now hold the reins of power.

I do not want to indict our traditional brand of formal education (although I have always felt that the man who gave me an A. B. degree at the end of four years of college committed a sin against society). Keep the "clinic of the classics" by all means. But to think or assume that we are going to supply leadership for the working people by any plan that disregards the actual requirements of the situation is naive theorizing. Give our students all the culture they can absorb, but if we must make

sacrifices to meet an overwhelming problem, let not nostalgic longings stand in the way of absolute necessities.

One more thought before we make our proposal. Lest any one be of the mind that a plea for a better means to develop labor leaders is an encroachment on the scope of formal education, I would remind you that over fifty years ago a venerable Pontiff proclaimed the condition of the working classes as the "burning question of the day." A very high superior of the Society has remarked within recent years that if we do not find a way of furnishing proper leadership in this most important field we may yet see the day when we will have no schools or colleges.

We have done well in educating leaders in all the professional avenues of life. Is there any one who will dare defend the thesis that we have shown an equal initiative in providing the fifty million people who must toil for their daily bread with efficient, capable, well-informed leadership? They have a right to expect such help from Catholic educators. Today more than ever the whole welfare of the world depends in large measure upon them. Millions of them are members of the Mystical Body—all are Christ's.

Here is what we suggest in a general way to meet in some degree the present desperate need. The technical arrangement of time, credits, etc., must be left to the experts whose work is to formulate balanced schedules of study. The *curriculum*:

#### FRESHMAN

*Public Speaking* (one full hour each day). The labor leader who cannot stand on his feet and talk might just as well go in for bookkeeping or mechanical drawing.

*History of the Labor Movement* (here and abroad). Without this knowledge he will not know what he is talking about even if he does learn to speak.

*Current Labor Problems*. Taught from accounts in the daily paper and current magazine articles. A syllabus in which the fundamental principles of the social encyclicals have been summarized would be needed. The complete and logical study of the encyclicals will be taken up later when the student is more mature.

*Minor Logic*. Special emphasis to be placed on the technique of meeting sophistry and trick argumentation. This will offset the advantage that the left-wing leaders have today.

*Religion*. Christ-Man, Model, Leader.

*English*. The art of writing strong, simple, forceful English sentences.

#### SOPHOMORE

*Rhetoric and Public Speaking*. A thorough course in applied rhetoric.

*Fundamental Sociology*. So taught as to supply for the deficiencies, if there be any, of philosophic subjects that may not be taught in thesis form.

*Parliamentary Procedure*. At least one full term.

*Catholic Lay Leaders in History*. A doctrinal religious program could be given at the same time.

*Industrial and Economic Topics*. This would be conducted by means of lectures,

discussions, and forums. Guest lecturers would be secured from the trade unions, labor boards, arbitration associations, and from among successful industrialists.

*Contract Negotiations.* A full year would be needed for a thorough training.

*A Course in English.*

#### JUNIOR

*Social Ethics.* General principles plus Special Ethics, particularly with emphasis on theses now taught in some of the Catholic labor schools. It can be assumed that suicide, duelling, and other kindred subjects are known to be illicit.

*Economics.* With a stress on statistics relating to economic and social conditions.

*Religion and Sociology (Advanced).* Again, philosophic principles and religious dogma to be interwoven with current sociological problems.

*Profit-sharing, Cooperatives, Credit Unions, etc.* A practical course in these topics with emphasis on their scope and present development.

*Advanced English Course.*

#### SENIOR

*The Encyclicals of Leo and Pius.* An intensive and comprehensive course, particularly in regard to *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*. There is hardly a thesis in philosophy that could not be treated within the framework of the encyclicals.

*Socialism, Communism, Liberalism.* With practical application to the movements as they are manifested today in America. The liberalism of organized management and in political trends should not be neglected.

*Advanced Economics.*

*Journalistic English.* With the objective of writing for trade union papers, etc.

*Encyclicals on State, Citizenship, Public Life.*

*Labor Law and Labor Board Procedures.*

*Apologetics.* Ready answers to current anti-Catholic accusations.

We are keenly aware of the fact that this proposed curriculum is open to many objections. It is submitted as neither perfect nor final. We offer it as a possible solution to a very vexing problem.

Considering the trend of the times we see no reason why efforts should not be made *immediately* to have some such curriculum accredited for a degree in industrial relations. Not so very long ago social science, business administration, and other curricula were looked upon with skepticism and at times with cynicism. Their need, however, was finally recognized and steps taken to meet the demands of the day. Is there any law of nature that impels Catholics to be always twenty years behind the times? Many secular universities have already inaugurated such programs and, *mirabile dictu*, Yale and Harvard seem to have incorporated into their schedules the very courses that the unsubsidized, struggling Catholic labor schools have been experimenting with for the past six years.

We feel confident that certain labor leaders, e. g., those in the Steel Workers of America, would welcome the opportunity to cooperate with a Catholic college that would courageously pioneer along these lines.



# The Teaching of High-School Mathematics

WILLIAM C. DOYLE, S. J.

Since Pearl Harbor mathematical periodicals have been full of stinging articles on the complete failure of the high-school mathematics course, brought out so glaringly by the discovery that our young draftees were almost totally illiterate in dealing with decimals and fractions and the simplest equations. Jesuit schools have at least held to the requirement of mathematics for all their students. But the record of our students in many places is not one to make us proud.

Four points are especially emphasized and generally agreed upon as necessary if any improvement is to be made: (1) a clearer conception and definition of objectives; (2) a revision of course content; (3) supervised study type of teaching; (4) homogeneous grouping of students.

Of course the *first* is the most important of these points, because once a clear objective is defined, it is more or less easy to choose subject matter and to teach it in an effective way. Let me comment on a few of the objectives proposed for high-school mathematics.

1. "Learning useful processes and ideas." This objective leads to all sorts of difficulties. To begin with, topics studied in the standard mathematics courses are for the most part quite useless to the average boy or girl. Realization of this fact has led many educators to insist on the need of making as many practical applications as possible, of "socializing" mathematics. In actual practice such an objective becomes so inane that soon reasons are sought, and found, for dropping mathematics from the curriculum.

2. "Inculcation of habits of strict logical reasoning." This objective applies only to Euclid's geometry, and even there its educational value can be questioned, at least for the unprepared mind of the American student in second year of high school. As a matter of fact, most geometry courses are little more than rather fruitless memory lessons. This matter deserves a much fuller discussion.

3. Learning the art of "mathematizing." This word has been coined to bring out the little recognized fact that the processes of mathematics are quite distinctive and should not be confused with logic or mere computation. Mathematics has been defined as the art of thinking with the aid of a pencil. Viewed as such, it has a great educational value and gives the student a training that no other subject ever claims to impart.

It makes him sit down, face a very complex situation, and then more or less by trial and error bring it to the point where it stands out clearly before him on paper. As a result of this experience, oft repeated, he gradually learns how to pull through similar situations in a neat and orderly way. Of course this is an oversimplified statement of the art of "mathematizing." It is not acquired in one year. Nevertheless it has always been the objective of the teacher who really knows mathematics.

The importance of this last objective can hardly be too much emphasized, and the author believes that until this objective is accepted there is no possibility of teaching mathematics successfully. The only valid objection to it is the extreme difficulty of finding a sufficient number of teachers who have the requisite skill to accomplish so ambitious an aim. It is not so much *teaching* skill that is needed. The teacher will have enough if he follows with patience and perseverance the method outlined in the June 1943 QUARTERLY, pages 51-52. Almost anyone can supervise desk work in the classroom, walking about giving individual help, and can administer and correct tests at frequent intervals.

But what is needed more, and that in a rather high degree, is *mathematical* skill. The teacher must above all be a thoroughly enthusiastic mathematician, one who can thrill over a mathematical situation, one who knows the history of mathematics, various approaches to problems and their connection with other mathematical ideas. He must, in a word, be such that the students will look upon him as having the stature of an Einstein. Failing this, it is better to drop mathematics from the curriculum until such men are found.

The acceptance of this aim also completely eliminates any need of worrying about subject matter. Almost any topic is worth while provided the teacher can wax enthusiastic about it and the student learns to "matematize." A well-known engineering scientist, on being asked for advice on the choice of a mathematics course in connection with some engineering field, invariably says: "It makes no difference what mathematics you study; choose what you like best and go into it as deeply as you can." The wisdom of this statement is amply proved by the successful engineers and scientists whose uses of mathematics in their field always come in most unexpected ways. Examples are Steinmetz' use of "i" in alternating current equations, Sommerfeld's application of determinants to quantum mechanics, Einstein's need for non-Euclidean geometry.

Of course the principal may begin to worry about standardizing agencies, national tests, and province examinations. But study for a moment an outline of high-school mathematics.

*Elementary algebra:* linear equations in one and two unknowns; quadratic equations; exponents (two classes).

*Geometry:* facility in dealing with triangles and circles; proportion and similar figures.

*Advanced algebra:* review; progressions; binomial theorem; graphing.

The content here is very meager for three years' work, a fact that allows the ingenious teacher to introduce much related matter that will add interest to the required topics. But then he is faced with a most unfortunate difficulty, the text.

The greatest curse to mathematics teaching is the standardized textbook. Look at any first-year algebra text as an example. The texts are all the same, each author changing the wording and problems sufficiently to escape the charge of plagiarism. Can it be that the American algebra course is so successful that there is no need of variety or change? Certainly results do not point that way! The situation in geometry is far worse. The authors are not so much to blame, however; for the publication of a mathematics text is an expensive project that must have a very wide appeal and sale in order to pay its way.

Rockhurst High School has solved this problem by means of a good duplicator that is easily available to any teacher at any time. It is surprising how little labor the constant use of such a machine involves. In the beginning it was used as a supplement to the textbook. Now textbooks are being dropped completely except as library reserve books. The student is taxed fifty cents a semester to pay for the paper needed and to help purchase texts for the library. The advantage of this system is that the teacher can continually revise his course as he sees cause for it in order to achieve the aim proposed. The author will be glad to send samples of these sheets to anyone who is interested.

It might be well to list some changes that could be made in subject matter without in the least affecting the teaching of a standard course. These topics are listed, it must be confessed, simply because the author does not care for them and has never succeeded in interesting students in them. Other teachers probably have entirely different views.

*Radicals.* The treatment in all texts is much too thorough and abstract. Problems are pointless to the student. This topic can be learned as occasion arises.

*Word problems.* These do not belong to mathematics and it is doubtful that they teach the student to think. Standard examples, however, must be taken in class because they occur in standard tests.

*Factoring.* This can be learned as occasion arises. Only the very simplest cases are of any mathematical value.

*Ratio and proportion.* These belong in geometry or trigonometry.

*Literal equations.* These are too dry and abstract except in more advanced classes.

*Multiplication and division.* These chapters should be omitted. The matter can be picked up in the solution of simple equations by defining what a parenthesis means. Two or three classes might be given to division.

It might be objected that the elimination of these topics from first year really cuts the very heart out of the course. This is not true if you consider the equation as the heart. At least it makes the course so simple that for superior classes much new material must be added. The author is strongly in favor of two topics to fill the gap.

*Graphing.* The treatment of this subject in the standard texts is wholly inadequate. It is extremely important in later advanced courses and vastly more simple and interesting to the student than radicals and factoring.

*Trigonometry.* This can be made interesting to the least capable if tables of three significant figures are used. The right triangle, law of sines, and cosines can be taken.

