

Library

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

MARCH 1949

GUIDANCE PROGRAM

THE FIRST FREEDOM

STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES: 1948-1949

SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES AND
ADMINISTRATION

VOL. XI, No. 4

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Contributors

FATHER CHARLES E. BURKE, principal of Cranwell Preparatory School, is currently the chairman of the Commission on Secondary Schools.

FATHER JAMES L. BURKE, Dean of Boston College Summer Session, teaches History and Government and is Chairman of the Department.

FATHER MATTHEW J. FITZSIMONS continues his interest in professional education while teaching English at St. Andrew-on-Hudson.

FATHER JOHN J. FOLEY is at present principal of Marquette University High School.

FATHER WILLIAM F. KELLEY is a student of education at the University of Minnesota.

FATHER CHRISTOPHER J. McDONNELL is the principal of Seattle Preparatory School.

FATHER WILLIAM J. MEHOK is Assistant to the Executive Director of the Jesuit Educational Association and Managing Editor of the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*.

FATHER JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY leads a busy life between the lecture platform and the classroom at Woodstock, where he teaches Theology.

FATHER LORENZO K. REED is a frequent contributor to the *Quarterly*. As Province Prefect of Studies for the High Schools of the New York Province and Chairman of the Secondary School Commission he delivered the present paper at the Annual Convention of the Jesuit Educational Association in San Francisco.

FATHER CLAUDE J. STALLWORTH is the principal of the Jesuit High School, New Orleans.

FATHER GEORGE A. WALLENHORST, besides teaching Latin, English and religion, is Director of Student Academic Counseling at the University of Detroit High School.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

March 1949

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS	194
GUIDANCE PROGRAM: UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT HIGH SCHOOL <i>George A. Wallenhorst, S.J.</i>	197
THE FIRST FREEDOM <i>James L. Burke, S.J.</i>	205
STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES: 1948 - 1949	209
SURVEY OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES AND ADMINISTRATION <i>William J. Mehok, S.J.</i>	215
TOWARDS A THEOLOGY FOR THE LAYMAN <i>John Courtney Murray, S.J.</i>	221
OBJECTIVES OF A JESUIT COLLEGE <i>Matthew J. Fitzsimons, S.J.</i>	229
COLLEGES ATTENDED BY 1947 JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES <i>Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J.</i>	242
BOOKS <i>College Organization and Administration.</i> By Roy J. Deferrari (ed.), (Reviewed by William F. Kelley, S.J.)	250
<i>Charters of Philanthropies.</i> By M. M. Chambers (Reviewed by William J. Mehok, S.J.)	252
NEWS FROM THE FIELD	254

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:

OSCAR F. AUVIL, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
EDWARD B. BUNN, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
HUGH M. DUCE, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
JOSEPH D. FITZ GERALD, S.J.	<i>New England 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, MARCH 1949

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Guidance Program: University of Detroit High School

GEORGE A. WALLENHORST, S.J.

To claim to be pioneering in the field of academic guidance requires some qualification. Without making a scientific inquiry into the procedures of the many schools of our provinces, it seems that very little has been done until recently that would fall under the term, academic guidance. We have always had vocational guidance and counseling in our schools but has it not been in the nature of guidance to the priesthood or religious life and counseling in spiritual things? Some of our colleges and universities have had guidance programs for a number of years. But our high schools? Yes, we have had entrance tests for the purpose of screening applicants; some time during the year there has been set aside a week known as Vocation Week when representatives of the various professions were invited to address the upper classes; here and there the State University has conducted surveys and aptitude testing programs and sent the results to the Principal. To my knowledge, no school has had an appointed director of academic guidance who would be responsible for vocational—in the wide sense—guidance and academic counseling other than the Principal who does this *ex officio* as one of his many duties. Whether or not these facts are correct, the situation at the University of Detroit High School was such until a few years ago. Therefore, when I was appointed to be the director of this guidance program, I knew of no Jesuit high school to which I could look as a model. It was necessary to adapt programs of other schools and the colleges to our needs and thus pioneer in the work of academic guidance in the Jesuit High School.

There is little doubt that this type of guidance is necessary in our schools; the need has been felt and supplied long since in other institutions of learning. Those in charge of the education in our provinces have also been aware of the need in our schools and about three years ago took the first decisive steps towards a solution.

At the Denver Principal's Institute held in 1946, the whole program of student personnel service was gone into, and recommendations were made. Our program at the University of Detroit High School is a direct result of that meeting. In the course of this article, I shall point out how far we have been able to follow these recommendations especially under the two headings of the class adviser system and the aptitude testing program.

CLASS ADVISER SYSTEM

There will always be members of the teaching staff who are interested enough in the boy's complete development and want to do more than impart knowledge for the periods assigned to them. The Principals in conference called attention to the fact that "the class adviser is no innovation, but rather a return, as far as is possible, to the traditional class teacher of the Jesuit school."¹ The difference is that now there is greater insistence on the obligatory, systematic interviews with all students of a class with definite time assigned for these conferences.

Our first attempt at this class adviser system was too ambitious and had to be changed. The difficulties were principally these: absence of full cooperation; too detailed a form to be followed. Since we had twenty-five classes in the school each numbering about thirty-five students, it was necessary to find twenty-five advisers who would be cooperative enough to carry out their part of the program. This was not possible. The alternative was to assign more than one class to the willing workers, but by doing this we only encountered the difficulties that have been experienced by the spiritual counselors for many years—too many students and too little time.

In an effort to correct this deficiency, we now have class advisers appointed for each class—priests, scholastics, lay teachers—who will have general care of the entire group; special care, however, is expected only for those who have grades of 70 or below. This does not go contrary to the Principals' warning that care be given only to the mentally deficient students since all are given attention but stress is placed where it will naturally fall. This system works better because only a few teachers who are assigned to the poorest classes have a great number of students to concentrate on. More time can be given these students; conferences can be held oftener. Much of the burden is removed by this method.

