

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

MAR 3 1 1944

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

MARCH 1944

MR. ADLER AND THE ORDER OF LEARNING

Gerard Smith, S. J.

STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN THE
ASSISTANCY, 1943-1944

READERS' SURVEY OF THE QUARTERLY

Allan P. Farrell, S. J.

LATIN-AMERICAN SURVEY

W. Eugene Shiels, S. J.

A COMPARISON OF NATIONAL STATISTICS

Charles M. O'Hara, S. J.

VOL. VI, No. 4

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Contributors

FATHER GERARD SMITH, professor of philosophy in the Graduate School, Marquette University, holds the doctorate in philosophy from the University of Toronto. He edited the volume *Jesuit Thinkers of the Renaissance*, published in 1939 by former students of Father John F. McCormick; and he contributed to the Maritain volume of the *Thomist* (1943) and to the memorial philosophical essays in honor of Father McCormick, sponsored by the American Catholic Philosophical Association (1943-1944).

FATHER ALLAN P. FARRELL is assistant executive director of the J. E. A. and managing editor of the QUARTERLY.

FATHER W. EUGENE SHIELS, associate editor of *America*, has his doctorate in history from the University of California. As a member of the committee of which he writes, he represented the J. E. A. and Jesuit historical scholarship with distinction.

FATHER CHARLES M. O'HARA, whose survey of enrollments appears late this year because of untoward conditions in the academic world, teaches education at Marquette University and is regent of the College of Engineering.

BOOK REVIEWERS in this issue are FATHER EDWARD J. BAXTER, Harvard Ph. D. in education, who is dean of the college, University of Scranton; and FATHER M. J. FITZSIMONS, college prefect of studies of the New York Province, and director of the City Hall Division of Fordham University.

The INDEX for VOLUME VI of the QUARTERLY (June 1943 to March 1944) is being sent with this issue.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

March 1944

CONTENTS

MR. ADLER AND THE ORDER OF LEARNING <i>Gerard Smith, S. J.</i>	205
READERS' SURVEY OF THE QUARTERLY <i>Allan P. Farrell, S. J.</i>	222
STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN THE ASSISTANCY, 1943-1944	232
LATIN-AMERICAN SURVEY <i>W. Eugene Shiels, S. J.</i>	235
CORRESPONDENCE	
"Blueprint for a College" (John F. Quinn, S. J., Laurence E. Henderson, S. J.)	239
"Amending the Liberal College" (Arnold J. Benedetto, S. J., A. J. Pilié, S. J., Charles L. Goetz, S. J., J. F. Murray, S. J., Youree Watson, S. J.)	242
Universities and a Just Peace (Robert A. Graham, S. J.)	243
"A Degree in Industrial Relations" (Bernard W. Dempsey, S. J., Hugh M. Duce, S. J.)	244
A COMPARISON OF NATIONAL STATISTICS <i>Charles M. O'Hara, S. J.</i>	248
BOOKS	
<i>Liberal Education</i> , by Mark Van Doren (Reviewed by Edward J. Baxter, S. J.)	253
<i>Educational Reconstruction in Great Britain</i> , by Stephen Duggan; <i>A New Order in English Education</i> , by H. C. Dent; <i>The Future in Education</i> , by Sir Richard Livingstone; <i>Education for a World Adrift</i> , by Sir Richard Livingstone (Reviewed by M. J. Fitzsimons, S. J.)	255
NEWS FROM THE FIELD	259
INDEX TO VOLUME VI	264

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.

JAMES A. KING, S. J.

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

BERNARD J. WUELLNER, S. J.

CHARLES M. O'HARA, S. J.

WILLIAM M. WELLER, S. J.

JAMES F. WHELAN, 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.

Mr. Adler and the Order of Learning

GERARD SMITH, S. J., PH. D.

Editor's Note: At a meeting of the Western Division of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, April 19, 1941, Mortimer Adler read a paper, "The Order of Learning," which caused wide discussion and some searching of hearts among Catholic educators. It was a penetrating analysis, treating as it did the learning process and the philosophy of Christian education. It required an equally able and penetrating answer. This was given by Father Gerard Smith, professor of philosophy at Marquette University, and presented first at the meeting of the National Catholic Educational Association in Chicago, April 7, 1942, and printed later in the *N. C. E. A. Bulletin*, Volume XXXIX, No. 1, August 1942, pp. 140-62.

As the *Bulletin* is an annual and of limited circulation, a reference book rather than a periodical, we feel justified in reprinting Father Smith's paper in the *QUARTERLY*. Mr. Adler's article is summarized in Father Smith's answer. The answer itself has a wider significance than the article that occasioned it, since it puts beyond cavil notions that are fundamental to any fruitful discussion of education. Their lack is a serious weakness in the writings of such conservative and able leaders as Theodore M. Greene, Robert M. Hutchins, Mark Van Doren, and others. Father Smith's analysis has long been needed by Catholic educators both to sharpen their own principles and to correct the misconceptions of well-intentioned educators outside the Catholic tradition.

Few men have done more, single-handed, to further the cause of education than Mortimer J. Adler. With fearless, relentless, and discerning dialectic he has stripped Deweyites of their pretensions, and left them exposed to the amusement of those who are still naive enough to fancy that man is a rational animal. He has done more. Not only has Mr. Adler's dialectic left the Deweyites naked and shivering; sufficient to bare their hides, its true premises are as well calculated to have the Deweyite hearts. But this is to say too little. Mr. Adler has pressed upon Catholics their own heritage. Too often had that heritage been forgotten, or misunderstood, or obscured. For his reminders, his clarifications, his luminous insistence that we enter into the educational patrimony which is *de jure* ours, we Catholics cannot be too grateful to Mortimer Adler. Grateful as well must we be to him for his part in our realization how far short we fall in fact from our own educational ideals.

How sincere that acknowledgement of Mr. Adler's services is, may be reckoned by the admission I herewith make: whatsoever worth there be in the considerations I propose to offer in opposition to his theory of edu-

cation as expressed in his *Order of Learning*,¹ that worth is due in no small measure to Mr. Adler himself. His quiver supplies many of my arrows.

The Order of Learning is an excellent piece. Catholics know, Mr. Adler tells them, the basic principles governing the order of things taught and the teaching of them. They know (1) the difference between intellectual habit and sensitive memory, even though they often violate that truth by putting a premium on memory instead of intellectual habit. They know (2) that intellectual habits can be formed only by intellectual acts on the part of the student, not simply on the part of the teacher. This principle they often violate by proceeding as if the teacher were the only cause, and as if the learner could be entirely passive. Despite the fact that they subordinate the liberal arts to a supposed mastery of subject matter, they know (3) that the intellect, dependent as it is upon sense and imagination, can be swayed and colored by passion. They know (4) that intellectual virtues are a mean between dogmatic affirmation in excess and skeptical denials in defect. Nevertheless they try to do the impossible; give students possession of truth without perplexing them by the issues which truth resolves.

Mr. Adler then sets forth the order of learning in two theses. The first thesis is "simply that mastery of the liberal arts must precede the mastery of fundamental subject matters, which constitute the matter of the speculative virtues. Though wisdom comes first in the natural order of virtues—graded according to their intrinsic excellence—the arts, least of the intellectual virtues, come first in the temporal order, the order of human development."² That the mastery of liberal arts does not precede mastery of speculative subject matter in Catholic schools is evinced, according to Mr. Adler, by the fact that logic is taught in them as a science, not as an art. For, if it were taught in Catholic schools as an art, it could not be divorced, as it is, from grammar and rhetoric; nor should Catholic graduates be unable, as they are, to write and read better than their secular fellows.

Mr. Adler's second thesis concerns the ordering of means to the virtue of wisdom, the order of learning in the field of speculative virtues. (His case in point is the teaching of philosophy.) In this ordering, the subjects to be taught should follow exactly the reverse of the order of the knowability of those subjects *secundum se*. Thus, theology, metaphysics, philosophy of nature, of man, science, is the order of subjects better knowable *secundum se*. Reverse the list and you have the order of the

¹ Mortimer J. Adler, *The Order of Learning*, reprinted from the *Moraga Quarterly*, Autumn, 1941, pp. 3-25.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

better knowability of those subjects *quoad nos*. It is in this last order that subjects should be taught and learned. Why? Because teaching is Socratic, and learning, whether by instruction or discovery, is an activity of the learner. "The significance of this point . . . may not be grasped unless it is put into contrast with the now prevalent error. Today, in most cases, teaching proceeds as if the order of teaching should follow the order of knowledge, the objective order of knowledge itself, even though we know that this objective order cannot be followed in the process of discovery. In fact, it is completely reversed. Instruction which departs from the order of discovery also departs from the order of learning, for the way of discovery is the primary way of the mind to truth, and instruction imitates nature in imitating discovery. The objective structure of knowledge in no way indicates the processes of the mind in growth. Now the order of discovery is primarily inductive and dialectic, not deductive and scientific."³ Whence, "the methods of teaching any subject matter should be primarily inductive and dialectical, rather than deductive and simply expository, for the former method is a conformity of teaching to the order of learning, as that is naturally exhibited in the order of discovery, which teaching must imitate as a cooperative art, whereas the latter method is a conformity of teaching to the order of knowledge itself, and this is an order which should not determine teaching, for it does not determine learning."⁴ Whence, also, teaching must be Socratic, for only thus can it avoid the substitution of verbal memory for intellectual habit. Such teaching will outlaw, for the most part, lectures, which are largely deductive and analytic; it will also outlaw textbooks, which are manuals for the memory, rather than challenges for the mind. Further, since few teachers are Socrateses, and since some books must be used, the only books which can be used to good effect are the greatest on any given subject. The test whether all this is being done is whether or no the teacher himself is learning.

All this is eminently good stuff, excellently argued and speaking straight from the shoulder. We all needed to be told it, and we cannot better the telling. Nor should I care to impugn Mr. Adler's estimate about what is going on in Catholic schools.⁵ Nevertheless I disagree. Mr. Adler's order of learning seems to be seriously defective.

Before proceeding to discuss what seems to be defective in Mr. Adler's theory of education, it may be well to add that a disagreement with him

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁵ I should wish indeed to be sure that Mr. Adler is always speaking from first-hand information about Catholic schools. I rather think he has well-founded suspicions about how they do their job, just as I have suspicions, well founded, about how St. John's is doing its job.

over anything less than a fundamental issue would not be worth noting; still less should I presume to oppose his theory upon grounds which are my purely personal opinions. It is the Catholic philosophy of education, I think, which opposes Mr. Adler's. Lastly, if the issues between Mr. Adler's and the Catholic philosophy of education are fundamental and opposed, it would be naive to suppose that he does not know all about them. It is not he who needs to be apprised of the differences between his theory and ours; it is rather some Catholics themselves.

Catholics cannot disagree with Mr. Adler about the invariability and universality of the ends of education. Nor would any one, it may be supposed, care to maintain that Catholics always use the right means to true ends. Further, one must agree with the author of *The Order of Learning*⁶ that in the dimension of means to education, liberal arts are ordered to speculative subject matters;⁷ that methods of teaching should follow the order of learning; that the order of learning is the order of discovery, which is primarily inductive and dialectic, not deductive and scientific. All this is excellently argued and speaks the plain truth. There is no disagreement in these matters.

The disagreement is rather attendant upon a paragraph which closes with the following sentence: "Philosophy can be called Catholic, then, only in the order of discovery, not in its logical structure, for as philosophy its ultimate principles are all rational and natural."⁸ (Doubtless Mr. Adler would say the same of any academic subject which can be called Catholic. We may, however, as he does, confine the matter mainly to philosophy.) Let us, then, focus the point at issue. Mr. Adler maintains, and rightly, that the order of teaching must follow the order of learning, that this order of learning is primarily the order of discovery, which is inductive and dialectic, not deductive and scientific.⁹ On the other hand,

⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 11-16, 17-24.

⁷ Although ordered to speculative subject-matters, liberal arts are not unqualifiedly without content (vd. *op. cit.*, p. 14). Liberal arts obviously contain their own wisdom, itself ordered to speculative wisdom. Besides, speculative matters get into knowledge, by way of the liberal arts, through faith, opinion, and enunciations. Nor can one legislate to the effect that no one may learn judicatively from great books, even when those books are just bones to puppies. Sometimes, *mirabile dictu*, the puppies learn. Even though it be true, therefore, that the arts cannot be acquired except through representative subject-matter, it is also true that they cannot be acquired without some assimilation of that same subject-matter. It seems quite anti-Thomistic to empty liberal arts of all speculative content: *Sensibile in actu est sensus in actu; intelligibile in actu est intellectus in actu*. Mr. Adler, of course, means only to emphasize the difference between liberal arts and speculative wisdom at a time when such emphasis is doubtless needed: I also wish only to emphasize the presence, somehow, of speculative content in the liberal arts, against the time when his emphasis might, unintentionally of course, reduce liberal arts to a mere practice scrimmage. The fact is, when there is question of human acts the score is always kept and it always counts.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

he maintains that "truths which pagans could not discover, can be taught to, and learned by, pagans, once Christians have discovered them,"¹⁰ It would be unworthy of any one to understand Mr. Adler's meaning perversely. For the purpose, nevertheless, of explaining the real point at issue, I am going to allow myself a fling into perversity. Consider the situation created by saying (1) that truth must be discovered, (2) that the truth discovered can be taught to, and learned by, pagans, once Christians have discovered it. Pagans, according to a perverse understanding of Mr. Adler's meaning, pagans, who could not discover philosophical truth and who can learn it only, primarily, by discovery—just as any one else must learn—can discover philosophical truth if some one else does. Is not this (recall, I am being designedly captious) to do in principle precisely what Mr. Adler with considerable truth accuses Catholics of doing in fact? He is saying that every one must learn inductively and dialectically; that so, also, must pagans learn; that pagans could not make the inductive discovery; that they, nevertheless, can make it if some one else makes it. Do, then, pagans, who must learn by induction, learn by some one else's induction? If they do, how can they? since learning is inductive. If they do not learn by some one else's induction, but learn, nevertheless, it must be by deduction, if we are not to appeal to their human faith or opinion. Whence, in principle, pagans must needs, or so it seems, resort to the very deductive principle which Mr. Adler repudiates in fact. May one fear that induction is thus turning into deduction after all?

Not if we can eliminate the awkward situation. (Here perversity ceases.) The situation in which pagans can learn by discovery, as any one must, the truths which they could not discover, or, to vary its description, the situation created by having pagans deduce truths which, in order to be learned, must be induced, can be saved by allowing that what one man discovers another can discover as well. That is, we might say that Man X can discover from Man Y, even though X does not discover in the same way as did Y. This would eliminate the awkward situation.

It is permissible, however, to ask if induction made from induction *in that way and about the matter in hand* will work. One may ask, in other words, whether philosophic truth, which must be primarily induced in order to be learned, can be learned by those who do not make under the proper conditions of its exercise, the very induction which teaches. Variant expressions of the difficulty are as follows. Can Catholic philosophy, which is Catholic only in the order of discovery and a-Catholic in the order of truths known, be taught in the *order of discovery* where precisely it is Catholic, as if it were *there* a-Catholic? Let us grant that the ultimate

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

principles of philosophy are all rational and natural. The difficulty is not there. The difficulty is here: Are those same principles, not in the order of truths known, but in the order of their discovery, quite wholly rational and natural? If they are not, the awkward situation persists: a-Catholic truth can be discovered as a-Catholic there, in the order of learning, where it is Catholic. This, it seems, is incomprehensible if a-Catholic truth is not learned in a wholly rational and natural way. For, if the way of learning a-Catholic truth is not wholly rational and natural, then pagans cannot learn it except in the way which is *not* wholly rational and natural; i. e., they must cease to be pagans. For that matter, neither can Catholics learn such truth in a wholly rational and natural way; but the reason why they cannot so learn is because they are Catholics.

Thus we come to the very core of the difference and opposition between Mr. Adler's and a Catholic philosophy of education. The question is precisely this: Are a-Catholic, philosophical truths learned in a wholly rational and natural way? One can well understand Mr. Adler saying *yes* to the question. And his *yes* would void my late dialectical perversity and leave flawless his own logic. The truth is, there is an element involved here which neither his philosophy nor mine (may I say, our philosophy?) can prove or disprove. That element is Catholic theology, and Catholic theology must contest Mr. Adler's supposed *yes* in answer to the question, is a-Catholic truth learned in a wholly rational and natural way? Here is the dividing line between his and a Catholic philosophy of education—a line, no doubt, which he knows all about, though he does not let it appear.