*Analytic geometry* should by all means be taught in high school. This is being done in many places and the author looks forward to the day when it can be made to replace Euclid's geometry.

A last parenthetical remark must be made about homogeneous grouping. It may be possible to teach English or history to almost any group of boys. It may even be that one who has taught high-school English can attend and learn something new from a first-year English class. But it is quite different with mathematics. The boy either knows how to solve the equation or he does not. If he does know how, he is very much in the way even by his presence in a class that does not know how. He is a distinct disciplinary problem by the fact that he is being held back from progress that he could otherwise make. Heterogeneous grouping in classes of mathematics in the high school is possibly even a worse evil than the textbook "racket."

It is a most extraordinary fact that our school curriculum contains no mathematical idea that is less than two hundred years old. Except in the classroom mathematics is one of the liveliest topics of our age. Why?

# Jesuit College Education after the War

JOSEPH A. WALSH, S. J.

After the war some rather radical changes may be expected in the educational chaos of America. What the nature of these changes will be or on what scale is difficult to say. There are, however, several important questions that face us, and for which we must have a well thought out solution that can be put into immediate effect. Do we, no matter what will be the trend of secular programs, intend to educate; that is, to discipline the intellect and will and emotions? Do we intend to train boys in our high schools and colleges, or are we going to adopt a system drawn up by secular schools which is based essentially on the denial of a spiritual soul, or which is at best agnostic, and considers that, if there is a soul, it is of no importance? Shall we attempt, as we have in the past, to adapt a materialistic system of that kind to our own, the principal aim of which is, we claim, to train men to be able to save their immortal and spiritual souls and achieve some amount of happiness in this life? Is it desirable and prudent to reject a system that has achieved results for centuries past, and experiment with theories, some of which are the output of men who really do not know what education is? Experimenting with unproved theories has been the story of American education for more than a quarter of a century, and the result is that all the theories have broken down. With the advantages and possibilities the present conditions give us for the consolidation and unification of Jesuit education in the United States, and with the opportunities for change that will be offered after the war, shall we be content merely to follow or shall we not take the initiative and conduct our schools ourselves? Finally, do we seriously intend to maintain a real liberal arts course?

The end of education in the schools is the attainment of truth by the arts. Now, truth is the object of the intellect. Consequently it follows that the arts are to be used to train the intellect, not to satisfy and please the senses, still less, merely to impart information. And, if our purpose in education is to train the intellect, we are not to make use of the arts indiscriminately, but of those that are by their nature suited for this purpose; not therefore the useful arts, nor the fine arts, which are an end in themselves, but the liberal arts.

Unfortunately, however, for many years intellectual truth as an end

of education has been practically denied. With the denial of the possibility of attaining truth and the denial even of objective truth, the very end of education became theoretically an impossibility, while in practice the so-called thinkers turned to wanton speculation and spinning of theories more absurd than ever appeared in decadent scholasticism. Educators substituted for intellectual training first, the cultivation and mere delectation of the senses and emotions, and later on, mere factual knowledge and research, which eliminated the hard but necessary activity of creative thinking. The evolution of such standards and aims in education is not difficult to trace. They had their origin as an active process in the intellectual and moral abuses that appeared with the decline of the Middle Ages. The Reformation was a movement not of reform but of revolution and rebellion. In the moral order it aimed at the overthrow of all authority, while in the intellectual sphere it virtually denied objective truth, for it made the individual the interpreter of the Holy Scriptures, where truth, if there is such a thing, must surely be found.

The first reaction to the frivolous speculation of the decadent Middle Ages was the launching of the Renaissance that later proved so disastrous to education. That there were abuses and serious abuses in the schools in the decline of the Middle Ages is a thing no one denies. The liberal arts had been so misused that they became subjects of ridicule, and it was the most natural thing that philosophy, the crown of liberal education, should in turn meet with ridicule. But the best minds of those days realized that the great learning of antiquity had played a tremendous part in the Europe which rose from the Christianized barbarians, and that the profound investigations by the great thinkers of Rome and especially Greece had produced the finest type of learning in Europe in the greatest days of European history. But instead of making use of this heritage in a legitimate way as the great scholars of the Middle Ages had done, the men of the Renaissance, wrongly called humanists, took up the learning of ancient classicism and misused it. They confused the liberal arts with the fine arts. Because the schoolmen of a degenerate day had travestied philosophy and the disciplines of the intellect, the humanists rejected them and deliberately set out to indulge the senses. There was a great revival of interest in the classics, but the effects of the Renaissance have been fatal.

These two movements, the Renaissance and the Reformation, prepared the way for the era of Romanticism that has played such havoc with our civilization and our education. The Romantics deliberately aimed at bringing into disrepute the analytical intellect, which Wordsworth characterized as "the false secondary power by which we multiply distinctions." Failing to penetrate to the permanent, the unchanging, the real, satisfied with the world of sense and emotion, the Romantics saw in man nothing more than

a creature of impulse who must be satisfied. The cultivation of the imagination and the senses was their only aim.

Romanticism was followed very naturally by Realism. Man's nature cannot be changed, and the attempt of the Romantics to live in a world of imagination could only be expected to produce in time certain revolt. But the revolt was again, very naturally, still more strongly in favor of the senses. The intellect had been discredited; so had morality. Realism, accepting the overthrow of the intellect, with equal right rejected the imagination and held up as the only reality that which is perceptible by the senses.

In education this meant the overthrow of philosophy and the disciplines preparatory to philosophy. It meant the insistence on factual knowledge, scientific training, the rejection of the liberal arts, a utilitarian program with vocational training as an end. And this was greatly furthered by the enormous advance in inventions. Man's life and worth are accordingly not estimated by his immortal soul, by which even the lowliest immeasurably transcends the beast, nor by his ability and the success with which he attains to ultimate truth in the natural order and learns such elemental principles as his origin, his condition, his purpose on this earth, but by material success and by what he can achieve in the material world. This is nothing more than pure and crass barbarism and, if such are man's standards of culture, it makes no difference whether he prowls through the jungles in a loincloth or has all the conveniences of an artificial, polite society of the twentieth century; he is no better than the barbarian and the savage.

But, in spite of all this the conviction held that the ancient classics had accomplished something very definite and very desirable in the world, and this conviction was maintained by those who had unfortunately been affected by the Romantic movement. They did not know how to use the liberal arts; they did not believe in them. The Renaissance and the Romantics had advocated the delectation of the senses, and consequently the educationalists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries read the classics not to arrive at intellectual truth but for pure sense delectation, and were in the end able to find nothing more in the ancient classics nor to make any more useful comment than "this is a beautiful passage." Later on the classics became the happy hunting ground for those in quest of the Ph. D. and were studied not for the truth they contained but merely for their by-products.

The end of education, then, to repeat, is truth. And since man can never attain happiness unless his life is founded on truth—unless he knows what man is, his origin and destiny—the attainment of truth is of extreme importance. But the attainment of truth is not the result of mere

wishing or desultory endeavor, but only of hard, consistent, toilsome labor. We may learn and hold true principles on another's authority, but he only has mastered truth, in the natural order, who maintains these principles on conviction from his own investigations. To reach such a goal is not an accomplishment of a few months or even a few years. On the contrary, if the mind is to reach truth it must be directed from earliest years toward truth and seek truth in all that it pursues. This demands that the young mind be severely disciplined and trained to accuracy. It will require hard and consistent training in a well-ordered program of studies made up of subjects that will force a boy to think and think accurately. The role of the student must be that of an inquirer and his training must be neither utilitarian nor directed to the appreciation and enjoyment of the beautiful, but to the finding of the true.

It was to provide this mental discipline that the literatures of ancient Greece and Rome were used. I am not denying by any means the very decided part the great works of these civilizations play in training the emotions and senses and in leading us to the enjoyment and appreciation of true beauty. All our knowledge begins in the senses. Consequently, Plato insists very rightly that the child should from his earliest years, when perception is largely sensory, be reared amid surroundings of true beauty. The fine arts, it is true, if directed and guided by the rational part of man, will arouse in us noble emotions and temper the otherwise savage passions which, when neglected, produce a man but partially developed and lacking in the finer qualities necessary for civilized society. This pleasure and delight we experience in literature when read as a fine art, is not to be confused with the stimulation of the emotions and sensations and catering to the passions. Good rhythm and order, to quote Plato again, are essential factors in beauty. These, however, must be dependent on words, and words in turn on ideas and the disposition of our soul, so that in our quest for beauty we are not guided by the flighty emotionalism of our twentieth-century beauty-seekers or the sordidness of the Realists, but rather by the austere precepts of a well-ordered, disciplined intellect.

Fine arts as such have no part in the liberal arts, and it is very doubtful if anything is accomplished in the so-called courses of appreciation. The fine arts should be, as in the great civilization of the Middle Ages, part of our environment. The child in the medieval town was surrounded by beauty and the products of the fine arts from his first conscious moments. He opened his eyes to the magnificence of great cathedrals or an artistic village church. He listened to the chimes of well-wrought bells and carillons, the peal of a great organ and well-trained choirs singing the praises of God, not in swing music nor jazz nor syncopated melodies, but in the stately rhythms of the Gregorian chant. There was shining armor,



well and artistically wrought, and rich cloth on display in the market place. There were beautiful clothes for men and women, full and amply made, that adorned the body rather than called attention to its shape, and these were made in beautiful colors, for men and women were allowed to admit that there was beauty and even good taste in color. There was beauty for the eye and the ear everywhere; but all this was part of the environment. In school the child learned to discipline his emotions and to train his mind to orderly and right thinking.

Truth was considered, as it should be, the end of education, and truth should be our goal. Consequently, the entire education of the child should be subservient to this end. But the means by which the child ultimately arrives at this truth must be proportionate to his years. We cannot put philosophy before a boy of fifteen or sixteen years, but we can offer subjects suitable to his age and teach him these subjects in a proper manner. We can insist that a boy pronounce correctly. We can teach him the principles of grammar so that he can speak and write correctly, accomplishments in which too many college men, and even our professors, are deficient today. We can teach young men to be exact in their use of words, to be certain they know what the words mean. We can teach them to think accurately and correctly.

The question naturally arises here about the place that foreign languages, whether ancient or modern, hold in education. The purpose of language is to convey ideas, and any language is useful only in so far as it conveys ideas and true ideas. Consequently, languages are studied to get at the ideas their literatures contain. This is the primary and important end; style, rhythm, and aesthetic qualities are secondary. There is besides this first end the disciplinary value of the study of foreign languages, by which we train the mind to accuracy. It is impossible, it seems to me, to emphasize this too much. A mind that is well disciplined will be accurate. It will not be satisfied with something that is near the truth, or more or less correct, but will only find quiet and tranquillity in the attainment of truth. To arrive at truth the mind must oftentimes reason its way through intricacies and complexities. Ideas are often subtle and, as we see from experience, frequently not clearly apprehended or understood. For the mind to be able to follow logically through a complicated and intricate process of thought and arrive ultimately at truth, or to penetrate with surety and certainty into metaphysical concepts, an accuracy is demanded that can only be achieved by a long process of training. This training should be begun as early as possible, and it is while the mind is young that we can discipline it to accuracy by training it in the logical and precise rules of grammar.