The form to be followed that first year was modeled on Traxler's Cumulative Record. Even those who were most sincere in their cooperation found it baffling. Now the form has been simplified so that it no longer takes concentration to know how to use it. It is merely one mimeographed sheet with suggested questions to guide the one conducting the interview under the general headings: STUDY HABITS AND CONDITIONS, EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT, HEALTH, and DISCIPLINE. There are spaces left between each heading for comments to be written in as a help for future interviews. Since these forms are to be

¹Proceedings of the Denver Principals' Institute—July 10-24, 1946. p. 54.

turned in at the end of the year, the next year's adviser, if he is changed, will have a miniature case history of the boy.

Along with this mimeographed form, the adviser is given a separate card containing pertinent data about the boy—the results of the entrance tests with the Province scores for comparison, and the results of other tests that are given the students in the course of the school year, e.g. results of a reading test, I.Q., etc. The idea of having a separate card for the grades and test results is good because they can be collected when further information is available and if a secretary enters the information no personal information is revealed.

Occasionally, the adviser is asked to turn in to the Office the names of the boys he has interviewed with some indication whether or not progress is being made. When parents inquire about their sons, they are referred to the class adviser.

The organization of the class adviser system could be done by any one of the staff or by the Principal. However, if a director is appointed for academic guidance, he should be the one who organizes the program and, under the Principal, directs the policies to be followed.

Does our present system work? Time alone will tell. Perhaps some changes will have to be made. It is our ambition to save boys who can do the work but fail because of poor study habits, misunderstandings, or lack of motivation. We hope to arouse the better students to even greater performance so that all will be achieving up to capacity.

TESTING PROGRAM

Vocational Guidance might be defined as an educational process by which the adviser, guided by a boy's grades in school, his general reactions to the circumstances of life, his expressed desires and ambitions, leads him to evaluate his own qualifications and interests so that he will make the best possible life adjustment in an occupation or profession in which he has high hope and great confidence of success and contentment.

Testing was deliberately omitted from this definition; genuine vocational guidance can be done without it. Those who have done guidance work, however, realize the many limitations of the evidence available for the work; grades, for example, even from our own schools, may be high or low depending on the leniency of the teachers; grades from other schools may mean nothing as regards true values. Then, too, the variety of study habits leaves it uncertain whether the boy has high mental ability or only dogged determination. Often a boy's expressed desire or ambition may be based not on a knowledge of the requirements of a craft or profession but on his desire to imitate a friend who has done well in that line or his father who happens to be in that profession. It is

difficult to keep personal bias and subjective opinions out of the work of guidance.

Some objective help should be welcomed by those who assume the responsibility for assisting our students to decide on a vocational choice and to direct them in planning the educational program required for the accomplishment of that choice. Objective tests, designed for the purpose of measuring interests and abilities and used as a supplement to the other methods of analyzing human abilities and achievements, seem to fill the need.

There are tests of all kinds and descriptions purporting to measure personality quotients and intellectual quotients. Naturally, a proper selection must be made of tests which will give the information desired; tests that have been proven by experience. When well constructed and wisely used, they are objective and their curricular and vocational significance can be established with relative ease.

The one who has been appointed to the work of academic guidance and who is to use the objective testing method must have some training in the use of the tools of the trade. The administration of the tests offers little difficulty; the interpretation of the tests requires trained ability.

The administration and interpretation aptitude tests is another part of our guidance program here at the University of Detroit High School. Since over ninety percent of our graduates go on to college, the tests we give are chiefly interest tests and those that measure general college mental ability and the required aptitudes for the professions.

The Principals, speaking of vocational guidance, say:

Though discussion of vocational possibilities should not be denied to the student counsellor or the class advisers, there is clear need of specialist service in this area in our schools. It is therefore recommended that a competent priest be trained toward competence in the following areas of vocational guidance: a) Diagnosis of the student's qualifications, not only by means of interviews with the boy, his teachers, his parents, study of his grades and tests, but by use of various aptitude tests and inventories.²

After recommending that each school should have a number of faculty members who are quasi-specialists in different fields, the Principals add:

In order to provide for this serious need in our schools, it is recommended that opportunity be given for gradual professional

²Ibid. pp. 56-57.

training of men in summer courses and in special in-service programs; and that if necessary, teaching schedules be adjusted to enable them to devote sufficient time to work with individuals and groups, and to continue to improve themselves.³

Before our program was inaugurated, the Head of the Department of Education of the University of Detroit requested permission to administer a battery of tests to as many of the seniors as desired it. That year forty-three seniors were tested. About twelve hours were required for the administration of the tests on three successive Saturday mornings. Later on each one had a private interview when the results of the tests were interpreted. A written resume was furnished. The price for this service was fifteen dollars.

During his vistration the following year, Father Maline suggested that I take over this program. John Carroll University in Cleveland was the school selected for the study of the field. During the war a complete guidance had been set up at John Carroll with Father Lionel Carron, S.J. in charge. He and his assistants, men remarkably well versed in counseling and in the testing program, were extremely cooperative in helping me become acquainted with tests and their interpretation. That year during October I administered the tests to those seniors that requested them. Eighty-three seniors were tested. The selection of tests was almost the same as the battery used the year before. With this experience, it was possible to evaluate the set of tests given and investigate whether they best served our purpose. The next summer I spent more time at John Carroll and decided on several changes to be made the following year. The present senior class is the third group to be tested. This year one hundred and one asked for the service.

There are at least two methods of approach as to the number of tests to be administered to any one person or group. One method is called the "shot-gun" method which implies the administration of multiple tests covering the most important functions of learning and interest. Another method would be to give one or two tests and supplement the information gained from these with the knowledge already had about the boy. It has been our custom for the past few years to use the former of these methods. On two successive Saturdays for periods of about five hours each Saturday, a battery of tests is administered measuring interests, intellectual ability and some personality traits. The following tests are the ones we have used here.