What is that dividing line? Before we jump over it, let us take a short run. One cannot admire too much the skillful diagnosis Mr. Adler and Mr. Hutchins have made of our educational ills: we need philosophy. This they have maintained; in this they speak plain truth. If we concur with them, we are immediately faced with another question: whose and what philosophy?¹¹ There seem to be almost as many philosophies as there are philosophers. It might first be observed that, though this is true, nevertheless the multiplication of philosophies no more vitiates the validity of a philosophy than does the prevalence of moral evil invalidate the moral

¹¹ Mr. H. D. Gideonse (*The Higher Learning in a Democracy*, Farrar and Rhinehart, N. Y.) is quite right in asking Mr. Hutchins this question. Until it be answered, there does not appear to be any successful issue to their controversy. I have not the illusion that the answer I, under the inspiration of E. Gilson's *Christianisme et Philosophie*, Vrin, 1936, shall propose will be accepted by non-Catholics; and if Catholics do not accept it, one can only ask, what then *is* the answer? It must be noted that Mr. Gideonse's question put to Mr. Hutchins is not meant by *him* to demand a serious answer. He seems to imply that to ask the question, what or whose metaphysics, is to answer it; for in his mind there is no metaphysics. Nevertheless, the question is serious if there be a preemptory metaphysic.

good. However, as often with the good, so with the true, we are *still* faced by the question, What is this true philosophy?

It does not appear deniable, except by two sorts of persons, that the answer to the question, What is true philosophy? is the following. True philosophy is the *philosophia perennis*, of which we have such a magnificent example in the works, say, of Saint Thomas Aquinas. Two sorts of people may with reason deny this.

First, those who deny that there is a theology may also reasonably deny that theology has any place whatsoever in the constitution of philosophy. Since, moreover, theology presided over the formation of Saint Thomas' philosophy, his, so will the deniers of theology maintain, or any such philosophy is not the *philosophia perennis*. In short, men who deny the existence of God may consistently deny a legitimate place in education to a philosophy which draws its inspiration from theology. Further, if a philosophy, inspired by theology, orders and regulates the fields of human knowledge, a naturalist may well add, as he does, that, in general, the supernatural has no place in an educational program.

On the other hand, Luther and Calvin, who deny the competence of reason, may consistently maintain that a Christian has no need of philosophy. *They* may consistently maintain this, I say, because, for them, it is an impertinent task to attempt the education of a fallen reason. Better leave fallen reason alone and bend all our efforts to theology. Thus, a philosophy which purports to stand by reason alone cannot, according to the Reformers, be a *philosophia perennis*. The philosophy of Saint Thomas Aquinas and of many others, they would say, professes to stand by reason alone. It cannot be the *philosophia perennis*. Fallen reason is incompetent to create the science which orders and makes intelligible the fields of knowledge. Thus, a purely Protestant educational program should by right have place only for the study of theology.

So it is that naturalists and atheists or the strict followers of Luther and Calvin are the only ones who can consistently deny the validity of a Christian philosophy which draws to a point the fields of education. Naturalists can do this because theology, they think, not only vitiates philosophy, but, also, by making it Christian, vitiates education as well. Calvinists can do this because a philosophy that is purely natural is, they must think, impossible, and so is an education which is not purely theological. Atheists may deny supernature and exalt nature; strict Protestants may deny nature and exalt supernature. The former may deny theology; the latter, philosophy. But they are the only ones who can do these things.

A Catholic cannot. A Catholic, who believes *both* in the competence of reason and in reason's restoration by grace, cannot deny *either* the possibility of a *philosophia perennis* and with it the need of profane edu-

cation, or the necessity of revelation in the constitution of such a philosophy and with it the necessity of Christianity in education. A Catholic cannot through despair of reason flee to God, nor can he despair of God and flee to reason alone. He may not be content, as was the Renaissance, with things as they are; nor may he be discontented with the grace which can make things as they should be. A Catholic school must have both at once, Christianity and philosophy; that is to say, a Christian philosophy. A Catholic school must have a Christian philosophy if a Catholic must hold, as he does, both that human reason is competent in its own sphere—Calvin denies this; and yet, because fallen, human reason must be restored by grace—atheists deny this. A rather wretched implement of his own exquisite definition, Erasmus has adequately described the proper function of a Catholic education: the establishing of a nature created good, *instauratio bene conditae naturae*. Catholic philosophy will stand or fall because it is or is not real philosophy. Catholic philosophy will be real philosophy if grace has restored the reason by which it stands; else it will not be Christian, and thus likely fail to be philosophy.

As is clear, there are two positions which a Catholic theory of education must maintain simultaneously: it must maintain that reason is competent *and* that grace is necessary to restore it. To hold this is not to say, with Calvin, that grace suppresses nature. Rather, it is to hold that grace re-establishes nature and that, thus re-established, reason really operates. It does not at all follow if reason needs grace, that with grace reason is not reason. Indeed, if nature with grace were not *still* nature, there would be no morality nor merit.¹² Just so, in the intellectual order, philosophy with revelation is *still* philosophy; Christian education is *still* education. Without revelation philosophy runs the risk of not being philosophy at all, and the education which philosophy orders runs a similar risk. Either Christian philosophy must be Christian or it is doubtful if it will be philosophy at all. Either philosophy must be philosophy or it will scarcely be Christian at all. We cannot debase reason, which was created good, nor exalt reason to the extent of refusing the remedy offered by God to heal reason's errors.¹³ Whether our task be to will the good or to know the

¹² *Summa Theologica*, Ia IIae, q. 114, a. 1 ad lum: Man merits inasmuch as it is by *his own will* that he does what he should.

¹³ Vd. *Summa Theologica*, Ia IIae, q. 85, a. 3 resp. Vd. *Conc. Vatican*, Sess. III, cap. 4, de Fide et Ratione, in *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, Denzinger-Bannwart-Umberg, Herder, 1928, n. 1789: "And faith and reason can not only never conflict with each other; each also aids and is aided by the other. The reason is: right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith, and, illumined by its light, cultivates the knowledge of divine things; whereas faith frees reason from its errors, safeguards and instructs it with many a notion. Whence, far from being an obstacle to humane arts and studies, the Church in many ways helps and furthers their cultivation. For She is neither unaware of nor despises the benefits to the life of man flowing therefrom; indeed She admits that, as they had their origin in God, the Lord of all knowledge, so, if they be rightly handled, do they, with the help of his grace, lead back to God.

truth, we know that we cannot in either case so attain the total good connatural to man that we be in no wise deficient.¹⁴ We cannot do this without God's help. Yet with His help, it is *we* who observe the law and *we* who know. We must, in short, acknowledge the healing which faith brings to knowledge. "This then I say and testify in the Lord: that henceforward you walk not as also the Gentiles walk in the vanity of their mind, having their understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their hearts."¹⁵

Only two objections can be raised to the educational purpose of restoring by faith and reason, a human nature created good. Both of these objections will arise from a confusion of knowledge considered abstractly with knowledge as it exists in the human intellect. Before stating those objections, it is well, therefore, to eliminate that confusion.

There are two problems of order we must consider. The one is concerned with the virtuous ordering of reason by acquired and infused habits. The other is concerned with the speculative ordering of knowledge in terms of principles and conclusions arranged in an hierarchical subordination. The first is the ordering of the knower; the second is an ordering of the objects known. Both objections confuse the two orders: objection one confuses the *knowing* of the knower with the objects known; objection two confuses the *objects* known with the knower's knowledge of them. The answer to both objections proceeds upon a distinction which must be drawn between knowing and the objects known, and consequently upon a distinction between the relation of knowledges in the knower and the relation of hierarchically ordered objects of his knowledge.¹⁶

Nor, of course, does She forbid that such studies, each in its own sphere, use their own principles and their own method; acknowledging rather this just liberty, She makes it her especial care that they oppose not sacred doctrine and thus be burdened with error or that they transgress not their proper ends and thus seize upon and perturb the field of faith." I have taken some liberty with the last sentence.

"*Neque solum fides et ratio inter se dissidere nunquam possunt, sed opem quoque sibi mutuam ferunt, cum recta ratio fidei fundamenta demonstret eiusque lumine illustrata rerum divinarum scientiam excolat, fides vero rationem ab erroribus liberet ac tueatur eamque multiplici cognitione instruat. Quapropter tantum abest, ut Ecclesia humanarum artium et disciplinarum culturae obsistat, ut hanc multis modis iuuet atque promoveat. Non enim commoda ab iis ad hominum vitam dimanantia aut ignorat aut despicit; tetur immo, eas, quemadmodum a Deo scientiarum Domino projectae sunt, ita, si rite pertractentur, ad Deum iuvante eius gratia perducere. Nec sane ipsa vetat, ne huiusmodi disciplinae in suo quaeque ambitu propriis utantur principiis et propria methodo; sed iustam hanc libertatem agnoscens, id sedulo cavet, ne divinae doctrinae repugnando errores in se suscipiant, aut fines proprios transgressae ea, quae sunt fidei, occupent et perturbent.*" Throughout this section of the text, the reader will recognize more than the inspiration of E. Gilson's *Christianisme et Philosophie*, Vrin, 1936.

¹⁴ S. T., Ia IIae, q. 109, a. 2 resp.

¹⁵ Eph. IV, 17-18.

¹⁶ Mr. Adler himself makes these distinctions; but he apparently does not admit the full force of their application.

The first objection is the following: It is impossible for secular studies, through philosophy, itself illumined, to be illumined by faith. We have and can have, e. g., no Christian chemistry or Christian mathematics. The objection misses the point. It is not a question of baptizing a philosophy, of making a philosopher see his subject by faith. That is impossible. It is a question of creating a Christian outlook upon, of having a theological viewpoint of, philosophy. Teachers and taught must learn. The question is, how? Turned from God by original and, likely also, actual sin, no man can return to God without God. Now, if in their return, teachers and taught be offered, not only the grace which exceeds, but, also, the grace which restores nature, why should they refuse the help which heals their minds and makes them to see their work for what it is, a block in the temple of truth? With the grace that exceeds nature one may save one's soul; with the grace that heals nature, teacher and taught may make their subjects a real means to salvation *and* education by rescuing them from that isolation from the hierarchy of knowledge which condemns those subjects to partial unintelligibility. Thus rescued, any subject is not only as sanctified as is the teaching of it; it is far more intelligible. Surely we cannot allow that work is sanctified by a good intention *à la* Kant (and before Kant, Abelard), as if intentions alone were good and not also what is intended. Nor can we allow that doctrinal content is quite complete without its completion by philosophy and theology. If mathematics, say, be a good and proper field of knowledge, if further, the teaching of it can be a holy task, if lastly, neither mathematics nor the teaching of it can be sanctified and properly educative without the aid of grace and reason ordering both the subject and teacher to the ultimate end of all knowledge, it becomes impossible that a fully acceptable scientific outlook be *not* a Christian outlook. The whole objection against the illumination, by faith, of reason in the teaching or learning of philosophy and other profane branches misses the point. No one asks that faith be substituted for science or literature. All that is asked is that teacher and learner and their subjects be properly organized, in the light of faith and reason, to ultimate ends. To think that they cannot be is to think as does a semi-rationalist; viz., we do not need grace to restore reason to its proper functioning upon properly ordered fields of knowledge.

The whole point in the last paragraph will be missed if it be thought that grace, affecting the reason which effects philosophy, which orders knowledge, must have the *immediate* purpose of eternal salvation. It is not a question immediately of saving a teacher's or student's soul. It is a question immediately of saving their education. The point is: the supernatural, affecting the metaphysics which effects order, is necessary properly to order man's intellectual life here on earth, for this is what it means to

be an educated man here and now; namely, to have a properly ordered intellectual life. Now, a properly ordered intellectual life is had when grace restores the reason which then proceeds to function *as* reason and as reason *should* function. To educate in order to save souls is indeed the ultimate purpose of a Catholic school; immediately, however, a Catholic school's business is to perfect man, under faith, in terms of his human nature upon this earth. *In statu viae* that sort of maturization of man is precisely what it means to be a man. It is he, the man, perfected by acquired and infused virtues, of whom education is to be predicated. A Catholic school does not carry the immediate burden of saving souls. It could not even if it tried. It has the immediate burden of instructing in relation to the intellectual virtues and in relation also to the moral virtues in so far as the directive principles of these last are in the intellect. In short, a Catholic school teaches the virtues of being a man. To be a man is to be one of a race descended from, and fallen with, Adam, redeemed by grace, and destined to the beatific vision; to be an educated man is to be awake and at home in this family which is always menaced here by sin, but always saved in hope. *This* is the function of Catholic education, to make a man intellectually alive to fallen and redeemed nature.

If, now, we do need grace to restore reason, will not this make our curricula theological? This is the second objection. It must be denied. It must be denied that Christian learning is not true learning. Grace does not suppress, it restores nature. To think the opposite is to think in the purest vein of Calvinism. Good theology has nothing to fear from natural truth. In fact, good theology exhorts us to the pursuit of natural truth. And even if this pursuit can have no ultimately successful issue without revelation, nevertheless, educators even with the Faith are not dispensed from pursuing truth. With Faith alone one simply does not know, without work, the answers to many pressing questions. Nor does study with Faith make those answers, when they are found, any less objective, any less scientific or peremptory. Who will deny that there is geometry in a facade of a cathedral? Who will deny the validity of economic theories based upon justice? Were Pasteur, Pascal, Wassmann less scientific for being Christian? The assertion that Christian learning is not real learning is *semi-fideistic*. Sigrid Undset *is* a great writer, Saint Thomas Aquinas *is* a great philosopher, Saint Teresa *is* a great business woman. They are great because Christian. Heresiarchs are not great in doctrine—for it lacks, at least, proper ordering—nor great in their lives—because they are not Christians.

"We must, unless we think ourselves better informed about the functions of a Christian man than was Saint Augustine, have a deep love of

the intellect, *intellectum valde ama.*"¹⁷ This means hard, painstaking investigation of our field of knowledge, an investigation which cannot stop short of the supreme effort to understand the reasons why there is anything to investigate. Possessed of these reasons, we can order our branch and ourselves in relation to the whole intellectual and social order of things. Thus ordered, our knowledge is unified and as intelligible as may be. Mr. Hutchins and Mr. Adler are right. They do not, however, go far enough for a Catholic theory of education. Philosophy can unify jumbled curricula, and restrain the pullulation of courses without content. But philosophy is not constituted without supernatural aid. The fallen reason of man needs the aid of faith in its task of being reasonable.

In this union of faith with reason we have the paradox of Christian education: education must be Christian, if it is to be education; education must be education, if it is to be Christian. Precisely because it is paradoxical, contradictory charges are made against such a notion of education. Is Christian education the training of a rational animal to be reasonable? Then why, it is asked, subject reason to faith? Is Christian education to develop the faith of a citizen *civitatis Dei*? Then why bother about the curricula of the *civitas mundi*? You Catholics cannot have it both ways: call your education Christian, if you must, but do not call it education; or, call it education, but do not call it Christian. It cannot be, so runs the charge, that reason aided by faith is still reason; nor can reason without faith fail to be reason. Now, contradictory charges cannot both be true, and if both charges are false, they cannot be contradictory. There is a possibility of some union of extremes. Such a union is a fact, as I shall indicate. Meanwhile, both these denials are false. Reason with faith is *still* reason. Reason without faith *fails*, in fact and at the level of cardinal truths, to be reasonable. The truth is, a rational animal does not grow to a full rational stature without divine nurture. Pelagius thought he did. So also thought the Renaissance. Despite the confidence of the Pelagian Renaissance, fallen reason is not normal reason. Gay at the time of the Renaissance, sceptics are sad today.¹⁸ To be alive today is no longer bliss. Three hundred years of joyous wantoning with fallen nature have but repeated, to date, the experience of the Prodigal Son. We see it all now. Having confused, once on a time, fallen with normal reason, seeing at long last the resultant confusion for what it is, viz., the result of sin, we are at the end of the Renaissance: either we return with the Prodigal or we face despair.