Now, the ancient languages serve this disciplinary purpose, it seems

to me, much better than the modern. There is, as we should expect, a great similarity of words, style, and idiom in the modern languages, even in those that are not derived from a common source. Intercommunication between the nations is so common that one language will incorporate words, idioms, and phrases of another. In the next place, the ancient languages are inflected languages, with a well developed, perhaps a complicated syntax and etymology that demand continual attention, concentration, and accuracy on the part of the student. Besides, there is no better way of being certain that a boy grasps the idea in a sentence than by forcing him to put that idea into the idiom of another language. When we can clearly and correctly turn ideas expressed in one language into another we understand those ideas. This is the great value of translation and especially of translation from the vernacular into a foreign language. Moreover, the study of a foreign language, if accuracy is insisted on, will gradually train a boy to read his own language more attentively and critically.

The ancient classics are to be read, as all realize, for their thought, and thought well expressed. The origin of our civilization, our thought and philosophy are rooted in the civilizations of Greece and Rome. Many of our greatest works have been written in these languages, and, since modern scholarship is so insistent on the reading of original documents, it is these great works which have done so much to mold Western civilization, which Catholic saints and scholars have continually employed in the formation of Catholic youth, that we ourselves should study and should put into the hands of our students. Excellent translations have been made, it is true, of most of the great books of antiquity, but we must admit that they can never, no matter how well they have been done, reproduce adequately the original. It is not necessary to consult many translations before discovering not only their deficiencies but the surprising fact that skillful and capable translators give at times interpretations that are almost contradictory. No word nor any language is capable of expressing adequately our thought. A piece therefore will suffer when we attempt to put it into translation. There have been made up to date twenty-seven translations, I believe, of the *Odyssey* into English. If any one of them had been satisfactory would a new translator have gone to the trouble of making a useless addition to the already large number? The language of emotion refuses to be translated. Everyone can appreciate the impossibility of putting into Greek or Latin "I fled Him, down the nights and down the days," or "Sunset and evening star and one clear call for me." It is equally impossible to convert Homer and Sophocles into English, to say nothing of Aeschylus and Pindar.

But we must not exaggerate the inadequacy of translation and the

impossibility of it to convey quite well the idea expressed in another tongue. Translations are inadequate, but to assert that irreparable damage is done to a piece of literature in translating it is a proposition up to the present unproved. St. Thomas transmitted to Europe the riches of Aristotle, which came to him through Avicenna and Averrhoes, in Latin. In our own day Benjamin Jowett, to single out but one, has given us Thucydides in our own language, and his translation has caught something of the emotion of the original. Above all, the evangelists gave us the exquisite teaching of Christ, not in the original language of the Master, but in translation and the world has suffered no loss. It is possible to conceive that had Homer written his story of Troy in English, or his Odyssey in French, he would have produced an epic of equal excellence to that of the Greek. But it would not have been the same as that which he has given us! Perhaps not, but it would have been something equally as good and expressing fairly well what he has left us in Greek.

The contention, then, of some stylists that it is absolutely impossible to experience the subtle emotions of the original in translations or to bring out in them the nice distinctions in words and synonyms or the full force of metaphors is highly exaggerated. Such claims savor of the Sophists and do the classics more harm than good. We can express emotion in every language and can bring out the nice distinctions between words. Metaphors too are effective only while they are fresh. After a short time they lose their original force so completely that men use the words unaware even that they are employing a metaphor. How many who speak of the Axis powers today realize the origin of the word? If they did it would have more meaning in one way, it is true, but the fact is that even this early the word is losing its force as a metaphor. For the vast majority it means nothing except the enemy powers, and like so many other metaphors it will probably pass into the language and in a generation lose its force completely. And it is conceivable that the classic authors used words that were at one time metaphors without feeling the metaphorical force at all. Moreover, it is not an unusual thing to meet foreign-born men, who, coming to this country at about the age of twenty, have lived here for as much as twenty-five years or more, to whom the English language has never become natural. In fact to very few who learn a language after they have reached maturity does it become really natural. They can speak it fluently; they do not hesitate for a word, and they read the literature with real appreciation. But there are idioms, ordinary idioms, that they do not appreciate even though we explain them, and their own language always conveys to them more feeling and emotion than English will. No matter how long they are in this country and speak our language, they will continue to say their prayers and confess in their own tongue.

We must not make a fetish of Latin and Greek. No language is an end in itself, nor have all the best things in the world been written in Latin and Greek. There are some who look upon the classical languages as possessed of magic powers which will achieve their ends no matter how cursorily they have been pursued or how slipshod and inaccurate their study. Latin and Greek are valuable, we may say are necessary, in a real curriculum for their disciplinary powers. But let us be reasonable. Because a work is written in one of these languages it does not follow that it must be perfect or even that it is worth reading.

We are not alone in our superstitious reverence for the classical languages. It is found also in outside schools. If not, why the insistence on the study of Latin to the almost complete exclusion of Greek? Greek is a more perfect language; its disciplinary powers are far superior to those of the Latin. No matter how much originality is claimed for Latin, it must be admitted in the end that Latin is greatly dependent on the Greek. Is there any reason anyone can give for the study of Latin that does not hold *a fortiori* for Greek? If this is the case, then why hold on to Latin instead of Greek? Again, if these languages have any value, why devote but two years to the study of them? That is one of the most stupid accomplishments of our modern education. But, when the North Central and other educational groups were drawing up their schedules some years ago, they decided that each pupil should have so many hours of informative knowledge in this course and that. The result was that these men seriously, without ever appreciating the purpose of studying a language, especially the ancient languages, decided that two years would be enough for any language. Why? Who knows? Certainly not for the mastery of the language. But they never for a moment thought that if a child were well trained and disciplined, he could, on reaching maturity, read with interest and profit and understanding many of the other branches with which they have cluttered up the curriculum.

If we are to train minds and develop thinkers, the whole system of present-day education must be revised. Our present system, aside from its other defects, is psychologically wrong. From the ages of six to ten or eleven is a time when the memory is nearly at its best. During these years it is almost by memory entirely that a child manifests his intelligence. During these years he takes great pride in feats of memory. Consequently, these are the years when he should begin to learn grammatical forms and rules of syntax, without which it is impossible to learn a language. About the age of eleven we see an advance in the manifestation of intellectual life on the part of the child. The memory is very vigorous, it is true, but the child becomes interested now in something more intricate, in finding the solution of a problem. He is concerned in solving

puzzles and in matching his wits with his companions. Merely to repeat what he has learned by memory has now lost some of its fascination; the child has become intrigued by something that calls upon his reasoning faculty. At the age of twelve then he should be taught the intricacies of the Latin and Greek sentence, which can be presented with all the interest of a puzzle.

From this age on till sixteen or seventeen he should be put through this discipline, reading much, but very accurately, so that he learns to construe with almost the same facility and ease as he does his mother-tongue. He should be made to see the various relations of one idea with another, their sequence, their logical coherence, the legitimacy of the conclusions drawn, the accomplishment of the purpose of the author. At the same time he should be taught by much exercise to compose in imitation of the models that he studies. This all requires a teacher who is alert, interested, and active, who in real Socratic fashion will draw the knowledge or the answers from his students by proper questioning. A student so trained and disciplined to think will not rush thoughtlessly at a conclusion. He will be prepared also to do research.

At the age of seventeen or eighteen the intellect becomes more inquisitive, especially the intellect of one well trained. The young man wants to know now the meaning of the world, of man, of nature, to see what others have to say about things, to investigate the phenomena of change and permanency, to challenge the ideas of others, to investigate the truth of their statements. It is here that the great philosophical treasures of antiquity should be opened, not all at once, but prudently, with proper consideration for a boy's development and ability. Reading everything that is good in ancient philosophy indiscriminately at this age is, to say the least, folly. It is also pedagogically unsound. To be able to read these treasures of antiquity in the original, even though it take a bit longer, is far more satisfactory than reading them in translation. However, rather than leave the ancient masterpieces unread it is far better to read them in translation, and it is probable that a renewed interest in the thought will revive an interest in the language that became atrophied in eighteenth-century classicism.

There is much dissatisfaction with the study of Latin and Greek, and rightly so. We have made the study of these languages an end in itself, or we have gone after the by-products, the Roman house, the Greek chiton, or tried to pour unending amounts of factual knowledge of a specialized nature into immature and undeveloped minds during the years when the mind should have been trained and disciplined. Moreover, the study of Latin and Greek has become disagreeable for boys because they do not relish the idea of so much memory work at the age of fifteen or

sixteen, the age at which we commonly begin Greek. For a college freshman to begin the rudiments of Latin and Greek is ridiculous.

And since the preparatory disciplines are in dishonor and almost universally neglected, or since, if they are not neglected, they do not achieve their purpose, is it to be wondered at that philosophy is in dishonor and about to be discredited? Will that be the next branch to be rejected?

When I say that philosophy is in dishonor I do not mean to say that the teachers of philosophy are not interested in their work or that they are not giving their best efforts to the work. The fault is not theirs but the system's. And if the statement is questioned that philosophy is one of the most discredited disciplines in our schools today, I only ask you to listen to the remarks, not the answers to your questions, of the young men on the campus, or of the graduates of a few years back, or better still, the discussions of the philosophical faculties at the meetings of the philosophical associations. It is hardly proper for us to boast about our courses in philosophy. In some of our schools we put everybody through a course, not in philosophy where they are forced to think things out for themselves under the direction of a capable and inspiring teacher, but a set of theses in psychology, logic, and ethics. To call that a course in philosophy where the very essence of philosophy, the study of being, is omitted is absurd. Often we give some lectures, apologetic in purpose rather than with a view to develop the students' powers of thinking and to have them arrive at truth. In this way we do save souls from hell, many souls. That is quite true and it is a blessed work. But by a serious course of studies that would bring well-trained minds to the study of the queen of the sciences, the crown of our education, to which it should all tend, we could do still more.

I believe there is no better preparation for the study of philosophy than the study of Latin and Greek, not for themselves, but for what they give and do. But, I repeat, it is ridiculous to have boys in freshman and sophomore college construing Latin and Greek, or even beginning their training in them. Again, if we are really interested in training and educating rather than in imparting factual knowledge and imitating secular schools, we should get back to the class teacher in the high schools and one teacher for Latin, Greek, and English in the colleges. As many are advocating the shortening of the grade school to six or even five years, would not the return to a seven-year high school, well planned and coordinated, to be begun at the age of ten or eleven, deserve consideration? The training in those years forms a natural unit. This would also make it possible for boys well trained through a solid, seven-year course to enter professional schools at once—medical students would require a year of

specialized science—and thus settle down to beginning their life work and building a home at about twenty-three instead of waiting till they are thirty, as is the case at present.

Some will object that this will mean a very decided decline in the enrollment of our liberal arts colleges. It will; but honestly, will not the decline be for the better? If we turn out but fifteen or twenty men a year from each of our colleges who are capable thinkers, men who will read and be able to write, who can, because of their training, meet successfully contemporary problems, are we not contributing much to the good of mankind? Will not the prestige of the Society be greatly increased? At present it is rather appalling to discover how many men graduating from our colleges have never read a book except what they were forced to read for class and who never read a book the rest of their lives, or to find how many are unable to write a good paragraph. Lecturing is never going to produce writers or thinkers, but only a well-ordered curriculum, sufficiently difficult and well taught. If boys and young men unwilling to study insist on going to college, let us try to find some department for them rather than the college of liberal arts, some other means of certifying their attendance at college than a bachelor's degree.