Both Cleeton's *Vocational Interest Inventory* and Kuder's *Preference Record* are good. The latter is probably the more standardized and more

³Ibid. p. 56.

widely used. Scores are obtained in the nine general areas: 1) mechanical, 2) computational, 3) scientific, 4) persuasive, 5) artistic, 6) literary, 7) musical, 8) social service, and 9) clerical. Occupations falling under each of these headings are included on a job chart. The listings are suggestive only. This test measures interest only and not ability. It compares interests with the interests of those already successful in the field. Everything know about a person should be taken into consideration in narrowing down the list of occupations. The other tests in the battery help to do this. A person's score on the *Kuder Preference Record* may be the result of appreciation rather than participation. This point is particularly important in the field of art and music. If a person's interest is obviously in appreciation rather than participation, the field should be eliminated from further consideration. One's abilities and achievements must be considered and occupations which are clearly inappropriate to his abilities should be eliminated. Electricians, for example, and electrical engineers probably have similar preference profiles but each would be expected to differ materially in ability.

An excellent test of the appraisal of scholastic aptitude or general intelligence with special reference to the requirements of most college curricula is the *American Council on Education Psychological Examination*. The 1947 edition for high school seniors includes four tests in two general categories as follows: Quantitative Tests: (the Q-Score) Arithmetical Reasoning and Number Series; Linguistic Tests: (the L-Score) Same-Opposite and Completion. If this test were given toward the end of the senior year the Freshmen College Edition should be used.

Because certain professions and occupations require specified skills, subject area aptitudes are very revealing. The *Iowa Placement Examinations* measure the student's abilities in certain specific branches of knowledge, namely, chemistry, English, foreign language, mathematics, and physics, and predict his probable success in these subjects. The series is designed for those who have taken no formal work in the subjects. It so happens that our students have completed a formal course in all the subjects except physics at the time of the testing. The scores on the physics test are uniformly lower than the other scores. This should not cause alarm but should show that it is necessary to formulate your own norms in your school for comparison rather than depend on national norms.

So often poor reading habits are responsible for poor performance in all school subjects as well as in the taking of these aptitude tests. A good test for measuring reading ability and comprehension should be included in the battery of tests given. I hesitate to recommend the test we have been using thus far. A new one will be included in future programs. Some schools have remedial reading specialists. The results of

tests administered by them might be included in the interpretation of the aptitude tests.

More and more students are being attracted to the engineering profession, especially in Detroit. The mortality in the first year of preparation for this profession is also very great. For those who have registered interest in this line on another test, there should be a further check on their ability for the work of the profession. Drawing is one of the important courses for beginners in the school of engineering. The *Minnesota Paper Form Board Test* measures ability to visualize spatial patterns in two dimensions. It is often called a spatial relations, mechanical aptitude test. The evidence accumulated thus far indicates that high scores predict: a) ability to learn mechanical drawing and descriptive geometry; b) success in mechanical occupations, and c) success in engineering courses.

For one administering tests to students about whom he knows little, some type of personality test should be included. The *Minnesota T-S-E Inventory* is constructed to measure Thinking, Social, and Emotional introversion-extroversion. For those working with our own students this information can be derived much more easily and convincingly from observation and interview. We no longer use personality tests in our battery.

It would require about ten hours of testing to cover the tests outlined above. When the number of testees is large the scoring requires much time. Many of the tests can be machine-scored. We hand-score all our tests. The only skills required are to be able to count and concentrate. It is possible to find reliable help to do this part of the work.

After scoring is finished, the results are arranged on a summary sheet. Quite a bit of information is mimeographed and given to the boy along with the summary sheet as soon as it is available. Each one is asked to read this carefully and study the results before the interview. A duplicate of the summary sheet is kept for reference. The interviews are held during class time and average about thirty minutes each. When the academic counselor carries a teaching schedule, it is necessary to arrange the interviews according to his schedule. This is often difficult and is a good reason why the counselor should be relieved of some hours of teaching in order to carry on his guidance work.

Each year when the aptitude testing program is announced, a letter is sent to the parents of each senior. The program is explained and the advantages of the testing are pointed out. It is an optional service; there is a fee of ten dollars. Unless the school has some fund to finance this project a considerable expense is involved; the tests are expensive, some office space and equipment is necessary, assistants will be necessary

if a large group is to be tested. In succeeding years, once the overhead is taken care of, the fee can be reduced accordingly. Any money which might be termed as profit can be well spent for vocational literature of which there is an abundance on the market.

Careers published by the Institute for Research in Chicago, *Occupational Abstracts* by the Occupational Index, Inc. in New York, *Vocational Guidance Manuals* by the Vocational Guidance Manuals Inc. in New York, and *Occupational Monographs* by the Science Research Associates in Chicago, are very good. The Government Printing Office in Washington, D. C. has much material prepared especially for veterans but excellent for general use. Hundreds of dollars would be required to purchase the items I have mentioned.

The class adviser system and the aptitude testing program are two of the features of our guidance program. It is difficult to use a yardstick on the progress made in the few years it has been in practice. Time is essential. So far, the advising system has saved not a few who would otherwise have failed because of poor study habits, misunderstandings, and lack of motivation; the testing program has been an aid to the Principal who welcomes additional information about his seniors both for guidance purposes and for his questionnaires and transcripts; teachers have been able to get information about the aptitudes of some of their students in the branches taught by them and compare the results with the class achievement; parents have welcomed the program because it has helped them in the important work of assisting their sons choose a vocation; the boys themselves have hailed the work as an answer to their perplexing problems of choosing among the many vocations that present themselves or of confirming them in the choices they have already made.

Besides the class adviser system and the aptitude testing program we attempt to use all the other means available for good vocational guidance. We have found that Vocation Week is more effective in December, with the early application to college; pamphlets and literature on the crafts and professions as well as catalogues of the various schools in the country are made available for all. Some fairly good movies can be obtained to demonstrate the work of many careers and the educational preparation required for them.