But a true Renaissance is still possible, if we eliminate the confusion.

¹⁷ Vd. E. Gilson, *Christianisme et Philosophie*, Vrin, 1936, p. 145, sqq.

¹⁸ E. Gilson, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience*, Scribners, 1937, p. 220, asks: "What was Hume, after all, but a sad Montaigne?"

Reason needs the help of God. Nor may we despair, with Luther, of reason, or, with naturalism, of God. We may not despair as long as we be given the concrete example in which the extremes, God and man, meet and are resolved, the Man-God, Christ. In Him are united the two factors which make a salvific education possible: human nature and divine. For, each Christian is now a participation in the Incarnation; each Christian is a humanity divinized by grace; Christian reason is strong in the truth of God. To refuse God's strength is the suicide of reason; to refuse reason is to deny the strength of God.

We are now in a position to contrast Mr. Adler's and a Catholic theory of education so far forth as education involves philosophy.¹⁹ Mr. Adler has subscribed to the notion of Christian philosophy. "The notion of Christian philosophy, to which I here subscribe, has two points in it: first, that the light of faith was, in fact, historically indispensable for the discovery of certain truths which, as such, belong to the domain of natural reason, and hence are strictly philosophical, not theological; second, that the light of faith is not similarly indispensable for the communication of these same truths, once they have been discovered; or, in other words, that whereas ancient pagans could not have discovered them, modern pagans can learn them from the teaching of Christian philosophers. If all (pagan) truth belongs to Christianity, as the spoils of the Egyptians belong to the Jews, so all (Christian) truth belongs to men in general, in so far as these truths are strictly evident or demonstrable in the light of natural reason."²⁰ The immediate reaction of Catholics to these weighted words might be as follows: What could be a fairer, a more accurate description of Christian philosophy than this? Indeed, Mr. Adler himself, I fancy, has been wondering all along what I can well be at in demanding that faith be as indispensable as reason is insufficient for the constitution of a Christian philosophy. Does he not himself admit this? Has he not himself said it? Not exactly. Mr. Adler says that faith *was* indispensable, etc. but *is* not similarly indispensable. Catholics must say that faith was indispensable and is similarly indispensable, etc. *now*. Mr. Adler accepts Revelation as an historical fact. Catholics accept Revelation not only as an historical fact, in Mr. Adler's sense, but, also, as a moral necessity within the philosophical order of learning. However necessary faith may be historically, Mr. Adler contends, nevertheless, pagans can know without believing. Pagans cannot, without the qualifications to be indicated, know as believers know. This, Catholics must maintain. Both Mr. Adler and Catholics are defending the rights of reason, let there be no mistake about

¹⁹ The points of agreement between the two theories have been indicated on pp. 206-07.

²⁰ Mortimer J. Adler, *Solution of the Problem of Species*, reprinted from *The Thomist*, vol. III, no. 2, April, 1941, p. 364, fn. 115.

that; only, Catholics are defending the rights of believing reason; Mr. Adler, the rights of unbelieving reason. Doubtless, Mr. Adler is allowing the rights of believing reason, but Catholics do not allow unqualified rights of unbelieving reason. True it is that pagan truth belongs to Christianity, but Christian truth which is evident and demonstrable does not belong, so Catholics must maintain, *de jure naturae lapsae* to men in general. The despoiling of the Egyptians is a one-way, non-reversible transaction; the Egyptians cannot trade off their truth for Christian truth; they cannot in exchange for their own get Christian truth back again, not unless they become Christians. The light of faith and revelation is as indispensable and as similarly indispensable *now*, in the learning of evident and demonstrable truth, as it was *then*. The reason is: the need for Faith and Revelation is the same now as it was then, and it is the same for all men. That need arises from a common fallen nature. It would be strange indeed if pagans, who are by hypothesis unhealed, were to enjoy with full right the philosophical truth which Christians can enjoy because, by hypothesis, their fallen nature has been healed. Is the healing of reason, which is an indispensable condition for being reasonable, to be indispensable for Christians and not for pagans? Is pure intellectualism, which fails, to succeed where only faith-illuminated intellectualism succeeds, viz., in the knowledge of the existence of God, of the immortality of the soul, and the destiny of man?

Let it be recalled once more that the need of reason, pagan or Christian, for faith is not a point which philosophy can settle. Only theology can settle it. Nor would it be fair to appeal to the norm of theology, unless Mr. Adler had invited and, I am sure, welcomes such a criterion. The situation, then, is as follows: Mr. Adler is telling Catholics what the Catholic philosophy of education is. In his treatment and description of the Catholic philosophy of education he is right in all points but one: the Catholic philosophy of education is not what he says it is. Catholic theology asserts the need of believing what natural reason can prove. Mr. Adler denies this need of believing what natural reason can prove: "Modern pagans can learn from the teaching of Christian philosophers . . . all (Christian) truth belongs to man in general, in so far as these truths are strictly evident or demonstrable in the light of natural reason."²¹ This is not so: according to Catholic theology Christian truth does not belong to man in general, not even the Christian truth which is strictly evident and demonstrable. The issue is not whether Mr. Adler be right or wrong in maintaining that demonstrable and evident truth belongs to man in general. Rather, the issue is whether he be right or wrong in saying that his is the Catholic version of the matter. In other words, does his description

²¹ *Loc. cit.*

of Christian philosophy, a philosophy which belongs to men in general without faith (i. e., pagans), fit the Christian description of Christian philosophy, a philosophy which belongs to men with faith? His description does not fit. Evidently he is not playing fast and loose with the notion of Christian philosophy. Evidently his point that Catholic schools are not always true to the ideals of the order of learning is well taken. Evidently there is a common element in his own order of learning and ours, or there should be. The serious error rather lies here: in his conception of what *Catholics* think about the role of revelation in the life of man. This is not a charge that he is wrong in maintaining that demonstrable Christian truth is open to men in general. (I believe he *is* wrong there, but that is not the point.) It is a charge that he is wrong in holding that *Catholics* think that.

They do not. Is it necessary, asks Saint Thomas, to believe those things which can be proved by natural reason? Yes, "it is necessary for man to accept by faith not only things which are above reason, but also those which can be known by reason: and this for three motives. First, in order that man may arrive more quickly at the knowledge of divine truth. Because the science to whose province it belongs to prove the existence of God, is the last of all to offer itself to human research, since it presupposes many other sciences: so that it would not be until late in life that man would arrive at the knowledge of God. The second reason is, in order that the knowledge of God may be more general. For many are unable to make progress in the study of science, either through dullness of mind, or through having a number of occupations and temporal needs, or even through laziness in learning, all of whom would be altogether deprived of the knowledge of God, unless divine things were brought to their knowledge under the guise of Faith. The third reason is for the sake of certitude. For human reason is very deficient in things concerning God. A sign of this is that philosophers in their researches, by natural investigation, into human affairs, have fallen into many errors, and have disagreed among themselves. And consequently, in order that men might have knowledge of God, free of doubt and uncertainty, it was necessary for divine matters to be delivered to them by way of faith, being told to them, as it were, by God Himself Who cannot lie." Saint Thomas then answers his three objections. The first runs: it is superfluous to believe what one can know. Answer: "the researches of natural reason do not suffice mankind for the knowledge of divine matters, even of those that can be proved by reason: and so it is not superfluous if these others be believed." The second objection is that "those things must be believed, which are the object of faith. Now science and faith are not about the same object . . .". Answer: "Science and faith cannot be in the same

subject and about the same object: but what is an object of science for one, can be an object of faith for another . . .” The third objection stated that “All things knowable scientifically would seem to come under one head: so that if some of them are proposed to man as objects of faith, in like manner the others should also be believed. But this is not true. Therefore, it is not necessary to believe these things which can be proved by natural reason.” Answer: “Although all things that can be known by science are of one common scientific aspect, they do not all alike lead man to beatitude: hence they are not all equally proposed to our belief.”²²

Let us now review the situation. There are two orders of knowledge: the order of truths known, the order of knowing them. The order of truths known is the order of specification, the order of knowing them is the order of exercise. Saint Thomas maintains that Revelation is *not* necessary in order to specify demonstrable, philosophical truth; and he also maintains that Revelation *is* necessary to constitute the exercise of knowing demonstrable, philosophical truth. Is, or is not, Revelation necessary to the exercise of philosophical knowledge? If Mr. Adler says, yes, Revelation is necessary to the exercise of philosophical knowledge, it would seem that he must revise his version of Christian philosophy; i. e., he may not say that demonstrable philosophical truth is open to unbelieving men in general. I mean, he may not say that *Christians* say that. If, on the other hand, Mr. Adler says, no, Revelation is not necessary to the exercise of philosophical knowledge, he may not say that he subscribes to a Christian version of Christian philosophy. The rationality of philosophical truth is one thing; the rationality of philosophers is quite another. The rationality of philosophical truth is not specified by Revelation; the rationality of philosophers is dependent upon Revelation. If, indeed, the rationality of philosophers did not depend for its exercise, i. e., for its being rational, upon Revelation, Mr. Adler's *Order of Learning* would be unquestionably true. If, however, the rationality of philosophers does depend for its exercise upon Revelation, then the *Order of Learning* is not a Christian version of the same order. The Christian version is this: only believers can do what Mr. Adler asserts unbelievers can do. In short, either Mr. Adler's version of the order of learning is not Christian, or, if it is Christian, he is not subscribing to it.

To conclude, it does not seem true to say that “if we wish to avoid violating the basic Thomistic distinction between philosophy and theology, between the spheres of reason and faith, we must, in speaking of the philosophy of education, restrict ourselves to purely natural education, natural both as to ends and to means.”²³ Quite the contrary: if we wish

²² *Summa Theologica*, 2. 2. q. 2. a. 4. Dominican Translation.

²³ *The Order of Learning*, p. 4.

to avoid violating Saint Thomas' distinction, we must *not* restrict ourselves to purely natural ends and means in speaking of the philosophy of education. Saint Thomas asks whether it be necessary to have another doctrine beyond philosophy. He answers, yes; yes, i. e., one must have more than philosophy, not merely in the order of salvation—rather evidently one must, if there be a supernatural order; but one must have that other doctrine coming from revelation even in the order of these truths about God which can be investigated by natural reason. In the order of these *natural* truths, he says, it was necessary that man be instructed by Divine Revelation. His reason is that without such revelation few men, and they very slowly and with the admixture of many errors, would come to the knowledge of such truths. Few men, slowly and with the admixture of many errors can know natural truths about God without revelation; thus is marked by Saint Thomas and after him by the Council of Vatican²⁴ the limit of human capacity to know metaphysics; *Ad ea etiam quae de Deo ratione humana investigari possunt, necessarium fuit hominem*²⁵ *instrui revelatione divina*. This Saint Thomas says in the first article of the first question of the first part of the *Summa Theologica*.

²⁴ *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, etc. n. 1786.

²⁵ I. e., man in general. Mr. Adler's philosophy is not in question; extraordinary as his philosophical gifts and attainments may be—and they are truly remarkable, he cannot but be one of the few who at long last will come to philosophical truth without revelation.

Readers' Survey of the Quarterly

ALLAN P. FARRELL, S. J.

In spite of their bad name, when surveys are conceived in humility and interpreted with charity, they often yield results that are both instructive and challenging. This at least is the conviction of those who superintended the survey of Jesuit opinion about the QUARTERLY. A brief questionnaire, directed to every Jesuit teacher in the Assistancy, and to philosophers and theologians in the scholasticates, launched the survey sometime in January a year ago. At first the response was disappointingly slow and meager. But gradually replies increased in number, and their complete frankness assured the survey of success.

The following summary proposes to put into a broad and not too formal framework the more significant opinions, criticisms, and suggestions of our readers. Any editorializing will be reserved for a concluding section or epilogue.

I. HOW WIDELY THE QUARTERLY IS READ

Curiosity, quickened by a certain uneasiness, made it seem advisable to attempt at the outset to gauge how large a clientele the QUARTERLY had won in its first five years. Accordingly this question stood at the top of the list: *Do you think the Quarterly has furthered Jesuit educational interests by its articles, features, statistical studies?*

A very considerable number of respondents answered the question in the affirmative, often with a hearty and encouraging affirmative. One reader proclaimed himself "*amicus curiae* from the first issue." Another praised "the fine variety of topics discussed and the consistent excellence of treatment." From a scholasticate came the comment: "When the QUARTERLY arrives, it is more difficult to get near a copy of it in the recreation room than to get hold of *Newsweek*. As a source of those private discussions which scholastics are known to have outside of times appointed for recreation, it is absolutely without peer." A teacher of long experience told us that "the J. E. Q. is doing a good job of keeping before us the educational system in its totality." "This," he added, "will prevent a narrow specialized outlook which readily possesses those who must spend much of their time concentrating on one or two branches." Finally, an administrator, who declared he had read every issue from the beginning, "was reminded by the questionnaire to re-read back numbers of the QUARTERLY, which proved highly profitable."

On the other hand, others, also to a considerable number, said that they were unable to answer the questionnaire because they had read the QUARTERLY only occasionally or not at all. Some *verbatim* quotations will briefly tell their tale. "I have not followed the publication closely enough to warrant a criticism worthy of consideration." "In as much as I never see your journal, I have no comments to make." "I do not remember having seen any issue of the QUARTERLY." "I must humbly confess that I have never read the J. E. Q., have never heard it discussed, and so it never came to my attention." "I have never seen your periodical." "I confess that I have neglected to read the QUARTERLY."

Other respondents corroborated these confessions from their own observation or inquiry. A high-school principal wrote: "It is surprising how few read it here. At . . ., among the theologians, the same was true." This was the observation of a college teacher: "I think the J. E. A. and the J. E. Q. are great instruments but working against a terrific inertia." Another teacher, in a high school, after commenting on how few he had found who read the QUARTERLY, added: "Some diplomatic way of getting Jesuits to read it must be found." Almost the identical remark was written by a high-school teacher from another part of the country, who "found few traces of the J. E. Q.'s influence, but rather a general lack of interest." Finally, the principal of a large high school, in returning answers to the questionnaire from a small fraction of his faculty, put the matter in this way: "The fact that so few took time out to answer the questionnaire may in itself be something of a response."

Not a few of the respondents offered explanations of this lack of interest. Among the causes most frequently enumerated were the pressure of teaching duties, apathy, distaste for educational periodicals, and lack of professional interest on the part of our teachers and administrators. Some were convinced that not enough copies are available in our houses; others commented on the fact that copies of the QUARTERLY somehow disappear from the recreation rooms and the library. The point was made, too, that there has been insufficient propaganda for the QUARTERLY by its directors and by those in a position to propagate it in our communities. Personal reasons accounting for want of interest ranged all the way from, "it does not have that necessary appeal as soon as you open it," to the more serious comment that the J. E. Q. "is too speculative, too little positive to give needed familiarity to Ours with their own formal principles," and to the somewhat thumping charge that "the QUARTERLY furthered educational interests at first, then by deteriorating in quality it injured them." Scholastics generally felt that too many of the articles were either theoretical disquisitions on ends and principles, or addressed to college and university rather than high-school interests.

II. SOME CRITICAL COMMENTS

The complaint of the majority of scholastic respondents, that articles in the *QUARTERLY* by and large have been too speculative and too exclusively concerned with higher education, has just been noted. In this connection, the old and valuable *Teachers' Review*, edited at Woodstock College for many years, was cited by a dozen or more as having filled a need which is very strongly felt today—the need, namely, of a periodical emphasizing techniques and methods for handling specific subjects in the several high-school and college classes.¹ It was admitted, however, that the scope of the *Teachers' Review* was limited and therefore its appeal was directed to younger teachers rather than to the whole body of Jesuits, whereas the scope of the *QUARTERLY* is much broader and should remain so. The suggestion was therefore made that the solution might be for the *QUARTERLY* to give a proportionate amount of space to considerations of practical pedagogy.