We constantly talk about our heritage; we claim that our traditions in education are the only ones that are sound. And we speak the truth. Others outside the Church admit it. Many of the men in service today write back to us and thank us for the course we have given them. Many of the officers in the Army and Navy compliment our students on their training. How much more effective we might be if we were to get back to our traditions. The matter itself is serious enough to justify extreme measures and radical opposition to any form of education that is not sound. It is nothing else than the salvation of the world and of souls. And if we are ever going to accomplish anything, it is not by adopting, wholly or partially, present-day standards or trying to make our colleges and high schools fit in with them, nor by trying to get back to what we had fifty years ago. It is true, as someone has well said, that we have during these years of pressure acted as a brake to keep the educational world from going over a precipice, but we must do more now. The reform must be deeper, more radical. We must get back to the educational ideals of the early Society rather than to those of the restored Society. The Society was reborn under conditions where she had to fight for existence. We must fight today, but our struggle is different. We must oppose our ideals to the standards that everyone admits are uncertain at the very best. We have the means; we have the traditions. When the opportunity comes let us attempt to put these traditions into practice again.

# BOOKS

---

**Christianity and Classical Culture.** By Charles Norris Cochrane. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Pp. vii, 523. £1/13.

This is one of the outstanding books of the twentieth century. To say that the author's knowledge of his subject is vast, precise, profound is true enough. More significant it is to say that Mr. Cochrane's vast, precise, profound knowledge is of a subject which touches more nearly than any other the fundamental issues of thought and action. There are two facts in the world: Christianity and classical or pagan culture. What are we to think of them?

The debacle of classical culture was a moral and intellectual failure, not merely social, economic, or political. The Roman mind could not come to grips with a material fact, and that was due to a radical defect in classical thinking.

The Romans, after the Greeks, conceived power as a combination of virtue (art, character, industry) and fortune (fate, the gods). Now, there is no necessary connection between virtue and fortune. "How have the wicked prospered?" The absence of such a relationship caused a partial obscurantism which classical reason strove to eliminate, and in part did, but the forest was always eating into the farm. Barbarism, when not fenced in, was only fenced out. Hence, classical culture was dominated by the fear of the unknown, as is evidenced by the Romans' cult of luck, astrology, and gnosticism. The classical ideal was to overcome barbarism by fortune and virtue. It was not done. It cannot be done.

Christianity cut to the root of the classical ideal by its dogma of the Trinity, a creative source of being, of thinking, of willing. Exit all fortune, good or bad, which is *not* from God. For Christians, the unknown remains unknown, though it is no longer feared. Furthermore, having exorcised the bogeys of classical hells, Christianity let in every good thing upon the sole condition that Christians should accept the terms of the admission of every good thing. Let Augustine epitomize those terms:

We assert that the human will is so far assisted by divine aid in the accomplishment of justice that, over and above the fact that man is created with the power of voluntary self determination, over and above the teaching from which he derives precepts as to how he ought to live, he also receives the Holy Spirit, whereby there is engendered (*fiat*) in his mind the love for and delight in that supreme and imitable good which is God, even now while he still walks by faith and not yet by sight; that, this being given to him as a free offering, he may be inflamed with desire to approach to participation in that true light.

Thus are censured the Pelagians, "classical" Christians who thought that it was only the world which was made by God, whereas the rest is



now made by the world, God Himself doing nothing. Nor need we imagine Augustine's comment upon the Yankee "God helps those who help themselves." Augustine makes it without leaving us to conjecture: "God helps those who do *not* help themselves in order that they *may* help themselves." Perhaps you will wish the original. Here it is: *Intende igitur, inquam, in haec, quae secuntur; diligenter et pie, quantum potes; tales enim adjuvat Deus. Quod non ita intelligendum est, quasi tantummodo tales adjuvat, cum enim etiam adjuvat non tales, ut sint tales, id est ut diligenter et pie quaerant: tales autem adjuvat, ut inveniant* (Retract., 1. 12, 4, 5, *Corpus*. . . .) (I'm sure Professor Cochrane would be glad to know about, if he does not know already, an even greater, if possible, theologian's epitome of the terms of Christian living—St. Thomas Aquinas' *Contra Gentiles*, IV, 22, *cum autem voluntas*. . . .)

Such, if I mistake not, is Professor Cochrane's central thesis. The impact of it, stuffed as it is with rich, meaty analyses of classical and Christian authors, should be overwhelming. I do not see how the job could be improved, unless these two suggestions might help thereto. First, Professor Cochrane should not say he refuses as an historian to pronounce upon the validity of Christian claims (p. VI); his own work belies his statement, so also does the "going over" he gives Herodotus and Thucydides. Secondly, expressions like "in this connection," "from this viewpoint," "thus envisaged," which recur constantly, seem to mar slightly an otherwise excellent style. To substitute for the *expression*, say "in this connection," the connection itself, would save the reader constant re-reading. Lastly—this is a third suggestion not thought of until now—Mr. Cochrane would help his reader by defining once and for all, in a footnote, what he means by the adjective "fresh." All three suggestions are trifling. They are made only because the book is *so* good.

GERARD SMITH, S. J.

**In Touch with God.** By Bakewell Morrison, S. J. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1943. Pp. vii, 184. \$1.75.

Another of Father Morrison's contributions to adult understanding of Catholicism in his latest book *In Touch with God*. The sub-title gives a summary of its contents: Prayer, Mass, and the Sacraments.

In easy conversational style, interspersed with apt illustrations from life, the author discusses as he would with one of his college students the nature and necessity of prayer. His analysis of the psychology of sacrifice, and its application to the Sacrifice of the Mass, is excellent—the best chapter in the book. A second chapter on the Mass, its significance to us, brings the great act into the daily life of the reader by relating the deep truths taught in the principal stages of the Sacrifice to truly "sacrificial

living." This important chapter could have been made more effective through a more fully rounded development of its theme. Again, the author notes that lack of realization of what the Redemption means to us is the principal reason for so many indifferently Catholic lives. He analyzes the defect which we all deplore, but fails to mention one of the most effective means of overcoming this apathy of Catholics—a vivid presentation of the liturgy of Advent with its soul-rending cries of prophets for the Redeemer to free them from bondage. The Church's dramatization of this yearning, as of the mysteries of Christ's life, has in view precisely the effecting of realization.

The most noteworthy feature of the author's treatment of the Sacraments is the abundance of very practical advice for their use and against their abuse. One wishes, however, that he had given cumulative value to his advice by greater unity of theme. Had he thought through more thoroughly the presentation of his whole subject matter, each precious bit of advice, from ripe wisdom acquired through many years as teacher, counsellor, and confessor, would have the value it deserves. Although he apparently was laying the foundation for this unity in the chapters on sacrifice and sacraments in general, the lack of a sufficiently dominating theme to vitalize the whole presentation in the remainder of the work leaves the reader with a sense of incompleteness. Those who are acquainted with the excellent work of unification done in some of the works on the Mystical Body will surely be disappointed with the accidental unity to be found here. The reader may further be disturbed by some serious defects in editing—occasional distracting punctuation, chapter subheadings which are misleading, and even a chapter—"The Sacrament of Penance: Qualities"—which does not seem to fulfill its promise.

It would be unfair, however, to allow these defects to influence one's judgment of what the book does, and does well. It gives a fund of wise and prudent counsel and instruction about prayer, Mass, and the Sacraments which will profit any layman who reads it.

A. PATRICK MADGETT, S. J.

**The Philosophy of American Education.** By John T. Wahlquist. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1942. Pp. 379. \$3.25.

The author of this useful volume, who is dean of the School of Education of the University of Utah, set himself an interesting task. He decided to write a textbook for a course in the philosophy of education built upon the three rival philosophies championed by leaders in American educational practice and accepted by large groups of teachers and administrators. These three systems of thought he labels the Idealist, the Realist, and the Pragmatist.

He believes that the philosophical assumptions underlying the more obvious issues in education deserve to be studied by students of the science of education. His purpose was not to propose and gain adherence to one position, but to make it convenient for a professor to examine with his class the several important positions American teachers and administrators have adopted. He thinks (and we agree with him without hesitation) that a teacher ought to examine all the implications of both his theory and his actual methodology. This book, then, is a workbook; it abounds in generous quotations from Bagley, Counts, Dewey, Finney, Hutchins, Judd, Kilpatrick, Rugg, Thorndike, and many other present-day contributors to the lively discussions that characterize every phase of contemporary American education.

The plan of the book will appeal to most. Dean Wahlquist, after justifying his decision to write this kind of volume, attempts a rather skimpy review of the history of philosophy to show that idealism, realism, and pragmatism embrace the views of the great names in the history of human thought; and he then sets forth, in a chapter devoted to each, what he understands by the three schools—idealism, realism, and pragmatism. These systems are explained in contemporary terms, as they are exemplified in the works of influential American educators.

Wahlquist then takes up, again in a chapter each, the type of elementary school, high school, and university that answers to the preferences of the Idealist, the Realist, and the Pragmatist. He includes the criticism each makes of the other's type of schooling, a procedure which makes reading the book rather exhilarating. It is like a continuous round-table discussion, with no blows barred. He then shows the implications of each outlook when applied to educational administration and supervision, to measurements and evaluations, to intelligence testing, and to the general topic of "school and society."

Our Catholic educational philosophy would fall under the heading of Idealism. Wahlquist's exposition of this position is about what one would expect from an unfriendly critic who is trying to be objective; the likeness he draws is a very pale imitation of the real thing. He describes Idealism as a system of beliefs in transcendentals, in an "unseen world," in an after-life, in man's soul, in education as a preparation for life after death. To find an important American educator who answers to this rather horse-and-buggy-era type, Wahlquist takes us back to the late William T. Harris (1835-1909), United States Commissioner of Education. Idealism fares better, however, in later chapters.

The Realist group consists largely of the standard-bearers of science in education. They are the least philosophical of the lot; in fact, they want to get away from all this airy tomfoolery about theories and get their teeth

into nice big juicy slices of *facts*. They have an affinity with the Idealists in believing in objective reality to which men must conform their actions unless they want to get hurt. They do not think the universe is putty in the hands of seven-year-olds. In fact, they regard the "child-centered school" as about as fantastic as a seminary. They have a fatal weakness, however, for quantitative measurements. The exponents of this system (Wahlquist is right in making philosophers out of these pooh-poohers of philosophy) range all the way from the comparatively satisfactory type of Charles Judd, through the hosts of statisticians and analysts like Terman, Cattell, Monroe, Breed, and Charters, to the ultra-materialist psychologist, Thorndike. They are the devotees of *science* in various shapes and forms.

Finally, we have to account for the Pragmatists. The slogan of this group is that schools and teachers should *let the natural tendencies of children unfold without outside restraint*. They believe in "growth," in "freedom," in the "child-centered school"; they oppose discipline, the imposition of hard-and-fast *content* requirements, and even the classification of educational matter according to subjects. They pride themselves on being practical; their boast is that their system, and only theirs, really *works*. It *works* because it adjusts children to contemporary American society. In fact, they turn a school into nothing more than another segment of contemporary American society where people (in this case children) follow their natural bent, work and/or play as fancy suggests, and in this way *live*. If you want to get on a Pragmatist's nerves, intimate that school is a *preparation* for life. He puffs and rejoins, "School, on the contrary, *is* life." Children learn in school as they learned before they came to school and will have to continue to learn after they leave school; namely, by doing. *Solvitur ambulando*. What the child is interested in is interesting.