Finally, the retreat is the climax of the seniors' thought and discussion about the future. Having made their decision on the basis of evidence and advice, they now ask God to give them the light to follow the right path and the grace to do well in the fields that they have chosen. After the semester examination grades have been tabulated they are ready to apply for college intelligently and confidently.

The First Freedom

JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.

The treatment of the subject of religious liberty in the United States is one that requires a wide range of knowledge—theological, philosophical, historical, legal, and practical. It is the great merit of this small volume that in clear and unemotional language Fr. Parsons has made a synthesis of all this knowledge.¹ His purpose is to examine what is the true meaning of the constitutional phrase “no law respecting the establishment of religion,” so that “some of the confusions and obscurities that have fogged discussion of separation of church and state will be cleared away.” With the historical and legal aspects of Fr. Parsons’ book, this review will concern itself.

It is not too often that the legislative history of the formulation of an early amendment is able to clarify the meaning and implications of its language. Because the Supreme Court in both the *Everson* and *McCullum* cases has based its legal conclusion on spurious constitutional history, it is gratifying to possess a book, easily read and easily understood, which shows why the Supreme Court’s history is spurious. Because the Court is transferring either words or concepts from the First Amendment, which binds the national government, to the Fourteenth, which binds the states, it is important that what is said to be transferred from the First Amendment to the Fourteenth is really there to be transferred. It is the cardinal point of Fr. Parsons’ case that something else was transferred.

Fr. Parsons is able to show that what the First Amendment bans is not any and all aid to religion but preferential aid. This he does by a study of the history of the formulation of the First Amendment and from the way in which Congress interpreted this Amendment in its subsequent legislative actions and discussions. It is extremely difficult in view of this historical exposition, which is easily checked from the material cited, to understand how the Supreme Court could originally adopt a different historical interpretation and later persist in this his-

1. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., *The First Freedom*. New York: Declan X. McMullen Co., 1948, XII + 178. \$2.25.

torical error when the pertinent historical data had been clearly called to its attention.

It will only be with the popularization of knowledge such as Fr. Parsons expounds and with its acceptance by some of our recognized constitutional experts that an authoritative change in constitutional doctrine can be brought about. For that reason, all those who have to deal with this constitutional problem are deeply indebted to Fr. Parsons.

On certain constitutional implications of this book, I would like to enter a caveat. I understand Fr. Parsons questions whether the "no-establishment clause" of the First Amendment is really transferrable, even in its proper and limited sense, to the Fourteenth Amendment. His reason, I take it, is based on the consideration that this particular limitation falls explicitly on the national government and, therefore, should not become any part of the content that may be transferred from the First Amendment to the general word "liberty" in the Fourteenth Amendment. I do not understand Fr. Parsons to question the authority of the Supreme Court to transfer the remaining content of the First Amendment to the general word "liberty" in the Fourteenth Amendment. But this remaining content [religious liberty, freedom of speech, press, petition, and assembly] is equally a direct limitation, not on the states but on the national government. If we admit, as Fr. Parsons presumably does, that religion, press, speech, petition, and assembly are transferrable to the general word "liberty" of the Fourteenth Amendment, then I find it difficult to understand why liberty from the preferential establishment of religion is not able also to be included under the word "liberty" in the Fourteenth Amendment. One is a liberty *from* laws establishing a preferential religion. The others are liberty *of* religion, and *of* expression.

It might, of course, be argued that the word "liberty" in the Fourteenth Amendment should be interpreted with a minimum meaning and that it should not include all that the Supreme Court had declared to be implied in ordered liberty. Since I do not understand Fr. Parsons to hold the view that "liberty" in the Fourteenth Amendment should not be able to include within its meaning the various liberties which today are judicially recognized as within its ambit, I shall not dwell on this point. I merely doubt that the transfer of the no-establishment clause, properly understood, is invalid for the reason given.

My second difficulty concerns the authority of the Supreme Court "to annul as unconstitutional an arrangement made by the local authorities and approved by the highest state judicial authority." (p. 161). This is the judicial authority which Fr. Parsons appears to deprecate. To me, this authority is precisely what the Fourteenth Amendment, as it has

been quite consistently interpreted since 1890, authorizes the Supreme Court to do in state matters concerning life, liberty, and property. It might be pointed out, too, that the Supreme Court, prior to the Fourteenth Amendment, was authorized to declare void a state arrangement which the Supreme Court determined to be a state impairment of the obligation of a local contract—as Marshall did in the Dartmouth College case. It is beside the point that the arrangement in question was passed by large majorities and approved by the state's highest court. It is sufficient for the Supreme Court to substantiate that a state did impair the obligation of a local contract.

While there may be a presumption that a financial arrangement made amicably in a state and approved in its highest court is not an impairment of an obligation of contract, still the Supreme Court is vested with authority to assert, if there is proof, that the arrangement is void. If the implications in *Fr. Parsons'* view were followed, judicial review both of state laws impairing the obligation of contract and of those running afoul of life, liberty, and property could only be exercised when there was a narrow majority for adopting the disputed arrangement or a division on the subject in the state's highest court. I do not believe that federal judicial review of such state legislation is so narrowly circumscribed or that it should be.

I shall not here cite the Oregon ban on parochial and private schools because in that instance judicial relief was sought directly in a federal court, not in a state court. The U. S. Supreme Court, therefore, merely overrode a local arrangement which at the time had no opportunity to be approved or disapproved by the Oregon Supreme Court. That a remedy, however, could be sought in a federal court was possible because the Fourteenth Amendment had placed limitations on states which neither the original Constitution nor the Bill of Rights had placed on them. This fact should not be overlooked, or questioned only when there is dissatisfaction arising on totally different grounds.

Nor should it be assumed that the Supreme Court is overprone to upset state arrangements where the case is not clear. Because the Supreme Court appreciates the delicacy of upsetting state arrangements, especially when they have the approbation of state court, it adopts the rule either of upsetting no such legislation unless it is clearly unconstitutional, or of insisting that what is done by state action is a clear and present danger against protected constitutional values. In cases involving the no-establishment clause, therefore, our objection to the Court should not be that a state arrangement locally approved has been upset, but that there has been a faulty judicial interpretation of the constitutional ban in question.