General criticisms offered by a number of respondents characterized the *QUARTERLY* as being ultraconservative in tone, as shying away from original viewpoints, and as being "a little too gentle in flaying abuses and mediocrity." On the question of style, somewhat contradictory opinions were expressed. One critic graded the stylistic qualities of the articles very low; another thought the style generally too lofty and bookish—"a bit on the heavy side"; and a third desired "a little more scholarliness without sacrificing the pleasant and rather friendly tone of the articles." The several groups of interests within the Jesuit Educational Association—college and high-school faculties, professional schools, scholasticates, scientists, philosophers, etc.—found some fault with the relatively small amount of space allotted to their special fields. And it was pointed out that in listing member institutions of the J. E. A. our houses of study have consistently been omitted.

Since formal reference was made in the questionnaire to the established feature sections of the *QUARTERLY*—namely, the Editorial Comment, Book of the Quarter, Broadening Horizons, Check List of Significant Books, Check List of Periodical Articles, and News from the Field—practically every respondent had something to say about these features. The comment, almost unanimously, was one of approval. Exception, however, was taken to the title "Broadening Horizons" as not being appropriate to describe the distinguishing notes of this department; a number of re-

¹ A modest publication called *Practice, A Pool of Teaching Experience*, was recently launched at West Baden College. Vol. I, No. 1 is the January 1944 issue. Its foreword says that its purpose is to channel to high-school teachers the helpful hints and tried techniques which have proved successful in classroom experience. Originally intended for teachers of the Chicago Province, *Practice* may be persuaded eventually to face a wider audience and resume the service once given by the *Teachers' Review*.

spondents thought that the "Book of the Quarter" could be eliminated and all book reviews put under one rubric; others stressed the value of reviews of books by non-Jesuit as well as by Jesuit authors. A general *caveat* was entered against having too many permanent feature sections, but, on the other hand, quite a number voted for a Letters-to-the-Editor department, and several suggested that there should be separate departments for discussion of high-school and college teaching techniques, experiments, and problems.

While the format of the QUARTERLY called forth relatively little comment, what was said on this head was both piquant and picturesque. A sample may speak for all: One respondent asked: "Why must an educational journal parade in formal dress? When I read your magazine, I feel that I am putting my mind into an overstuffed shirt. The small print, together with its long lines and paragraphs, is an eye-strain. A layout such as that of our *Catholic Digest* would make, even for a Jesuit audience, all the difference in the world."

III. CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS

Without doubt the most significant results obtained by the questionnaire were the answers to questions four and five: "Please suggest topics you think should be treated in the QUARTERLY," and "Have you any other suggestions to offer?" Scarcely a respondent failed to nibble at this inviting bait. Very many swallowed it hook, line, and sinker. The value of the catch may be judged by what follows.

There were first certain intimations to the editors for a broader editorial policy and for winning a larger audience. It was thought, for example, that there should be more follow-up articles on the progress and results of projects and experiments reported in the QUARTERLY, such as honors courses, the grammar test devised for high-school freshmen, alumni colleges, the course in effective thinking, science survey courses, and, in general, more of an attempt to get supplementary papers that would discuss challenging proposals made by our contributors. Father Cantillon's plan for Jesuit library cooperation was mentioned; also the debates started by Father Parsons on why our colleges do not turn out more writers, and by Father O'Hara on putting Jesuit education before the public. Of a similar nature was the suggestion, made by several, that the editors try to get behind significant facts or events recorded briefly in "News from the Field" and expand them by reporting how they came about, and why, and with what results. It was remarked, too, that some way should be found of keeping *au courant* with the more important happenings in *all* our schools.

Another general view was expressed in favor of more surveys and

statistical studies. It was felt that there was too great a tendency to make broad statements and draw inferences from personal experience or isolated facts rather than from objective data. One type of survey recommended was a study of the contemporary educational scene, Lippmann-like, tabulating main points of agreement and disagreement, and proposing the alternatives for the future. More prosaic, but perhaps more feasible, was the recommendation of certain statistical studies; for example, of tuition charges in our schools, together with percentages of non-payment; of the teaching loads of Jesuits and laymen in specific terms; of the actual distribution of a Jesuit's time; of the man-hour load involved in running a Jesuit institution and the proportion of it borne by Jesuits; and of the success of various promotional methods. It would be reasonable, of course, to expect the statistician to interpret his findings and formulate suitable conclusions.

Scattered here and there in the replies to the questionnaire were five further editorial directives that deserve to be listed. First, interest more *laymen* in contributing articles; second, stress the improvement of what *is* rather than the theory of what should but cannot be; third, present at least two substantial articles in each issue, prepared on a long-range plan, and, when it is practicable, have two sides of significant questions presented by two or more competent men; fourth, get experts to draw up lists of the best books of the year in the subject fields commonly taught in our schools; and fifth, make available concise reports of the *acta* of important educational meetings, secular as well as Catholic, with brief interpretative comments.

For the rest, limitations of space make it necessary merely to enumerate, under appropriate headings, some of the many topics which respondents declared they would like to see treated in future issues of the *QUARTERLY*. The editors will be more than glad to enter into correspondence with readers who may wish to write upon any of these or other topics. It will be understood that the wording of the suggested topics is, in the main, a direct quotation from the replies of respondents.

A. *General Topics*

1. Historical articles on liberal education; e. g., what did the Fathers understand by a liberal education? What did *our* early fathers understand by it?
2. What is the relation of faith and reason in Christian education?
3. What are specific ways of obtaining the 100% humane dividend of which Father Castiello speaks in his *Humane Psychology of Education*, page 141?
4. How can we improve relationships with and take a more active role in worth-while educational associations, such as the American Council, National Association of Church-Related Colleges [now a part of the Association of American Colleges]?

B. *Jesuit Topics*

1. A commentary on Father Ledochowski's *De Ministeriorum delectu Nostrorumque ad ea institutione* (*Acta Romana*, 1933, pp. 455-93) would furnish some excellent points for examinations of consciences.

2. A discussion of a well-defined and thoroughly planned program of special studies for scholastics. Teaching fields which are wanting qualified teachers and scholars should be specially indicated, together with opportunities available in the right places, type of preparation needed, etc.

3. Present Jesuit educational ideals, methods, etc. All need to know how to apply the *Ratio* (the "spirit and method of the *Ratio*," as the *Instructio* says) to modern conditions and circumstances. It is frequently assumed that *all* Jesuits are fully familiar with the *whole* range of Jesuit educational principle. One does not need to listen very long to Jesuits gloating over recessions from our traditional education to realize how untrue this assumption is.

4. Let someone give us a platform, a slogan, a rallying cry that will epitomize the whole Jesuit educational movement, help unify it throughout the Assistency, and distinguish it from all others.

5. Jesuit institutes; and first, What is the status of the Institute of Jesuit History at Loyola, Chicago? What has it accomplished? Have other institutes been planned or inaugurated?

6. The work of our university presses—Loyola, Fordham, Marquette—and the part played by Jesuits in the Bruce "Science and Culture Series."

7. Have editors of Jesuit magazines write about their publications, showing their scope and the place they might have in our schools and communities. Such magazines would be *Thought*, *Modern Schoolman*, *America*, *Classical Bulletin*, *Historical Bulletin*, *Woodstock Letters*, *Mid-America*, etc.

8. Historical articles on Jesuit mathematicians, physicists, litterateurs; on the Jesuit theatre; on Jesuit criticism (Longhaye, and others).

9. Articles that will encourage a professional attitude and professional reading among our teachers.

10. Does the authoritarian spirit of Jesuit education tend to repress the possibilities of leadership in some of our students and build up resistance in others?

C. *Scholasticates*

1. An evaluation of the new *Ratio Studiorum Superiorum*.

2. An occasional report, in article form, on special seminars and *cursus peculiare*s conducted in scholasticates—with outline of content, etc.—would interest Ours in studies and those in charge of graduate seminars and courses in our universities.

3. Why do many men depart from our juniorates with a distaste for the classics? Is it that they are presented too much as the be-all and end-all for all alike?

D. *High Schools*

1. A statistical study of the percentage of our high-school graduates who go to college; to *Jesuit* colleges, to other Catholic colleges, to secular schools.

2. Are the growing enrollments in our high schools an unmixed good, or are they likely to lessen the quality of our educational work?

3. A pro-and-contra debate on the permanent acceleration of high-school courses, with proper eliminations, intensification of effort.

4. Plan and map the reorganization of our high schools on a Jesuit basis. It would be a revolution!

5. A study to solve the growing and insistent problem of giving a fully authentic Jesuit education, at high standard, to our better high-school pupils.

6. What should be said about vocational and technical courses in our high schools?

7. What is the future of Greek?

8. Have experiments been made in our high schools with senior-year comprehensive examinations? Let us discuss what has been done and what might be done in this regard.

9. What result has been obtained with the use of objective tests in mid-year or other high-school examinations?

10. Each year's work in high school should have a goal which is *aimed at* by all who teach its subject matter and, therefore, *striven for* by the students under the guidance of teachers. When will these goals of successive years be set for us? Now few teachers know exactly what they should guide their pupils to achieve in any given year of high school.

11. We need articles on formal religious instruction in our high schools, as compared with the emphasis given to other subjects, and articles on the content, approach, problems, techniques of high-school religion.

E. *Common to High Schools and Colleges*

1. Extra-curricular activities: for example, compare emphasis accorded sports with that accorded dramatics, debating, literary clubs; various debate methods used by our schools in different provinces, together with analysis, results; a survey study of debating societies over a year: what they did, what subjects they debated, with what schools, what debating methods were used. Finally, can a method be worked out for placing academic extracurricular activities within the framework of class schedules?

2. A discussion of the pedagogy of religious truth and of the religious teaching problem in its many aspects.

3. Is there a way of estimating and presenting the real, factual extent of the influence which our schools exert on the moral and spiritual life of our students? Can ways and means be recommended of improving that influence?

4. Does someone wish to confer the high favor of drawing up an outline of an ideal syllabus (a) for a high-school unit (a year's work in a subject), and (b) for a college course of a semester or a year?

5. The aims of teaching science and mathematics on both the high-school and undergraduate levels.

6. Frankly face the question of whether Latin and Greek are under attack because they are out of date or overemphasized, or because they are poorly taught by poorly prepared and unenthusiastic teachers.

F. *Universities*

1. A developed adult education program, especially for after the war.

2. Give our significant graduate work the forum it deserves.

3. Give an account of rank and tenure norms and procedures that have been worked out and put into effect in our higher institutions.

4. Are we thinning out our effectiveness as educators by trying to run 12-13 universities? A factual study should be undertaken—for each province and eventually for the Assistancy—to determine whether or not we are overexpanded, that is,

whether we have resources of men and materials for doing well the job which we have undertaken.

5. Give an account of the work of our professional schools. All too few of us know what the other fellow is doing and how he is doing it.

6. What is wrong with Catholic higher education? Note the inferiority of scholarly productivity in our Jesuit universities; our small representation on committees and programs of learned societies; the too frequent saturation of effort by university spokesmen on pious or purely parochial speech-making; the fact that the so-called leading proponents of liberal education have produced scarcely a worthwhile book on the subject; and the spectacle of our graduates going forth bedecked with honors but also in a cloud of ignorance as regards primary research techniques, choosing a good book, or knowing how to read it.

G. Topics on Teaching

1. Conduct a teachers' clinic for proposing and solving problems; give us reports by experienced teachers on handling "difficult courses," such as freshman English, college religion, social science in high school.

2. Present the teaching methods and experiences of practiced teachers, of *great* teachers, Catholic and non-Catholic, Jesuit and non-Jesuit; their style of teaching, their success. For example, men like Billy Phelps, Bliss Perry, Wendell, Briggs, Babbitt.

3. The difference between the teaching task at the high-school and college level; at the lower- and upper-college level.

4. Our scholastics are supposed to be given a course in the methods of the *Ratio*. What relation exists between the theory they learn and the practice they find?

5. A prime subject is that of *motivating* our students to get a real education and not merely a certificate or a degree.

6. Tell us about standard tests that have been found useful—entrance, placement, achievement, mental, English, etc.—their purpose, limitations, values.

7. Outline for us a well-integrated four-year program in English for high school. Most do not know where they are going, what they are trying to achieve.

8. How can we make the teaching of mathematics or science Christlike? Father Delaney was only able to say, in the *ISO Bulletin* some years ago, that "all that concerns us now is that there is no class distinction in the multiplication table."

H. Alumni Topics

1. Can education do more for those who have graduated? Can we bring our alumni back to our campuses for more than an athletic or social event? Can frankly mature alumni study clubs for reading and discussing religious and philosophical classics, for debating issues of the day in the light of Catholic teaching, catch up the slack?

2. There are interesting possibilities in a statistical analysis of the occupations of our alumni.

3. Is the charge true that Jesuit alumni know little or nothing about and have no love for good literature, music, the arts, and no ability to distinguish good from poor paintings, a great from an inferior book?

4. Why do our alumni make so little impact on their surroundings?

IV. CONCLUSIONS FROM THE SURVEY

The first word of conclusion must be one of thanks to the many readers of the *QUARTERLY* who took the trouble to answer the question-

naire fully and frankly, and with such an evident desire to be helpful. The editors received compliments, complaints, and suggestions gladly and gratefully. This is plain, I believe, to anyone who has observed how much the QUARTERLY has profited, or attempted to profit, by the help it received. The format is less formal, although the type cannot for the present be changed. The feature departments have been reduced so as to give more room to discussion of important topics. The addition of the "Correspondence" department, however, has won the acclaim of our readers. It is hoped that it will become a busy forum for the exchange of ideas, viewpoints, experiences. In order to achieve this end, brevity will have to be insisted upon. Another suggestion is also being kept in mind. A beginning at least has been made to provide discussions of teaching techniques, methods, and problems.

In opening the survey with an analysis of the size of our audience, there was no wish to overplay our hand. Clearly, many Jesuits read the QUARTERLY, many do not, just as many do and do not read other periodicals of a popular or specialized nature. The concern of the editors was based on the conviction that until the QUARTERLY reached and influenced a much larger proportion of Jesuit *schoolmen*, until it was talked about, criticized, praised in our communities, its important purposes could not adequately be realized nor that perfection attained which its directors sought. Exponents of the questionnaire may make what use they wish of the fact that the circulation of the J. E. Q. questionnaire definitely enlarged the circulation of the QUARTERLY. Thereupon another effective promotional measure was taken. A letter was addressed to the Rectors of all Jesuit houses, in March 1943, asking the favor of having at least one article from each issue of the QUARTERLY read at table. The favor was granted in a way that was nothing less than magnificent. Unfortunately it has not been possible, up to the present, for the editors to take advantage of another tempting means of stirring up interest in the QUARTERLY, suggested by a friend at court; that, namely, of visiting the houses of study and discussing with the very receptive scholastics our aims and plans, and their role as readers and contributors. Finally, much good would result from occasional discussion of articles at meetings of high-school and college faculties.

The recurrent insistence by younger teachers on the need for "tips" on teaching, for more articles on methods, and for a frankly pragmatic approach, should be examined perhaps a little more fully. It may betoken a certain lack in the pedagogical preparation of scholastic teachers, or their inability to apply theory to the practical problems they meet in the classroom. But there is reason for believing, too, that the principal functions of the QUARTERLY may not have been clearly enough enunciated. Its aims

are to establish and illumine principles which are lacking or erroneous in secular education, to help *all* Jesuits to determine what *Jesuit* education really is, and to provide a stimulating challenge to Jesuits to broaden their educational interests and thinking. In this way they will come to exercise responsibility and initiative, and make their concern the broad purposes of our educational vocation rather than the narrow interests of a specialized field. It is undoubtedly true that "great teaching" has always been a Jesuit ideal. That ideal needs constantly to be reaffirmed and revived. Mere techniques and methods, however, are not enough. They draw what value they have from a clear and deep understanding of educational aims and principles, from a growing and inspiring sense of power over the subjects one teaches, and from a mastery of the art of eliciting, by communication of mind with mind, a fruitful response in the student. It is this that is the essence of great teaching. And it is this that the QUARTERLY would make its chief concern.

Status of Graduate Studies in the Assistancy, 1943-1944

This year's survey of special studies in the Assistancy shows that there are seventy-six Jesuits doing graduate work on a fulltime basis in nineteen different graduate schools and in nineteen different fields. Sixty of the graduate students are priests, sixteen are scholastics. A comparative record of the past three years indicates a yearly decline in numbers, due in part at least to the exigencies of the war. The most noticeable decline is in the number of scholastics pursuing special studies. Comparative statistics for the past three years are given here.