The exponents of this system—called Progressivists since the organization of the Progressive Education Association in 1918—count Rousseau, Herbart, and Froebel as their godfathers, and the late Francis W. Parker, and C. W. Eliot, J. L. Merriam, John Dewey, Harold Rugg, Boyd Bode, William Kilpatrick, Thomas Briggs, George Counts, J. L. Childs, and others as their leading spirits. Teachers' College has cradled Progressivists for the whole country.

What does all this add up to, for us Jesuit educators?

First, we have to remember that these people have the public school system in mind. The premises of that system are secularistic. As Wahlquist says, speaking of the Idealist attack on overreliance on quantitative measurements: "Obviously, the religious note was rarely mentioned in the controversy; public school matters must be fought on another front" (p. 242). As far as high schools, colleges, and universities are concerned (the units with which we have most to do), we must keep in mind that they

are searching for a type of education adapted to all the children of all the people. Our classical system gives our schools a much more specialized function. We do not attempt to shoulder the burden of mass education, of both boys and girls. Our schools are also free from political control. As a result, public school administrators face twenty-five problems for every one we face regarding questions of curricula, discipline, and other central issues in education. They are vague about the ends of human life, and hence they are vague about the means, of which education is one of the most important. They are apt to be tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine.

Secondly, American educators are much more self-critical than we may think. The Essentialists have challenged the Progressivists. Hutchins, Adler, Bagley, and to a lesser but still very important extent, Judd, Gideonse, and others, have criticized the "child-centered school" somewhat as we would. But *timeo Danaos*. Hutchins makes the rather preposterous claim that "the heart of any course of study designed for the whole people will be, if education is rightly understood, the same *at any time, in any place, under any political, social, or economic conditions.*" Plato in the *Laws* (Books VII and VIII) proposes a scientific curriculum, for the very sound reason that the humanities had not yet been developed in Greece. In the Christian era, education received a completely new orientation because of the historical fact of the Incarnation and all its consequences in human life. With the development of scholastic philosophy in the Middle Ages and of the national vernaculars somewhat later, education found new tools at hand. The natural sciences, and then the social, came later. So even in regard to available content education depends on the evolution of human cultures. In Plato's day no education could have been based on the "Great Books" because in Greece there were so few of them. I omit the circumstance that there were no *books* (in our sense) of any kind.

But what about adaptation of education to the needs of students in adult life? Pius XI defines education as consisting "essentially in preparing man for what he must be and do here below, in order to attain the sublime end for which he was created . . ." I think the higher one goes in the level of education, the more specialized this adaptation should become, according to each student's interests, talents, strength, and financial resources. It is not a question merely of saving one's soul, but of being fitted to achieve the maximum of good for others and of happiness for oneself open to one here below, in the United States of 1943. An education which gives this preparation will differ from one country to another, from one period to another in each country, and even under different "political, social, and economic conditions." To say that a farm boy, who

intends to spend his life farming, should get the very same college education as a boy who envisages the priesthood in an urban diocese as his calling, does not make sense to me. Hence I sympathize, for example, with Harry Gideonse's criticism of Hutchins. Hutchins does not sufficiently appreciate the role of *experience* in human life. He cannot even understand a great thinker like Edmund Burke who does, as is obvious in Hutchins' article in *The Review of Politics* for April 1943.

I think that we Catholics, and we Jesuits, can learn from both Realists and Pragmatists. We have learned from Realists the value of scientific accuracy in measurements. We use placement tests in our schools. We can improve our techniques of teaching in almost every branch by consulting studies that believers in scientific education have carried on. From Pragmatists the officials in our schools can learn to democratize their methods of administration by giving teachers more of a voice in making decisions and policies. We can learn the value of flexibility, the value of judiciously adapting our curricula to the needs of students (as we are actually doing), the value of letting students express themselves more freely than they were allowed to in the past (as we are actually doing), and the value of a generally freer atmosphere. Toeing the line is not the only ideal of education for us, as some of our European brethren have been finding out. They have come to realize that there is something wrong with a system of discipline so rigid that few students from our own colleges ever ask for admission to the Society. The plain truth is that our schools have to reflect, in some degree, the tone of the *milieu* in which we work. We are alive to the need for a stronger *social* emphasis. If we make this accommodation with an acceptance of the principle behind it, we are so far forth pragmatists. It would be too bad if we were not.

Lastly, we are getting support from outside quarters. We felt greatly disadvantaged and wronged by the mere quantitative standards applied to us some years ago by accreditation agencies. Who led the attack on these quantitative standards? Our friends from Morningside Heights. The Pragmatists, the Progressivists, deny that you can evaluate either an individual or an institution by piece-meal measurements; e. g., of sizes of endowment, faculty, classes, library facilities, and so on. They ask: "What is this school interested in? What is it trying to do? What community-interests is it trying to serve?" They judge us in the light of *what we want to do*, not what the Realists think we *ought* to want to *be*. The Pragmatists have led the attack on intelligence tests as the sole criterion of the standing of students.

On the other hand, the Realists are comparatively conservative in the face of the radicalism of the Progressivists. They have no flair for ideologies.

Bagley has himself become, as Dean Wahlquist says, "the great critic of American education." With Herman Horne, Henry Morrison, and the late Ellwood Cubberley and Ross Finney, he believes in content, believes in the traditional American school.

Besides administrators and professors of education, it seems to me that professors of philosophy might well interest themselves in this book. They could make their instruction of lay teachers and religious more relevant to education.

ROBERT C. HARTNETT, S. J.

**Universities Look for Unity: An Essay on the Responsibilities of the Mind to Civilization in War and Peace.** By John Ulric Nef. New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1943. Pp. 42.

Mr. Nef, professor of economic history at the University of Chicago, is serving that school in its academic planning, especially on the graduate level. It has seemed to this reviewer for several years that he may prove to be the best educational thinker in the Hutchins' set at Chicago.

This brochure is chiefly about graduate scholarship and graduate schools. Many ideas of high value crowd its pages. They are constructive ideas, humane, usually definite, and forcefully expressed. Mr. Nef can write as well as think, though his writing sometimes fails before the pressure of his ideas and their associations.

The main thought of this essay can be summed up in a chain of topical paragraphs.

1. Scholars (and artists; I wish for unity's sake that he had left them out!) have responsibilities to the world. From them men derive ideals of humane living, of ordered democracy, and all that these things connote. The gains of battle merely provide the occasions and the time for the cultural works of peace. The issues of the war are not decided on battlefields. Thinkers are responsible to the fighting men and to the people for winning or wasting the fruits of victory.

2. But at present scholars are not able to meet this responsibility, for the graduate schools have not humanely and rightly educated them. Hence they have not the spiritual treasure within themselves to give to men. Worse still, the public and the government feel that they have little to contribute to civilization except in technical scientific fields. Hence the war's demands for man power have declared a moratorium on graduate education.

3. Reformation of graduate studies, not a moratorium, is the right policy. Unless this is undertaken now, nothing will ever be done.

4. The aim of this restoration must be to impart general and humane culture to graduate students; to unify their knowledge, to make them

educated men and not just educated economists or educated chemists, etc. Thus, they will be fitted to be thinkers who are leaders of men.

5. Among the means of restoration Mr. Nef suggests philosophy courses as mandatory in all graduate curricula, but still more so a philosophical outlook and attitude in many nonphilosophical courses. He suggests the cooperation of many departments in the instruction of graduate students and in integrating those students' knowledge. He suggests more preference for the study and research of problems other than the technical advance in atoms of rare scholarly lore. To implement these views further, he details a plan for a really comprehensive graduate examination both for masters' and doctors' degrees. One third of such an examination would always be in philosophy. These ideas on means, the writer works out most fully and most promisingly for the concentration field of history.

It is a brave little essay. Mr. Nef himself knows that it will take courage to carry it through. But he has not spoken the last word on integration and on humanizing the universities. He speaks of educational responsibilities, he uses the phrase "Christian humanism," he hopes that a university of this type will deserve well of God. But it would seem that a fearless, uncompromising educator and thinker would say forthright that no thinker and no university meets its responsibilities, nor imparts Christian humanism, nor deserves well of God until it restores to its halls and to its examinations a loving knowledge of the mind and example of Christ.

BERNARD J. WUELLNER, S. J.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

**The Philosophy of Being.** By Henri Renard, S. J. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1943. Pp. 251. \$2.50.

An extended and, on the whole, favorable review of this work in planograph edition appeared in the March 1943 edition of the *QUARTERLY*, pages 264-66. The work has now been included in the Science and Culture Texts.

This is a very substantial first course in Thomistic metaphysics. As a purist text in Thomism, the work will stand in most interesting contrast to other English texts now being used in Catholic colleges. I do not suppose that a single sentence of the text or the organization of the materials has been changed since the appearance of the planographed edition. The writer has added a foreword in which he takes gracious cognizance of the comments which this *QUARTERLY* made, and tries to warn other teachers against impressions which the reviewer had formed of the work.

The makeup of the book gives it a convenient size. But the text and print are really crowded, and too small in type font. Other Bruce books



have fared better on makeup. The preface by the General Editor of the Science and Culture Texts is somewhat unfortunate; it moralizes about a metaphysics book, and it speaks of the theologian, De la Taille, as a scholar in Thomist philosophy, and of the eclectic, Adler, as a Thomist.

B. J. W.

**The Exemption of Religious in Church Law.** By Joseph D. O'Brien, S. J. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1943. Pp. xvii, 307. \$3.75.

This scholarly work by Father O'Brien, professor of Canon Law at Alma College, Alma, California, fills a need that has been felt for many years, but particularly since the publication of the new Code of Canon Law (1918). It is an authoritative, complete, and interestingly written exposition of all the phases of the exemption of religious. In this country, where so many schools and universities are conducted by religious, Father O'Brien's study will be found especially pertinent and illuminating. The extensive bibliography of sources, authors, and periodicals puts us in touch with the best that has been written on this important and difficult subject. Certainly all Jesuit libraries should have a copy of this book.

E. B. R.

**Pius XII on World Problems.** By James W. Naughton, S. J. New York: America Press, 1943. Pp. xxiv, 199. \$2.00.

This useful collection of what Pope Pius XII has said on world problems is of more than usual interest at this time when discussions of the future peace are heard on every side. There can never be too many books that present the calm and authoritative pronouncements of the Holy Father. They should be disseminated widely. Fair-minded non-Catholics would profit immensely by being brought into contact with this book. But first of all Catholics should make the papal messages their own. Jesuits who are serving on peace and reconstruction committees or teaching college classes or conducting sodalities will want to know at first hand Father Naughton's orderly presentation of Pius XII's public and private utterances on the problems of today.

F. P. A.

Father Charles M. O'Hara's "Survey of Enrollments, 1943-44" will appear in the March QUARTERLY.

# Correspondence

## Preserve Recorded Appreciation of Our Schools

Dear Editor:

Whenever Jesuits get together these days, we hear them telling of glowing tributes paid to Jesuit education by alumni in the Armed Forces or by Army and Navy students now being trained in our institutions. It is all very heartening and encouraging.