Fr. Parsons' case against the recent Supreme Court decisions, it should be made clear, does not rest on either of these controverted views. It rests on the grounds that the no-establishment clause bans merely the preferential treatment of religion. It would strengthen his exposition were these two constitutional implications to be removed or to be so fully explored that their cogency would be evident.

After this review was mailed, there appeared in the December issue of *Thought* an article by Prof. Edward S. Corwin, a recognized constitutional expert. He dealt with both of the constitutional issues which I raised. Corwin holds that the no-establishment ban is not transferrable to the Fourteenth Amendment *unless* some one's religious liberty is adversely affected by the no-establishment ban. I had attempted—with what success your readers may judge—to show how this transfer *could* be made to the term "liberty," i.e., liberty *from* the establishment of religion. Like Fr. Parsons and Prof. Corwin, I have doubts as to whether the court marshalled facts to substantiate this contention even in its interpretation of the no-establishment clause.

Corwin also questions the propriety of the Supreme Court's assuming jurisdiction over the arrangements of a local school board. On this point Corwin is much more in agreement with Fr. Parsons than with me. My grounds for continued doubt on this point lie in the belief that governmental arrangements, whether local or state, both are and should continue to be the object of Supreme Court scrutiny whenever a governmental deprivation of life, liberty, and property is alleged.

Status of Graduate Studies:

1948-1949

In his letter to the Fathers and Scholastics of the American Assistancy, published on the occasion of the revision of the *Instructio*, Very Reverend Father General stated:

The list of special students appearing during recent years in the annual catalogues of the Assistancy bears most gratifying testimony to the loyal determination of the Reverend Fathers Provincial to implement these provisions (for preparation of future teachers) of the *Instructio*. While we praise them very sincerely for this, we remind them that, as the work continues and increases and the demand grows for ever higher levels of instruction, these lists too must continue to grow.¹

The statistical study on the status of graduate students of the Assistancy for the year 1948-1949 will without doubt be a further source of satisfaction to Father General as it bears witness to the effectiveness of the prescriptions of the *Instructio*. This year's total of 243 full-time graduate students is the largest since we began to publish these studies in 1942. Comparing totals for the last five years only we find that 1948-1949 shows an increase of 150 students or 161%, over 1944-1945.

(Continued on page 214)

I. COMPARATIVE STATISTICS 1944-1949

	1944-45	1945-46	1946-47	1947-48	1948-49
Full-time graduate students.....	93	141	194	208	243
Priest graduate students.....	78	118	168	159	186
Scholastic graduate students....	15	23	26	49	57
Candidates for the Ph.D.....	63	93	123	127	153
Candidates for the M.A.....	14	18	23	40	43
Candidates for the M.S.....	7	13	18	16	21
Candidates for other degrees....	9	19	26	23	22
Special studies, but no degree....	2	3	4	2	4

¹"*Instructio Pro Assistentia Americae de Ordinandis Universitatibus, Collegiis, ac Scholas Altis et de Praeparandis Eorundem Magistris*," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XI, No. 2, (October 1948), p. 71. Letter of Very Rev. John B. Janssens, S.J., September 27, 1948.

III. SCHOOLS*

	California	Chicago	Maryland	Missouri	New England	New Orleans	New York	Oregon	Total
American Institute—Rome.	1	.	.	.	1
Biblical Institute	1	.	3	.	4
Boston College	2	.	.	.	2
Brown	1	.	.	.	1
California	3	.	.	1	.	1	1	.	6
Cambridge	1	1
Catholic University, The..	3	2	.	2	3	1	4	.	15
Chicago	.	.	.	1	1	.	1	1	4
Clark	1	.	.	.	1
Columbia	.	1	1	.	1	.	4	1	8
Cornell	.	.	.	1	1
Detroit	.	2	2
Fordham	3	2	5	3	10	1	13	2	39
Geneva	1	1
Georgetown	2	1	2	.	5	.	3	2	15
Gregorian	5	.	.	3	9	.	3	.	20
Harvard	3	2	2	1	4	.	6	2	20
Holy Cross, College of the.	2	.	.	.	2
Indiana	1	.	.	.	1
Iowa, University of	1	.	1
Johns Hopkins	.	1	.	.	2	.	.	.	3
London	.	.	1	1
Louvain	1	.	1
Loyola — Chicago	.	3	2	5
Marquette	1	1
Michigan	.	.	.	1	1
Minnesota	.	2	.	1	3
Montreal	2	.	2
New Mexico	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	1	2
New York University	.	.	1	.	1	.	.	.	2
North Carolina	.	1	.	.	.	1	1	.	3
Northwestern	.	1	1
Notre Dame	1	1
Oxford	.	1	.	.	5	.	2	.	8
Paris, University of	1	.	1
Pennsylvania, University of	1	.	.	.	1
Princeton	.	.	1	.	.	1	.	.	2
Private Study	1	.	1
St. Louis	3	8	1	15	2	1	3	2	35
St. Louis I.S.S.	2	.	2
Stanford	1	1	.	2
Toronto	2	3	.	2	7
U. C. L. A.	1	1
Vanderbilt	1	.	.	1
Washington, University of.	1	1	2
Yale	1	3	.	1	.	.	2	2	9
Total	30	33	14	33	53	7	55	18	243

*Accounting at St. Louis; *American History* at Columbia, Harvard, Stanford; *Arabic* at Harvard; *Ascetical Theology* at Gregorian (5); *Astronomy* at Georgetown; *Biology* at Catholic U., Columbia (2), Fordham, Loyola (Chicago), Princeton, Vanderbilt,

IV. DEGREE SOUGHT

	California	Chicago	Maryland	Missouri	New England	New Orleans	New York	Oregon	Total
Ph. D., new . . .	5	5	4	10	5	1	12	1	43
Ph. D., cont. . . .	16	21	7	9	17	3	24	13	110
M. A., new	3	2	1	7	9	3	8	1	34
M. A., cont.	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	2	9
M. S., new	2	2	2	4	5	0	2	1	18
M. S., cont.	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Others, new . . .	1 ⁸	1 ⁵	0	1 ⁸	5 ⁸	0	2 ⁸	0	10
Others, cont. . . .	2 ^{3,4}	1 ⁷	0	2 ^{2,4}	5 ^{5,6,8}	0	21 ⁴	0	12
No Degree	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	4
Total	30	33	14	33	53	7	55	18	243

¹B.L. S.