	1941-42	1942-43	1943-44
Full-time graduate students	127	90	76
Priest graduate students	75	63	60
Scholastic graduate students	52	27	16
Candidates for the Ph. D.	60	47	58
Candidates for the M. A.	39	14	8
Candidates for the M. S.	10	13	6
Candidates for other degrees	10	6	4
Special studies, but no degree	8	10	0

The 1943-44 record in detail is as follows:

I. DEGREES SOUGHT

	Calif. Prov.	Chic. Prov.	Md. Prov.	Miss. Prov.	N. Eng. Prov.	N. Orls. Prov.	N. York Prov.	Oregon Prov.
Ph. D., new	3	3	2	0	0	2	4	5
Ph. D., cont.	5	5	1	4	9	0	5	10
M. A., new	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0
M. A., cont.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
M. S., new	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0
M. S., cont.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Others new	1 ¹	1 ²	0	1 ¹	0	0	0	0
Others cont.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Totals	11	9	4	6	11	6	14	15

¹ S. T. D.

² M. D.

II. MAJOR FIELDS

	Calif. Prov.	Chic. Prov.	Maryld. Prov.	Miss. Prov.	N. Eng. Prov.	N. Orls. Prov.	N. York Prov.	Oreg. Prov.	Totals
Archaeology					2 Ph. D.				2 Ph. D.
Astronomy							1 Ph. D.		1 Ph. D.
Biology	1 M. S.	1 Ph. D.			1 M. S.	1 M. S.	1 M. S.	1 Ph. D.	2 Ph. D. 4 M. S.
Chemistry					1 Ph. D.	1 M. S.		2 Ph. D.	3 Ph. D.
Classics	1 Ph. D. 1 M. A.		1 Ph. D.				1 Ph. D.	1 Ph. D.	1 M. S. 4 Ph. D.
Dogma	1 S. T. D.			1 S. T. D.					1 M. A. 2 S. T. D.
Economics		1 Ph. D.		1 Ph. D.	2 Ph. D.	1 Ph. D.	2 Ph. D.	2 Ph. D.	9 Ph. D.
Education	2 Ph. D.		1 Ph. D.		1 Ph. D.				4 Ph. D.
English	1 Ph. D.	1 Ph. D.			1 Ph. D.		1 Ph. D.	2 Ph. D.	6 Ph. D.
Geophysics				1 Ph. D.					2 M. A. 1 Ph. D.
History			1 M. A.	1 Ph. D.			1 M. A.	2 Ph. D.	3 Ph. D.
Mathematics						1 Ph. D.	1 M. A.		2 M. A. 1 Ph. D.
Medicine									1 M. A. 1 M. D.
Patristics							1 Ph. D.		1 Ph. D.
Philosophy	2 Ph. D.	3 Ph. D.	1 Ph. D.		1 Ph. D.		2 Ph. D.	4 Ph. D.	13 Ph. D.
Physics				1 Ph. D.	1 D. Sc.	1 M. S.			1 Ph. D.
Political Science	1 Ph. D.	1 Ph. D.							1 D. Sc. 1 M. S.
Psychology							1 Ph. D.		2 Ph. D. 1 Ph. D.
Sociology	1 Ph. D.	1 Ph. D.		1 M. A.	1 Ph. D.	1 M. A.		1 Ph. D.	4 Ph. D. 2 M. A.

III. SCHOOLS³

	Calif.	Chic.	Maryld.	Missouri	N. Eng.	N. Orls.	N. Y.	Oreg.	Totals
Calif.	1	1	.	.	2
Cath. U.	1	.	.	1	1	1	2	2	8
Chicago	1	.	.	1	2	.	.	.	4
Clark	2	.	.	.	2
Columbia	1	1	.	2
Fordham	1	6	2	.	3	1	5	.	18
Georgetown	1	.	.	.	4	.	5
Harvard	1	.	2	.	1	.	4
Immaculee, Montreal .	1	.	.	1	2
Iowa	1	1
Johns Hop.	1	1	1	3
Loyola, Chicago	1	3	4
Michigan	1	.	.	1
M. I. T.	1	.	.	.	1
Ohio State	1	1
St. Louis	2	.	.	3	.	2	.	4	11
Toronto	3	1	4
Washington, Univ. of.	2	2
Yale	1	1

³ *Archaeology* at Chicago; *Astronomy* at Harvard; *Biology* at Fordham and Johns Hopkins; *Chemistry* at Catholic U., Clark, Ohio State; *Classics* at Harvard, Johns Hopkins, St. Louis (2), Toronto; *Economics* at Chicago, Clark, California, Columbia, Georgetown, Harvard, Catholic U., St. Louis; *Education* at California, Fordham (3); *English* at Fordham, Harvard, Iowa, St. Louis, Univ. of Washington, Yale; *Geophysics* at St. Louis; *History* at Catholic U., Georgetown, Loyola, Chicago (2); *Philosophy* at Catholic U., Fordham, Loyola, Chicago, St. Louis, Toronto; *Political Science* at Chicago and Fordham; *Sociology* at Catholic U., Fordham, St. Louis.

Latin-American Survey

W. EUGENE SHIELS, S. J.

Recently there appeared a book¹ that will mean much to teachers and writers on Latin America. Several Jesuits had a hand in its production, and many more will enjoy and profit from it in classwork, discussion, and lecturing. For these reasons the genesis and character of the book seem worthy of some notice in these pages.

The book is an answer to the question: How do American schools teach Latin-American affairs? The question has long been asked by many who know that to the south of the United States live millions of our fellow-Catholics and fellow-Americans in a great continent which will surely play a vital part in our immediate future. Do we know those peoples? What are our educators doing to learn more about them and to present it better to their students?

This same question came with increasing urgency to the American Council on Education, that agency in Washington which looks after the interests of American schools without attempting to determine their policies or their conduct. Late in 1942 the President of the Council, Mr. George F. Zook, acting as spokesman of his group, went to the office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and asked for financial support for an investigation into this question. The coordinator, Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, allotted \$37,000 and commissioned the Council to produce a thorough and honest report on the subject.

Though the study would not be motivated by any political party, nor essay any political purpose, it would obviously be most useful in informing the American mind in regard to Latin America. And as it is very much to our national and particular interest to understand Latin America, and to cultivate closer cultural relations with the peoples of the other American republics, the Council received the appropriation most gratefully and went to work on its use.

Mr. Zook wisely avoided a total investigation of school practice in this matter. Time and the nature of the problem dictated that he concentrate on one special phase of instruction, and this is the final reason why the survey centered itself on the study of textbooks used in our classrooms. Furthermore, American schools use textbooks more than do

¹ *Latin America in School and College Teaching Materials: Part I.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1944. Pp. 42. \$.25.

schools of any other people. For this reason our texts are probably more diversified and more highly developed than those in foreign countries. And so it was thought that, in a brief and concentrated investigation, a study of our textbooks would reveal the quality of material studied and the method of presenting that material. Consequently it was decided to examine all the main texts dealing with Latin-American materials taught in American grade schools, high schools, colleges, and universities, and from this examination to draw some general conclusions on their educational worth and some specific recommendations for their improvement.

In order to guarantee a fair and full investigation, a committee of qualified scholars was appointed by the American Council and given complete charge of the survey. The chairman is Professor Arthur P. Whitaker, Latin-American historian and director of the graduate department of history in the University of Pennsylvania. (Professor Whitaker is currently on leave to the State Department, where he heads the Latin-American section of the Division of Political Studies.) One of his colleagues of Pennsylvania, Professor E. D. Grizzell, of the department of education, sits on the committee as the special representative of educational interests. Dr. Wendell C. Bennett, anthropologist of Yale University, speaks for that field. Dr. Irving A. Leonard, of the University of Michigan, looks after literature and is generally reckoned a man of special understanding in the entire range of Latin-American teaching. Col. Preston E. James, U. S. A., now on leave from the University of Michigan and engaged in the Office of Strategic Services of the War Department, is the geographical expert. Dean Henry Grattan Doyle, chancellor of George Washington University and highly reputed as a director of language study, oversees the linguistics. The broad international outlook is guaranteed by Mr. Malcolm W. Davis of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The author was invited to be a member of the committee to look out for proper religious interpretations both in the work of the fact-finders and in the final composition of the report. Dr. Zook sat in on all but one of the meetings of the committee, which were held monthly, for one or two days at a time, from February to December of 1943.

The director chosen to superintend the survey was Dr. Howard E. Wilson of Harvard University. He was paid \$5,000 for the immediate task of guiding the progress of the study. His was the duty of contacting specialists, later chosen by the committee; of traveling over the country where the specialists were at work on their separate sections of the enterprise; of bringing the specialists together for regional conferences, maintaining a central office for handling completed studies, channeling

the advice and corrections given by the committee and a host of reviewers, demanding the rewriting or reallocation of the special sections of the work when the originally chosen specialists proved unsatisfactory, and in general acting as spokesman for the committee.

Twenty subjects were selected as fields in which Latin-American materials were being or should be taught—from geography and language to sociology, music, and art. Teams of two experts in each field were selected by the committee to examine the more generally used textbooks. Each team then drew up its preliminary report and submitted it to the committee. Whereupon special reviewers were assigned to go over this report, and again after the second or even the third draft had been drawn. In this process over a hundred and fifty specialists took an active part and more than eight hundred texts in the various disciplines were examined. It was then the committee's function to edit the final report, the summary of which is the publication cited at the beginning of this account. The full report, which will run to a book of about four hundred pages, will be published sometime in the spring.

The subjects reviewed were the following: World History, Foreign Policy and International Relations, Geography, Modern Problems, Education, Spanish Language, Portuguese Language, a group containing Philosophy, Economics, Sociology, Political Theory, and Anthropology, then Music, Arts and Crafts, Literature, United States History, Latin American History. Two additional studies reviewed Latin-America in biography and in current events magazines. Visual education aids, such as moving pictures and pictorial charts, also formed a separate field of investigation.

Throughout the survey, the questions constantly before the minds of the specialists were three: Is the treatment accurate? Is it sufficient? Is it biased or prejudiced? Answers to these questions depended obviously on criteria which might not receive universal acceptance. However the composition of the committee overseeing the survey was such that the criteria employed kept well within the bounds of integrity and common sense.

What were the answers, what were the results obtained by the highly qualified and laborious specialists who made the study? What general conclusions did they reach? What recommendations did they make for improving textbooks, and incidentally curricula and teaching techniques?

The answers will be found summarized in the brochure referred to above. Of course serious teachers and writers will not be satisfied with this condensation of findings. They will wish to consult the larger report, which contains chapters on each of the individual investigations, a list of the texts examined in each field, and a complete roster of the specialists

who cooperated in the survey. This volume also is being published by the American Council on Education.

One last word. This survey is actually being made effective even now. Its implementation is going forward under the direction of the Council. To date the best single effect was obtained when the committee held a meeting with publishers in November 1943. Every important publisher in the country came personally or sent his qualified representatives to the meeting, at which every detail of the study and its conclusions were explained and discussed. The tremendous interest this group of publishers showed in the study made it evident how much they valued it from a business standpoint. Beyond this, a publicity program is under way to spread over the educational world the findings of the survey. Great hopes are entertained that in this way the work will produce important results wherever the subject of Latin America is matter for instruction or discussion.

Correspondence

“Blueprint for a College”

Dear Editor:

Father Davis' "Blueprint for a College" comes as a trumpet call. It should bring joy to the heart of every Jesuit interested in liberal education. The objectives are traditional Jesuit objectives, the means traditional Jesuit means. It lacks the modern vagaries most of us deplore and cannot correct. In following educational "trends" for the past thirty years we have strayed from orthodoxy and this looks like the road home. Even if the product of this ideal school did not enter the fields mentioned, the school would still justify its existence.

I doubt if two Jesuits would agree with the plan in all its details. But it is wise and sound. I do hope Jesuits in college work will be interested enough to offer criticisms and suggestions. I would like to see such interest result in establishing this institution, which, like St. John's College, would be castigated by the progressives and imitated by the wise.

If the proposed college is not a boarding school I fear the worst. The objectives sought cannot, in my opinion, be attained in a day school. Sustained interest and prolonged reflection are not possible in a day school. The academic atmosphere disappears when students escape from class into the busy world. The best college students I have observed in the past ten years have had so many calls on their time—social engagements, radio, movies, duties at home, outside work, travel back and forth, to mention a few—that it was impossible for them to maintain the interest and attention so necessary for sound intellectual growth. Consequently the most gifted students very often failed to attain their maximum potentialities. But these same students, in the right surroundings, would discover the joy of intellectual pursuits and not seek those wasteful "extracurricular" activities which critics tell us are the students' refuge from boredom.

The college should, I think, be an independent institution near one of our large universities, and the students should be chosen exclusively from Jesuit high schools in the Assistancy. In the selection of students, scholastic ability should not be the only norm; unless character and personality are carefully weighed we might waste our time on genuises who lack these most important qualities. I strongly support a faculty exclusively Jesuit, but I think that five priests and four scholastics would be a wiser division of the mystic number nine. For many years I have watched the work of

scholastics and the best of them can accomplish what priests older in years, in the main, cannot do. I would also limit the bewildered freshmen to a three-day closed retreat and experiment with the "long retreat" of eight days on college seniors. Even that may be too much, but I would like to see it a success.

Father Davis wisely expects everybody to disagree with the curriculum to some extent. He will not be disappointed. After consulting the experts in the different fields I think it could be improved, especially in the philosophy sequence. That, however, remains a matter of discussion and adaptation. The general scheme of the curriculum without majors and minors or electives is excellent. The fact that music and the fine arts are omitted from the liberal-arts program is probably an oversight.

Among the extracurricular activities I would omit play-shop, which commonly is mostly play. Too many valuable hours have been wasted in building scenery, hanging drapes, and making costumes. This is vocational not liberal. Play-shop has no more relation to playwriting than vocational education has to liberal education.

While I could continue at length in praise and criticism of a great idea, I will close by suggesting that a committee be appointed to refine and perfect the plan and present the final blueprint to the Fathers Provincial and Father Assistant. If a generous and wise donor cannot be found, each province in the Assistancy could contribute to the establishment of one small college which represents so well the ideals of the Society. At least the plan outlined by Father Davis is worthy of serious consideration. It is either a futile dream of an idealist or an enterprise of great pith and moment.

JOHN F. QUINN, S. J., Dean
University of Detroit,
College of Arts and Sciences

Dear Editor:

I have been exceptionally impressed by the amount of favorable discussion which the younger men of our Province have given to the article by Father Thurston Davis in the October QUARTERLY, "Blueprint for a College." This alert and ambitious interest points to a solid and wholesome orientation for our educational policy in the not-too-distant future when these scholastics will be occupying posts of authority.

What I mean by "solid and wholesome orientation" is not at all a blanket condemnation of our educational policy in its present form. On the other hand, the practical exigencies of survival and of providing necessary relief to critical conditions here and now probably are monopolizing the attention of our administrators a little too exclusively for our future

corporate welfare. The times are hard. The task of directors is complicated beyond all known precedent. But one sign of regrettable oversolicitude became apparent at the recent meeting in Cincinnati of Jesuit delegates attending the convention of the Association of American Colleges.

In the discussion, which centered on liberal-arts education, there were two main currents of opinion. Some wished the standards of our present arts colleges relaxed still more in order to admit further study of subjects with an *ad hoc* usefulness in earning a livelihood. It was their conviction that students from less wealthy families, who are in the majority in our schools, cannot afford many years of mainly *liberal* education. Others believed we should strive to inject a still greater liberalizing content into our business, industrial, and professional courses; for thus could be achieved all essential purposes of a liberal education in each of the university curricula.

To my way of thinking, neither of these proposals would bring benefit either to the Society's schools or to the development of human society. It must be conceded, it would seem, that purely liberal training is not likely to become the predominant form of education in our colleges within the space of several generations to come. The question baldly posed is rather whether or not we should let that genuine liberal training die out of the memory of our twentieth-century generations once for all. The recommendations I have referred to above seem capable of bringing this about in our schools if they are acted upon.

