

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

JUNE 1948

PROCEEDINGS ANNUAL MEETING 1948

BUSSES, RELEASED TIME AND THE
POLITICAL PROCESS

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON
HIGHER EDUCATION

THE PRELECTION METHOD

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE A. B. DEGREE IN
JESUIT COLLEGES

RELIGION IN THE UNDERGRADUATE
JESUIT COLLEGES

VOL. XI, No. 1

GONZAGA U. LIBRARY

JUN 29 1948

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Contributors

FATHER LAURENCE V. BRITT took time out from his studies in education at the University of Minnesota to outline the broad principles of the *Ratio* on the prelection, and point out practical applications of that method to present needs.

FATHER JAMES L. BURKE, director of history and political science at Boston College graduate school and arts college delivered a most comprehensive critique of the Supreme Court's recent decision at the general gathering of the annual meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association.

FATHER ALBERT I. LEMIEUX, dean of faculties at Gonzaga University, outlines the President's Commission on Higher Education, especially parts dealing with finance, offers a criticism and points out implications to Jesuit schools.

FATHER PAUL L. O'CONNOR, formerly of the United States Navy and now dean of Xavier University's Downtown College, has had ample opportunity to judge whether the present religion course prepares students for life and offers suggestions for its improvement.

FATHER EDWARD B. ROONEY, Executive Director of the Jesuit Educational Association, again presents his annual summary of that association's work in Jesuit education.

FATHER ANDREW C. SMITH, Province Prefect for New Orleans and dean of Spring Hill College, presented the general picture of the A.B. degree throughout the Assistancy.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

243511

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

June 1948

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS	2
REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR 1948	
<i>Edward B. Rooney, S.J.</i>	5
BUSSES, RELEASED TIME AND THE POLITICAL PROCESS	
<i>James L. Burke, S.J.</i>	15
REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION	
<i>Albert I. Lemieux, S.J.</i>	25
THE REQUIREMENT OF THE A. B. DEGREE IN JESUIT COLLEGES	
<i>Andrew C. Smith, S.J.</i>	35
RELIGION IN THE UNDERGRADUATE JESUIT COLLEGES	
<i>Paul L. O'Connor, S.J.</i>	41
THE PRELECTION METHOD	
<i>Laurence V. Britt, S.J.</i>	49
PROGRAM OF ANNUAL MEETING JESUIT EDUCA- TIONAL ASSOCIATION	58
NEWS FROM THE FIELD	61

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

WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

Advisory Board

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>
WILLIAM J. CODD, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
HUGH M. DUCE, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
WILFRED M. MALLON, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
JOHN J. NASH, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
LORENZO K. REED, 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>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 EAST 84TH STREET

NEW YORK 28, N. Y.

COPYRIGHT, JUNE 1948

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Report of the Executive Director, 1948

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

The year 1948 is a memorable one in the history of Jesuit education. It marks the fourth centenary of the founding of the first Jesuit college, in Messina, Sicily. We in America are surely in a position to see the contrast between those first years of Jesuit education and our own times. Probably at no time in our history has Jesuit education in any country shown such growth as it has in the United States. It is a far cry from 1548 with that one tiny Sicilian college of the Jesuits to America in 1948 with our 27 colleges and universities, our 38 high schools, our Philosophates and Juniorates, and the 120,000 students under our guidance, our 6000 American Jesuits, the great majority of whom are either teaching in our American Jesuit schools at home and abroad, or preparing for such teaching.

But such phenomenal growth can bring with it certain dangers, among them the danger of spreading our lines too thinly and the danger of loss of that unity and cooperation which should characterize Jesuit activity. An awareness of such dangers led our Provincials years ago to look for means to guard against them.

Recently I was reading through the Minutes of the Meetings of the "Inter-Province Committee on Studies." This Committee was composed of representatives of each of the American provinces, appointed in 1921 by the Provincials to discuss problems of mutual interest to our educational institutions, and to bring to the solution of these problems the benefit of country-wide experience. I was struck by the insistence from the very first meetings of this Committee on the need for a national association of our Jesuit high schools, colleges, and universities. Those Fathers who first made this far-sighted recommendation would be pleased, were they present here tonight at this meeting of the Jesuit Education Association, to see representatives of every Jesuit high school, college, and university, Juniorate and Philosophate in the United States. I think they would admit that this was just what they had hoped for twenty-seven years ago when they met at Campion and first suggested the idea of our own association.

Because of my position as Executive Director of the Jesuit Educational Association, and of my intimate contact with Provincials and General Prefects of Studies, I am very conscious of the shortcomings of Jesuit education in the United States. But for those same reasons, no one is more aware of the excellent work that our institutions are accomplishing today, and of the great contribution they are making to the Catholic life of our country. Were some of the "Founding Fathers" of the Jesuit Educational Association present tonight I could go through the minutes of their meetings with them and show that many of their suggestions on ways of improving Jesuit education in the United States have been carried out, and that today our schools and our Association are achieving that position in American Education which they had the courage and the foresight to dream of.

The temptation to tell more of the story of the past twenty-seven years is strong, but my Report is meant to tell only of the past year. This alone would consume more time than is at my disposal and so I shall restrict myself to reporting on a few events of the past year, of major importance to American Jesuit education, and then tell, in a summary way, of some of our Association's activities.

It is easy for us to imagine St. Ignatius writing to the Fathers at the College of Messina, stressing the aim of their educational work, and the principles to be applied to the problems they were sure to meet. St. Ignatius was a man of vision; but, above all, he was a man of his own time. While he had learned at Manresa and had passed on to his sons principles that were ageless, he realized that principles have to be applied, and policies and procedures adapted to specific ages and circumstances.

Were St. Ignatius alive today, I feel perfectly certain that his advice to Jesuit educators of the Twentieth Century, and particularly to Jesuit educators in the United States, would not differ in the slightest from that contained in Very Rev. Father John Janssens' letter written in June, 1947, on the occasion of the canonization of St. John de Britto and St. Barnadino Realino. To my mind, no event of this past year is of greater importance to Jesuit education in the United States than this letter of Very Rev. Father General.

Jesuit activity in the United States—but let me confine myself to my own field—Jesuit educational activity in the United States has a tremendous field open to it. Numerous requests for new schools, for new departments, for new divisions and courses come to us each day. This fact imposes on us the necessity of judicious choice, if we are to avoid the evils of over-expansion. Father Janssens' principles on the choice of

ministeria will, if properly applied, tell us when to accept, when to refuse such requests. For they tell us that we must look to what is for the greater service of God; that we may not be local or even provincial in our outlook but must seek the service of the universal Church; that our duty is to stick to our specialities; that we must prefer the future greater good to the present lesser good; that we must be careful not to undertake what is beyond our powers and our facilities. How the sincere application of those principles would prevent us from making serious mistakes in the direction of over-expansion and would give us the opportunity for that consolidation of effort that will surely strengthen our works and bring them to that standard where they will accomplish the greater and more universal good!

Let me suggest a possible application of those principles. I wonder if we have not reached the time when it is necessary to consider some consolidation in the graduate and professional fields. It is difficult to see how each and every one of our graduate schools could build up top-flight departments in every field. But suppose for the sake of example, that all of our undergraduate colleges were to offer strong undergraduate courses in philosophy, and all graduate schools offered excellent courses leading to the master's degree, but that it were understood that if one of our students, lay or Jesuit, wanted to go on for the doctorate he would go to St. Louis or Fordham, which would have built up a first class department of Philosophy, wouldn't we as a group of schools be in a much stronger position than we are today? Where are the majority of Catholic students going who want to specialize in Philosophy? Suppose again that all our Jesuit graduate schools were to offer solid courses leading to the Master's Degree in Political Science, but that for the Doctorate in Political Science it would be understood that we direct our students to, let us say, Georgetown where a top-flight Institute of Government or Department of Political Science would be built up. And so on, we could develop a plan of locating various specialities in different institutions throughout the country, and perhaps they could call on the help of other provinces for staff members. Maybe the examples I have used are not good ones. The point I am trying to make is that to attempt to build up sixteen Jesuit graduate schools with six to eight departments leading to the doctorate, to try to staff all of those schools with competent Jesuits and laymen, and to build up adequate libraries worthy of graduate work is taking on more than our share, and more than we can effectively carry out. Some consolidation of effort would certainly bring strength. Perhaps such a consolidation could best be worked out on a province or regional basis.

Were Father General actually living in America he could not have given us sounder advice than that contained in the section of his letter which deals with the importance of "truly scientific" work, and the preparation by special studies of men for such work. For how true it is in America, especially in the educational field, that the well-trained man, the truly scientific leader, can meet on their own ground the leaders in other colleges and universities; how true it is that really learned men beget respect for the Church and for our Catholic educational institutions; how true is the need for scholarly publications by Ours. Each and every one of these points is developed at length by Father General. I know of but one other document in recent years that has given such a "lift" to Jesuit Education in the United States and that is the *Instructio* on Studies written for the American Assistancy in 1934 by Father General Ledochowski. Father Janssens' letter spells out the principles of the *Instructio*.

For some years now, especially since the publication of the *Instructio*, the American Provinces have been preparing a large group of Ours by special studies. This has been a costly program and it has imposed great sacrifices on our high schools, colleges, and universities, all of which were in dire need of more Jesuit teachers. But the principle of the "future greater good" of the provinces was put into effect and now, when each year more and more trained Jesuits are coming into our institutions, we see what fine dividends the principle is paying.

Innumerable authoritative documents today, among them the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education and the latest "standards" of accrediting associations call upon educators to state and evaluate the objectives of their institutions and the means they employ to attain those objectives. No more up-to-date statement of the principles and objectives of Jesuit Education, of some of the salient characteristics of our schools, and the means to achieve these, can be found than Section 6 of Father General Janssens' letter. There he describes the product that our schools should strive to produce, and emphasizes again the importance, if we are to attain our objective, of well-trained teachers, of Catholic teachers, and of definite norms for selection of students lest our schools become overcrowded and our work become less effective.

Last September, I had the pleasure of a long conference with Father General in Rome. His fine grasp of our educational situation here in America, was surprising. Perhaps because he had so recently written his letter "*De Ministeriis Nostris*" he himself brought up again several of the points stressed in his letter, but with particular application to the

American scene. Thus, he emphasized philosophy and religion requirements in our schools, the necessity of asking approval for new courses, and the importance of not admitting so many non-Catholic students as to change the character of our teaching. He mentioned a further point not touched on in his letter, viz., Insurance and Retirement Plans for lay faculty members. He is very desirous that where it has not already been done such plans should be introduced so that our lay teachers may have the security they merit. He also asked if we have any plan for "family allowances," i.e., a graded scale of salaries according to the number of children a lay teacher has. He spoke of such a plan that had been inaugurated on a cooperative basis by a group of Jesuit Colleges in Belgium.

Surely, we wish our schools to measure up to the high hopes of the Church and of the Society. If they do not, it will not be for lack of wise counsel from our own General.

And now a word on some of the activities of the Jesuit Educational Association during the past year.

In the International field, the Jesuit Educational Association participated in the Semaine International d'Etudes held at Versailles, France, August 17 to 24, 1947. There, a paper on Jesuit Education in the United States was well received by delegates from all parts of the world, gathered to discuss the work of the Society in meeting the grave problems that confront the world and the Church in the post-war world. Fathers Guthrie, Parsons, Masse, Graham, Fitzgerald, J. C. Murray and Corley, were among the American delegates. You would have been proud of your fellow-American Jesuits if you could have witnessed, as I did, the telling contributions made by these men. It was good to see Americans accepted and enthusiastically received for something more than our traditional "practicality."¹

The October, 1947, issue of *America* contained an article entitled, "PhD's in the DP Camps." That article by Father Gerald Walsh, and a paper I am to read at the meeting of the College and University Department of the National Catholic Educational Association, Thursday, April 1st, tell the story of Jesuit cooperation in a project inaugurated by Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs and War Relief Services of National Catholic Welfare Conference, to do something for Catholic intellectuals marooned in the DP Camps of Europe. I shall not repeat here details already given by Fr. Walsh or to be given on Thursday, but I do wish to say that Very Rev. Father General was

1. Cf. Parsons, Wilfrid, S.J., "Jesuit International Study Week," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Volume X, Number 2 (October 1947), pp. 69-76.

most happy when the cooperation of American Jesuit Educators in this project was reported to him. It is to be hoped that Jesuit institutions desiring to make some excellent additions to their faculties and at the same time to do a work of real charity will study carefully the tabulation drawn up by NCWC of our interviews with the DP scholars.

The Second General Conference of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization was held in Mexico City from November 6 to December 3, 1947. In an effort to create more widespread interest in UNESCO, invitations were sent to a selected list of national associations in the fields of education, science, and culture to send "unofficial observers" to the meeting in Mexico. I had been told by Very Rev. Father General that if an opportunity were given to attend UNESCO either in an official or semi-official capacity, I should accept the invitation. When, then, Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt requested me to go to Mexico as the unofficial observer for the NCEA, the Prefects General and Provincials urged me to accept. During the UNESCO Conference I sent back some reports which were mailed to you as Special Bulletins. I had hoped to send many more but the schedule of meetings was so heavy that no time was available for more writing.

Unofficial observers at the Mexico City Conference were given credentials that enabled us to attend almost all of the meetings. This was in strong contrast to the procedure in Paris where so many of the meetings were "closed"—a procedure which the American delegation found very disturbing. I had perfect freedom to come and go as I chose, and had no special obligations to committee meetings. I did, however, establish very friendly contacts with several members of the American and other delegations and with Mexican Jesuits since I stayed at one of our houses. Thus I was able to get a side-line view of the Conference and to sound-out delegates and observers. This proved very valuable in forming an estimate of UNESCO, its achievements, its personnel, its possibilities, and its dangers. My views on all of these points I have stated in a paper to be given at the dinner meeting of the Department of Superintendents of the NCEA. To give but the briefest summary here, I would say:

- 1) The achievements of UNESCO up to November 1947 were in no way impressive. This, I ascribe to the fact that the program adopted at Paris was entirely too diffuse and went far beyond the facilities of the organization and its budget.

- 2) The 1948 Program while much more modest is still too diffuse; but at least it will concentrate on some major projects and is strictly within a determined budget.