But is there not in these tributes a value for the future which may be lost unless we are aware of it and alert to take advantage of it? That is to say, in the postwar period will not these spontaneous expressions of approval of our educational work received from our alumni, our product, be the best type of argument to present to students choosing a high school or a college, and to their parents? If we can show them a sheaf of such testimonies, actual quotations from letters written by specific officers and men in the various branches of the Services or carefully recorded statements gleaned from their conversations or testimonies volunteered by this and that superior officer regarding the high caliber of the Jesuit graduates who were under their command, will we not persuade them, or at least many of them, more readily than by the most cogent of our academic arguments that our school is the school for them? At the weakest, will not these testimonials be a strong support to the best plea we can make for Jesuit education?

If all this be true, then it would seem to be wise and prudent for each Jesuit institution to appoint one member of the faculty to gather and record the words of these witnesses along with the name and position of the man making the statement, and to preserve them carefully for future use.

JULIAN L. MALINE, S. J.  
West Baden College  
West Baden Springs, Indiana

## "Blueprint for a College"

Dear Editor:

I realize quite well that Father Thurston Davis' "Blueprint for a College" (QUARTERLY, October 1943), presents a tentative program, but the slighting of medieval history, which does not appear formally in the program and is merely included as background material for the Latin Averrhoist controversy, gives me cause for some concern. That a Catholic

college destined to produce enlightened Catholic leaders should disregard well over a thousand years of Catholic history is quite inconceivable.

During the medieval period the Church did its greatest cultural work. It built a new Europe out of a disintegrated Rome and laid the educational foundations of Western thought. It developed the "Western man" and provided him with a magnificent Catholic heritage and morality. It fashioned a culture whose vitality continues to influence even our own day. Certainly this great work must be known by the Catholic leader and evaluated in reference to the historical setting in which it was accomplished. At a time when modern non-Catholic scholars of culture and politics seek more and more the answers to present-day problems in the history of the medieval age, it would be rash for the Jesuit educator to relegate this entire history to a position in which it becomes mere background material for an academic controversy. After all, the Thomistic-Averrhoist debate in the thirteenth century is in last analysis a family squabble, with no direct bearing on the general course of medieval history.

If therefore your goal in education is to produce Catholic leaders, hold fast to medieval history. A few reasons will make this quite evident. Medieval history is a Catholic history, with Catholic actors, in a Catholic setting. It is a mighty synthesis of Catholic endeavor. Secondly, it holds the key to many of the problems that confront scholars in other disciplines. Thirdly, it is one of the most controverted periods of Western history, and our apologetic success in defending the Faith is often measured in direct proportion to our ability to discuss intelligently the medieval panorama. Finally, it is one of the richest periods of human achievement, whether considered from a theological, philosophical, political, or cultural angle. The world of our day seeks feverishly for ideals in private and public life, and nowhere are these ideals more clearly sculptured than in that period which saw the welding and civilizing of a Roman-pagan world that began life anew with a completely Catholic philosophy of living.

Our Catholic leader may speak with the tongue of Demosthenes, and have Cicero's power of expression, but if he cannot discuss intelligently such topics as the Inquisition, medieval education, the "Unam Sanctam," the "Babylonian captivity," and the Crusades, to give but a few examples, he will not long command respect as an educated Catholic, for these are *clichés* of the modern attack on medieval "clericalism" and "obscurantism." The Catholic leader must be conversant with the Catholic tradition—and that certainly includes the Middle Ages.

The Popes of our times have given us the lead in these matters. They have insisted on the pre-eminent importance of a sound philosophy that will provide us with a rational foundation for our Faith. They have insisted on a deep understanding of the whole Catholic tradition so that the

scholars of the Church never again find themselves philosophically and historically unprepared, as they certainly seem to have been on the eve of the Modernist upheaval. And Modernism, as Mourret has said, was as much an historical as a religious heresy, drawing its arguments from a garbled history of the early and medieval Church. We should have such papal directives in mind when we conceive of our ideal college.

JOHN ARTHUR KEMP, S. J.  
West Baden College  
West Baden Springs, Indiana

Dear Editor:

On the Contributors' page of the October issue of the *QUARTERLY* you indicate concerning Father Davis' article that you hope discussion may be aroused which will even reach your office. Here is one piece of discussion of the article which I hope reaches even the pages of the magazine.

It appears to me that in our educational planning for the postwar world, we should be at least as realistic as were the Fathers of the old Society in their "blue-printing" for the postwar Reformation world where they campaigned. It can be demonstrated, I believe, that the Jesuits who wrote the *Ratio* chose a curriculum on the basis of need and usefulness. "Eloquentia" was a *sine qua non* for a hearing in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. Eloquentia is still a necessity today, if one is to be heard, but the modern eloquentia must have a different basis.

In attempting to produce Catholic lay leaders one might be deceiving himself sadly if he assumed that a formula which once produced leaders will continue to do so. The Society in America has followed much of the plan offered by Father Davis through most of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century. We had small colleges then with excellent opportunity for integration of courses as well as teacher-student contact. Yet we did not produce an astonishing number of leaders. Of course, one must not forget that the Church and the laity were then still in the pick and shovel stage. Also, it must not be asserted that the system produced no leaders. It did. However, not in the quantity nor perhaps the quality desired.

Specifically, my objection to the plan, so neatly proposed, might be formulated thus: Why should one subscribe to a curriculum in which almost 50 per cent (actually six hours less than half) of the emphasis is on language study? Our world is, and for our lifetime will remain, one in which the paramount problems are of a social character. Can a man who puts thirty-six (of a possible eighty-four) hours of his college career on languages be expected to cope as a leader with social problems? Or are we to accept as *de fide* that there is some unique value in language

studies which will make some sort of subtle transfer of training immediately possible?

Let me hasten to assert that no Jesuit, I think, is seriously opposed to the study of languages, both ancient and modern. We all know the value of such study from long years of having been trained in them. Nor does any of us disregard the value of the ideological content of the Greek and Latin classics or of the classical pieces of any language. Obviously, again, we are all aware of the prime importance of facility in modern languages in a world which will be more closely knit. But are these as important as economic and social problems in the training of selected groups of leaders, in fact very, very select groups as Father Davis proposes them? Would the training proposed prepare a Catholic adequately to take his place as a leader in the world before him? I am not forgetting the courses to be offered in "theology" and philosophy.

"From where I sit," Father Davis is begging the question. It seems to me that we Jesuits, who hold the most powerful position in Catholic education in this country, should have a better program to offer—"journalism and creative writing, the theater, the radio, social work, labor-union leaders, politics, school and university teachers," to repeat Father Davis—than a blind belief in an almost infallible efficacy of language study.

I often think, in my own simple way, that we are playing the old head in the sand game which the French provinces played previous to the French Revolution. We then had, in France, hundreds of endowed schools where we pounded *Eloquentia* into thousands of little Jacques Bonhommes. We made the intellectual leaders of the French Revolution, indeed, but they were false leaders. Can I at least propose as a theory that the Jesuits then failed to realize the needs of their day? Their problems were social just as ours. The difference is only one of degree. For us seriously to propose to produce leaders from Father Davis' formula seems a repetition of our eighteenth-century mistake in France. We should learn by experience.

I should like to repeat: I am convinced that the Jesuits who composed the *Ratio* were not believers in the infallible efficacy of language study. They conducted a survey to determine the needs of their time. They discovered that the ancient classics were a solution. They might have taken astronomy as a core had it been considered as useful as the classics. Were they to survey our situation, I am sure they would not produce a curriculum so foreign to our needs. Large in the scheme would loom economics, history, philosophy, political science and theory, mathematics, and religion. Would that we were as brave!

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY, S. J.  
St. Louis University  
St. Louis, Missouri

**Gerard Manley Hopkins**

Dear Editor:

A commemorative volume of essays for the one hundredth anniversary of Gerard Manley Hopkins' birth (1844) is being projected by several American Jesuits. Any member of the Assistancy who would care to contribute an article of some length on a specific aspect of Hopkins' poetry or prose is invited to communicate with me. Copies of mimeographed bibliography of about 140 writings which have appeared on Hopkins are available. This bibliography is the work of Messrs. R. V. Schoder (Chicago Province) and William T. Noon (New York Province).

NORMAN WEYAND, S. J.  
Loyola University  
Chicago 26, Illinois

**Sociology**

To the Editor:

I should like to raise the question of making the course in general sociology obligatory for all our college students. The present social crisis has shown conclusively the need of a scientific knowledge of society and of the social processes by a far greater number of our people. We can hope to influence more deeply the social life in America only if we have more Catholic laymen with a better knowledge of the social sciences. Since the arts course embraces some physical science and the scientific course includes some of the arts, why should not both courses include a course in social science to give a cross section of all the realities of the universe?

At best we Catholics find it hard to receive a hearing from our non-Catholic brethren. But the task of making America understand the meaning of a true social order is made doubly hard by the lack of a sufficient number of Catholic laymen to proclaim the true doctrine. Between the course in ethics and that in general sociology for all our students, we would, I feel, soon exercise a far greater influence in American social life than we do today.

JOHN J. O'CONNOR, S. J.  
Canisius College  
Buffalo, New York

**Summer Schools for Teachers**

Dear Editor:

When our philosophers have finished their *De Universa Philosophia*, their thoughts immediately turn to the very practical consideration of teaching class, either in high school or college. During their seven years of training they have had little time to give to pedagogical methods.

Consequently, they come out from philosophy with the greatest enthusiasm, but also vaguely aware that enthusiasm is a poor substitute for training in practical pedagogy, effective methods of discipline, actual organization of subject matter, and a certain amount of information which is necessary for successful teaching.

Hence the natural questions in the mind of a new regent are: Will I be a success at the teaching profession? How can I best prepare for successful teaching before entering the classroom?

The Society provides a summer school to help these men. The time is short, and so only fundamental notions regarding subject matter and methods can be taught. The selection of the right men to conduct the summer-school courses is therefore of first importance. The point of this letter is to suggest that the staffs of our summer schools for regents be composed, in the main, of men who have just finished their first year of theology. These men are fresh from regency and have had a year in which to think over their successes and failures, the methods they used, the problems they met, the plans they have for the future; in a word, the beneficial experiences of scholastic teaching.

Some of the provinces have employed first-year theologians in the summer schools in a limited way, and have found that their sober yet enthusiastic influence on the young teachers has been indeed fruitful. These provinces have felt that those who have just finished tertianship are too far away from the problems of the regency and that those who hold administrative positions find it difficult to come down to the practical needs and problems of the new teacher. It is not intended, of course, that fathers who have had a long and successful career as teachers should be excluded from the regents' summer school. Far from it. They should be there to direct the work of the first-year theologians.

To summarize the suggestion put forward in this letter, I represent the conviction of many of my contemporaries and of many older men when I urge the consideration of first-year theologians as teachers in our regency summer schools. They will have faced, just a year before, most of the trying problems which a new teacher ordinarily must face, and they have found practical solutions for these problems. Their knowledge and experience will be of inestimable value to any scholastic who is about to start his career as a teacher in the schools of the Society.

J. JOSEPH RYAN, S. J.  
Weston College  
Weston, Massachusetts

**Medieval Research Institute**

Dear Editor:

Some of the previous issues of the *QUARTERLY* have made suggestions for establishing special research departments in our universities. Unfortunately, these suggestions have been rather vague and have not been emphasized sufficiently. It is with the hope that some thoughtful attention will be devoted to this important question that I am writing this letter.