It is in view of this danger that the appearance of Father Davis' article and the attitude of our younger men toward it are so refreshing. For whatever may be said with justice concerning our duty to the ordinary student and his immediate pecuniary needs, as it was presented at the Cincinnati meeting, the fact remains unchanged that we as Jesuits have an even more urgent duty of not deserting our exceptional students. From among them there is hope that we can develop adequately formed and normally matured Catholic thinkers and writers who will help in regenerating society. Other needs of even a majority of our students should not be allowed to hide this truth from us. While *all* men must "make a living," *some* men must continue to know also, and with adequate comprehensiveness, *what it means "to live."* Some men in every age must guard humanity's great thoughts about itself and its destiny—at once guard and adapt and amplify them with befitting accuracy and beauty. Else making a living is going to be a very shabby business for everybody. Even the boys who cannot afford complete education, ultimately must depend upon the wise judgment and guidance of men who have had those opportunities to the full.

We Jesuits have considerable control of higher Catholic education in

the United States. Our long period of presacerdotal training fits us to supply in sufficient quantity a personnel for colleges that claim and are in fact broadly human. And atop these facts rests the intention which was typical of our founder St. Ignatius, that before all else his Company's efforts should go to the training of leaders. (Who will argue that he meant by this term "business or professional or political successes" in the modern confined sense of the phrase!) Therefore we must promote and maintain *some* schools at least where the *best* in Catholic human tradition is fostered without any adulteration. "*Vel sint scholae nostrae inter optimas, vel ne sint*" are the strong words of our late Father General. The practical mode of action seems to be one that will recognize and provide for all our responsibilities side by side without any extremes of oversimplification. We have, however, a few very definite and very unalterable commitments of which we must remain ceaselessly mindful. One of those commitments is that it will never become impossible for Catholics to acquire the best of Christian humanistic education from us.

In the light of such commitment, I consider Father Davis' article a significant contribution toward sane educational policy for our immediate future. Without the need for completely separate, new foundations, the "Blueprint for a College" is capable of realization on most of our existing campuses, provided its faculty be composed, as Father Davis recommends, of "men who are convinced of the value of liberal education, enthusiastically eager to harness our way of education to new times, and willing to engage themselves unselfishly in the teamwork requisite for such a college." No great outlay for equipment is necessary. Where facilities will permit the assigning to it of a building apart, on or near the campus, in which its life may concentrate, that surely will be helpful though not strictly essential. I hope the idea will not be crowded out of the minds of our administrators by the particular problems of today. I should like to see Father Davis' plan tried in many places, and the faculty to staff it chosen from men whose idealism and elasticity will guarantee its success.

LAURENCE E. HENDERSON, S. J.
Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio

"Amending the Liberal College"

Dear Editor:

Our thanks to Father Hartnett for writing, and to you for featuring the article, "Amending the Liberal College" in the January number. . . . We think it is the best program we have seen so far, and very definitely superior to the general prewar setup of our Jesuit schools. The recommendations appear to us to exhibit a rare combination of theoretical sure-

ness with practical balance. No less valuable than his detailed treatment of college reorganization, seem his suggestions for improving our high schools.

ARNOLD J. BENEDETTO, S. J.

A. J. PILIE, S. J.

CHARLES L. GOETZ, S. J.

J. F. MURRAY, S. J.

YOUREE WATSON, S. J.

St. Mary's College

St. Marys, Kansas

Universities and a Just Peace

Dear Editor:

The Universities Committee on Postwar International Problems (40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston 8, Massachusetts), which is under the chairmanship of Ralph Barton Perry of Harvard, has asked universities throughout the country to join it in the study of problems affecting a just and lasting peace. Many, if not all, of our institutions received invitations to participate.

The procedure of the committee is this: An expert chosen by the committee prepares a review of the question to be discussed. This is sent in printed form to the universities participating. A faculty group then discusses the issue, and the conclusions representing their collective or individual opinions are forwarded to the committee. The reports thus submitted are collated and the resulting synthesis circulated to the general public. Shades of differences and sundry recommendations are carefully reported. In the summation of opinions no particular view is identified with any individual institution, but at the end are given the names of the universities and colleges taking part.

A review of the subjects treated in the past year reveals matter that Catholic institutions definitely should be concerned with:

1. Treatment of defeated enemy countries: Germany
2. International organization against military aggression
3. Relief and rehabilitation
4. International economic collaboration
5. Proposed methods for international collaboration
6. Colonies and dependent areas
7. Education and world peace
8. Protection of the freedom of the individual
9. Postwar treatment of Japan

No one can doubt that these issues are of vital interest to Catholics. The Pope's program for peace involves just these problems. The recent

Declaration on World Peace, endorsed by leading prelates, priests, and laymen, as well as by representative Jewish and Protestant leaders (and by the West Baden ISO Conference), enunciates definite principles which bear on these questions. Our Jesuit professors are in a position to contribute mightily toward spreading these principles and activating them.

The reports of the Universities Committee on Postwar International Problems which have been published thus far show that our colleges and universities have found it worth while, in spite of abnormal conditions under which most of them exist, to take part in at least some of these studies. Five of our institutions of higher learning have submitted reports at one time or another. These are Loyola of the South, Fordham, St. Louis, John Carroll, and Holy Cross.

The report on the most recent problem, however, listed only one Jesuit school out of a total of thirty-seven cooperating groups from which replies had been received. Perhaps the readers of the *QUARTERLY*, especially in those places which have collaborated with the Universities Committee, can offer some comments as to the value of this sort of study. Is it worth while to continue or increase our efforts in this sphere? If we should take a larger part, we would like to know it. If it is not worth the trouble—well, we would like to know that too.

ROBERT A. GRAHAM, S. J., Secretary
ISO Committee on a Just World Order

“A Degree in Industrial Relations”

Dear Editor:

There is a famous English economist—highly gifted too as a mathematician—who refuses to read the economic classics, but is forever experimenting with equations in an attempt to discover economic principles. Whenever he formulates something which he thinks is really good, he is discreet enough, before announcing it as revolutionary, to take it to one of his friends and inquire if anybody had ever discovered it before. He usually finds, of course, that somebody had.

Father Smith is in a similar position. There are only two courses in his proposed curriculum (*QUARTERLY*, January 1944, pp. 157-58) which are not at present available to economics majors in St. Louis University's School of Commerce and Finance. Of these two courses, the one which is worth giving is available in different forms in both the Labor College and the Graduate School, as well as in the Engineering, Science, and Management War Training courses. In effect, what Father Smith does is to introduce into the lower division informational courses about labor, which are designed to stimulate the student's interest before he has the intellectual apparatus, either philosophical or economic, to cope with them. I do not

propose to lay down any general formula for choosing between the logical and psychological approach to a subject, but I do not see any purpose in teaching "current labor problems" to freshmen who have absolutely no tools to set about solving the problems. A person can learn a great deal pattering around a hospital ward, but when we are ill, most of us would prefer to be cared for by a man who had had a good course in anatomy and physiology before he attacked pathology.

Two students at St. Louis University, both now in the service, planned to enter the field of industrial relations. Both had their bachelor's degree in commerce, including such a mundane concern as accounting, which I think is indispensable in determining whether an enterprise *can* pay a given wage scale—a matter at least as important as knowing whether an enterprise *ought* to pay such a wage scale. The study of industrial relations planned for these two young men was to be a master's program, as it should be.

An informal but rather thorough survey of the St. Louis market indicates that it would not be easy to place young men in industrial relations jobs, either in the companies or in the unions. The handling of these affairs naturally falls to persons of considerable experience in the particular enterprise or interested concern. With graduate students a beginning can be made. Practically all of our graduate students have acted as field agents for the National Relations Board at various elections. In this way they begin to see the processes in operation, and become fit for posts in the United States Employment Service, the Wages and Hours Division, etc., where they gain the experience needed if they are to be of use to a union or a company with major personnel problems. But when we get that far, we are a long way from using the newspapers and magazines as textbooks for freshmen.

This school has very friendly relations with the local Export Managers Club and related groups in the Chamber of Commerce and the National Foreign Trade Council. St. Louis does a substantial export business, and there are almost three hundred good jobs in St. Louis in foreign trade administration. When our best friends were seriously questioned on the advisability of establishing a foreign trade curriculum, the unanimous answer was "No."

Send us (they said) a boy with an education, a good economist, accountant, and statistician, and we will make a good foreign trade man out of him. We cannot make good economists, statisticians, and accountants, but you cannot teach the shifting details of export practice. These must be learned on the job. The school should continue to do the things that only the school can do, but not attempt to teach those things which can be learned only by experience.

The student at St. Louis University who has taken our courses in labor economics, labor relations, social insurance, the economics of the wage contract, government and business, competition, combination and control, and theories of corporative economy has about all that a curriculum in industrial relations can reasonably hope to give him.

The realization that certain things need to be done is not in itself proof that they are not being done.

BERNARD W. DEMPSEY, S. J.
School of Commerce and Finance
St. Louis University

Dear Editor:

The proposed program for a four-year course leading to a Bachelor of Industrial Relations (*ISO Bulletin*, I, 1, pp. 14-17; *QUARTERLY*, January 1944, pp. 155-58) is open to a number of serious objections. In order to be as brief as possible, I shall merely enumerate these objections.

1. The program is apparently influenced by the common American educational heresy that the proper preparation for a job is a degree based upon training for that particular job. This is to lose sight of the fact that the primary academic objective of all Jesuit undergraduate education should be formation, not information.

2. Provided the college is genuinely Catholic, there is nothing worth while in the program that could not be more effectively worked into a good major in economics.

3. The philosophy course, as it is currently given in our schools, is here emasculated.

4. The religion course, which should run through the four years of college, is reduced to two, or at least three years, and is very vague—v. g., "Junior Religion—interwoven in an advanced course in sociology," or, "*Religion and Sociology (Advanced)*. Again, philosophic principles and religious dogma to be interwoven with current sociological problems."

5. Much of the instruction is based upon the false notion that the encyclicals were written to be used as textbooks. On the contrary, they are written in a very technical style (*stylus curiae*) and, for the most part, are directed to a very special audience, the "*Ecclesia docens*," whose duty it is to popularize them. It is our duty to see that the *doctrine* of the encyclicals permeates our whole course and finds expression in our textbooks.

6. A student going through this course would receive a very inadequate knowledge of the Catholic contribution to western civilization.

7. One wonders what kind of course in Current Labor Problems would be taught from newspapers and magazine articles.

8. "Catholic answers to questions asked by non-Catholics" sounds like the prescription of Conway's *Question Box* as a senior religion text.

9. One fails to see the necessity of devoting a course to Parliamentary Procedure. If the future labor leader were obliged to become a member of a well-organized debating society, he would not only master the technique but also the practice of parliamentary procedure.

10. One would like to see a syllabus of such a course as "Catholic Lay Leaders in History." If, as it should, the college develops intelligent reading habits in its students, there should be no need for a "course" such as this.

11. "Journalism" should not be recommended even as an elective. We should teach our students to think and write correctly. After that it should not take them long to master the tricks of journalism.

12. One wonders if there are not some very definite omissions in the proposed program; for example, a future labor leader should certainly know something of the federal and state laws affecting labor, and also something of the problems of production and distribution, if he is not to be entirely one-sided.

13. We will not enhance the position of the future labor leader by creating a special degree for him. The prestige degree is still, and is likely to remain for some time, the A. B. degree.

In conclusion I make these two recommendations: First, that qualified young men must be encouraged by all means to look upon labor leadership not only as a career but as an apostolate, for which they must adequately prepare themselves both spiritually and intellectually. Secondly, to prepare such leaders, the Catholic college must be fearlessly Catholic, which means, among many other things, being delicately sensitive to the directives of the Holy See; and it must really educate, that is, it must form and not merely inform.

HUGH M. DUCE, S. J.
General Prefect of Studies,
California Province

A Comparison of National Statistics

CHARLES M. O'HARA, S. J.

The difficulties inherent in presenting the Jesuit enrollment statistics and in comparing them with the national figures of this year can readily be imagined. There are many divergences in the programs now followed by our schools, and as many ways of reporting them. Naturally it has in many cases taken some time to reach decisions as to how they were to be presented. Some of the figures still remain military secrets.

The trouble has been nationwide. The first of the semiofficial articles containing the national statistics, presented annually by President Raymond Walters of the University of Cincinnati in *School and Society*, appeared, later than usual, in the issue of December 25, and the second, in the issue of February 12, has just come to hand.

On this account it was thought better to publish the enrollment statistics as soon as possible, and they appeared in as good form as could be devised in the January QUARTERLY. The "Survey" follows in this issue. Incidentally, Mr. William Penney, director of the Central Bureau of Information and Statistics of Marquette University, has been an invaluable aid in the preparation of these annual presentations. Another very helpful fact was that statistics from individual Jesuit schools were returned with dispatch.

A continued effort is being made to eliminate duplicates and to distinguish more carefully between full-time and part-time students. This of course has become a more difficult problem than ever before to the schools.

There are 19,841 students enrolled in the thirty-seven Jesuit high schools, and, allowing for the statistical uncertainties of the year, 36,276 enrolled in the colleges and universities. Thus there is a total of 56,117 students now receiving Jesuit education in the United States. In the case of the high schools this represents a gain; in the case of the higher schools, a decrease; but in both cases the result was to be expected.

This analysis consists of three parts: I. The High Schools; II. The Universities and Colleges; and III. Interpretative Notes. The notes in Part III should be consulted in connection with the enrollment tables.

I. THE HIGH SCHOOLS

The increase in high-school enrollment was almost identical with that of the year previous: 1,491 this year as against 1,441. However, this year the three new schools of last year contributed only their increase, totalling

105, with Dallas losing 8; whereas last year their total enrollment was added. The "net" increase last year was 4 per cent, as against 4.3 per cent the year before. This year, the increase amounted to a solid 7.85 per cent over last year.

Eight high schools showed decreases, but most of them were quite small. In the case of Champion there was a technical decrease of 1, and we understand that Champion cannot possibly take in more students. In no case does the decrease amount to 10 per cent. The few numerically larger decreases are in relatively old, established schools, probably for local causes. The smaller decreases, none of which reach 10, are in relatively new and small schools. Thus none of the schools has definitely suffered.

Boston College High School shows a substantial increase to continue its position as our largest school, with 1,170 students. There are several other large increases in the strong industrial centers. Of course, in the case of several of the larger schools normal capacity has been reached and even exceeded.

Despite this last fact, it is to be expected that the high-school enrollment for the country will march over the 20,000 mark next year.

The proportions in the classes are quite satisfactory, considering the circumstances. There is a percentage of 34.4 in first year. This represents an even greater proportion of the total than for last year. The percentage for second year is 26.6, about equal to last year. In third year the percentages remain about the same, 21.3 for this year as against 22. However, in fourth year, although last year's graduating class was the last of the "depression" classes, it counted 19 per cent of the total enrollment as against a decrease to 16.6 per cent for this year. ("Special students" are excluded in these percentages.) No doubt the withdrawal of students for reasons of war is responsible for this condition. Since the figures are taken for the first semester, high-school students entering college after seven terms would hardly represent a sizeable number.

II. THE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

One has only to glance at the first article of Dr. Walters in *School and Society* to realize the difficulty of setting forth any satisfactory national figures this year, to say nothing of making comparisons. The necessary military secrecy in some of the armed force categories makes it absolutely impossible to give correct figures. Another difficulty is that the length of residence of other of the armed force categories is so diverse. In the February 12 paper in *School and Society*, for example, Harvard reports that "the turnover in some of these schools is very fast, varying from three weeks to four months." When a succeeding group of students arrives for some course every three weeks, is it fair to count all the students who

have taken that course during a year, or merely to give the average number enrolled at one time?

The summer period also presents its own difficulty. One school will have three four-month sessions during the year and therefore no summer session at all. (In some of the larger universities there are two or three different calendar arrangements in different schools.) Another school will have as many as three successive summer sessions. Can satisfactory comparisons be made, even counting on the elimination of duplications? The duplication problem itself is being slowly conquered in our schools, but it is not yet entirely eradicated.