- 3) UNESCO, if it develops as it should, is capable of great good or

great harm depending on the ability and character of its leaders. Consequently, it needs to be watched—and to have the cooperation or right-thinking, in two senses of the expression, educators.

4) At the Mexico City Conference there were definite if all too feeble signs of a growing emphasis on spiritual and moral values. This was in contrast to the Paris meeting. One could sense the widespread dissatisfaction with Julian Huxley, Director General of UNESCO, and with the thoroughly materialistic and secularistic philosophy he had tried to foist on the organization.

5) Most delegations are dominated by individuals who look on education as the function of the State alone. Our participation in UNESCO could very well be a source of danger for American education were it, even indirectly, to result in the assumption by our federal government of an unhealthy control or influence over American education. For this reason, it is of the utmost importance that as far as education is concerned, the American delegation's views should originate not in the State Department but in the field of education and in our National Commission. Fortunately, this has been the case so far. Only constant vigilance by educators will guarantee its continuance.

6) Catholic Educators have much to contribute to UNESCO, but to do this they must take an interest in the organization. They must know about it and encourage campus studies and activities on its program. They must make themselves available for committees, and for regional and local meetings.

To come now to the national scene: During the past year the Central Office of the JEA has endeavored to keep members informed of events and legislation of particular interest to our schools. Some twelve or thirteen Special Bulletins have been issued and various circular letters have been sent to Presidents and Rectors. One of these dealt with National Federation of Catholic College Students Student Relief Campaign. The reason for this letter was the fact that on two or three different occasions I was confronted with the charge that Jesuit schools were not cooperating. I suspected that the charge was entirely too sweeping. When I investigated, Miss Joan Christie, Director of the Student Relief Campaign, confirmed my suspicion. However, I determined that it would be well to urge all our colleges to cooperate to the best of their ability, since there were some that had done very little.

In one Special Bulletin we published a list of the summer courses and institutes to be offered in our schools, that might be of special interest to Ours. In looking over this list I think you will find a number of courses that would prove valuable as "in service" training courses for

self-improvement of some of our Jesuit teachers. Occasionally following such courses would do much to prevent teachers from falling into a rut.

It was suggested at the JEA Meeting last year that we publish each Spring a list of the prospective candidates for degrees in our graduate schools who might be available for teaching positions. This would be a way of giving our schools first choice. Such a list has been prepared and will be sent soon to Presidents, Rectors, Deans and Principals.

Within the past few months the JEA Committee on Professional Schools has met with the Regents and Deans of our Medical and Law Schools. A similar meeting with the Regents of Dental Schools will be held very probably in June. Jesuit College administrators should be interested in a remark made by a Regent of one of our Medical Schools. He wondered, he said, if the deans and advisors in our colleges make sufficient effort to try to steer the most capable of our premedical students to our own medical schools. If we steer our best students to non-sectarian medical schools we give these schools an advantage over our own.

I announced last year that the Revised Edition of the *Instructio* and the Constitution of the JEA were ready for publication. They were, and it was our intention to publish them in the March issue of the *Quarterly*. However, a difficulty occurred with regard to one especially important article of the *Instructio*. The matter had to be referred to Rome and we were told to hold up the publication for a short time. It is our hope that this difficulty has been settled or will be soon, and that we shall be able to print the *Instructio* in the September issue of the *Quarterly*.

You are aware, of course, that Jesuits have as usual been very active in other Regional and National Educational Associations during the past year. We have been represented at the regular meetings of the American Council on Education, its Executive Committee, and at some special meetings of the Representatives of the Constituent Members of the Association. The same holds true for the Association of American Colleges, the Department of Higher Education of the National Educational Association, regional accrediting associations, and the National Catholic Educational Association. Those of us who have had experience with the Association of American Colleges are well aware that this is one of the most representative of all the national educational associations. In no group have Catholics been given fairer representation, and no group has shown itself so consistently sympathetic to the needs of private colleges. Since, however, this Association makes it a practice of appointing to its committees and boards only college presidents, it is of

great importance, that our presidents make a special point of attending the meetings. Only in this way will we continue to have the representation that we should have in its councils.

Two of the most important projects that the JEA is working on now are the Institute for Deans that will be held in August this Summer at Regis College, Denver. Father Wilfred Mallon has been named Director of the Institute and, as you well know, has done an excellent job of preparation. We are most grateful to him. This Institute promises to rival in success the one held for our Principals a few years ago. It is expected that all Jesuit Deans of Colleges of Arts, Sciences, as well as Deans of Business Administration will attend the Institute.

An Institute on Guidance is in preparation for the Summer of 1949. This Institute, which will be under the direction of Father Edward Bunn, will offer an intensive training course both theoretical and practical for Guidance counsellors. The faculty of the Institute will be recruited from the Jesuit institutions throughout the country.

The Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education is one of the outstanding educational documents of the year. The National Catholic Educational Association Department of Higher Education appointed a special committee to review it. Among the members of this committee were three Jesuits, Fathers Wilfred Mallon, Allan P. Farrell and Paul C. Reinent. The results of the deliberations have been published in mimeographed form.

The review, besides being a critical analysis of each section, offers numerous resolutions of interest to Catholic colleges. It is now being revised, will be edited by Father Farrell and is to be published as a brochure. Its implications for Jesuit colleges are great and should be studied carefully by administrators of colleges and universities.

Through the Special Bulletin, I have already informed the schools of the inquiry conducted by the House Ways and Means Committee into noninstructional activities of educational institutions. The Chairman of this Committee, Mr. Knudson, seems to lean definitely toward taxation of such activities. The American Council on Education is conducting a survey on the activities of schools and will, I presume, make every effort to ward off any threatened legislation. I checked with Washington just a week ago, but there was no further word to be had on the activity of the inquiry.

Each year the Provincials have been good enough to give a written response to my annual report I make on the JEA during the meeting of the Provincials. A summary of the responses that directly concern

the administration of our schools is sent to them shortly after the Provincials' Meeting.

CONCLUSION

I wish to take this opportunity to thank publicly in the name of the Executive Committee, the Provincials, Presidents and Rectors, Deans and Principals of our institutions for the fine cooperation they have shown in the work of the JEA I myself and my assistant, Father Mehok, owe you a particular debt of gratitude. If the Central Office of the JEA has been able to be of some help in the work of our schools it is due in large measure to the thoughtful, prompt, and courteous cooperation we have always received from Ours.

I think you ought to know that the work of our schools in the United States is well-known to our higher Superiors in Rome and a source of great consolation to them, and to our Highest Superior, Our Holy Father himself. Last September when I was in Rome, Father General asked me to tell you how pleased he is with your work, and how earnestly he desires that this work shall continue to meet with God's blessings. When I had the great privilege of an audience with Our Holy Father, His Holiness told me that he too knew of the fine work of Jesuit education in the United States. He said that he was proud to be an alumnus of three of our first Jesuit institutions in the United States—Fordham, Georgetown, and St. Louis. And his last words to me were that when I went back to the States I should tell the Fathers how dear to his heart is the work of our educational institutions in the United States and how earnestly he desired this work to continue and flourish.

What better can we do than try to deserve this confidence of the Vicar of Christ on earth.

Busses, Released Time and the Political Process

JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.

I have chosen to discuss two of the many problems connected with the two recent Supreme Court decisions based on the "liberty from the establishment of religion" as transferred from the First Amendment to the general word liberty in the 14th Amendment.¹ The first problem is a reply from history to what is set forth by the Supreme Court as an exposition from history of the amplitude of this expression. The second problem deals with a questionable reaction to the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court under the due process of law clause over an arrangement of matters brought about amicably by a local majority and enjoying the approbation of the State courts.

The first problem has been fairly widely expounded in Catholic circles. I consider its best brief exposition to be that of a Woodstock theologian, Mr. Francis Canavan, S.J., which appeared in *America* for November 22, 1947. Fr. John Courtney Murray in his various articles on all the facets of the problem of civil authority and religious forces, Fr. Robert Hartnett and Fr. Wilfrid Parsons have also dealt luminously with this same subject.²

Both Justices Black and Rutledge in the majority and minority opinions in the *Everson Case* relied almost exclusively on historical arguments to expound the amplitude of "no law respecting the establishment of religion." Both rely on what can honestly be said to be true but inapposite historical data. Their historical foundation is essentially what James Madison thought and did about the separation not merely of church and state but of political authority and religious forces in Virginia. All that they say of Madison's beliefs and actions in Virginia to segregate the two is undoubtedly true. To this they might also have

¹An account of the process whereby certain liberties of the first eight amendments have been included under the term "liberty" in the Fourteenth Amendment may be found in the author's "The Founding Fathers and the Bill of Rights" in *Phases of American Culture* (Rev. C. E. Sloane, S.J., ed.; Worcester: Holy Cross College Press, 1942).

²For the most recent extended account of the historical, legal, and philosophical aspects of this problem, cf. Rev. Wilfred Parsons, S.J., *The First Freedom* (New York: Declan McMullen, 1948).

added Madison's views as set forth in the recently published "Detached Memorandum" without in the least making these views of Madison constitutionally germane. Mr. Irving Brant in his recent second volume on Madison, like the Supreme Court, has also *assumed* that these earlier Virginia views of Madison are necessarily inherent in the no-establishment clause of the First Amendment. For it is the unproved assumption of both Mr. Brant and the Supreme Court that Madison's private views and public actions in Virginia, 1784-6, are the touchstone of the constitutional interpretation of the First Amendment.

How can this assumption be denied, it might be asked, since it was Madison himself who introduced into Congress what is now the First Amendment? Madison in introducing this and several other proposals was merely attempting to make good the promises of the supporters of the new constitution to propose as amendments what certain states had suggested as the price for their ratification of the Constitution.³ It was not a case of Madison introducing this religious clause as his own personal idea. If we had no account of the congressional debates on the formulation of the no-establishment clause, we *might* assume that its words were measured by the sense in which Madison stood for separation in Virginia from 1784-6. Fortunately there is evidence—if not in abundance—of the sense in which these words were accepted by Congress when it proposed this amendment to the states.

In its primitive form the proposal read: "The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship, nor shall any national (sic) religion be established, nor shall the full and equal rights of conscience be in any manner, or on any pretexts, infringed." (Cf. *Annals* I, p. 434-June 8, 1790). This text along with texts of other proposed amendments went to a Select Committee on Tuesday, July 21. When referred back to Congress on August 15th, the proposal in question read, "No religion [N.B. national is omitted] shall be established by law, nor shall the equal rights of conscience be infringed." (Cf. *Annals* I, p. 729-August 15). On these words the entire extant debate ensued. (Cf. *Annals* I, 729-731-August 15). Sylvester of New York feared that these words might be misconstrued to abolish religion altogether. Gerry of Massachusetts felt it more appropriate to say that "no religious doctrine shall be established by Law." Carroll of Maryland favored the committee's phraseology on the score that dissenters, now

³The form in which Virginia suggested the no-establishment clause may be found in Jonathan Eliot, *Debates in the several State Conventions on the adoption of the Federal Constitution* (5 vols.; Phil.: Lippincott and Co., 1859), III, p. 659: "... that no particular religious sect or society ought to be favored or established, by law, in preference to others."

disgruntled with the constitution, might be won over by learning that no *one* religion could be established by Congress to the disadvantage of others. The plain assumption in these three utterances is that the words were intended to oppose the exclusive establishment of one religious faith, not that they commanded a divorce between government and religion in all its moods and tenses.

At this point Madison, on whose Virginia ideas the Supreme Court case is made to rest, joined the congressional debate.

"Mr. Madison said, he apprehended the meaning of the words to be, that Congress should not establish *a* religion and enforce the legal observation of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience . . . to prevent these effects [fear that without it the national government could make laws infringing rights of conscience and establishing a national religion] he presumed the amendment was intended, and he thought it was as well expressed as the nature of the language would admit." [Annals I, 730] (Brackets and italics mine)

Huntington, though agreeing with Madison's views, feared that they "might be taken in such latitude as to be extremely hurtful to the cause of religion." In the course of his statement Huntington expressed the one thought which Justice Rutledge in the *Everson* dissent thought historically meaningful in this entire legislative history. Huntington pointed out that in New England, financial contributions to churches were regulated by law and were actionable in courts. He wondered whether as a result of this clause federal courts would be denied jurisdiction to vindicate such pledges. Would it not be possible that "support of ministers or building of places of worship" might be construed into a prohibited religious establishment. Some modification of the words, Huntington thought, was necessary if they were not to "patronize those who professed no religion at all." Prescient words in view of Mrs. McCollum.

Did Madison's reply indicate that this total segregation was just what the words meant? If he were as bent on divorcing the State and religion forces, as his admirers maintain, or on denying the use of the secular arm to assist religious forces, here was his opportunity to say so clearly and frankly. All of Mr. Huntington's fears could be removed, replied Madison, if the committee's words were kept, and if the word "national" were re-inserted before the word religion as it had been inserted there in his original draft. For, argued Madison, all that the "no-establishment" clause had in mind was to lay to rest the fear that one sect or two sects in combination would get such numerical predominance that they

could compel others to conform. Such was Madison's exposition at a time when his exposition was legally pertinent. Yet Madison elucidating on this matter in Congress is never recognized nor allowed a chance to open his mouth in the Supreme Court opinions which purport to give an authoritative historical exposition of the no-establishment clause.

If it was disappointing to have several columns in the *Everson* opinions given over to the Virginia Madison to the exclusion of Congressman Madison, it was much more disheartening to read the short shrift which Justice Black for the *McCullum* majority gave to the request that the historical significance of this clause be re-examined.

"Recognizing that the Illinois program is barred by the First and Fourteenth Amendments if we adhere to the views expressed both by the majority and the minority in the *Everson* case, counsel for the respondents challenge those views as dicta and urge that we reconsider and repudiate them. . . . After giving full consideration to the arguments presented [to this point and to a contention not here germane as to whether the no-establishment clause can be transferred to the First Amendment] we are unable to accept either of these contentions." Period. No factual grounds, just the bare assertion that the no-establishment clause, historically, is broad in its amplitude—no aid to one religion or to all.