While it is true that our graduate schools have excellent departments in philosophy, history, social work, and science, for some reason they are neglecting a line of study in which Jesuits should be leaders. That subject is medieval literature. At least one of our universities, it seems to me, should institute a department of medieval literature whose aim at first would be not so much to teach as to do research and publish the findings of this research.

A group of young Jesuits could be selected to devote their time to a thorough study of the background of the medieval period. A man versed in classical languages, another in English, and a third in modern languages could be chosen and sent to the university sponsoring this work. Living in the same community, they could then delve deeply into the literature, each in his own particular phase, but always in correlation and unity of purpose. It would be hard and tedious work in the beginning, and perhaps for the first few years the printed results would be negligible. But eventually, with the Jesuit knowledge of theology and of the Faith, there would be no doubt about the success of their work.

With an eye to the future importance of medieval literature, non-Catholic universities have been devoting themselves zealously to this task. Witness, among others, the publications of Harvard and the periodical *Speculum*. Unfortunately an ignorance of Catholicity has not only prevented real advance in medieval studies, but has even been the cause of misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the medieval period as such. The literature is Catholic to the core; Catholics alone can interpret it correctly. It is therefore the duty of Catholic universities to interest themselves in this almost virgin field. Prestige will result both for themselves and for the Catholic cause. Certainly a sufficient number of Jesuits can be found who will willingly devote their intellectual and literary interests to this work.

PATRICK A. SULLIVAN, S. J.  
Weston College  
Weston, Massachusetts



# NEWS FROM THE FIELD

---

**Jesuit Educational Association.** The several special bulletins and communications sent out from the central office in recent months have dealt especially with the question of a proper basis for the remuneration of religious teaching in Army and Navy programs—a question of serious concern to our schools not only at the moment but also for its bearing on the administration of future government-sponsored programs. A satisfactory solution was reached on November 22 at a meeting in Washington of the Joint Army-Navy Board for Training Unit Contracts. Father Edward B. Rooney, together with Monsignor George Johnson, presented arguments in favor of a salary remuneration comparable to that paid lay professors on our faculties for comparable services. The Joint Board accepted these arguments and amended its contract clause to read:

In some institutions, teaching may be done by members of religious societies or orders who are not paid regular salaries. In such instances, the teaching salary may be considered as the proper and fair allowance for the equivalent to the cost of room, meals, clothing and other benefits furnished the member of the society or order, including health and retirement benefits,—or, on the same basis as average salaries actually paid to comparable lay teachers in the same institution for similar work.

Prior to the November 22 meeting of the Joint Board, representatives of our colleges which have Army or Navy programs met with the general prefects of studies at Loyola University, Chicago, to discuss the arguments prepared for presentation to the Joint Board and to consider the question in its several ramifications.

A second concern of the central office has been the various proposals and bills on postwar educational opportunities for service personnel (cf. Special Bulletin No. 27, July 6, 1943: American Council Questionnaire on Postwar Education, and No. 31, December 13, 1943: Postwar Education). A committee appointed by the President made a preliminary report on July 30, 1943. This report the President transmitted to the Congress at the end of October with an expression of general approval and with a request for early action on it. Soon afterwards, November 3, Senator Thomas of Utah introduced a bill in the Senate (S. 1509) embracing the main recommendations of the President's committee. A revised form of the Thomas Bill was reintroduced on December 10 and has been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. The general provisions of the bill are:

1. Persons who served in the armed forces, the Merchant Marine, or the auxiliary branches for at least six months after September 16, 1940 and are honorably discharged, shall be eligible for training at government expense in any approved educational institution for a period of one year.

2. On a state-quota basis, persons of exceptional ability shall be allowed a further period of training up to three years.

3. Part-time as well as full-time attendance at educational institutions is provided for.

4. All tuition and fees are to be paid by the government to the school; full-time students are to receive \$50.00 per month for living expenses; other provisions are made for dependents.

5. Choice of educational institution is left to the individual, subject to regular entrance requirements of the institution of his choice.

6. The program is to be administered by an agency set up within the U. S. Office of Education. An advisory council to the agency is established, consisting of fourteen members, seven from government agencies and seven from educational associations.

7. Each state is to appoint its own agency to administer the program within the state.

Along similar lines, the American Council on Education has been preparing its own plan for war service education. While the Thomas Bill and the American Council plan are, in the main, quite acceptable, both contain certain features which seem questionable; for example, the possibility that other than educational agencies will administer the program in the several states; the undetermined authority of the advisory council to the "agency" within the Office of Education, as well as the rather wide authority of the Commissioner of Education. Furthermore, the bill grants a federal agency more power in determining educational policies than it ought to have; and, on the other hand, in view of the fact that many states prohibit the giving of state funds to private and denominational institutions, there is an insufficient guarantee in the bill that the funds to be expended through the states will remain *federal* funds. Finally, the states are given too much latitude in the method of selecting "approved institutions."

The central office has communicated these objections to the officials of the American Council and is watching carefully the progress of the Thomas Bill, so that proper action may be taken as soon as opportunity offers.

This important question of federal proposals for postwar educational training of service personnel will be debated at the meeting of the J. E. A. in Cincinnati on January 12, 1944.

**Executive Committee Meeting.** The fall meeting of the executive committee of the J. E. A. took place on November 6 and 7 at Loyola University, Chicago. Fathers Edward B. Bunn and Joseph C. Glose were welcomed as prefects general respectively of the colleges and high schools of the new Maryland Province, and Father John F. Dougherty as the new prefect of the Oregon Province. The three sessions were devoted to a discussion of committee reports and of postwar education.

Father Edward B. Rooney commented on the visits he and Father Farrell made to our schools conducting Army and Navy programs. Gen-

erally cordial relations exist between trainees and Jesuit faculty members, and between our administrators and the commanding officers of the military units. There is indeed much praise of our teaching and of our personal interest in the service men. The very important role of the Jesuit chaplain in relation to the trainees in our schools was emphasized. He should of course have the special faculties, easily obtained, for evening or late afternoon Mass, etc., and his office should be readily accessible to the men. Some of the chaplains publish a weekly bulletin of information and spiritual guidance, which they find is read and discussed not only by the Catholic trainees but in many instances by the non-Catholics as well. Father Raymond L. Mooney, chaplain at Xavier University, calls his bulletin *The Beam*; and the Marquette University bulletin, issued by Father George E. Ganss, is called *Bearings*. Both are noteworthy for the very simple, brief, man-to-man way in which they discuss the truths of the Faith and hold up religious ideals to the men in training.

A second report to the executive committee was on the progress made in revising the *Instructio*. It was the late Father General's intention, clearly expressed in his letter promulgating the *Instructio*, August 15, 1934, that after a practical and thorough test by way of experiment the *Instructio* would become permanent with whatever additions and modifications experience should dictate. A subcommittee of the general prefects of studies, appointed in 1942 to prepare a revised edition, completed a tentative revision in the spring of 1943. A second draft is now being prepared in the light of the comments made by the Fathers Provincial and their consultors. If this is found satisfactory, it will be submitted to Father Vicar for official approval.

A report on the N. C. E. A. Committee on Reorganization was made by Father Allan P. Farrell. The only Jesuit representative on the original committee, set up a year ago, was Father McGucken. The intent of the committee was to offer plans for reorganizing the Catholic school system. During the first year a tentative report of progress was issued in mimeographed form, covering discussion of reorganization proposals for the elementary, secondary, and collegiate levels. On June 24 the progress report was discussed in executive session of the N. C. E. A. and approval given to print, as an N. C. E. A. bulletin, the committee's two plans for accelerating the elementary school. Preliminary to formal consideration of secondary-school and college reorganization, the personnel of the committee was somewhat changed and enlarged. Among the new members are Father Julian L. Maline, Father Farrell, Dean Francis Crowley of the Fordham School of Education, President George F. Donovan of Webster College, Webster Groves, Missouri, and Brother Emelian James, president of La Salle College, Philadelphia. At the first meeting of the reconstructed

committee, at Pittsburgh, November 5, 1943, four principal steps were taken: (1) For the present, because of their interdependence, high-school and college reorganization are to be considered together; (2) the proposal, vigorously urged by Father Elwell (diocesan director of high schools, Cleveland), for reorganizing the schools on a 6-6 basic—six years of elementary school, six of secondary, followed by the university—was voted down; (3) it was agreed, instead, to adhere to the typical American Catholic system, but to consider possible acceleration on one or more levels, and to plan specific improvements in the operation of the system; (4) as an aid to the work of the committee, an Inquiry Form was drawn up for collecting significant data on existing practices and on trends in Catholic high schools and colleges.

**The J. E. A. Committee on Postwar Education.** The debate in the executive committee of the J. E. A. on postwar education terminated in a motion, entertained and passed, that a central committee be set up to formulate a Jesuit educational program. The central committee is to be assisted by a larger committee of consultants drawn from all the provinces of the Assistancy. On the central committee are Fathers Edward B. Bunn, president of Loyola College, Baltimore; Allan P. Farrell, assistant executive director of the J. E. A. (chairman); M. J. Fitzsimons, college prefect of the New York Province and director of Fordham's City Hall Division; John J. McEleney, rector of Fairfield College Preparatory School; Miles J. O'Mailia, professor of philosophy, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, and A. H. Poetker, executive dean, University of Detroit.

The committee met for the first time on December 15 in New York. A second meeting will be held in the early part of January, and a progress report will be submitted for discussion to the delegates of the J. E. A. meeting in Cincinnati on January 12, 1944.

The scope and purpose of the committee is to make a blueprint of Jesuit education on the secondary, collegiate, and university levels. There is no intention, however, of imposing from above a detailed application of the blueprint to individual schools. Rather each school, making use of the blueprint, will be able to evaluate itself and through a local working committee plan for the future. Nevertheless, it seems imperative at this moment, amid the welter of conflicting formulas for postwar education, that Jesuit education contribute not merely a liberal, nor even merely a Catholic educational program, but a distinctively *Jesuit* one, if the Society in this country has a distinctive contribution to make or wishes to inaugurate one.

Three approaches were discussed at the first committee meeting: *First* (in the ideal order), to sketch distinctively Jesuit aims and principles, and to apply these as concretely as possible to the several educational levels;

*secondly* (in the real order), to evaluate the accomplishment and basic weaknesses of our performance to date; *thirdly* (combining the ideal and real orders), in the light of the analyses and conclusions of parts one and two, to propose necessary changes and developments. In this third part it will be proper also to consider the peculiar conditions and circumstances of the postwar world, not so much with a view to making temporary adaptations only, but rather to seizing the opportunity of inaugurating long-needed improvements.

**The Military.** The following letter, sent by Father Raphael C. McCarthy, president of Marquette University, to the parents of all Catholic Navy trainees at Marquette, has elicited a splendid response of appreciation from those to whom it was sent and from others who came to know of it. The letter was dated July 12, 1943. A similar letter, with only minor changes, was sent to parents of non-Catholic trainees.

I am writing to tell you that we are happy to have your son at Marquette, and to assure you that we shall do all we can to make his stay with us pleasant as well as profitable to him.

It is unfortunate that his education must now be directed primarily to war, that his talents and his energies must be given over to winning the struggle for existence in which his country finds itself. You can, however, take pride in the fact that he has been chosen by the Navy for a position of responsibility in that struggle and, in conjunction with the Naval personnel here, we shall strive to prepare him for the commission which will later be his.