²D. S. Scr.

³Ed. D.

⁴J. C. D.

⁵L. L. B.

⁶L. S. S.

⁷M. S. in S. W.

⁸S. T. D.

Yale; *Canon Law* at Gregorian (3); *Chemistry* at Boston College, Clark, Detroit (2), Fordham (4), Holy Cross (2), Notre Dame, Princeton, St. Louis (2), Washington; *Classics* at American Academy (Rome), Fordham (6), Harvard (4), Oxford (5), Stanford, Toronto; *Cosmology* at Gregorian; *Dogma* at Gregorian (3); *Drama* at Yale; *Ecclesiastical History* at Gregorian (2); *Economics* at California (2), Columbia, Fordham, Georgetown (2), Harvard (2), St. Louis (7), St. Louis I.S.S. (2); *Education* at Catholic U. (4), Chicago, Fordham (3), Minnesota (2), New York U., U.C.L.A., U. of Washington, Yale (2); *Engineering* at California; *English* at Cambridge, Chicago, Columbia, Fordham (5), Harvard (2), Iowa, North Carolina (2), Oxford, St. Louis, California, Yale (2); *Experimental Psychology* at Yale; *French* at U. of Paris; *Geology* at Harvard; *Geophysics* at St. Louis; *Geopolitics* at London; *Government* at Geneva, St. Louis; *Guidance* at Catholic U.; *History* at California, Catholic U., Columbia (2), Harvard (3), Fordham (3), Georgetown (4), Loyola (Chicago) (2), St. Louis (6), Toronto; *Journalism* at Marquette; *Latin* at Catholic U., Fordham; *Latin American History* at California; *Law* at Georgetown (3), Yale; *Mathematics* at Cornell, Indiana, Michigan, St. Louis (3); *Library Science* at Chicago; *Library Service* at Columbia; *Moral Theology* at Gregorian, *Oriental Languages* at Johns Hopkins (2); *Patrology* at Gregorian; *Philology* at California; *Philosophy* at Fordham (4), Georgetown (3), Gregorian, Harvard (2), Louvain, Montreal (2), St. Louis (5), Toronto (5); *Physics* at Boston College, Brown, Catholic U. (4), Fordham (2), Minnesota, St. Louis (3); *Political Philosophy* at Fordham (4), Harvard; *Political Science* at Fordham, Georgetown, St. Louis, Yale; *Psychology* at Catholic U., Loyola (Chicago) (2); *Scripture* at Biblical Institute (4), Gregorian; *Seismology* at Georgetown; *Semitic Languages* at Johns Hopkins, Oxford; *Slavic Language* at U. of Pennsylvania; *Social Psychology* at Harvard; *Social Science* at New York U.; *Social Service* at Fordham; *Social Work* at Catholic U., Oxford; *Sociology* at Catholic U., Chicago, Fordham (2), Harvard (2), North Carolina, St. Louis (3); *Spanish* at New Mexico (2); *Speech* at Northwestern; *Steel Industry* private study; *Theology* at Gregorian (2).

(Continued from page 209)

Of our 243 special students, 105 started work this year for graduate degrees; 134 are continuing their studies from last year. They are studying at 43 different universities. Fourteen of these are Catholic and 30 are secular institutions. The subjects studied show a very wide variety as can be seen from table II.

The good effects to be gained from this program of special studies, and the reasons why it must continue to grow have been well summed up by Father General in the letter referred to above.

“With their staffs eventually strengthened by these specially trained scholars, your Colleges and Universities should take a more prominent place in that group of centers of learning and culture that by their erudite publications extend their influence far beyond their own walls. Thus you will advance the honor of the Church and the glory of the Creator and Lord of all.”²

²Loc. cit.

Survey of Jesuit High School Graduates and Administration 1948-1949

WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

Two previous studies and another appearing elsewhere in this issue add to the factual data that has recently been compiled on current Jesuit High Schools. The first was a general survey of significant items in the JEA High School Blanks for 1946-1947.¹ The other treated in greater detail two specific areas, the composition of the faculty and the number of students and the subjects taken by them.² This survey continues where the others ended, purporting to give a detailed break-down of the items dealing with graduates and administration.

Father Reed's article appearing elsewhere in this issue, parallels the present study of graduates. A comparison will prove useful in determining the consistency of the figures from one year to another.

As in the past, averages per school rather than totals will be the basis of comparison since in many cases the number of schools replying to various items is not the same. For the sake of comparison, a few general items are here included in the areas of Faculty, Students, Religious Activities, Non-Religious Activities and Library, though the major emphasis will be placed on Graduates Last Year and Administration. A careful inspection and comparison of Table 1 with the corresponding table in previous articles will give comparative data over a three year period.

TABLE 1. THE NUMBER OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES SUPPLYING USABLE DATA ON SELECTED ITEMS OF THE J.E.A. HIGH SCHOOL BLANKS, 1948-1949; TOTALS, AND THE AVERAGE PER SCHOOL.

NUMBER	ITEM	TOTAL	SCHOOLS	AVERAGE
16	FACULTY , Total: Full-Time T.Y. ³	1,301	38	34.236
18	Total: Part-Time T.Y.....	156	36	4.055
20	Total: New T.Y.....	328	38	8.631
70-71	STUDENTS , Total: Enrolled T.Y.....	23,059	38	606.815
72	Total Sections T.Y.....	707	38	18.605
73	Total, Latin T.Y.....	20,385	38	536.447
74	Total, Greek T.Y.....	3,185	38	83.815

¹Mehok, William J., S.J., "Survey of Jesuit High Schools 1946-1947," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. IX, No. 4., (March, 1947), pp. 216-220.