That there may have been some non-articulate members of the first Congress who were of the secularistic views of the Virginia Madison may be the explanation of one odd development in the course of the voting in the First Congress. Samuel Livermore of New Hampshire sponsored a substitute form of the amendment: "Congress shall make no laws *touching* religion, or infringing the rights of conscience." This proposal received 31 votes with only 20 votes against it, but not the necessary two-thirds, i.e., 34, which favorable formulation of an amendment required. Although every spoken difficulty, observation and answer stated or implied that a narrow amplitude was to be given to the no-establishment clause, Livermore's resolution—if its words are to be interpreted literally—lends some weight to the broader view. But this broader view, I repeat, did not command the required constitutional two-thirds strength.

On August 20 the House passed the Amendment in the following form: "Congress shall make no law establishing religion or to prevent the free exercise thereof, or to infringe the rights of conscience."

In what form the Senate discussion began or how modifications were made is unknown historically. The form in which the pertinent section came to the House for conference is this: "Congress shall make no

law establishing articles of faith or a mode of worship . . .” This language quite clearly shows that the Senate’s purpose was to outlaw an exclusive religious establishment, not to outlaw aid for public purposes even though religious forces are assisted.

The joint conference committee of the First Congress compromised not ideas but phraseology; its product is the current form of Amendment One. This history, all groups of the Supreme Court notwithstanding, shows that what was banned was not the aiding of religion, but the imposing of one religious faith or worship on the people to the exclusion of others.

It is curious, therefore, after this survey of the only pertinent history to read what Mr. Justice Black in the *Everson* Case asserted as the minimum meaning which history gave to this clause:

“Neither a State nor the Federal government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, *aid all religions* [this is *the* illegitimate historical conclusion], or prefer one religion over another. . . . No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practise religion.” (Brackets mine)

This principle with its wide coverage cannot be drawn from the legislative history of the First Amendment.

From such a principle, allegedly based on pertinent, non-controvertible historical data, it is much *easier* to understand last year’s *Everson*’s 4-5 minority opinion and this year’s 8-1 *McCollom* majority opinion than last years 5-4 majority opinion in the *Everson* Case. Yet I believe that the practical consequence of the *Everson* majority opinion can be justified in recalling that the tax-money in question as a matter of fact was expended not “to aid” religious activities or institutions of set purpose, but to promote a legitimate public [at least non-private] purpose even though aid to religious activities or institutions was a close-knit and substantial by-product.⁴ Since at present we have only that distinction on which to rest non-discriminatory governmental services to religious groups, I think it is better to see its good point rather than to join its foes in ridiculing this distinction.

The remaining point in this historical exposition had been prepared before its fundamental approach was employed by the only real dissenter to the broad amplitude of the no-establishment clause—Mr. Justice Reed.

⁴This appears to be the manner in which Mr. Justice Reed understands the expression: aid all religions. A comment on this aspect of Reed’s dissent may be found in the June, 1948 issue of *Thought* under the title “Reflections on the Champaign Case.”

The argument here presented rests on what the Supreme Court calls practical constitutional construction, especially practical constitutional construction which is early and extended. Its rationale in constitutional argumentation was once well stated by Mr. Chief Justice Taft in the *Meyer's* case.⁵

"This court has repeatedly laid down the principle that a contemporaneous legislative exposition of our Constitution when the founders of the government and framers of our Constitution were actively participating in public affairs acquiesced in for a long term of years, fixes the construction to be given its provisions. . . ."

What the very first Congress believed that it was not forbidden to do under the no-establishment clause is clear from the appointment by both House and Senate of official congressional chaplains. They were voted for, it is true, before the First Amendment was formulated and adopted, but no subsequent change was made on the score that their appointment had violated its ban. It was the same men, too, who voted for congressional chaplains and for the First Amendment. As early as 1797, Congress voted for consular relations with the Papal States and this relationship lasted until 1870. Diplomatic relationships, it should be observed, began with executive proposal and formal congressional approval only in 1848 when Polk was President.⁶ The two early congressional actions—provision for chaplains in Congress and initiation of consular relationships with the Papal States—show that those who made practical decisions on what was within constitutional limitations considered the First Amendment no barrier to this kind of relationships between the United States and religious offices and institutions.

If, too, it was so evident verbally or historically from the no-establishment clause that no public funds could be given in a general, non-discriminatory way to foster religion, it is difficult to explain the repeated and unsuccessful efforts of some congressmen from 1875 on to amend the Constitution so that it would ban all use of federal public moneys for any kind of sectarian use. These efforts *imply* that such a ban was not then in the Constitution. They establish, too, that when, on the plane of policy, this ban was attempted, the efforts were in vain.

⁵This norm of constitutional interpretation is contained in Taft's majority opinion in the 1926 decision on the ouster power of the President of the U. S. Cf. 272 U. S. 52, 175 (1926).

⁶For a valuable essay on this consular and diplomatic relationship between the U. S. and the Papal States, cf. Rev. Joseph A. Thorning, "American Notes in Vatican Diplomacy," *Historical Records and Studies*, XX (1931), 1-27.

The Supreme Court, it is true, is not obliged to sanction even long-adhered to practices if these are *clearly* contrary to explicit constitutional limitations. If today the Court is to hold that it cannot presume the legitimacy of such legislative practices where a basic civil liberty is involved, as it might so presume where a procedural or economic liberty is involved, it should be more skillful historically in establishing the fact that a basic liberty is involved. Without the aid of pertinent history, the Court is now defending against presumptively valid legislative action freedom *from* religion and not merely freedom from state-imposed religious orthodoxy. I mention this rule of constitutional construction, which is best set forth in *Thomas v. Collins*,⁷ because so competent a constitutional expert as Mr. Dowling of Columbia Law School told one of our fathers that the dissenting opinion in the *Everson* case was more constitutionally valid than the majority opinion. His proof was that it is the task of the court never to yield to presumptions of constitutionality when a basic liberty would be impaired. The whole point in controversy, however, is not the validity of this rule against constitutional presumption in such a case, but whether as a matter of *fact* the alleged basic liberty is a constitutional liberty with any solid and pertinent historical grounding. That it is not such a liberty, is our precise and often-repeated point.

I now turn to the matter of a current reaction to this decision which on historical grounds has apotheosized no-establishment of religion. Might I suggest that Catholics have in the *grounds* of last year's decision and in both the *grounds* and the *conclusion* of this year's decision a situation similar to what labor and liberal elements in this country faced in the matter of liberty of contract from the time of *Lochner v. N. Y.* in 1905 to the *Tipaldo* case in 1936. Valid liberty of contract, which would be protected by federal courts under the same due process of law clause that now covers genuine religious freedom, had been so enlarged by a series of Supreme Court decisions that it was able to strike down rather than to aid and protect clear rights. On the score that social legislation impinged improperly on liberty of contract, yellow-dog contracts were given free rein, and the most reasonable of minimum wage

⁷*Thomas v. Collins* (323 U. S. 516, 530) gives this exposition of the "more-preferred-position" theory in regard to basic liberties. "For these reasons any attempt to restrict those liberties (contained in the First Amendment) must be justified by clear public interest, threatened not doubtfully or remotely, but by clear and present danger. The rational connection between the remedy provided and the evil to be curbed which in other contexts might support legislation against attack on due process ground, will not suffice. These rights rest on firmer foundation. Accordingly, whatever occasion would restrain orderly discussions and persuasion, at appropriate time and places, must have clear support in public danger, actual or impending. Only the gravest abuses, endangering paramount interests, give occasion for permissible limitations."

and maximum hour laws were declared automatically unreasonable and therefore, unconstitutional.

What was one reaction of labor and liberal elements to these parallel cases where there was a majority legislative agreement on state social legislation, where state courts had upheld this policy as valid, but where the U. S. Supreme Court under the due process of law clause struck this legislation down by its laissez faire sword of liberty of contract? It was to work either for a new constitutional theory or for a new constitutional amendment which would deprive the Supreme Court of its authority to invalidate state laws by the use of substantive due process of law, i.e., the power to invalidate laws as clearly unreasonable or arbitrary in relation to life, liberty and property. This effort to deprive the Supreme Court of all substantive due process of law authority would, of course, also deprive it of authority to protect against contemporary state majorities all the other liberties which are contained in the word liberty. It would mean—to speak of a matter with religious connotation—that there would be no power in the Supreme Court to invalidate an Oregon law forcing all children to attend public schools. There are at least 7 substantive liberties found in the first eight Amendments and many more substantive ones contained on judicial understanding in the general word “liberty” in the 14th Amendment. All of these would be left to the mercy of contemporary majorities in the states if substantive due process was removed. Yet this was the remedy often advocated by labor and labor’s friends to get around certain unjustifiable decisions; but fortunately the remedy was never realized.

Should Catholics, who are both citizens and Catholics, follow a similar course? Because—at least for the immediate future—a secularist concept of liberty from religion has been ensconced with the general term ‘liberty’ in the Fourteenth Amendment, should they support a theory, whereby this and all valid liberties would be cut off from federal judicial vindication? For a long period of time there has been a doctrine enuntiated in political theory and in some Supreme Court decisions that political rather than judicial remedies should be relied upon to protect liberty and to vindicate justice. Instead of having federal courts of law serve ultimately “as havens of refuge for those who might otherwise suffer because they are helpless, weak, outnumbered, or because they are non-conforming victims of prejudice and public excitement,” we would entrust our liberties exclusively to the political processes. Thus it would come about that the “power of the people in the states would not be fettered, their sense of responsibility lessened and their capacity for sober and restrained self-government weakened” by federal

judicial protection of liberty and justice. Zeal for state experimentation on basic rights shows a callousness to liberty and to justice. For every village Hampden that can be pointed out to glorify the political process, there can also be found a village Kessler.

As a professor of constitutional law in a Catholic college, I have praised the judicial history whereby liberty is protected in federal courts even when local communities for laudable purposes wanted shortcuts around liberty. I have tried to have pupils see that fundamental liberties (even procedural ones) are too valuable to leave exposed even to allegedly enlightened political majorities or to state courts often not too judicially independent. Before espousing proposals—because of one misdeed—to strip the U. S. Supreme Court of its substantive due process of law authority vis-a-vis life, liberty and property, I would like to see the consequences carefully weighed.

In numerous judicial opinions attention is often called to the fact that, if one or two competing interpretations is followed in preference to the other, serious and unpleasant consequences will follow. At times, these listings of consequences are far-fetched. Then it is correct to refer to them invidiously as a judicial parade of horrors. But not every enumeration of serious consequences inherent in a poor choice of two competing possibilities is a parade of the horrors in this pejorative sense. Let me name a few of the liberties which would be left solely to state political processes rather than to possible federal vindication if due process were emptied of all its content except its most general procedural due process of law. Gone from even the possibility of Supreme Court vindication would be the following liberties vis-a-vis state power: freedom of petition, assembly, press and speech, fairness of trial, effective employment of counsel in criminal cases, freedom of religious worship, of religious exposition, association and conscience, freedom to educate children in non-public schools. All of these and many more lapse, we might just as well recognize, if we are to urge with some economic journals and religious magazines that local matters should be for the future outside the vindicative authority of the U. S. Supreme Court and left exclusively to the realm of state majority policy. Instead of urging such an emptying of the vessel of due process of law, we should be striving to support the view that every genuine liberty should be as untrammelled as valid public purposes will permit.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who believes somewhat strongly in the preference of political over judicial protection of liberty, but who would at least safeguard the channels of communication (freedom of expression and freedom of elections) against untoward majority policy, must smile when he sees how one historically ungrounded interpretation

of the Supreme Court brings him such strange bedfellows. With keen satisfaction he and others, who favor making as many as possible of our burning questions into policy-matters exclusively, will be pleased when editorials in Catholic journals re-echo such statements of his as the following:

"Except where the transgression of constitutional liberty is too plain for argument, personal freedom is best maintained—*so long as the remedial channels of the democratic process remain open and unobstructed*—when it is ingrained in a people's habits and not enforced against *popular policy* by the coercion of adjudicated law." *Minersville School District v. Gobitis*, 310 U. S. 586, 599 (1940). (Italics min.)⁸

In advocating such ideas in American jurisprudence we shall have emptied out of public law its great natural law content in the name of saving the natural law. It is still true that the best propaganda device to rid law of religion must somehow guise itself in the language of religion if it is to prevail. I trust that such a crusade will not succeed. With all the moral and intellectual earnestness of which I am capable, might I urge Catholics at least to think twice before they lead a parade to Mr. Frankfurter's judicial bed-chamber.

⁸That the saving-clause in this quotation, "except where the transgression of constitutional liberty is too plain for argument," cannot always be taken at its face value appears to be evident from Mr. Frankfurter's dissent in *U. S. v. Lovett*, 328 U. S. 303, 319-330 (1946). That even the electioneering process need not be too sedulously safeguarded by court review against restrictive legislation appears from the division of the Supreme Court in *United Public Workers v. Mitchell*, 67 S. C. 556 (1947).

Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education

ALBERT I. LEMIEUX, S.J.

I. ANALYSIS

On July 13, 1946, President Truman appointed a Commission of thirty outstanding civic and educational leaders to examine "the functions of higher education in our democracy and the means by which they can best be performed." In December of this academic year the Commission published the results after its 18 months of research, consultation and discussion in a five volume report entitled "Higher Education for the American Democracy." The circulation of this important report has already reached more than 20,000 copies. From the very nature of the report we may be sure that its recommendations undoubtedly will command the attention of all persons responsible for the future planning of higher education in the United States.

Recognizing the importance of the Commission's report, Father Edward B. Rooney, Executive Director of the Jesuit Educational Association, has asked me to present a brief analysis of perhaps the most pertinent aspect of the report, federal aid to higher education, together with an appraisal of its implications for Jesuit Higher Education. Federal assistance to education is treated principally in volume two (Equalizing and Expanding Individual Opportunity) and in volume five (Financing Higher Education).