In the national survey, Dr. Walters confines his workable statistics to the civilian students who remain in residence as compared to last year. It is true that he gives, separately, such figures as the armed forces have released, but does not take them into direct consideration in his national comparison. He mentions a total estimate of 300,000 enlisted men, but this is an estimate of the armed force enlisted men in all the schools of the country, whereas the civilian figures are not universal.

As regards full-time students, Dr. Walters reports a drop from 750,233 in 674 institutions last year to 460,849. This is a decrease of 38.6 per cent. It will be remembered that there were national decreases of 9 per cent and 9.5 per cent in the two preceding years. For part-time and full-time resident students, Dr. Walters reports a drop from 1,074,983 to 746,831 in 1943, or a decrease of 30.5 per cent.

Even these figures are not comparable with those of the Jesuit schools because, in the national scene, there has been a great increase in the number of women students. No less than 67 per cent of all civilian students in college and university residence this year are women, "practically two out of every three." Nor is it to be thought that all these women students are registered for the less solid and possibly ephemeral curricula of the day. As Dr. Walters says, "most substantial increases of all are reported by twenty-eight Catholic colleges for women situated in all parts of the country."

Dr. Walters calls the current enrollments in teachers colleges "alarmingly low." He states that there is a loss of 49 per cent of full-time civilian students in forty-nine independent technological schools. And, "in colleges of arts and science, both with universities and of independent status, the drop in civilian men is tremendous."

In a general way, but only in a general way, the Jesuit statistics can be compared to this picture. Last year, allowing for a greater number of duplications, especially with regard to the summer sessions, which were then counted in, the total enrollment in the Jesuit higher schools was 50,443. This year, the enrollment is set down as 36,276. In some cases,

armed force categories are included. In others, it is out of the question to do so. It is hardly right to draw up a percentage of decrease, but the figure stands at a little over 28 per cent. The addition of students who registered only for short summer sessions would lower this percentage.

The liberal arts colleges have dropped from 16,715 to 8,714, a decrease of almost 48 per cent. The decrease in all commerce courses amounts to 63 per cent. Medicine has dropped slightly, while dentistry has forged ahead somewhat. Engineering has dropped from 2,183 to 1,319, a decrease of 864, or almost 40 per cent. The graduate-school enrollment has held up very well, dropping from 2,546 to 2,488. Possibly the effect already felt by graduate schools nationally, where attendance decreased from 10 to 60 per cent, will be more evident in large-city graduate schools, such as ours, in another year.

Dr. Walters reports that only a handful of men students is to be found in standard law schools. Harvard, for example, records a drop from around 1,600 to 100 in the past two or three years. Our own decrease in day law courses is from 355 to 174. We had taken a severe drop in the two preceding years. Our night law enrollment seems to be holding up about as well as is the case nationally.

Should the general international situation remain about the same for the next year, it would seem that further decreases are in prospect, judging from the most recent directives from the selective service and armed forces offices.

III. INTERPRETATIVE NOTES TO THE TABLES

These notes are to be taken in conjunction with the tables that appeared in the January *QUARTERLY*. The general treatment remains the same as last year, and the general explanatory notes given in the January 1943 issue are still valid.

Graduate social work students are included in the "Graduate" column, as follows: Boston College, 162; Fordham, 212; Loyola, Chicago, 102. St. Louis has a division of Social Work, but did not distinguish the number registered in its report.

Nursing: St. Louis University and St. Peter's College entries are all "B. S." Of Marquette University's students, 22 are "R. N.," and 149 of Seattle College's 521. Georgetown has 3 students registered in the "B. S." course. All the rest of the entries in this column represent "R. N." classification.

The "Miscellaneous" column includes: Georgetown, 132 Foreign Service; Loyola, Chicago, 417 Home Study; Loyola, New Orleans, 60 Music; Marquette, 26 Dental Hygiene, 21 Speech, 22 C. P. A. Quiz; Seattle, 14 Music, 6 Home Study, 120 Night Aviation.

In the first "Totals" column, a double column, the left-hand figures record the total full-time students included in the columns to the left, as well as they could be segregated; the right-hand column gives the actual

totals of all the entires to the left, including full-time and part-time students.

Part-time students, as well as they can be segregated from the reports of the schools, appear in the seventeen left-hand columns as follows:

Boston College: 98 Graduate, 6 Night Law, 134 Social Work, 238 Extension.

Canisius College: 8 Liberal Arts, 77 Graduate, 30 Afternoon and Evening (in "University College" column), 128 Extension.

Creighton: 6 Day Commerce, 48 University College.

University of Detroit: 265 Liberal Arts, 11 Day Commerce, 233 Night Commerce, 66 Engineering, 63 Graduate, 10 Day Law, 25 Night Law, 70 Extension.

Fordham: 7 Commerce, 815 Education, 651 Graduate, 162 Night Law, 2 Pharmacy, 104 Extension.

Georgetown: 58 Graduate, 112 Night Law.

Gonzaga University: 3 Liberal Arts, 33 Night Law.

John Carroll University: 9 Liberal Arts, 3 Graduate.

Loyola, Chicago: 289 Night Commerce, 4 Night Law, 751 University College, 417 Home Study.

Loyola, Los Angeles: 64 Night Law.

Loyola, New Orleans: 224 Liberal Arts, 162 Night Commerce, 19 Education, 31 Night Law, 1 Medical Technology, 8 Music.

Marquette: 13 Liberal Arts, 133 Night Commerce, 202 Graduate.

Regis College: 2 Liberal Arts.

Rockhurst College: 12 Liberal Arts.

St. Joseph's College: 45 Liberal Arts.

St. Louis University: 259 Night Commerce, 8 Medicine, 414 University College, 223 Graduate—50 per cent estimate. (Corporate College enrollment in "Extension" column.)

St. Peter's College: 1 Liberal Arts, 3 Nursing.

University of San Francisco: 35 Liberal Arts, 34 Night Commerce.

University of Scranton: 100 Liberal Arts, 202 Night Commerce.

Seattle College: 120 Night Aviation, 6 Home Study, 3 Extension.

Spring Hill College: 36 Liberal Arts.

Xavier University: 406 Liberal Arts, 269 Night Commerce.

BOOKS

Liberal Education. By Mark Van Doren. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1943. Pp. xi, 186. \$2.50.

Here is an eloquent appeal for the revival or resuscitation—or is it inauguration?—of liberal education in our American colleges after the war. Whatever it is, it is hardly *continuance* because the author believes that what went by the name before the war is not worth saving, and that what enjoyed the name of humanism for centuries was really a distortion of what the Greeks knew, in that, unlike them, it separated man from nature and thereby created an unnatural dualism. The author claims little originality in the ideas he purveys—even apart from the plethora of quotations with which he enriches his statement—but he presents them in such brilliant language and with such depth of reflection that no Jesuit will find it anything but stimulating and delightful. At times, to be sure, his depth charges make navigation for the reader difficult and progress slow, but the journey is all the more exhilarating for that.

The educated person, according to Van Doren, may be defined in various terms, but in its simplest analysis it comes down to one who knows how to read, write, speak, and listen—four major arts in which he claims few are evenly proficient. Education's task is to make man more human than he was, or better perhaps, to make each person as human as he individually is able to be. He feels that seeing man in the middle position between animals and angels lights up his dimensions as nothing else does. Animals are unconscious of their ignorance and angels know without difficulty; whereas man, conscious of his ignorance, knows with difficulty. Man, however, is the only being that can misconceive his nature; animals do not conceive at all, angels conceive without error.

On this understanding of education—namely, to produce in each person the utmost of his humanity—Van Doren claims that education must be for *all*. Liberal education—and all education should be liberal—must work to make the aristocrat, the man of grace, the person, as numerous as fate allows. For in Van Doren's view no society can succeed henceforth unless its last citizen is as free to become a prince and a philosopher as his powers permit. He recognizes only too well that all men cannot be the best men, but holds the objective that they be as good as possible, for "the higher the average the safer the state."

To the question "What is liberal education?" Van Doren reminds us that it is "more than a classical education, more than an education in English literature, more than an education in what is called 'the humanities,' and more than a training in the moral virtues." It is all these and more, and even these must be understood in a correct sense, not the distorted

sense in which they have too frequently been taken. Above all, he deprecates the isolation, if not antipathy, in which science is currently held by exponents of liberal education and insists that science must again be recognized as humane and as an integral part of liberal education. "The science we use liberates more minds," he contends, "than the classics we have, since we do not know how to use the classics." Science, too, he adds, is an excellent medium for inculcating virtue, intellectual virtue to be sure, but then that is the conscious business of the educator rather than moral virtue. The liberal arts are the specifically intellectual arts, and therefore are keys to all of man's operations as man. They are basic, says Van Doren, to the life he lives in so far as it is unique, for his intellect has no counterpart elsewhere. In common terms, they are reducible to two—language and mathematics—but they are better understood perhaps under the traditional captions of *trivium* and *quadrivium* and the seven disciplines which these comprise. No new names have been found to supplant these seven, and so the old ones must be saved until such time as their meaning can be transferred without loss to another set. Just as we cling to the three R's as a prescription in elementary education, so in higher education we might well cling with equal tenacity to these seven.

The bane of the liberal-arts curriculum, of course, was the elective system, for which Van Doren has no kind words. For the three disciplines of Latin, Greek, and mathematics it substituted a hundred subjects for none of which a discipline can be named. It confused variety for breadth. A curriculum, on the contrary, which is deserving of the name, must be one that is worthy to be uniform and universal. The formula must be a narrow one, wisely narrow, consisting of but a few heads, three or four at most. A genuine curriculum, according to Van Doren, will permit no student to miss any important thing anywhere. The whole of it will be prescribed and prescribed for everybody—which, of course, stirs up the whole question of formal discipline. This Van Doren takes right by the horns by insisting that to assert that a study yields no discipline at all is to assume that all studies are hopelessly unrelated—"once a relation is assumed, then one study helps another as truth helps itself."

So far the Jesuit reader will agree with much that Van Doren has to say and says so well. But the climax that he is working up to is the view that liberal education is essentially and exclusively tied up with the program that has come to be identified with St. John's College, Annapolis, Maryland—Reading the World's Great Books. This question has been thrashed out thoroughly elsewhere; nor is this the place to discuss it. But the reader will be interested in the reasons why Van Doren feels this is the only solution for liberal education if it is to avoid the atomization of knowledge and retrieve the synthesis which only the Greeks enjoyed.

Liberal education, Van Doren insists, is useful education although it is not education in the useful arts. All education is useful, he rightfully urges, and none more so than the kind that makes men free to possess their nature. It is both useful and liberal, he notes, to be human, just as it takes both skill and knowledge to be wise. "If education is not practical when it teaches men the things which become men, then no education is practical." That is his final encomium.

EDWARD J. BAXTER, S. J.

Educational Reconstruction in Great Britain. By Stephen Duggan. New York: Institute of International Education. Pamphlet Series No. 7, December 1943.

A New Order in English Education. By H. C. Dent. London: University of London Press, 1942. Pp. 89. 3/6.

The Future in Education. By Sir Richard Livingstone. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. Pp. 148. \$1.25.

Education for a World Adrift. By Sir Richard Livingstone. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943. Pp. 152. \$1.25.

"If a boy from a secondary school can save us in a Spitfire, surely that mind can be trained to build a better world," is the reported remark of Ernest Bevin after a London blitz. Something of Bevin's attitude has informed most of the discussion of postwar education in England during the last two years. In the books listed above two notes are sounded: the *urgency* of the planning and the *opportunity* given by the war. "Britain faces today the greatest crisis in her history"—the winning of the war and rebuilding her social order. "Without the democratic mind, the democratic order cannot be sustained. . . . In this task education must play a vital part." "England has probably never been so interested in education as today."

Stephen Duggan, director of the Institute of International Education, after a recent visit to Great Britain, reviews the plans already made. Perhaps the most important is the government's White Paper on Educational Reconstruction, issued last spring by the Board of Education. Mr. Duggan summarizes the report. The basis of all changes is equality of opportunity, especially in the elementary and secondary school systems of the future. The report envisages inspection of all schools by the Board of Education. Denominational schools may receive increased grants from public funds for buildings and equipment. Such schools will retain the right to select principals and teachers to give religious instruction.

The White Paper describes a radical departure in educational selection.

When a pupil is eleven years of age, an attempt will be made to determine as far as possible his aptitude in order to decide upon the nature of his future education. This may be done again when the pupil is thirteen, if the original choice proved to be faulty. The selection should consider the economic status of the pupil, but if he is manually minded and shows an interest in elementary science and machinery, he is channeled off into the technical secondary school; if he is inclined to affairs of commerce and business, he is directed to the modern, or commercial, secondary school; if he is obviously of the intellectual type, he is placed in the grammar, or academic, secondary school. Unlike the rigid system of France and Germany, the English system will be flexible and allow for mistakes in evaluation.

Compulsory part-time education until eighteen is planned in "Young Peoples' Colleges" attached to industrial establishments. Programs of adult education will be continued for workers, and provisions are made for men and women to return to school or college during vacation periods and especially after retirement from productive labor. It may be noted that the Public School, that is, the expensive private school, is not mentioned in the report.

The proposals of this new program are already receiving support, and it is urged that they be quickly passed into a law. Aid for denominational schools, however, is meeting opposition, and the plan as a whole calls for extensive financial support.

About six months before the White Paper appeared, H. C. Dent, editor of the *Times Educational Supplement*, issued *A New Order in English Education*. It is significant that the essentials of Mr. Dent's planning appear in the official White Paper. Will it follow that the current interest and plans for postwar education in this country will have effect in outlining our future education? If so, Catholic educators may here learn a lesson. Mr. Dent claims that his book is an introduction only. It discusses the need for a new order, the defects of the past, and offers a unified plan of education from the nursery school to the university. He disclaims any concern with an educational Utopia and, in fact, explains in detail how educational opportunities may be increased by converting many of the military camps throughout the country into schools, and offers suggestions for staffing them.

Compulsory education in England ends at fourteen. Mr. Dent sketches an educational program from the years fourteen to eighteen, especially for the workers. "Every worker has the right to a fortnight a year at a short-term residential college and a course at a long-term residential college once every five years." He explains how workers may be released from industry for this period. The author has a professional grasp of the educational

system and there is an urgency in his writing which is a reflection of his insistence on the immediacy of educational planning, "before the war ends." From a general view, his basic idea is sound. "The educational system must be planned to secure the full and harmonious development of the body, mind, and soul for the threefold purpose of personal living, civic responsibility, and useful employment" (page 45). But when he adds that, "Since this system is for the benefit of all, it should belong to all and be provided by all. Education in a democracy must be 'of the community, by the community, for the community,'" he includes a dangerous premise; one which needs much careful distinction.

The two books by Sir Richard Livingstone may be described as the *ideas* behind the educational planning in England. It is again significant that H. C. Dent quotes them with approval and that his "New Order" contains in striking detail many of the ideas and plans proposed by the president of Corpus Christi College.

The Future in Education is an eloquent plea for adult education, for an opportunity to resume study methodically in later years when men and women have had experience of life; opportunity, that is, for those who left school at fourteen and for graduates of secondary schools and universities. With such a system an educated nation could be built. He advocates a period of work between secondary school and university. Dent is more open in his statement: "Entry to the university must no longer be confined to the young. The minimum age of entry should be raised by at least three years. Much of the work done in the universities is sheer waste, simply because large numbers of undergraduates are too immature either to understand it or take any real interest in it."

Livingstone would delay many subjects to the adult period. In the school years, he claims, there are certain subjects which need no experience of life for their full comprehension; among these are languages, mathematics, the sciences. "With those subjects we are safe." You would imagine you were reading the lament of an American educator rather than that of an English don when he says: "The overcrowded curriculum [in English schools] based on the amount of knowledge supposed 'necessary to the modern man,' leads to intellectual dyspepsia, hopeless malnutrition and often to a permanent distaste for knowledge and incapacity to digest it, to plastering ideas and facts on the surface of the pupil's mind . . ." (page 27). Therefore, subjects in the curriculum must be governed by the principle of means and ends. "There are only four subjects in education which—if properly taught—continually confront the pupil with a Supreme End—theology and philosophy which study them directly, but with which the school is not concerned (sic!); and two subjects with which the school is very much concerned—literature, where all the visions

of men are recorded; and history, where, behind the confusion of unceasing movement, the human spirit can be discerned weaving, painfully and uncertainly, a coherent design" (page 115).