²Mehok, William J., S.J., "Survey of Jesuit High Schools: Faculty and Students, 1947-1948," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 4., (March, 1948), pp. 231-235.

³T.Y., This Year i.e., 1948-1949.

81	GRADUATES: February L.Y. ⁴	95	38	2.500
82	Graduates: June L.Y.....	4,909	38	129.184
83	Graduates: Total L.Y.....	5,004	38	131.684
84	Continuing Education T.Y.....	4,052	38	106.631
85	In Catholic Colleges.....	3,132	38	82.421
86	In Jesuit Novitates.....	142	38	3.736
87	In Other Novitates.....	37	38	.973
88	In Diocesan Seminaries.....	67	38	1.763
89	Total: In Catholic Institutions.....	3,378	38	88.894
90	Total: In Non-Catholic Institutions.....	674	38	17.736
91	Not Continuing, Employed.....	323	38	8.500
92	Not Continuing, Unemployed.....	5	38	.131
93	Status Unknown	545	38	14.342
94	Total: 91, 92, 93.....	873	38	22.973
95	Total: Armed Forces.....	79	33	2.393
100	ADMINISTRATION: Jesuit Faculty			
	Meetings	161	36	4.472
102	Jesuit and Lay Faculty Meetings.....	179	37	4.837
105	Supervision Principal, Min., Wk.....	8,725	36	242.361
107	Asst. Principal, Min., Wk.....	1,825	36	50.694
109	Delegated, Min., Wk.....	350	36	9.722
111	Total: Supervision, Min., Wk.....	10,900	36	302.777
115	Student Coun. Teach Ave. Hours.....	387.5	38	10.197
117a	Homogeneous Grouping	28 Yes, 10 No	38
120	Jesuit Class Teacher.....	385	38	10.131
121	Laymen Class Teacher.....	70	36	1.944
125-27	Activity Period	30 Yes, 2 No	32
150, 55	Freshmen, Dismissed, L.Y.....	741	37	20.027
151, 56	Sophomores, Dismissed, L.Y.....	480	37	12.972
152, 57	Juniors, Dismissed, L.Y.....	349	36	9.694
153, 58	Seniors, Dismissed, L.Y.....	63	37	1.702
160, 65	Freshmen, Fail Subject, L.Y.....	1,758	37	47.513
161, 66	Sophomores, Fail Subject, L.Y.....	1,362	37	36.810
162, 67	Juniors, Fail Subjects L.Y.....	1,128	37	30.486
163, 68	Seniors, Fail Subject, L.Y.....	418	37	11.297
170, 75	Freshmen, Conditioned, L.Y.....	1,582	35	45.200
171, 76	Sophomores, Conditioned, L.Y.....	1,695	35	48.428
172, 77	Juniors, Conditioned, L.Y.....	1,568	35	44.800
173, 78	Seniors, Conditioned, L.Y.....	1,133	36	31.472
180	Freshmen, Repeating, L.Y.....	110	35	3.142
181	Sophomores, Repeating, L.Y.....	43	35	1.228
182	Juniors, Repeating, L.Y.....	41	37	1.108
183	Seniors, Repeating, L.Y.....	4	35	.114
190	Association Reports.....	18 No 8 Yes	26
200	RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES: Mass Oblig.28 No 10 Y		38
210	Communions, Wkly. Average.....	11,640	33	352.727
220	Confessions, Monthly Average.....	40,954	34	1,204.529
261	Sub. <i>Queen's Work</i> , L.Y.....	3,068	31	98.967
273	Mission Collections, L.Y.....	\$44,937	32	\$1,404.281
420	LIBRARY: ⁵ Total Vols.....	285,682	35	8,162.342
421	Vols. Added, L.Y.....	20,584	35	588.114
422	Periodicals Total	1,541	36	42.805
423	Periodicals, Catholic	424	33	12.848
430	Circulation Total, Wkly.....	6,618	34	194.647
440	Library Open Hrs. Wkly.....	206.8	35	5.908
456	Expenditure Total, L.Y.....	\$91,134.04	32	\$2,847.938
466	Budget Total, T.Y.	\$90,115.70	29	\$3,107.437

⁴L.Y., Last Year i.e., 1947-1948.

⁵Items 420-466 exclude one school which shares its library with the College.

GRADUATES

Of a total number of 5004 graduates from Jesuit High Schools in 1948, 4,909 graduated in June and only 95 in February. Only three schools graduated students in February. Of the total number, 81% are continuing their formal education in all types of schools exclusive of the Armed Forces, 2% are in the Armed Service, and the remaining 17% are not continuing their formal education.

Of the number continuing their formal education, 77% (68% of the total graduating class) are in Catholic institutions and the remaining 23% (13% of the total) are in non-Catholic institutions. Of the group that is continuing its education in Catholic institutions, 93% are in Colleges and Universities for lay students, 4% are in Jesuit novitiates, 1% are in other novitiates and the remaining 2% are in diocesan seminaries, or a total of 7% going on for studies in the priesthood or religious life.

Of the 17% group not going on to college nor in the Services, 37% (6% of total) are employed, less than 1% are unemployed and the status of the remaining 62% (11% of total) is unknown. It should be noted that only those definitely so listed were classified as employed and unemployed and the rest were placed among those with unknown status.

Were we to follow up the 132 members of the typical Jesuit High School graduating class of 1947-1948, we would find that 107 were in school, 2 were in the Armed Services and the remaining 23 were otherwise accounted for. Eighty-two of the school group attended Catholic colleges and Universities, 4 entered Jesuit novitiates, 1 entered the novitiate of another order or congregation, and 2 began their studies for the priesthood in diocesan seminaries. In all 89 were in one or another Catholic institution and 18 were in non-Catholic institutions of learning.