The basic assumption of the Commission's report is that provision should be made for a greatly increased enrollment in the nation's institutions of higher learning. On the basis of the Army General Classification tests given during World War II to about ten million men representing a broad cross section of the population, the Commission estimates that 49% of American youth between the ages of 18 and 21 could profit by at least two years of college work and at least 32% have the ability to complete four years of higher education.¹ The Commission gave no serious consideration to making attendance even in the 13th and 14th years compulsory; it merely expressed the opinion that a greater percentage of American youth could and should be given the opportunity to

¹Vol. 2, p. 7; Vol. 1, p. 39-49.

profit from benefits of college. The Commission's concern was more with the possible means by which a college education might be made possible to all qualified youths regardless of race, creed, color or national ancestry. It does suppose, however, that education at least through the 14th year, is indispensable for a more enlightened citizenry, for individual effective living, and general welfare of the nation. The minimum numerical goal for which the Commission would have higher education plan is 4,600,000 by 1960, an enrollment just double the current enrollment. (4,000,000 in undergraduate level; 600,000 in research and graduate work.)²

The Commission sees two major barriers to attainment of this goal of expanding and equalizing educational opportunity to all American youths who have the desire and ability to profit by higher education: (1) the economic barrier;³ and (2) the barrier of discrimination.⁴

First the economic barrier. The Commission is convinced that the lack of adequate financial resources on the part of the individual (as well as on the part of institutions) represents the greatest single barrier to the achievement of a desirable program of higher education. Hundreds of thousands of the nation's talented youth come from families too poor to afford a college education. Data reported to the Commission showed that "in 1945, nearly 75% of all the children under 18 in this country were living in families whose total money incomes were less than \$3,500 a year. Nearly 50% of the children under 18 were in families whose incomes were at or under \$2,500 in that year, and 36% were in families with income of less than \$2,000 a year."⁵ This general inability to pay for college education is accentuated in rural over urban districts, where incomes generally are lower than in cities. The problem of financing education, however, is not only a matter of low incomes. The cost of education itself has risen. The average increase in fees has been 28% between 1938 and 1946. No estimate is given on the increased cost of board and room which the Commission enumerates as obviously the greatest single cost to the individual.⁶ Low incomes together with rising educational costs, then, have created a well-nigh insurmountable barrier to many qualified students who could profit from higher education. The loss in potential leadership to the nation is clear.

Among the *ways* for removing individual financial barriers now deny-

²Vol. 5, p. 2.

³Vol. 2, pp. 11-23.

⁴Vol. 2, pp. 25-44.

⁵Vol. 2, p. 12.

⁶Vol. 2, p. 16.

ing many the benefits of higher education, the Commission recommends:

1. A national program of federal scholarships:⁷
 - a. Such scholarships to be provided for at least 20% of all undergraduate non-veteran students; (300,000 in 1948-49)
 - b. The maximum number of seven annual grants to one student;
 - c. The maximum amount of any one grant; \$800 per year;
 - d. Each applicant would select the college or university he or she desires to attend, and would assure his or her admission to it in the regular way;
 - e. The primary basis for determining the award of the scholarship to an individual student: his financial need. It would further depend upon his ability, character, sense of responsibility, etc.
 - f. The Commission recommends the establishment in each state of a representative scholarship commission to administer funds granted to it for this purpose by the federal government. This commission is to include representatives of public and private colleges and universities, of the chief state school officer and of public spirited citizens at large within the State.
2. A national program of federal fellowships for graduate study and research.⁸
 - a. Amount of each fellowship: \$1,500 a year;
 - b. Each fellowship to continue for a maximum of three years if the student maintains acceptable academic standards;
 - c. The holder of a fellowship to be allowed to select his own field of graduate study and to pursue it at an institution of his own choice;
 - d. Recommended number of fellowships: 10,000 in 1948-49; 20,000 in 1949-50; 30,000 in 1950-51 through 1952-53;
 - e. Fellowships to be awarded on competitive examination basis.
3. Free public education through the 13th and 14th years, i.e. elimination of tuition and other required fees in publicly controlled institutions. This is a pattern of finance substantially the same as that adopted for supporting elementary and secondary education.⁹
4. A reduction of fees above the 14th year, particularly in graduate and professional schools, to the 1939 fee level.¹⁰

⁷Vol. 2, pp. 52-55.

⁸Vol. 2, pp. 55-57.

⁹Vol. 2, p. 22.

¹⁰Vol. 2, p. 22.

N.B. Commission expresses hope that private schools will keep fees as low as is economically possible.

5. Great multiplication of tuition free "community" colleges, technical and vocational institutions, thus eliminating the expense of travel and the cost of living away from home.¹¹

The solution of an individual's economic difficulties, however, will not necessarily assure him a place in college. Even assuming his ability to finance his education, he might still find it impossible to attend the college of his choice, particularly the professional school of his choice. There is a second barrier which must be removed according to the report. This is the barrier of racial and religious discrimination.¹²

While racial discrimination is practiced against Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Latin Americans, Italians, and Orientals, the report emphasizes the discrimination practiced against the Negro on all levels of education. It condemns the policy of non-admission of Negroes existing in some American higher institutions and deplores the lack of quality and number of educational facilities provided for Negroes particularly in graduate and professional fields in areas which have institutionalized segregation.

The Commission acknowledges that both Jews and Catholics are victims of religious discrimination but it singles out the Jewish minority (which it lists as a religious rather than a racial group), because it feels that discrimination against this group is more readily available. While it recognizes that there are justifiable standards of selection of applicants, it scorns selection criteria which are used for purposes of screening out Jews. Tacit and overt quota systems, application blanks inquiring into applicant's religious affiliation and racial origin, are cited as common discriminatory techniques employed against Jews. The Commission also blames in part professional associations which influence so tremendously the admission policy to dental and medical schools.¹³

In regard to the practical means for eliminating racial and religious discrimination, the Commission makes two recommendations: (1) the enactment of legislation against discrimination, (2) and withholding of federal funds from those institutions which employ discriminatory practices. The mind of the Commission on enactment of legislation is expressed in the following excerpts: "... The invoking of legislation ... against discrimination ... seems the logical way of advance ... to assure a universal and equal regard for a policy of nondiscrimination the legal method becomes both fair and practical. ... There has been

¹¹Vol. 2, p. 22.

¹²Vol. 2, pp. 25-44.

¹³Vol. 2, pp. 29-37.

too much tardiness and timidity. It now seems clear that many institutions will change their policies only under legal compulsion. . . . Laws which place equal obligation upon every institution of higher learning to admit applicants only on the basis of publicly justifiable criteria would not resolve every problem of discrimination which exists within colleges and universities. If carefully devised, however, such measures should go far toward equalizing educational opportunity. Many believe that voluntary action, if vigorously and universally pursued, would be more desirable than compulsory action. But the assumption that early and general voluntary action will be adequate to meet the need does not appear to be warranted."¹⁴

If this expanded program of higher education is to be encompassed, it is not only the individual who must be helped but the institution must be aided as well. The program recommended by the Commission will necessitate a 100% increase in university and college personnel, 100% increase in current operating expenses, and 100% increase in educational plant facilities. On the matter of faculty salaries alone, the Commission reports that not only is the number of teachers to be doubled but the salaries themselves call for a 50% increase above the 1946-47 level, to be brought up to non-academic salary schedules.¹⁵ To pay the costs of this expanded program of higher education in both private and public institutions, the Commission estimates that by 1960 it will take annually two and a half billion dollars for current expenditures alone and if capital outlay is added, three and half billion.¹⁶ On the basis of estimated income available from local governments, greatly expanded appropriations from State governments, reduced student fees, and miscellaneous sources, it must be planned to meet a deficit of almost two-thirds of a billion dollars by 1960 for current operating expenses alone. There is but one source capable of providing funds needed to avoid a deficit and to guarantee an operating budget for higher education; the federal government. The commission therefore recommends that the federal government become a strong, permanent partner in the system of financing higher education and that federal government grant very substantial aid to meet increased current operating expenses, increased faculty salaries and required building programs. This aid is to be given to publicly controlled colleges and universities only, to the exclusion of privately controlled ones. According to the estimates and recommendations of the Commission, the Federal govern-

¹⁴Vol. 2, pp. 28; 43-44.

¹⁵Vol. 5, p. 14.

¹⁶Vol. 5, p. 26.

ment will contribute roughly one billion to the building programs of public colleges and universities by 1953 and roughly two-thirds of a billion dollars for current operating expenses by 1960.¹⁷

Among other measures to aid in financing higher education the Commission recommends that the federal government protect the complete tax exemption privileges of higher institutions against the growing tendency in some quarters to raise questions relative to these privileges, particularly federal tax exemption on corporate income.¹⁸

The Commission also recommended that the federal government finance capital outlay for non-instructional purposes (v.g. dormitories) in both publicly and privately controlled institutions *on a loan basis* at low interest with a 30-year period for retirement of debt.¹⁹

One of the most hotly contested proposals of the President's Commission is its policy of discrimination against independent schools by barring them from the right to federal funds for the expansion, maintenance and staffing of their institutions. It is this precise point that was questioned by the two Catholic representatives on the Commission and is treated at length in part II of this paper. The state of the question in the Commission's own words is best found in the heading which reads: "Federal funds for the general support of current educational activities and for general capital outlay purposes should be appropriated for use only in institutions under public control."²⁰

The reasons given by the Commission for refusing federal aid to private colleges and universities are: (1) it would tend to weaken the program of public education due to spreading of funds; (2) it would tend to introduce federal control into private institutions—public responsibility for support would imply public responsibility for and review of educational policies; (3) it would thus tend to destroy the competitive advantages and free inquiry which they establish; (4) it would be contrary to best interests of these institutions as well as those of society in general.

How, then, are privately controlled colleges and universities to fare in the face of the tremendous competition from the federal subsidized

¹⁷Vol. 5, pp. 5-6; pp. 41-43.

¹⁸Vol. 2, p. 40;

See also letter of Feb. 9, 1948 of George F. Zook, President of the American Council on Education, addressed to the presidents of colleges relative to action of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives under Senator Knutsen on Nov. 16, 1947, which proposes to investigate tax exemption privilege on business enterprises conducted by colleges and universities in competition to those engaged in private enterprise.

¹⁹Vol. 5, p. 45.

²⁰Vol. 5, pp. 57; see also pp. 57-58 for further development.

publicly controlled colleges and universities? How are private institutions to finance increased operational costs (which already are 50% above the 1940 level according to *Fortune*, Feb. 1948, p. 103), meet the 50% increase in present salaries and building programs, and this in face of reduction of fees to 1939 level, which the Commission finds private institutions must make to avoid catering to a "money class" and to keep in line with the sharp fee reductions in public institutions?²¹

The President's Commission, to quote from its report, "is fully aware of the serious financial problems facing many of these (privately controlled) institutions. The Commission is also aware of the fact that its proposals for a great expansion of higher education in publicly controlled institutions may make it extremely difficult for many private institutions to survive. A system of tuition-free education up through the fourteenth year and relatively low fees above the fourteenth year and in graduate and professional schools of public controlled institutions will undoubtedly force many of the weaker private schools out of existence and profoundly affect the whole pattern of private institutional support. Furthermore, the strengthening of publicly supported institutions, as recommended by this Commission, may have the effect of further increasing the gradual upward trend in the flow of private benefactions to State institutions."²²

And what hope for survival does the Commission hold out for the better established private institutions? Of such institutions, the Commission reports: "first, they should confine their enrollments as well as their programs to levels which they can support on a high quality basis with the funds in sight; secondly, they should take all the steps necessary within reason to expand and strengthen their methods of appealing for contributions."²³

In table 6, page 42, Vol. 5, the Commission estimates that in 1960 private colleges and universities (in the over all picture of colleges and universities) will derive 53% of their income from student fees and 40% of their revenue from non-student dollars. At the same time on page 28 of Vol. 5 the Commission gives factual evidence of the dwindling income from benefactions and endowment, diminishing number of philanthropic big donors, and the increasing tendency of phil-

²¹Vol. 5, p. 35 and 46.

N.B. According to *Time*, March 15, 1948, Columbia raised its tuition 33⅓%; Colgate raised tuition 20% since the President's report.

²²Vol. 5, p. 46. Parentheses mine.

²³Vol. 5, p. 46-47.

anthropists to shift their benefaction to public institutions. From what non-student sources, then, must administrators of private institutions struggle to raise revenue equal to 40% of the costs of simply maintaining and operating a university? Again the Commission has a happy solution. Private institutions must devise ways and means of hitting a lot of little givers—people in the middle income brackets. Private institutions should make fuller use of highly developed group appeals akin to those used in national or local relief drives, take fuller advantage of alumni support and draw more heavily upon annual benefactions from community business which the university should convince as to its needs and as to its community service.²⁴

The Commission appreciates that there is a distinct ratio between potential revenue and potential expansion. Since it does not visualize any appreciable increase in the revenues of private institutions over the 1946-47 level, it estimates that the enrollments in private institutions will not go beyond the 1946-47 level, 900,000. The contemplated tremendous expansion in American colleges is all to take place in publicly controlled colleges.

II. STATEMENT OF DISSENT

The Catholic members of the Commission, Msgr. Frederick Hochwalt of NCWC and Mr. Martin McGuire of Catholic University entered a vigorous protest against the recommendation of the Commission that the appropriation of federal funds for current expenses and building programs be restricted to publicly controlled institutions of higher education, to the exclusion of private ones. They affirmed that this recommendation was a purely arbitrary one, and that the reason advanced for it, namely, that the appropriation of federal funds for private educational institutions would expose them to Federal control, lacked cogency, since in the mind of the Commission publicly controlled colleges and universities could accept such federal aid without exposing themselves to the danger of Federal control.

Secondly, service to the public rather than public control should be the principal criterion of the school's eligibility to receive public funds. The Commission itself acknowledges that private institutions are vitally affected with public interest, and on many matters in the report (such as fees and discriminatory practices) the Commission charges private institutions with public responsibility.

Thirdly, the mighty system of public higher education financed by tax funds might permit the government to use schools for political

²⁴Vol. 5, p. 47.

purposes, particularly if the development of such a vast system eliminates a large number of private schools from the American educational scene. At least that threat becomes more ominous as the role of private school becomes diminished. The American people should not forget that the exclusive control of education made dictatorship in foreign lands acceptable to an unsuspecting public.²⁵

III. APPRAISAL

The most fruitful of the Commission's financial proposals is the federal scholarship and fellowship program which would finance the education of hundreds of thousands of American youth in the colleges and universities of their own choice. This proposal is in closest accord with the Commission's determination to assure a much greater equalization of educational opportunities among individuals and in their respective states. It aims at greatest single obstacle which confronts the individual in financing his education, board and room, and rightly conforms to traditional government policy in its aid programs as exemplified in NYA and G.I. Bill of Rights. Its rules for administering the scholarships give good assurance that there will be a minimum of government control, and a minimum of discrimination between public and private institutions. But inasmuch as the Commission has recommended that federal funds be denied to institutions guilty of discriminatory practices, administrators of our Jesuit institutions should examine their institutions to see that they are free from such practices lest they jeopardize the right of the institution to receive federal funds. Administrators of Jesuit institutions which have graduate programs should plan to initiate programs of research which might win government approval for grants-in-aid. We also suggest, if we may, that administrators study the possibilities of the Commission's recommendation that the Federal government finance capital outlay for *non-instructional* purposes in private institutions as well as in publicly controlled institutions on a loan basis, and that they cooperate in all endeavors to protect tax exemption privileges now guaranteed by federal government.