Education for a World Adrift claims we have lost our direction, that our age is an "age without standards," that the spiritual element is the only true foundation for education, that the schools must be places where the mind is enriched by the right visions and where the ends of life are learned. He quotes Whitehead: "Moral education is impossible without the habitual vision of greatness." He laments that "speeches, conferences, the educational press are more occupied with educational machinery than with education," and recalls what Plato said—the noblest of all studies is the study of what man should be and how he should live. Livingstone's solution is the use of history and literature in forming values and standards, and the inculcation of a spiritual philosophy of life. Nevertheless, Sir Richard's idea of the spiritual element in education is pleasantly vague. The sum of it is a study of the Bible. From his Oxford window he aims a shaft at John Dewey, "whose influence in American education has been great and in some ways unfortunate." I note that an American reviewer dismisses Livingstone and his book as belonging to the nineteenth century.

The two books are, nevertheless, pleasant and profitable reading. They are pocket size and appear in the "Current Problems" series; and have been influential, as noted previously. Livingstone gives reasons for the current and wide interest in education:

the obvious and increasing importance of knowledge to life; a sense of the great possibilities of modern civilization and of its disorders and its dangers; the perception that our democracy is very ill-educated; a realization that in foreign politics between 1919 and 1939 we have thrown away a great victory with a rapidity and completeness perhaps unexampled in history and that this has been partly due to political ignorance; the need of extending education if equality of opportunity is to be more than a phrase.

The same reasons apply on this side of the Atlantic.

M. J. FITZSIMONS, S. J.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Salute to Holy Cross. The QUARTERLY joins the whole membership of the J. E. A. in congratulating Holy Cross College on its centenary. It was the first Catholic college in New England, and the sixth in the United States (Georgetown 1789, St. Louis 1818, Spring Hill 1831, Xavier 1840, Fordham 1841, and Holy Cross 1843). The celebration of the centennial was of course restricted very much because of the war. However, on October 31, 1943, in connection with a wartime commencement, the Most Reverend Thomas M. O'Leary, Bishop of Springfield, celebrated a Solemn Pontifical Mass, at which Monsignor Edward J. Maginn, class of '18, Vicar-General of the Diocese of Albany, preached the centennial baccalaureate sermon. Governor Leverett Saltonstall gave the centennial commencement address. It is good news to know that a history of Holy Cross, written by Father Walter J. Meagher, will soon be published. Incidentally, *The Hormone*, published by the Chemists' Club of Holy Cross, paid its respects to the centenary by issuing a very useful index to volumes 1 to 5, February 1927 to December 1931.

J. E. A. Meeting at Atlantic City. The National Catholic Educational Association will meet at the Claridge Hotel, Atlantic City, on Wednesday and Thursday of Easter Week, April 12 and 13. And according to custom the J. E. A. will hold its annual convention at the same place, on Thursday evening, April 13, and all day Friday, the 14th. The Thursday evening session will open with dinner at the Claridge Hotel. This will be followed by the report of the Executive Director of the J. E. A., an open discussion of the ISO in relation to the J. E. A., led by Father Daniel Lord, and a report of the J. E. A. Committee on Postwar Jesuit Education. The Friday sessions will be as follows: *J. E. A. Secondary School Department*, 9:30-12:00, Postwar Planning for Jesuit High Schools; 2:00-4:00, ISO in the High Schools, together with other topics suggested by the Commission on Secondary Schools. *The College Department*, 9:30-12:00, ISO in the Colleges, and other topics suggested by the Commission on Liberal Arts Colleges; 2:00-4:00, Postwar Plans of Immediate Concern. *Professional and Graduate Schools*, 9:30-12:00, separate meetings, the agenda being in charge of the respective Commissions. On Friday afternoon at 4:15 there will be a short general meeting of all groups. The several Commissions within the J. E. A. are arranging details of the program.

The Military. Three new alumni news sheets arrived at the central office recently: the *G. I. Eye*, Volume I, No. 1, January 1944, of St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland; the *News Letter for the Loyola Academy* [Chicago] *Alumni in Service*, No. 5, January 1944; and the *Discipline*

Office Newsletter, Georgetown University. The responsible parties are respectively Father Gerald B. Garvey and Mr. Robert P. Pingstock for the *G. I. Eye*; Father G. M. Legris for the Loyola Academy News Letter; Father Richard C. Law for the Georgetown publication. Welcome and congratulations!

Philosophical Cooperation. The Jesuit Philosophical Association voted at its Christmas-week meeting in Chicago to cooperate actively with the Commission on the Function of Philosophy in Liberal Education set up by the American Philosophical Association. A comprehensive questionnaire is being sent to all Jesuit teachers of philosophy in order to secure information on what philosophy faculties in Jesuit schools are doing, are aiming at, and are planning to do after the war. Father Bernard J. Wuellner, president of the Jesuit Philosophical Association, is in charge of the project. It is hoped that all Jesuits concerned with philosophy will give hearty support to it.

Academic Solidarity. Whether from fear of that big bad wolf "inbreeding," or some other fear equally mythical, Jesuit administrators—and occasionally simple classroom teachers as well—have been known to dispatch their clever academic inventions to a select list of *non-Jesuit* addresses; for instance, an improved record form, announcements of scholarship grants, a new wrinkle for improving book reporting. There are those, of course, whose fear is of communicating their abundance to anyone. A moment's thought, however, will suggest almost a page of reasons why there should be constant intercommunication of views, projects, problems, ingenuity *among Jesuit schools*. Each Jesuit college and university should have handy a list (with addresses) of the other twenty-four colleges and universities *and of the thirty-seven Jesuit high schools*, which should receive first copies of every bit of significant printed and mimeographed material—school catalogues, alumni news sheets, record forms, school papers and magazines, scholarship announcements, commencement programs, handbills of annual plays, and the rest. And the same first principle applies with equal force to the thirty-seven high schools in relation to each other and to the twenty-five colleges and universities. The resulting academic solidarity among Jesuit institutions would not foster a false inbreeding; the inventions of the outer world are always very much with us and upon us! Rather it would go a long way toward achieving the ideal of mutual helpfulness and interchange of ideas urged upon us in that great but too little known document, the *Instructio*, whose tenth anniversary falls on August 15, 1944.

The J. E. A. Library. The library in the central office of the J. E. A. has been enriched recently by gifts of books from Father Francis P. Donnelly, of Fordham; from the Loyola College Library, Baltimore (kindness

of Father Edward B. Bunn); and from Father Victor C. Stechschulte, Xavier University, Cincinnati. Father Joseph D. FitzGerald, dean of Holy Cross College, and Father C. E. Sloane, the librarian, cooperated in supplying a much-appreciated number of the *Teachers' Review*, Vol. XI, No. 3, whole number 43, needed to help complete our set. Other single numbers wanted are Vol. I, No. 1; Vol. II, No. 1; Vol. III, No. 2; Vol. IV, No. 2; Vol. V, No. 2; and the indexes for Volumes IX-XVIII.

Requiescant in Pace. Since the last issue of the QUARTERLY went to press, death has taken several well-known and esteemed members of the J. E. A. FATHER ALOYSIUS J. HOGAN (December 17) was president of Fordham, 1930-36, and president of the College Department, N. C. E. A., 1934-37; FATHER OTTO J. KUHNMUENCH (December 19) taught the classics for thirty-seven years, mainly at St. Louis University, and was the author of classical textbooks; FATHER PHILIP H. BURKETT (December 3) was in the classroom or in administrative work for thirty-five years, and taught sociology at Georgetown, 1921-25, and at St. Joseph's, Philadelphia, 1925-1939; FATHER JOSEPH A. McLAUGHLIN (January 9), author of textbooks in logic and epistemology, spent thirty-one years teaching, chiefly philosophy, at Marquette and Loyola of Chicago.

Those who knew FATHER T. CORCORAN, professor of education at University College, Dublin, and European authority on Jesuit educational history and practice, will be sorry to know that he died on March 23, 1943.

Selling the Classics in High School. The meeting of the principals and their assistants with the general prefects of studies of the Chicago, Missouri, and New Orleans Provinces, December 2-3, 1943, at St. Louis University, brought up again the problem that is always with us: How to sell Latin and Greek to parents and students. Some hard-headed answers were offered. Father W. P. Donnelly (Jesuit High, New Orleans) opened with a plea for arguments that will convince and that can be printed in leaflet form for wide distribution. Father W. B. Martin (Campion) claimed effectiveness for the argument that Latin and Greek make the student work and teach him that to secure the better things he must expend all his energies, not because he likes to, but because that's the only way to success. Two further arguments that bring results were reported by Father Ara Walker (Loyola Academy, Chicago). First, if the able student drops Latin, he will find himself in a class that is usually intellectually and socially inferior; secondly, if parents esteem *Jesuit* education, they should also esteem Latin and Greek, which Jesuits consider the core of their best curriculum.

Reference was made by Father Andrew C. Smith to excellent mimeographed articles by Father Hugh P. O'Neill of the University of Detroit, "What Happens in the Mind When We Think" and "How Latin Trains

the Mind," and to pamphlets by Father F. P. Donnelly of Fordham, e. g., "Latin, the Channel of Our Civilization."

[The Minutes indicate that the whole meeting was eminently successful. It is unforunate that principals of all our high schools could not share the many good things discussed. Here is an opportunity for furthering that academic solidarity urged in another paragraph.]

Another Argument. Albert Jay Nock, author, some years ago, of the first-rate book, *The Theory of Education in the United States*, offers a view in his recent autobiography that is not emphasized nearly enough in discussions about the value of classical studies. Ingenious schoolmen should be able to reduce Mr. Nock's "brief" to an even simpler and more concrete formula. He writes:

The literatures of Greece and Rome comprise the longest, most complete and most nearly continuous record we have of what the strange creature known as *Homo sapiens* has been busy about in virtually every department of spiritual, intellectual and social activity. That record covers nearly twenty-five hundred years in an unbroken stretch of this animated oddity's operations in poetry, drama, law, agriculture, philosophy, architecture, natural history, philology, rhetoric, astronomy, logic, politics, botany, zoology, medicine, geography, theology,—everything, I believe, that lies in the range of human knowledge or speculation. Hence the mind which has attentively canvassed this record is much more than a disciplined mind, it is an *experienced* mind. It has come, as Emerson says, into a feeling of immense longevity, and it instinctively views contemporary man and his doings in the perspective set by this profound and weighty experience. Our studies were properly called formative, because beyond all others their effect was powerfully maturing.¹

Academic Freedom. Notice has gone out that the *Atlantic Monthly* is offering a thousand-dollar prize for the best article on "Freedom of the Press in the United States." A columnist who reported the offer ventured to suggest that there is as great a need to clarify what constitutes academic freedom in schools and universities. The newspaper flurry over Dr. McMahon's departure from Notre Dame has given excuse for I-told-you-so shaking of heads over the views evidently held by Catholics on this question. Even the Catholic press was sharply divided on the Notre Dame incident. And Professor Ralph Barton Perry, of Harvard, expressed doubt (*Commonweal*, January 7, p. 304) that academic freedom was rightly understood at Notre Dame. Jesuit schools need to have a very clear concept of the issues at stake and a well-defined policy fully promulgated to faculty members. Two good sources are Father Andrew C. Smith's article in the *Modern Schoolman* (May 1941, pp. 73-76) and Father Edward B. Rooney's in *A Philosophical Symposium on American Catholic Education* (Fordham University Press, 1941, pp. 116-28). The article by Alvan S.

¹ *Memoirs of a Superfluous Man*, p. 81. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Ryan, "Newman on Academic Freedom" (*America*, February 12, 1944), does not live up to its title; it rather discusses the status of laymen in Catholic universities. The *J. E. A. Special Bulletin* (No. 1, February 1, 1939) on the Fleisher case at St. Louis University is very much to the point. The report of the Association of American Colleges on "Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure" (printed in the *QUARTERLY*, March 1940, pp. 202-03) is a plain and fair statement of principles.

Persons. FATHER JOSEPH P. ZUERCHER, president of Creighton University, 1937-43, succeeded Father Peter A. Brooks as Provincial of the Missouri Province on December 8. FATHER PERCY A. ROY, president of Loyola of the South, has been reappointed to the Executive Board of the Association of American Colleges. FATHER BERNARD J. WUELLNER, Loyola University, Chicago, has succeeded Father Stephen McNamee as president of the Jesuit Philosophical Association, and FATHER JAMES A. MCWILLIAMS, of St. Louis University, is the new secretary of the same association. FATHER ROBERT I. GANNON, president of Fordham University, has been elected to several important committees and councils: to the Committee on Postwar Education of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York; to the Advisory Council of Education for Freedom (and speaker, January 31, on its radio hour); to the Pan American Society, and to the Committee for International Economic Reconstruction, sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment and the International Chamber of Commerce. FATHER THOMAS S. BOWDERN, new president of Creighton University, spoke before the National Conference of Church-Related Colleges at their convention in Cincinnati, January 11. FATHER GERALD B. GARVEY, principal of St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland, has been named member of the Ohio State Committee of the North Central Association. FATHER JOSEPH R. N. MAXWELL, president of Holy Cross, spoke on the evening panel, on liberal education, at the convention of the Association of American Colleges, Cincinnati, January 13. He has been appointed, by Governor Saltonstall, a member of the new Board of Collegiate Authority in the Massachusetts State Department of Education, and he is this year's chairman of the New England Regional Unit, N. C. E. A.

The Philosophy of Catholic Education, by Father William J. McGucken, has just been published by the America Press in pamphlet form, 48 pages. It is a reprint of Chapter VI, *Philosophies of Education*, Part I, of the Forty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. It represents Father McGucken at his best. *All* Jesuits and especially scholastics preparing for or in teaching should have a copy. Prices: Single copies, 22 cents by mail; 10 copies, \$1.75; 25 copies, \$4.25; 50 copies, \$8.00; 100 copies, \$14.00.

AN IDEAL TEACHER

"As a high-school boy, I had one teacher who, I still think, was very nearly an ideal one.

"He was, in passing, a fine scholar, valedictorian of his class in college. But that is not the point. I have seen plenty of valedictorians who did not thrill me. He taught me what little Greek I know, but that is not much, for I gave him only a year to do it. In the classroom, he was a strenuous drill master, and kept us all on our toes with excitement, as if we were playing tennis, very keen about Greek grammar and accents. But that is not the point either. He also drilled me on the notes in the back of the high-school edition of *Macbeth*, yet *that* is not the point.

"The point is that this teacher had in himself a white-hot love for fine things in literature, and whenever one touched him one took fire. That is just the whole secret in a nutshell.

"I remember one day he told us all—a senior high-school class in English—to close our high-school editions of *Macbeth*. Then without a word of comment he read us the 'Death of Socrates' from Jowett's Plato, read it with a kind of intensity and grave feeling, which made the conversation in the prison house very real to us. I could hardly wait till the session was over to get hold of Jowett and read through the 'Dialogues.'

"His most effective teaching, as far as I was concerned, was done in the five minutes between 4:00 and 4:05 in the afternoon, as I was passing by his desk on the way out of the classroom.

"He would stop me and say, 'Look here, Sherman, have you read the *Epithalamium* and the *Hymns* of Edmund Spenser?'

"And I would admit that I had not.

"'Ah,' he would exclaim, with a flash and a glow of remembered pleasure in his eyes, 'Ah, but I *envy* you reading those poems for the first time!' Then I would go and buy the works of Spenser and read him straight through, in a cheap little thirty-five-cent edition, which I have to this day, and still prefer to any other, for the sake of my memory of first exploring there in search of the gusto I heard in that teacher's voice, in search of the glow I had seen in that teacher's eyes.

"Under the influence of these little fiery touches of enthusiasm between 4:00 and 4:05 in the afternoon, I read through while in high school the works of Spenser, of Keats, of Shelley, of Byron, of Tennyson, the whole works of Matthew Arnold, politics and theology included, Plato, Milton's *Areopagitica*, and some of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. I remember those offhand as some of the books bought and read under that teacher's influence."

(Zeitlin and Woodbridge, *Life and Letters of Stuart P. Sherman*, I, 55-56)

193.
=