While doing this, however, we are not unmindful of the cherished hopes and ambitions which your boy was forced temporarily to lay aside. We hope that the education which he receives at Marquette will not only enable him to acquit himself creditably in the service of his country but will also equip him for the business or profession which he chooses after the war is won.

As an all-important means toward this twofold end, we shall endeavor to safeguard your son's spiritual as well as his material well-being. Marquette, as you know, is a Catholic university. Its educational system is integrated with the Christian ideals of justice and charity, with the recognition of our dependence upon God and of the brotherhood of man which this dependence implies. We are especially proud of the Catholic young men from Marquette who are now in the service. With conspicuously few exceptions, they are better Americans because they are sterling Catholics, and by the example of their lives they are an inspiration to others who have not had similar opportunities. It shall be our earnest endeavor to keep your boy true to his Faith so that he may not only serve his country more gloriously but also merit a place among those Marquette men who are outstanding in the service of their God.

I want you to feel free to write to me at any time in regard to your boy. While the duties of my office may not permit me at all times to give personal attention to the problems which your letters may present, I shall see to it that they are given prompt and sympathetic consideration.

The several news sheets that come faithfully to the central office—from

the University of Scranton and from St. Ignatius High School, Chicago, for a long time now—deserve the acclaim of the J. E. A., and surely they have the acclaim of their alumni. To the old guard three new regulars have been added in recent months, the *Xavier Newsletter* (Xavier University, Cincinnati), the *Pauw Wow News Letter* (St. Peter's College, Jersey City), and the *Loyola Alumnus* (Loyola University, Chicago). Many of the college newspapers are serving the alumni in the service splendidly also; for example, the "Letter to Camp" feature in the *Canisius College Griffin*. Other schools, like Fordham, Holy Cross, Boston College, Creighton, Detroit, have well-established alumni magazines for channeling news to their men in the service. (An especially interesting item in the September *Boston College Alumni News* was the list of seventy-three B. C. graduates who are F. B. I. agents.)

The University of Scranton *News Sheet* has been praised before in these pages. Higher praise still to its recent pictorial supplement and up-to-the-minute service statistics, as of November 15! It has 1271 all-but-Jesuit alumni in the service, of whom 456 are commissioned officers. Thirteen have died for their country, six are reported missing in action, two wounded; twelve men have received twenty-nine decorations, and one has been cited for special bravery. Father Vincent I. Bellwoar edits the *News Sheet* and is the statistician as well.

**Good Neighbor Ambassadors.** Fathers Peter M. Dunne and Carlo Rossi, of the University of San Francisco, are spending the year in South America. The former is doing research work in the National Archives at Buenos Aires; the latter is putting the finishing touches to a Brazilian grammar. Upon completion of their special work, both will visit the Jesuit schools of South and Central America as representatives of the J. E. A. to further educational cooperation and understanding between the schools of the two Americas.

**"In the Service of Your Country."** Under this title Father Lorenzo Reed, principal of Canisius High School, Buffalo, has published a mimeographed booklet of twenty-seven pages for the students of Canisius High School. It contains excellent information and guidance—interestingly, briefly, and competently presented—about the armed services. The contents are: The Selective Service; Induction; The Reception Center; Training; Voluntary Enlistment; Educational Opportunities in the Service; College Training Programs; The Seventeen-Year-Old Graduate; After Demobilization; The Catholic Way.

**The Cooperative Play Bureau.** At the annual meeting of the principals of the Chicago, Missouri, and New Orleans provinces held in December 1934, Father Lawrence M. Barry, principal of St. Ignatius High School, Chicago, suggested that a clearing house for all-male-cast high-

school plays be set up at Milford Novitiate. Thus came into existence the Cooperative Play Bureau now entering on its tenth year of service to the Jesuit high schools of the United States and Canada. In 1941 the Bureau was transferred to West Baden College, West Baden Springs, Indiana, and entrusted to the care of the theologians. Father Julian L. Maline, general prefect of studies of the Chicago Province, has fathered the Bureau from the beginning. The following summary report of the activities of the Bureau from August 15, 1942 to August 15, 1943, submitted by Mr. John H. Williams, the present director, shows that it still serves a need. During the year twenty-five schools in nine provinces (California, Lower and Upper Canada, Chicago, Missouri, New England, New Orleans, Maryland-New York, Oregon) and two missions (Belize and Patna) borrowed eighty-two different plays from the Bureau.

**De Te Fabula Narratur?** Here is a challenging extract from a letter sent by an alumnus of a Jesuit school from an Army camp.

Since I left . . . University I have not received a single letter or bulletin or anything from them. The Knights of Columbus send all kinds of stuff. This war affords . . . University a golden opportunity to show its alumni that it is interested in them by sending them news of the other graduates and of the school itself; yet it does absolutely nothing. They have our home addresses, so they cannot beg off on that score. Years from now they will be able somehow to dig out our addresses and come around and ask us for a donation to build a new building. They will receive some mighty disappointing replies from many of us. They should remember that a lot of people go to . . . University for financial reasons. Their friendship and help cannot be counted on unless it has been carefully cultivated.

**The J. E. A. Library.** It seems proper that a library of texts used in our schools and of significant *Jesuitica* should be located in the central office of the J. E. A. Efforts to build up such a library have received heartening support from many sources, from our university presses especially, and from a number of individual Jesuit authors. Our thanks are cordially given to the following for generous contributions: Loyola University Press and Father Austin G. Schmidt; Fordham University Press and Father Robert Holland; the America Press and Father Joseph Carroll; the Marquette University Press and Dean Jeremiah O'Sullivan; the Bruce Publishing Company; to Fathers Daniel M. O'Connell, Gerald Ellard, W. Eugene Shiels, M. J. Fitzsimons, James F. Moynihan, Robert Swickerath, Martin P. Harney, Bernard A. Hausmann, William J. Devlin, Francis J. Gerst, Vincent V. Herr, A. H. Poetker, and to Woodstock College and Milford Novitiate.

**Latin Verb Chart.** A wall chart, five and a half feet long from top to bottom and twenty-two inches wide, printed on sturdy tagboard, has been prepared for a visual presentation of and drill on the Latin verb

forms. It is particularly suited for first-year high, and is useful too for second year. The chart is substantial enough to post in the classroom permanently, yet it is light enough to remove easily. It follows Father Henle's presentation of the verb. Quite a number have found it of assistance in teaching the English as well as the Latin verb. It is a great timesaver for the teacher, and a handy instrument for conducting games, contests, and spelldowns. The chart is priced at \$1.00, two for \$1.75, three for \$2.25, five for \$3.00. Application may be made to Father J. L. Maline, S. J., West Baden College, West Baden Springs, Indiana. The charts are sent, if desired, on a ten-day classroom trial.

**The Aquinas Lectures.** The Marquette University Aquinas Lecture, an annual event of the Aristotelian Society, has attracted a great deal of attention locally and nationally through the publication of the successive lectures in book form. Outstanding scholars have been secured over the years to deliver the lectures, which are always concerned with the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. The published volumes in the series to date are:

- St. Thomas and the Life of Learning*, by Father John F. McCormick, S. J. (1937)
- St. Thomas and the Gentiles*, by Mortimer J. Adler (1938)
- St. Thomas and the Greeks*, by Anton C. Pegis (1939)
- The Nature and Functions of Authority*, by Yves Simon (1940)
- St. Thomas and Analogy*, by Rev. Gerald B. Phelan (1941)
- St. Thomas and the Problem of Evil*, by Jacques Maritain (1942)
- Humanism and Theology*, by Werner Jaeger (1943)

The 1944 lecture will be delivered in March by Father John J. Wellmuth, head of the department of philosophy, Loyola University, Chicago. The Marquette University Press publishes the lectures.



## "HIGH SCHOOL VICTORY CORPS"

"Comes a letter from a teacher, enclosing a pamphlet about the High School Victory Corps which the Federal Security Agency of the U. S. Office of Education is promoting in the high schools of the land. This pamphlet, for all its honest purpose, chilled my correspondent to the bone, and it does me too. The Corps is designed to prepare high school children for their place in the war before they have left school. They are to be given a sort of pre-flight training. They will be made physically fit, will wear a uniform, and will be taught 'the habit of immediate and unquestioned obedience to proper authority' (whatever that is). The pamphlet is full of insignia, *esprit de corps*, and organizational charts—rectangles connected by straight lines, illustrating those subtle dependencies so pleasing to the bureaucratic heart. . . . Membership in the Corps is voluntary, but somehow the word 'Victory' leaves a boy or girl little choice in the matter, I should think.

"In essence the plan put forward is to prepare youth for war production by changing his normal studies and diverting him into technical, vocational, and military paths. This sounds reasonable enough, and maybe it is. As for me, I can't help thinking it is a highly dubious course, even in the present state of affairs. The question obviously is this: at precisely what moment in a youngster's life shall we summon the drillmaster and the technician to take over? Shall we do it well in advance of the great day, or shall we hold off till the last possible moment, in the meantime hanging tight to the teachers of history, English, philosophy, language, art? The Office of Education has made its answer. It says 'start now,' and perhaps that is the wise course. But I am the parent of a boy about to enter high school and to me the Victory Corps pamphlet is a dismal and forbidding prospectus. I think there is a considerable temptation in any war to become so absorbed in its military urgencies as to forget the broad strategy of life itself. I should feel more confident about the general program of whipping the Axis if I felt sure that the high schools of America were sticking to their guns right up to the last minute. . . . If we prepare children at an early age for nothing but military triumph, direct their gaze steadily toward the infamous enemy, and indoctrinate them with hatred for opposing peoples, we shall endanger our own position. The best pre-flight training is a view of the whole sky, not a closeup of an instrument panel."

(E. B. White, "One Man's Meat," *Harper's Magazine*,  
186:499-500, April 1943)

## CITIZEN OR MECHANIC?

"The truth is, advocates of the humanities are lost, bewildered men. They have not, despite innumerable committees and conferences, recovered from the shock of discovering they were of no particular importance to the Government. They lack any central philosophy, and, in contrast to the definiteness of aim among scientists and technologists, they have as yet been unable to construct any coherent educational philosophy governing the years to come. One of their difficulties is that, whereas in scientific and technological training, departmentalization is, by focussing attention upon a job to be done, an extraordinary source of strength, in the humanities, still bemused by scientific methods, departmentalization is an extraordinary source of weakness.

"General training, general education, liberal education, or whatever one chooses to call it, must, it seems to me, be re-oriented at whatever level around two central ideas if the republic is to survive. The first of these must be the assumption that the individual human being has dignity and worth and that therefore human history has meaning only as it reveals the emergence of spiritual values in the story of mankind. The second is the concept of civic virtue, or the notion (higher, in my thinking, than 'civics,' 'social studies,' or 'American history') that the individual human being should be proud to serve the state provided the state is worthy the best service of the individual human being. In our existing educational systems art as a release of self-expression, philosophy as a queer sort of history, social studies as excursions into determinism, and psychology on the conditioned-reflex basis do not seem to rise to the height of this great argument. We cannot have responsible citizens unless we believe a philosophy of free-will and are prepared to hazard our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor on the chance that rationality is in the long run more persuasive than emotionalism. Technological skills are insufficient guarantee for the health of the state. Only by a courageous refocussing of values in general education can we hope to offset the tremendous practical demand for a merely vocational training now upon us and likely to become increasingly insistent after the war."

(Howard Mumford Jones, "Citizen or Mechanic?" *Saturday Review of Literature*, XXVI:26, September 18, 1943)