The implications of the Commission's other recommendation on federal assistance have been ably appraised in the statement of dissent drawn up by Msgr. Hochwalt and Mr. McGuire. To their statement I should like to add an observation of my own. The Commission, which devotes fully 15 pages of its report to a vigorous denunciation of discriminatory practices in higher education, is itself guilty of flagrant discrimination

²⁵Vol. I, p. 65 ssq.

against privately controlled colleges and universities, a discrimination which, according to its own admission, "will make it extremely difficult for many private institutions to survive, and which will undoubtedly force many of the weaker private schools out of existence." This, paradoxically, the Commission proposes to equalize and expand educational opportunity by a program which, in one of its most basic recommendations, necessarily has the effect of unequalizing and contracting educational opportunity.

The Requirements for the A.B. Degree in Jesuit Colleges

REV. ANDREW C. SMITH, S.J.

For some time now the Commission on Liberal Arts Colleges has been concerned with the curricular problems connected with the A.B. degree as given by our Jesuit Colleges. Three areas particularly have been under their scrutiny, viz., Religion, Scholastic Philosophy, and Latin. The fact that these particular studies have long been characteristic of the Jesuit A.B. degree explains the Commission's preoccupation with their current status and future development, but the particular reason why they are being reevaluated now is that contemporary conditions in the schools—the heavy influx of students, and the current emphasis on scientific studies—are making it more and more difficult to hew to the line on traditional requirements. Indeed, a survey of the actual practice in our colleges across the continent reveals a significant variety both in the detail of curricular requirements and in the proportion of students who so fulfil them as to merit the A.B. degree.

In the course of this program, the Commission through its Chairman, Father Gianera, will report its findings and make recommendations to this audience and ultimately to the governing body of the Jesuit Educational Association. That, I take it, will be our main act. My own function I conceive to be something akin to that of the Elizabethan actor who spoke the Prologue.

First then, as stage setter, I tabulated results of a survey of our 27 American Jesuit Colleges and Universities. The question to be answered in tabulated results was, What are the A.B. requirements (semester hours) in religion, philosophy, English, Latin, modern language, Greek, mathematics, natural science, social science? The answers to this question was listed by colleges. The colleges were arranged by provinces, listed in their turn in geographical rather than alphabetical order. I had thought that there might be some significant pattern revealed as we moved westward from the classical East. In reality there is less pattern than anticipated. Westerners seem to be just homesick Easterners.

Not that there are no differences in the listed requirements; but the

differences are not always territorial in their incidence. Sometimes they occur within the colleges of the same province. But on the whole the differences are not as striking as the uniformity. Five subjects in fairly good amount (say a year's work as a minimum) are required in each of our higher institutions; viz., philosophy, religion, Latin, English, and history. A fifth subject, natural science, would be found in the same category except that in the colleges of the Mid-west it is an alternative to mathematics, and in one institution, Loyola of New Orleans, it is not required at all. So too, mathematics misses making the select company by reason of the alternative before mentioned, and likewise because Greek is an alternative for it in some nine Eastern colleges (and Seattle). Two of the California Colleges, Santa Clara and San Francisco, do not require Mathematics or any alternative for it. Greek still has a respectable foothold in two-thirds of our institutions, but it is always a precarious or conditional existence which it enjoys. Thus Greek may be required for an A.B. with Honors, as at Boston College, or permitted as an alternative to Mathematics, as mentioned before, or to Modern Language, as in some ten colleges—all west of the Alleghanies. In three colleges, Detroit, San Francisco, and Loyola of Los Angeles, neither Modern Language nor Greek is a requirement. The remaining fourteen demand a Modern Language, with no alternative permitted. Speech, presumably in deference to the well-known insistence of the *Ratio* on "eloquentia" is required in twenty of the twenty-seven colleges. And the modern insistence on sound social principles has had its results in inducing some seven colleges to require a year or more in Sociology, and three at least to demand some introduction to Economics. Only one institution (Detroit) lays down the law that the Bachelor of Arts must be acquainted with the Fine Arts as well as the Liberal Arts. Besides one course in Music Appreciation every graduate must show credit for four semester hours in the understanding of ancient and mediæval art.

These in summary are the subjects required of our A.B. candidates in the twenty-seven colleges under our direction; the picture reveals a pleasing variety, yet withal enough similarity to constitute a real family resemblance. St. Augustine would find in it a consoling example of his maxim, "in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas." Nor does the picture vary too greatly should we consider in detail the quantitative requirements for the different subjects. While the range may be wide between the highest and the lowest requirements in a given subject, there is always a middle ground common to more than half of the institutions. For the sake of brevity, I offer the data in tabular form.

TABLE II. SEMESTER HOUR REQUIREMENTS IN REQUIRED SUBJECTS

Subject	Range of Hours in Various Colleges	Median Requirement	Number of Colleges with Median Requirements
Religion	4-18	8	19
Philosophy	15-34	15-20	14
Latin	10-20	12-16	23
Modern Language	6-16	12	14
English	6-16	12	18
History	6-16	12	18
Science	6-16	8	18
Mathematics . . .	3-12	6	16

EVALUATION OF THE PRESENT REQUIREMENTS

Were we merely historians we could stop at this point, having set forth objectively the requirements for our A.B. degree. If we were *good* historians we probably wouldn't, until we had explained the stages by which these present requirements have evolved in the various colleges. We might even want to compare our end result with the curriculum envisaged by the *Ratio* of 1599, as well as that of 1832. But most of us, for better or for worse, are inveterate philosophers rather than historians. More than how things came to be as they are, we want to know *how good* they are as they are, and more particularly how we can make them better.

Certain reasons for considering some revision in our practice may occur unsought to every thinking administrator. One is a corollary of the variety revealed by the results of our questionnaire. Is this variety necessary? And if it is, should there not be still more variety according to differing needs in different parts of our country. Two particular arguments for change of some sort have been pointed out by more than one of the many Deans who contributed their thoughts for this paper. But before I set them down for critics to shoot at, I think it might save time and argument to list briefly in sentence form certain assumptions in the argument on which all of us can and do agree. Thus:

1. The A.B. degree is our traditional degree, the one about whose good fame we ought to be most concerned.
2. The objective of this A.B. degree is primarily cultural formation.
3. The curriculum, as the controllable factor in education, is of fundamental importance in achieving this end.
4. Required courses form a desirable part of the curriculum, and hence there is a limit to electivism.
5. The credit system (or something like it) is necessary for the time being as a convenient measurement of curriculum requirements.

These propositions may or may not be axiomatic, but if we accept them

as if they were, our arguments about the curriculum proper to the A.B. degree are liable to stay on the tracks and reach some ultimate fixed destination.

Now, I think, we may safely approach those arguments previously mentioned as impugning the prevailing pattern of the A.B. requirements. The first is this: "Too many and too soon." There are far too many common requirements, leaving far too little for the development of individual talents, to say nothing of desirable concentration on some field of special interest. A glance at the table showing the full spread of requirements will reveal that this argument is not entirely groundless. In nearly a dozen instances, the total of required hours is in excess of one hundred.

A second difficulty is concerned with the nature of certain particular requirements. Some of these—Latin is a prime example—demand a specialized preparation somewhat beyond what we can expect of the average incoming Freshman. And so the question naturally arises, Should we temper the wind to the shorn lamb, by permitting some non-classical substitute study for the ambitious youth who out-Shakespeares Shakespeare in his "little Latin and less Greek"? There are those who feel that events have already given the affirmative answer for us, and they point to dwindling Latin classes as they look forward with dismay to graduating exercises with no A.B. degrees to be conferred. But then too there are others, perhaps a pathetic old guard, who mutter in their beards that to yield on this point would be to desecrate the Holy of Holies and to deform the A.B. beyond recognition.

But as one last preliminary to that report and in virtue of my role of Prologue, I would like to clear the atmosphere a bit by determining how far we can legitimately go in modifying our traditional requirements. And since Philosophy and Religion have more explicit recognition in subsequent papers, I will confine my attention and yours for the rest of my allotted time to the single question of Latin, which anyhow is probably fated to bear the brunt of any agitation for change. Why have our Jesuit Colleges clung tenaciously to the Latin requirement for the A.B., when our rival schools, one after another have been making Latin an elective, or (what is often the same thing) letting it drop from the curriculum completely? Is there perhaps some positive legislation has effectively deterred our administrators from yielding the last redoubt? The only statement of this nature which I can find occurs in the "Standards for Jesuit Colleges," adopted by the immediate predecessors of this Association, meeting at Santa Clara in 1926. In Standard VI, we read:

"The A.B. degree will be conferred on such students only as have included Classics (at least two years of Latin) in their course. This degree may be conferred without Greek."

Perhaps there is no legislative force in this statement of a minimum ideal. Even if there were, because the Provincials approved it, it could conceivably be revoked by that same authority. This could not, however, be done without due attention to the spirit of the *Ratio Studiorum* and its abiding values. In this connection it is enlightening to note that as late as 1938, our American authority on the *Ratio*, Father Allan P. Farrell wrote in the closing chapter of his study, *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education*.

So consistently held since the time of St. Ignatius as to be considered the second principle of the *Ratio* is the conviction that the Latin and Greek classics and Scholastic philosophy are constants in any educational planning, because they offer abiding and universal values for human training. Through close and inspiring contact with classical culture students will have high human standards by which to appraise not only works of art and literature, but also social and political theories and movements.¹

There, it seems to me, you have in one brief statement the arguments both from authority and from reason for the retention of the Latin requirement. The argument from authority is not to be taken lightly. We Jesuits, by nature, or perhaps in some cases by grace, are conservative, and we hate to fly in the face of tradition, particularly our educational tradition, the *Ratio*. It is this very conservatism that has been our strength and our title to the esteem we enjoy. We sacrificed something of our tradition when we gave up Greek, in order to match the secular trends around us. Shall we now give up Latin for the same reason? After all, the arguments against the ancient classics are not entirely new. One thing perhaps that is new is the discouragement that has come to many of us who have been trying fruitlessly and perhaps—such is the influence of one's surroundings—not too hopefully, to stem the ebb-tide of the humanities. If in spite of our twenty years of effort, the status of the classics has retrograded, why should we keep up a hopeless fight? And then to substitute a rationalization for a counsel of despair, we begin to exalt the values of alternative disciplines. After all, we say, just as many roads lead to Rome, so also many are the varied curricula that can impart that humanistic culture which is the object of our A.B. degree. Who knows? Perhaps the Social Sciences, so popular

¹Farrell, Allan P., S.J., *Jesuit Code of Liberal Education*. Milwaukee: Bruce (1938), p. 403.

and so important in our day, can become for the Jesuit education of tomorrow what the ancient classics were for the educational system of the Renaissance? Or again, for the training of the mind what can compare with the exacting demands of the experimental sciences, with their wonderful potentialities for improving our material life? Arguments like these can at times sound very specious, threatening to deceive even the elect. Fortunately it is at this juncture that there comes into play the saving conservatism of all our tribe. We still hesitate just long enough to see through the sophistry that vitiates all such arguments of the "either—or" type.

It is indeed a strange paradox that non-classical disciplines which came into the educational picture under the plea of tolerance of all values have thus become in many cases most intolerant themselves. Few of us are likely to deny that all of the many disciplines now composing the curriculum, Physical Science, History, and the Social Sciences generally, can and do make their own particular contribution to the complex that is a truly liberal education; but that fact should never blind us to the equally evident fact that the ancient classics too have their special contribution to make, one that as the heirs of Rome we should be loath to forego. Technological developments, war or the threat of war, or other overmastering circumstances that we do not now even foresee may make it a matter of sheer necessity or wise compromise to modify beyond recognition our traditional ideal of education, but let us acknowledge them that it is a sad necessity. The difficulties of keeping Latin, particularly in certain parts of our country, may indeed be insuperable. If they are, then we have no choice except to give Latin up. Our apostolic purpose in education would seem to require that. But if do it we must, let us do it with our eyes open to the sacrifice we are making. The situation has been well described in the words of one of our number whose counsels we sorely miss in these deliberations today, and with his words, as found in his little book, *The Catholic Way in Education*, I shall close my introduction to the Commission's report:

"That the literature of Greece and Rome are necessary for a liberal education in our times would be difficult to prove; but until something better is provided to give youth standards of taste, and at the same time train his mind . . . it can be safely maintained that the liberally educated man should be trained in Latin and Greek, or else must go forth lacking half his birthright . . ."¹

¹McGucken, William J., *Catholic Way in Education*. Milwaukee (Bruce). 1934., p. 45.

Religion in the Undergraduate Jesuit Colleges

REV. PAUL L. O'CONNOR, S.J.

Everyone of you has at one time or other sat upon the stage at graduation and writhed inwardly as the golden tongued orator eulogized the graduates in some such terms as, "You are the cream of our Christian culture, you are the Catholic leaders of tomorrow who must save the world for Christ. The religion you have studied here had made you the supernatural man thinking and acting and judging constantly and consistently in accord with right reason." You writhed simply because the statements were not true, because many of our graduates do not measure up to that standard—a standard, incidentally which most colleges carry as a statement of objectives in their catalogues. I think most of us are willing to admit that our graduates are, on the average, good, but they are not good enough. Called to be saints they are willing to settle for mediocrity. They are possessed of certain Catholic practices and professions, but they are not thoroughly Catholic minded. They turn out, at the best, to be excellent doctors and good Catholics, or fine lawyers and good Catholics, but they are not Catholic doctors and Catholic lawyers.

This fact was brought out during the war. It was a common opinion among chaplains that by and large our Catholic men neither knew nor lived their religion as they should, and that while the graduates of Catholic Colleges were certainly better than those who had no religious training, they were certainly not the militant leaders we had a right to expect them to be after all their specialized religious training. No doubt about it, much good was done during the war by the example of our Jesuit college men. Conversions resulted. As a matter of fact, there were so many adult baptisms during the war that the Military Ordinariate still refuses to release the figures, prudently fearing that the "Protestants and Others United" would accuse the Catholic Chaplains of direct proselytizing, and demand that during the next war their activities be curtailed. Yet despite all this good, the wonder was that more good was not done. A survey among chaplains was conducted by Fr. Stedman's Monastery of the Precious Blood. But the chaplains were

so pessimistic about the leadership of Catholic young men that the results were not published until after the war, because during the war, for the benefit of the parents at home, every Catholic boy in uniform was supposed to be going to Mass and Communion daily. The specific accusation made against the college trained man was that he was strong on apologetics (due largely to his philosophic training) and weak on what has become known as Catholic Action. He was definitely not the genuine and finished Christian man whose interior life and social spirit have so often been described in the great encyclicals. Now, that is undoubtedly a pessimistic report. I do not think most chaplains would go that far in evaluating the Jesuit college graduate. But I think most of them would agree with the statement, they were good, but they weren't good enough. They should have been the leaven, they should have been strong enough to be plunged into a modern secularized milieu, and confidently left to the inner resources of a mature faith be able to stand by themselves, and strong and intelligent enough to reform the milieu into which they were plunged, but by and large they did not.

And why not? I think the answer to that emphasizes both the strong and the weak points of our education today. The fact that our graduates were good is a tribute to our discipline, our insistence on philosophy, our personal contact, and our extracurricular religious training. The fact that they were not good enough, in my opinion, points squarely at our greatest weakness today, the religion courses in our colleges.

I am not trying to say that the formation of the true supernatural man depends entirely upon what is taught in religion classes. All the subjects must be impregnated with Catholic doctrine and train the supernatural man. As Cardinal Newman says, this Catholic training is found in the very atmosphere of the Catholic college, inculcated in the yearly retreats, fostered at daily Mass, made active and vocal in the Sodalities. But I do maintain that the heart and the core, the main-spring, of the development of the true supernatural man who, in the words of Pope Pius XI, "thinks and acts and judges constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason, as illumined by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of Christ," (is) the course in religion. And our religion courses have not accomplished that task.

With that last statement I think most of you will agree. At least the results of the questionnaire I sent out a month ago bear out that contention. Of the 27 Jesuit Colleges in the country (all of whom, let it be said to their credit, responded to the questionnaire) only five replied that they were satisfied with their religion courses, 5 more

were undecided, and 17 said flatly that they were dissatisfied. Even more revealing were some of the comments, I quote a few.

"We need a change of textbooks on the college level." That appeared frequently. "Introduce courses dealing in practical Catholicity." "We need a more positive treatment of theology." "Put Christ into our Religion classes." "Too much repetition. Get the philosophy and religion departments together." "Why can't we section our students in religion? We do it in languages, English and math." "The deans are the principal stumbling block to the effectiveness of the religion program. They are so tangled up in the details of their office, they haven't time to give real and inspiring leadership." "I am very pessimistic about religion in our expanding colleges." "Set a fire under those administrators out there so that they come to realize that religion is important."

I add that the only fire I might wish to set under you is a fire composed of all the old theology notes yellowing in the file cases of all the Jesuits in the country. Which is a fairly good transition to my next point.

I think the entire discontent manifested by the deans and the heads of religion departments in the answers to the questionnaire arises from the fact that the end product of our education is not the religious-minded graduate we have a right to expect. And I do not think that this discontent is a kind of divine discontent, ever striving after higher perfection, but an honest realization that something is wrong and let's do something about it.

The real core of the problem seems to me to be the fact that in most of our colleges we are teaching a watered down version of our own seminary courses in theology simply because it is easier for a busy and perhaps a part-time teacher to teach from his own theology notes—which are usually notes based on the theology teacher's notes taken from a textbook. And we are teaching it as something added on to the margin of our curriculum to large disinterested classes.

Now, as a matter of fact, the teaching of theology to the laity should be informed by its own special well-defined purpose, quite different from the purpose that directs the theological instruction of priests. You will pardon me if I seem to labor this point. I think it is essential if we are ever going to be satisfied with our college graduate. For much of the following material on the distinction between theology for the priest and theology for the laity, I am indebted to Father John Courtney Murray. I think that every educator who has anything at all to do with religion courses should read the two illuminating articles he has

written for "Theological Studies." They appear in Vol. 5, pages 43 and 340, and are entitled, "Toward a Theology for the Layman." He says quite specifically that "we may not suppose that what the layman needs is a sort of diminished theology, only quantitatively or rhetorically different from that taught in seminaries—a sort of *Summa Theologica* with the hard parts left out. On the contrary, what he needs is a theology that, remaining theology, keeps to an order of its own, and has all the perfection proper to that order. Both the theology of the seminarian and the theology of the layman will verify the abstract idea of theology—the science of faith in the service of the church. But they will be 'totaliter diversa.' It is a question—not of teaching a different faith—but of effecting for a specified purpose, a particularly apt organization of the truths of faith, and of adjusting emphases within this order of truths, and of communicating them according to a particular pedagogical method. One method will be the logical method, the other what we may call the psychological method."

The method is different because the purpose is different. The specific finality of the clerical course is "That intelligence of faith, especially in its relation to human reason and philosophy, which is required in order that the magisterium of the church may be able effectively to preserve, explain and defend the whole of 'revealed truth.'" While the specific finality of the lay course is "That intelligence of faith, especially in its relation to human life and the common good of mankind, which is required in order that the laity of the church may be able effectively to collaborate with the hierarchy in accomplishing the renewal and reconstruction of the whole of modern social life."

The central argument is that the laity, as members of the Church, have indeed a share in her whole redemptive mission and are divinely called to participate in her hierarchical apostolate; but they participate in her apostolate as they participate in her priesthood—analogously, and in a manner proper to themselves. The conclusion is that when theology, which is the science of faith in the service of the Church, is taught to the laity, it should be conceived in function of the specific needs of the laity, and it should instruct and form them for their special service to the Church. From this principle it follows, I think, that a theology for the laity should have its own distinctive structure, and a distinctive distribution of emphases throughout its content.

For our graduate is, concretely, the Church's grip on the temporal order. The responsibility which the Church has for the sanctification of the secular and social life of humanity falls directly and immediately upon him, for he is present in, and a part of, that life in a way that

the priest is not, and consequently he can be the creator of its spirit and the artisan of its form in a way that the priest cannot.

The consequent problem is, how may this type of lay spirituality be created at least insofar as doctrinal instruction can create it. For my part, I do not think it will be created by an emphasis on apologetics and apologetic argument.

Moreover, apologetics tend to create a defensive mentality; one is always answering, and one frequently has the defeated feeling that one is not reaching the source of the difficulty which is often not in reason and cannot be reached by reason. There is always a gap between apologetic argument and faith; it leads up to faith, not into it, still less does it engender an experience of faith as the power of God unto salvation.

In this connection, it is important to realize, first of all, that secularism and indifferentism are not just religious errors, but religious diseases which have to be healed at a level in the soul deeper than that of reason. Though they have their "philosophies," they are not intellectualist aberrations; their origins are not so much in reason, as in myth—the myth of the self-sufficient man in the naturalist closed universe—which then seeks to rationalize itself.

In this situation, our tactics should be clear. To a radical and total challenge, one must fling a radical and total answer. To a complete system of thought one must oppose another system of thought, even more unitary, coherent, articulated. Against an all-devouring *mystique* one must turn the full force of another *mystique*, whose inner dynamism is still more triumphant and whose engagement of the whole man is still more imperious.

It is interesting to note that the Christian people (and even the general public), wearied with all the proving and answering, bored by the noise and apologetic conflict, is demanding something more than proofs and something better than answers. It is demanding a total and pacific exposition of divine truth.

This, I say, is the decisive intelligence of faith, particularly for the purposes of lay theology. These demand that faith be presented as more than an *assensus in verum*, but as more fundamentally a *consensus in vitam*.

In some colleges this is being done. At Georgetown, Loyola of Baltimore, and possibly two other colleges, this plan is being tested and constantly revised by the religious departments of those schools. The head of the religion department at Georgetown writes, "I know that finally we are on the right track. The results that we have been getting with it encourage our efforts."

Do not misunderstand me. I am not of the opinion that all of our colleges should be required to follow rigidly this one plan. I don't think that any lasting good will be accomplished merely by imposing it from above. The enthusiasm must come from those who are actually engaged in the teaching of subject. My point is simply that this program has succeeded precisely because it had the courage to tear away from the old seminary, logical order of presenting thesis, "status quaestionis," proof, adversaries and objections. It took into account the first principle of effective teaching, i.e., that the vital possession of any truth requires discovery on the part of the learner. It discarded the logical or scientific method of presentation for the more suitable psychological or inspirational manner.

The psychological approach is not made with the science of theology but with the vitality of religion. The student's mind and heart are considered the double object at which the religion course must aim. The student must be met with new ways of viewing his religion. He must be shaken from the rigid formulation which his high school has, perhaps, given him. He must be taught to savor an atmosphere first rather than to rationalize his religion. To this end dogma is not omitted nor even neglected, but dogma is thrown into new contexts and the Mass and prayer and the Sacraments are made the vehicles through which his religion is presented to him. Through these ideals and practices he is taught the underlying and motivating dogmas but in a context which is miles away from the theology course which every priest has had.

The principal text of the courses is the New Testament. These are supplemented with texts that are at present being photo-offset by Edward Brothers of Ann Arbor, Michigan. The first year has as its particular finality a knowledge of the gospel as a form of literature, including the political, historical and religious setting, with a detailed study of Christ as Prophet and teacher of mankind. The second year studies Christ as Priest of mankind, offering sacrifice, and enkindling a desire to participate in that priesthood of Christ. The third year concerns itself with the mission of the Holy Ghost with a view to imparting a special knowledge, esteem and love for the supernatural life. The fourth year concerns itself with apologetics, encyclicals, and asceticism and some moral problems in order to drive home the lesson that Christ and His plan are the sole hope of the salvation of the world.

I have dwelt at some length upon the important distinction of theology for the priest and theology for the layman, because I believe precisely in that point have most of the colleges failed in not turning out the kind of graduate who has a definite Catholic influence upon the

secular world in which he lives. Since this paper is directed not to heads of religion departments, who must determine the precise content of the religion courses, but to administrators who must make the larger decisions to bring about this change in the method and content of religion courses, I would like merely to recommend to administrative officers certain courses of action that they can take immediately and certain long range plans.

First of all, the administrators must be absolutely convinced of the primary importance of the religion courses, not merely theoretically, but practically, in our colleges, here and now. They must be as convinced of that fact as Mr. E. I. Watkin was when he wrote these lines:

A sufficient Catholic education, which imparts a living organic and interior knowledge of the Catholic religion is now literally a matter of life and death. The Catholic today as he grows out of his childish acceptance must either go into an interior vision of Catholic truth or go out of the Church.

Members of the religion department are constantly complaining that the deans regard the religion courses as secondary, allotting them the poorer hours of the day, allowing students who have failed in real religion courses to substitute easier culture courses for them; and that deans allow priests to teach religion who are too weak to teach other courses.

I am not convinced that these accusations are wholly correct though there might be some truth in them. They fail to take into account the overworked condition of our colleges, the scarcity of qualified teachers and the fact that we too have our problems with province education directors and provincials.

But once the deans are convinced that the supreme objective of a Christian education is to form a Christian man, and that a Christian man can be formed only by vital contact with Christ, and that the proper objective of the course of Christian theology is precisely to bring the college student into vital contact with Christ, then obviously the course in Christian theology must be considered the very soul of the college curriculum, then and only then will the dean be willing to put into effect the following recommendations:

First, the Religion department should be a real department with an active, experienced head who realizes that he is teaching theology for the lay person; one who is energetic, interested, and capable of inspiring the men in his department with some of his own enthusiasm. If you haven't such a man now, you should be on the lookout for one. Once

you have such a man he should be given all the encouragement in the world to build up his department until it is second to none in the school.

Secondly, the courses should be placed on a high academic level: Objective tests should be administered, especially in those places where by force of circumstances it has been necessary to employ a great number of part-time religion teachers. Grade studies should be made and published. If at all possible, substitute 3-hour religion courses for the prevailing 2-hour courses. And most of all, make sure that the entire religion sequence and content of courses is well thought out; that it has a central idea, and a progression of learning so that the religion sequence is such a compact unit that there can be no question of electives in junior and senior year. At one of the faculty meetings the head of the Religion Department should be allowed to explain how Religion is at the heart of our whole curriculum and exactly how the religion sequence aims to help turn out the desired graduate of a Jesuit college.

Moreover, incoming freshmen should be sectioned at least according to their backgrounds, if not also according to their intelligence. At the present time only 6 out of the 27 colleges section freshmen students.

So much for what you can do immediately. There is a long range program that I think should be put into effect as soon as feasible. Teachers should be trained as they now are for almost all other collegiate subjects. Likely scholastics should be told at the beginning of their theology that they are to teach religion, and they should be given a year's extra study at the end of their tertianship. I would like to see the Institutes of Religion revive their summer meetings. If this is impossible then meetings of the heads of religion departments in one province should be held at least once a year. Perhaps Father John Courtney Murray could be persuaded to hold a religion seminar with picked men from each province this summer.

I realize that such a program demands work and sacrifice on the part of the deans; and they will never do this unless they are convinced of the crying need for a decided emphasis on the religion courses in the colleges. That is why I devoted so much of this paper to what may have seemed to be destructive criticism of the state of religion in our colleges today. Such action on the part of administrators demands vision and courage, but I would hate to think that vision and courage were lacking in the Society today.

The Prelection Method

LAURENCE V. BRITT, S.J.

Group discussion of the prelection method of the *Ratio Studiorum* might be introduced in a variety of ways. One might, for example, approach the subject in controversial spirit, setting forth his own convictions with the intention of persuading all others, and be prepared to defend such views against the onslaughts of the audience. Such a contest of trenchant criticism and witty repartee might prove highly entertaining—to the audience—but its genuine, educational value is rather doubtful.

Again, one might approach the subject in a somewhat authoritarian fashion, pointing out that, according to the mind of the Society, teaching in Jesuit schools is to be “according to the principles and method of the *Ratio Studiorum*,”¹ which is the “Society’s own method.”² Interesting though such an approach might be for some, its practical, educational value may also be questioned.

Thirdly, a discussion leader might content himself with a few glittering generalities. He might solemnly proclaim that the Society’s method is strictly in accord with sound principles of educational psychology, and insist that experience has amply demonstrated the superiority of the prelection method over other methods for the attainment of our common educational goals. Such claims are occasionally made, but usually with little in the way of supporting evidence and with little indication that any account has been taken of manifold changes in the educational picture, such as the multiplication of required courses, curtailment in time allotted to specific subjects, changes in educational goals, and changes, too, in the abilities and interests of students.

In this paper we shall attempt, at least, to avoid all such naive approaches and confine ourselves to a more realistic view of the subject we are to discuss. Our purpose will be to consider criteria by which methodological principles are to be evaluated, to understand the real meaning of the prelection as a method, to see what applicability it may have in modern secondary education, and, finally, to suggest at

¹*Epitome Instituti Societatis Jesu*, 297.

²*Ibid.*, 397, #3.

least one way in which the utility of the method may be experimentally investigated.

Before considering the prelection itself, some attention should be given to the distinction between methodological principles and techniques, since there is danger of the two being confused in any discussion of the prelection. The distinction is important. A technique is a specific way of doing something, a specific procedure adapted to a more or less restricted set of circumstances or conditions. Being specific, it usually requires that the situation for which it was designed remain substantially unchanged, if the technique is to prove effective. A principle, on the contrary, is something general: a rule, a law, a concept, a fundamental truth or method, founded on some fundamental, underlying uniformity, and admitting of broad application. Techniques usually derive from principles and are employed to apply them.

In any attempt to evaluate the merits of respective teaching methods, we shall obviously be faced with many serious problems, since all methods are invariably affected, in practice, by the personality, ability, interest and zeal of the teacher employing them. We would probably all agree, however, that for most teachers a good method will be both helpful and necessary, while conceding that methodology alone will not make an efficient and effective teacher. We would probably also be inclined to accept the judgment of modern researchers in methodology that any "method which provides for adaptation to individual differences and which encourages student initiative and responsibility is likely to be more effective than one which does not."³

While it is probably true that up to the present there is no experimental evidence that solidly favors any one method over all others for the teaching of all subjects, we nevertheless realize the value of good method. In evaluating a method we know that a good method must square with certain criteria. For example, it must be in accord with known principles of effective learning, it must be common sense and practical, and it must work.

While principles proper to the psychology of learning have still to be defined in final form, the following, in one form or other, will have to be considered in any discussion of teaching methodology:

- 1) Learning must be adapted to the development level of the learner. Teaching, consequently, should be gauged to the abilities and backgrounds of the students we have; not to that of students we wish we had.

³Corey, S. M. and Monroe, W. S. "Methods of Teaching," in the *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, p. 726.

- 2) Learning must be directed toward goals which are meaningful to the students and accepted by them.
- 3) Learning takes place only to the extent that the individual is actively participating.
- 4) Constant stress should be placed on relationships. The more thoroughly organized the learning activity is, the longer will be its retention and the less the interference from intervening activities of a similar nature (retroactive inhibition).
- 5) Learning must be adequately motivated. Intrinsic motives, or those growing out of the activity itself, should normally be preferred to extrinsic or artificial motives.
- 6) Learning should be planned with explicit attention to probable later uses of the materials, since transfer cannot be assumed to occur automatically.
- 7) Periodic evaluation definitely promotes learning. Not only does it enable the student to recognize that he is making genuine progress, but it also aids him in understanding how his actions are related to the results obtained.⁴

If one choose to regard learning activity as primarily problem solving, then principles similar to the following would have to be kept in mind:

- 1) When a learning situation is intended to be a problem, the relationships necessary to its solution should be (a) well within the understanding of each child and (b) identifiable by him with reasonable effort.
- 2) Organized experience is most valuable for solving problems.
- 3) Practice in problem solving, to be most fruitful, should consist in the solution of different problems by the acquired techniques and in the application of different techniques to the same problems.
- 4) A problem is not truly solved until the learner understands what he has done and knows why his actions were appropriate.⁵

The proponents of many of the so-called modern methods of teaching, such as laboratory methods, directed study, diagnostic and remedial teaching, differential assignment, class grouping, project method, etc., would probably claim that their method is in accord with the principles stated above. Any attempt at evaluating the prelection method will have to take account of the same basic principles.

Keeping these preliminary points in mind, we may now proceed to an examination of the prelection method as it is proposed in the *Ratio*. As you are well aware, the prelection is not the *Ratio*, but only a teaching method proposed in it. Careful study of the *Ratio* will reveal that this document is concerned with four fundamental educational

⁴Eckert, R. E. "The Psychology of Learning," issued in mimeograph form at the Workshop in Higher Education, University of Minnesota, Summer, 1945.

⁵Brownell, W. A. The Forty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II The Psychology of Learning, pp. 438-440.

elements: administration, curriculum, method, and discipline.⁶ In the area of methodology the *Ratio* takes account of a variety of educational principles and techniques, such as the prelection, lectures, dictation, disputations, repetition, examinations, assignments, memory recitations, correction of written work, Latin conversation, laboratory work, concertations, prize awards, public exhibits, academies, and promotions.⁷ Of these we shall be concerned only with the first, the prelection, and with that only in so far as it may be considered a method.

Unfortunately, there is no one place in the *Ratio* to which we may turn for an adequate treatment of the prelection as a general method. Frequent mention is made of it, of course, but always in its application to a specific learning situation common in the schools at the time. As a result, we find the principle combined with specific techniques, with the result that the two may be identified, or, at least, confused. If the method itself be confused with accidental details of its practical application to an educational picture that has radically changed, then the applicability of the method in modern times may be questioned. Consequently, in looking for methodological principles in the *Ratio*, we must bear in mind the fact that the *Ratio* is a practical manual, written for specific schools, with the result that principles will often be only implicit in descriptions of their detailed application.

The most detailed statement of the prelection will be found in the "Rules Common to the Professors of the Lower Classes."⁸ If we keep in mind the fact that these classes had for their object the development of students' ability to read, understand, write and speak fine Latin, we shall not be surprised that the method is adapted primarily to the more effective teaching of Latin. In Rule 27 we find the most detailed statement, where we read:

The form of the prelection shall be about as follows:

1. Let him (the master) read the whole passage without interruption, unless in rhetoric and the humanities it would have to be too long.
2. Let him explain the topic and, if necessary, its connection with what has preceded.
3. After reading a single sentence, if he is interpreting Latin, let him explain the more obscure parts; let him connect one to another; let him explain the thought, not in inept metaphor by giving for each Latin word another Latin word, but by expressing the same thought in some intelligible phrases. But if he does it in the vernacular, let him

⁶Farrell, A. P. *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education*, pp. 339-340.

⁷Ibid., pp. 354-355.

⁸*Ratio Atque Institutio Studiorum Societatis Jesu*, translated in Edw. A. Fitzpatrick's *St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum*, cf. pp. 201-203.

preserve the order of words as much as possible; for so he will accustom their ears to the rhythm. But if the vernacular does not lend itself to this, let him explain everything first word for word, and then in the vernacular. But if the vernacular idiom will not allow this, let him first explain all things word for word, and afterwards according to the vernacular idiom.

4. Starting from the beginning, unless he prefers to insert them in the explanation itself, let him give observations suited to each class; but they should not be many, for he shall order them to be taken down, either by interrupting the explanation or by dictating them separately, when the prelection is finished; but it is usually considered better that grammar pupils write nothing unless ordered.⁹

In later rules provision is made for study, repetition, recitation, and written composition, the end product being demonstrated mastery of Latin. It was not considered sufficient that students should know Latin or be able to translate it with facility. They had to be able to *use it*, to rival the master in original, imitative compositions.

Quite obviously, method and techniques are here presented together, and logically so, since the document was prepared for those teaching Latin, at a specific educational level, to a certain type of selected student, in a school whose time schedule was set, and whose goal was, to a large extent, proficiency in the use of Latin. cursory reading of those parts of the *Ratio* which deal with the prelection might leave us with the impression that the prelection is a technique exclusively fitted to the teaching of Latin. We might even regard it as teacher-dominated. And we might easily regard it as too idealistic and rigid for modern use. Few things, however, could be further from the truth.

The Society's direction that all Jesuit teaching be "according to the principles and method of the *Ratio*," logically presupposes that the method outlined is general rather than specific. Again, the direction that the "Society's own method . . . be preserved in all matters in so far as may be possible," clearly implies that adjustments will have to be made to local teaching situations. Finally, the direction that members of the Order familiarize themselves with the Society's method by reading, not merely the Constitutions and the *Ratio*, but also our recognized educational authorities, implies that the *Ratio* may need interpretation.¹⁰

Careful study of writings on the subject will reveal that the prelection is not a specific technique for teaching classical languages only, but rather a broad methodological principle. In essence, it is presented as a method of previewing, or studying beforehand, a specific author, rule,

⁹Ibid., pp. 201-202.

¹⁰*Epitome Instituti Societatis Jesu*, 297, 313, 397, #3.

theory, or problem, with a view to facilitating and promoting private study and mastery, so as to make possible skillful use of the knowledge, skill, method, etc., that may be acquired.¹¹ Father Farrell has defined the prelection as

a preview, conducted by the teacher, with the active cooperation of the class, of every class assignment. It is not a lecture (he continues), but a prelude to and preparation for private study and mastery of an assignment. It is a natural way of realizing the principle of self-activity on the part of the student, which is considered necessary both for mastery and the formation of habits. Thus, the teacher is a coach; his chief task is to "create the mental situation and to stimulate the immanent activity of the student."¹²

According to Father Farrell, the aims of the prelection will be: (1) To awaken the interest of the students in the subject matter of the assignment; to motivate; (2) to set precise and attainable objectives for the assignment . . . ; (3) to point out more important or complicated phases of a subject, and to offer a solution of matters beyond the grasp of students at a particular grade level; (4) to indicate cognate subject matter when it is available and useful; (5) to suggest problems to be studied for review or discussion or judgement.¹³

Among the values to be derived from proper use of this method Father Farrell lists the following:

(1) It gives the student a *start* on private study, and thus almost automatically provides motivation for at least some effort and interest in study; (2) it prepares the student to obtain from every subject and every assignment not only intellectual content but also an intellectual method (the basis of habit formation) the best way to grapple with an assignment, how to explore its reaches as well as master its significant details, so that gradually the habit of orderly procedure and of mastery can result; (3) it makes it possible for the teacher to demand more thorough private study and consequently a better class recitation, discussions, etc.; (5) with it a teacher can go into a few aspects of an assignment thoroughly . . . or into many aspects (cursorily) . . . ; (6) in the hands of a practiced teacher, it is a constant and fruitful object-lesson to the pupil in the art of studying.¹⁴

As a methodological principle, then, the prelection might be expressed somewhat as follows: the self-activity, interest, motivation, and appropriate study habits requisite for effective learning can be stimulated

¹¹Donnelly, F. P. *Principles of Jesuit Education in Practice*.

Farrell, A. P. Op. cit.

McGucken, W. J. *The Jesuits and Education*.

Schwickerath, Robert. *Jesuit Education: Its History and Principles viewed in the Light of Modern Educational Problems*.

¹²⁻¹³Farrell, A. P. "Notes on Jesuit Teaching Procedures," *JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY*, March, 1943, p. 238.

¹⁴Farrell, *ibid.*, pp. 238-239.

by a well planned, teacher-directed, preparatory study of the assignment to be mastered, in which the class actively cooperates, with complete, demonstrable mastery of the assignment as the goal. In other words, no lesson is to be assigned for private study without having been explained first, and explained thoroughly, brought down to the pupils' level, with the major difficulties smoothed out, and the road made plain for the pupil, so that when he comes to study his lesson at home he will find it attractive from being made easy, interesting from his being made to see what it contains.¹⁵

Back in 1943 Father Farrell, in a series of articles in the JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY,¹⁶ presented some practical suggestions for the application of the prelection method to specific courses in a modern Jesuit High School. As time will not permit us to review each such application here, we shall consider briefly merely the applicability of the prelection to a modern Latin class. Actually, what is said of Latin may, with minor changes, be applied to Greek, English, and modern languages.

Presuming that the class has been properly oriented to the work of the year and that the instructor has familiarized himself to some extent with the ability, achievement, and interests of his students, we shall consider how the prelection might work in a sample class, say in third high.

AUTHOR PRELECTION

- 1) In starting a new section of author the instructor will first read the entire selection through, as interpretatively as possible.
- 2) He will then (or possibly before the reading) give the *argumentum*, or precis, of the selection, tying it up with what preceded, indicating the gist, etc.
- 3) Then follows the *explicatio*: a thorough analysis of the selection by members of the class, under the teacher's direction, to give all a substantial start toward solving difficulties of vocabulary, grammar, word order, clauses, connections, etc.
- 4) Then, if it seem desirable, the instructor may give, or draw from the students, appropriate comments on finer points of syntax, style, allusions, etc.
- 5) *Repetition*, briefly, of more important points of the *explicatio*, followed by dictation of essential helps.
- 6) Assignment of prelected selection for private *study*, not translation, at home, with the reminder that future translation and theme assignments will be based on the selection for vocabulary, syntax, style, etc.

¹⁵McGucken, opt. cit., pp. 200-201.

¹⁶Vol. V, p. 237; Vol. VI, p. 44, 48, 95.

On the following day, after the original prelection has been "given," and after students have re-studied it at home, the whole passage will be reviewed in class, with every student responsible for everything included in the first prelection: reading, precise explanation, erudition, Latinity, moral points, etc. The idea here will be to have as many of the class as possible take an active part in the review, either as defendants or critics.

Assuming now that the original prelection has been given and followed by home study and repetition in class, what is the next step? Is it sufficient that students demonstrate their understanding of the text? By no means! They will next be given an original theme, based on the text, and be required *to prove* that they can *use* what they have learned. In addition, some part of the text may be assigned for idiomatic translation, though this is primarily an English exercise.

To summarize, we may call attention to the fact that the daily class program will include a variety of activities, all characterized by rather intense student activity. Each day the students will be faced with the following tasks:

- 1) Repetition of a passage prelected the day before.
- 2) Assignment of a small part of the thoroughly studied selection for idiomatic translation (*si videatur*).
- 3) Assignment of and prelection of a short original theme based on passage(s) previously prelected, studied at home, and reviewed in class.
- 4) Brief correction and discussion of original themes and translation assigned on preceding day.
- 5) Prelection of new author assignment.

At home each night, therefore, the students will have three short tasks:

- 1) Intensive study of passage prelected in class.
- 2) Idiomatic translation of some part of passage(s) previously mastered.
- 3) Composition of original theme.

It is evident that students' attention will be focused on the master (e.g. Cicero): vocabulary, grammar, syntax, points of erudition, moral lessons, etc., will all be studied functionally, in the text, which becomes the model the student is to attempt to rival.

Should objection be made that the above outline is visionary, taking no account of the limited time at the teacher's disposal, my only reply would have to be: the method as outlined above has been used successfully with bright, average, and dull groups, in the usual 50 minute period, in a modern Jesuit High School, and the classes trained in the method have covered at least the usually required matter and come closer to attaining the defined objectives in Latin, Greek, and English

than teachers have found similar classes capable of doing with other methods.

Others, using applications of the method similar to those suggested by Father Farrell in his *Quarterly* articles, have found the prelection method, not only applicable to, but extremely valuable in teaching other subjects taught in our schools today. Study of the method in the light of the principles of learning proposed above will reveal that the method seems to be sound in theory. That it has been used successfully under current conditions seems to indicate that it is practical. That is designed to stimulate self-activity on the part of students and lead them to form proper study habits, note relationships, and strive for something more than mere memorization or acquisition of knowledge, should be clear from analysis of the method. Perhaps the Society's conviction of its utility will dispose us to give it at least a trial. Beyond that we probably cannot go, since there seem to be no experimental data that render possible a truly scientific comparison of this method with others.

Anyone interested in scientific appraisal might begin by arranging a series of experiments, in which the prelection method would be experimentally compared with others. This would involve equating classes, teaching them by the prelection and other methods, with the prelection as the experimental variable. Pretest and final comprehensive testing would indicate the merits of various methods used. Until such time as experimental evidence is forthcoming, we shall probably have to content ourselves with judging the prelection method in the light of principles of learning, to see if it be more in accord with them—at least apparently, than other methods; and with accepting the somewhat subjective opinions of teachers who have used this method and others. The fact that it has been used in modern secondary teaching will prove that it is not restricted to a purely Latin school; and the fact that it has seemed to those using it far more effective than other methods, may serve as an inducement for ours to try it.

Program of Annual Meeting Jesuit Educational Association

March 28 and 29, 1948

University of San Francisco and St. Ignatius High School
San Francisco, Calif.

GENERAL MEETING OF ALL DELEGATES

EASTER SUNDAY, MARCH 28, 7:30 P.M.

University of San Francisco Auditorium

Presiding: REV. WILLIAM J. DUNNE, S.J.

GREETINGS.....Very Rev. Joseph J. King, S.J.
Provincial, California Province

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR....Rev. Edward B. Rooney, S.J.

CHURCH AND STATE.....Rev. James L. Burke, S.J.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON

HIGHER EDUCATION.....Rev. Albert I. Lemieux, S.J.



COMMISSION MEETINGS

The time and place of the meetings of the Commissions on Graduate Schools, Liberal Arts Schools, and Seminaries, and the meeting of the Deans of the Juniorates, will be announced by the respective Chairmen.



MEETING OF SECONDARY SCHOOL DELEGATES

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 9:30 A.M.—12:00

St. Ignatius' High School

Presiding: REV. GERALD A. SUGRUE, S.J.

The *Ratio Studiorum*:

ESSENTIALS OF THE *Ratio* WITH EMPHASIS ON

SELF-ACTIVITY.....Rev. Joseph C. Glose, S.J.

THE PRELECTION.....Rev. Laurence V. Britt, S.J.

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 2:00 P.M.—4:30 P.M.

Presiding: REV. RALPH T. TICHENOR, S.J.

A SPEECH PROGRAM FOR JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS

Rev. Harold X. Folser, S.J.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON SECONDARY
SCHOOLS ON:

Present Speech Program in Jesuit High Schools

Rev. Claude J. Stallworth, S.J.

Colleges Attended and Curriculum Followed by 1947

Jesuit High School Graduates

Chairman, Rev. Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J.

MEETING OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DELEGATES

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 9:30 A.M.—12:00

University of San Francisco, Administration Building, Room B-1.

Presiding: REV. EDWARD J. WHELAN, S.J.

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE A. B. DEGREE . . . Rev. Andrew C. Smith, S.J.

REPORT OF THE LIBERAL ARTS COMMISSION ON:

The A. B. Requirements Chairman, Rev. W. C. Gianera, S.J.

RELIGION IN THE UNDERGRADUATE JESUIT COLLEGES

Rev. Paul L. O'Connor, S.J.

REPORT OF THE LIBERAL ARTS COMMISSION ON:

Religion Curriculum Rev. M. G. Barnett, S.J.

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 2:00 P.M.—4:30 P.M.

Presiding: REV. JAMES A. KING, S.J.

OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES IN TEACHING

PHILOSOPHY IN JESUIT COLLEGES Rev. Robert J. Henle, S.J.

Discussion Leader Rev. Daniel McGloin, S.J.

REPORT OF THE LIBERAL ARTS COMMISSION ON:

Texts and Hours of Philosophy Rev. John F. Quinn, S.J.

A RETIREMENT INCOME PLAN Baldo Ivancovich

DINNER MEETING

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 6:00 P.M.

University of San Francisco Auditorium

Presiding: REV. EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

WELCOME Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.

President, University of San Francisco

ADDRESS, *Developing Statesmanship* General Fred D. Butler, U.S.A.

LUNCHEON

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 12:30 P.M.

University of San Francisco Faculty Dining Room

LOCAL COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS

REV. WILLIAM J. DUNNE, S.J. REV. RAYMOND T. FEELY, S.J.

REV. HUGH M. DUCE, S.J. REV. RALPH T. TICHENOR, S.J.

PRESIDENT

VERY REV. JOHN J. McMAHON, S.J.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

VERY REV. HARRY L. CRANE, S.J.

VERY REV. JOSEPH J. KING, S.J.

VERY REV. JOHN J. McELENNEY, S.J.

VERY REV. JOHN J. McMAHON, S.J.

VERY REV. DAVID NUGENT, S.J.

VERY REV. LEO J. ROBINSON, S.J.

VERY REV. LEO D. SULLIVAN, S.J.

VERY REV. JOSEPH P. ZUERCHER, S.J.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

REV. EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

REV. OSCAR F. AUVEL, S.J.

REV. EDWARD B. BUNN, S.J.

REV. HUGH M. DUCE, S.J.

REV. JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S.J.

REV. JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.

REV. WILFRED M. MALLON, S.J.

REV. JOHN J. NASH, S.J.

REV. LORENZO K. REED, S.J.

REV. ARTHUR J. SHEEHAN, S.J.

REV. ANDREW C. SMITH, S.J.

ASSISTANT TO THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND TREASURER

REV. WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

COMMISSIONS 1947-1948

GRADUATE SCHOOLS: E. J. DRUMMOND, S.J., *Chairman*; C. E. SCHRADER, S.J.; C. A. BERGER, S.J.; J. H. GUTHRIE, S.J.; S. E. DOLLARD, S.J.

LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES: W. C. GIANERA, S.J., *Chairman*; J. F. QUINN, S.J.; L. A. WALSH, S.J.; M. G. BARNETT, S.J.; F. K. DRANE, S.J.

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS: EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.; JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.; WILFRED M. MALLON, S.J.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS: L. K. REED, S.J., *Chairman*; J. J. FOLEY, S.J.; C. E. BURKE, S.J.; C. J. McDONNELL, S.J.; C. J. STALLWORTH, S.J.

SEMINARIES: T. J. WOLF, S.J., *Chairman*; R. J. HENLE, S.J.; J. M. MOREAU, S.J.; M. R. VOGEL, S.J.; J. F. McDONNELL, S.J.; R. O. DATES, S.J.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

CENTRAL OFFICE

NEW PROVINCIALS: Father John J. McMahon has been appointed Provincial of the New York Province and Father Harold O. Small is the New Provincial of the Oregon Province.

DISPLACED PROFESSORS: Father Rooney and Father Gerald Walsh are now on a special two months' mission for War Relief Services to interview displaced persons with the object of screening promising candidates for teaching positions in American colleges and universities. They will stop at DP centers in Rome, Salzburg, Vienna, Gratz, Munich, Freiburg, Frankfort and Cologne. Results of the interviews will be compiled by WRS and sent to all Catholic colleges as was done last year. Jesuit schools in need of professors with special qualifications are asked to write this office, giving a detailed description of their requirements, and their requests will be forwarded to Father Rooney. Information concerning the mission has also been released to all members of the Association of American Colleges.

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION'S newly elected vice-president is Father Julian L. Maline, Prefect General of the Chicago Province.

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY INDEX: Accompanying this issue are two indices. The *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, "Index of Topics, Volume I to Volume X (June 1938-March 1948)" is a subject index of all articles appearing in the Quarterly from its inception through a ten year period. Book reviews, news from the field, tables of contents, lists of contributors and short notices other than articles are not included. Run at the same printing and folding to facilitate handling and reduce cost is the usual annual index to Volume X. This index is distinct from the index of topics and is the one customarily bound with the volume.

GENERAL

WORKSHOP IN FUND RAISING, a practical course, designed to acquaint alumni and public relations executives with specific techniques

in that field will again be conducted under the direction of Mr. Bernard P. Taylor at Chautauqua, N. Y. July 26-August 13, 9:30-12:00. Further information can be obtained by writing Mr. Taylor at 111 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Ill.

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION: Attention is called to *The Journal of Higher Education*, Volume XIX Number 4 (April 1948), which is devoted almost exclusively to a discussion of the President's Commission on Higher Education.

FEDERAL AID: The much debated Taft 300 million dollar education bill, S472, passed the Senate by a majority of 58 to 22. How the discriminatory measure will fare in the House is a matter of time and popular reaction.

CLASSIFIED CATHOLIC READING LIST, including nearly six hundred references in all fields, is the work of Mr. Theodore Makin, scholastic at the University of San Francisco.

NCEA VICE-PRESIDENT: Rev. William H. Dunne, president of the University of San Francisco, was recently elected vice-president of the college division of the NCEA.

COLLEGE

UNITED NATIONS: As part of the Cincinnati Plan for the United Nations, Xavier University presented to the public "The Drama of the United Nations." Divided into two parts, the first offered a series of episodes giving the history and functions of UN; the second, a quiz program, called upon the audience to answer questions on UN and gave cash prizes to successful participants.

INTERCOLLEGIATE LATIN CONTEST conducted by Jesuit colleges of the Chicago and Missouri provinces was won by Marquette, St. Louis and Loyola respectively. Leonard R. Ewing of Marquette captured first place.

NFCCS: Three of the four administrative positions in the National Federation of Catholic College Students went to students of Jesuit colleges at the tenth annual meeting held in Philadelphia. James E. Doherty of St. Joseph's College was elected president; Cornelius Scanlon of Boston College, vice-president; and Jack Cunningham of Loyola, Los Angeles, treasurer.

HOME STUDY Division of Loyola University completed 25 years in extension education.

MOTION PICTURE depicting the life of the typical University of Detroit engineering student is in the process of being filmed.

THE BILLIKENS of St. Louis University won the National Invitational Tournament basketball championship held in New York.

GUIDANCE PROGRAM, revolving around a student handbook, will enable department heads to direct their students at John Carroll University.

AQUINAS LECTURES: published recently by Marquette University Press are: Bourke, *St. Thomas and the Greek Moralists* and Gilson, *History of Philosophy and Philosophical Education*.

FOURTH BISHOP alumnus of Gonzaga University is newly consecrated Bishop Francis D. Gleeson, of Alaska.

THE JESUIT APOSTOLATE IN EDUCATION is the motif of an academy conducted by Philosophers at St. Louis University. Outstanding Jesuit educators accepted engagements to speak and answer questions on all phases of Jesuit education ranging from adult education to graduate work.

HOLLYWOOD WRITER, John Farrow, was the judge of University of San Francisco, "Manuscribblers' " fiction award contest.

MEDICAL AND DENTAL CENTER: Loyola University acquired eight and one-half acres for future expansion of its medical and dental center. The plot lies within the area allotted to Cook County Hospital for its future expansion.

STUDENT RELIEF was taken seriously at Los Angeles as Loyola University where students collected \$10,000 for the NFCCS drive.

A PLACEMENT BUREAU is John Carroll University's latest successful enterprise.

FACULTY SEMINAR on the philosophy of various subjects to integrate the different disciplines at Xavier University proved interesting enough for twenty men to attend regularly each week its two-hour session.

PHOTOGRAPHIC COPIES of the card indices of both libraries will provide complete catalogues for Loyola University's uptown and downtown campuses in Chicago.

A DONATION of \$250,000 was recently acquired by the University of Santa Clara.

HIGH SCHOOL

SCHOLARSHIP WINNERS: Winners in the Pepsi-Cola Scholarship Program of four year scholarships to colleges of their choice are Michael A. Geraghty, St. Ignatius High School, Chicago; John H. Arbogast, University of Detroit High School (honorary); and Dennis G. Lyons, St. Peter's College High School.

PRACTICE, West Baden's pool of training experience, requests its readers to send information on visual aids that has proved useful in the Jesuit classroom so that it might be included in a forthcoming list.

JESUIT MISSIONS MAGAZINE went to over 1900 new subscribers as a result of St. Louis University High School's recent drive.

MISSIONS prospered as Jesuit High, New Orleans, collected almost four thousand dollars in its Mission Drive. One class contributed over a fourth of the amount.

LIGHTED PLAYING FIELD for night sports is the most recent donation to Bellarmine High, Tacoma, by its alert and active Fathers' Club.

SMALL-GROUP RETREATS were a success at Jesuit High, New Orleans. Besides separate sections and directors for each of the lower grades, four closed groups of seniors made the Exercises at Manresa retreat house.

ART CLUB at Xavier High School, New York, made its formal debut with a public exhibit.

NEW CHAPEL AND REFECTORY BUILDING at St. Louis University High School was opened with a dinner to which the lay faculty were invited.