By way of comparison with the two previous studies we find the graduating class growing steadily larger and the proportion continuing its education advance from 74% to 80% to 81%, the Armed Forces group drops from 10% to 2%. This accounts for the fluctuation, as the otherwise explained group remains constant, 16% and 17%. The proportion attending Catholic schools shows a slight increase from 58% to 66% to 68% and accordingly a drop in the proportion of those attending non-Catholic schools from 16% to 14% to 13%.

ADMINISTRATION

Under this heading are listed various items of information, the most complete being information on dismissal, failure and conditioning of students.

Information on number of faculty meetings shows that annually an

average of five faculty meetings were held for the Jesuit faculty alone and five for the combined Jesuit and lay faculty.

The total average amount of time spent in classroom supervision last year was about five hours per week. This time was distributed; 4 hours by the principal, 50 minutes by the assistant principal and 10 minutes by others delegated.

The average teaching load of the student counselor is 10 hours a week. Only 4 of the 37 schools providing data assign no teaching to the Student Counselor.

Twenty-eight schools use some form of homogeneous grouping while the other 10 do not.

Defining a class teacher as one who has a section for two periods daily, we find that about a third of the teachers qualify. The proportion of Jesuits to lay faculty members is 5 to 1.

Of 32 schools giving usable information, 30 have an activity period and 2 do not.

The sad story of dismissals, failures and conditions is told in Table 2. Dismissals range in evenly spaced steps from Freshman to Senior year

TABLE 2. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS⁶ DISMISSED OR WITHDRAWN BY REQUEST, FAILED IN ONE OR MORE SUBJECTS, CONDITIONED IN ONE OR MORE SUBJECTS LAST YEAR, AND REPEATING THIS YEAR

	Dismissed or Withdrawn by Request	Failed One or More Subject	Conditioned One or More Subject	Repeating This Year
Freshmen	11.1%	24.1%	25.0%	1.7%
Sophomore.	8.3%	23.7%	31.2%	.8%
Junior	6.7%	21.1%	31.0%	.8%
Senior	1.2%	8.3%	23.2%	.1%
Total	7.2%	19.8%	27.6%	.9%

with an average of 7.2% of the entire beginning Class of 1947 having been dismissed or withdrawn by request. Failures in one or more subjects is quite uniform in the first three years with a sharp drop in Senior year and an average of 19.8% for the entire school population. The pattern of conditions bulges in the center with Sophomores and Juniors having a higher percentage than Freshmen and Seniors; in all, an average of 27.6%. Having failed in this year, about one in every hundred students is repeating the year. These proportions are considerably higher than would normally be expected and point to the necessity of revising admissions practices or, having selected carefully, to the introduction of reme-

⁶1947-1948 figures based on *op. cit.*, Vol. X, No. 4, p. 232.

dial or other help to save students, before the easy way of dismissal or failure is employed.

MISCELLANEOUS

In addition to a detailed study of Graduates and Administration, a few general items present themselves for comparison.

The condition of the faculty this year is generally better than the two preceding years. The teacher-pupil ratio progresses favorably from 1 to 16.35 in 1946-1947, and 1 to 15.97 in 1947-1948 to 1 to 15.84 this year. Full-time faculty percentage mounts from 86% and 88% to 89%. The new faculty percentage shows a steady four point yearly decrease from 30% and 26% to 22%. An increase in the availability of teachers after the War and curtailment of enrollment are the greatest contributing factors to this happy condition.

Enrollments shows a slight downward trend of 1% over the two preceding years. The number of sections is slightly smaller and the students per section over a three year period is 33.02, 33.00, and 32.62.

Percentage of students taking Latin remains exactly the same at 88% for the last three years as does Greek at 14%.

Turning, now, to Religious Activities, we find that 28 schools do not have daily Mass of obligation against 10 which do. The average number of weekly Communions (exclusive of First Fridays) is 352.7 which is slightly higher than the 1946-1947 figure of 343.6. The two fewer schools in the current study may account for the difference. The number of Confessions per month also shows an increase of 9.8 but here again three fewer schools were listed in the study. There is a decided drop in number of subscriptions to the *Queen's Work* of 23 copies per school; and the amount contributed annually to the missions shows a downward trend of \$2.66, \$2.58 and \$2.31 per year per pupil.

Turning now to the figures on the library we find that the average library had grown in total number of volumes, exclusive of periodicals, by 1063 volumes since 1946-1947 with an average annual increase in number of 211.8 volumes since then. Total number of periodicals subscribed to is the same as last year, and Catholic periodicals have dropped 14.7, 13.1, and 12.8 in the last three years. Reading habits of students have remained about the same with the average weekly circulation at .48, .27, and .32 books per student. The library is open to students 5.39 hours a day in 1946-1947 and 5.90 hours this year. Expenditures on the library during the last two years have been the same at \$4.69 per student. The budget allowance, as well as can be estimated from limited data, is \$5.12 per student.

CONCLUSIONS

It need not be emphasized that a good school is determined more by its philosophy and the quality of its teachers than by the more measurable factors considered in this survey. Mark Hopkins' definition of a school as a log with a teacher at one end and a student at the other is still more valid than any that modern materialists have constructed. Still, presupposing a philosophy that has survived four centuries of attack and teachers prepared in the most thorough manner yet devised, a factual study is not without value. The Jesuit High School, like the Church it wishes to spread, has certain external notes; and, being external can be subjected to similar scrutiny and for the same reasons. It is committed to fallible men who come and go all too frequently. Now, they can learn by the success and failure of others, and ought to think twice before they deviate too far from accepted desirable practice. Our light can shine before men more effectively if we increase the intensity from that of a single school to that of all together. The public relations value of the true picture is more effective than volumes of misleading propaganda. It is hoped that as this picture unfolds, highlights will be embellished and smudges and errors erased.

Towards a Theology for the Layman

JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY, S.J.¹

Some maintain that a theology for the laity is simply the product of a process of abbreviating and simplifying the scientific course in the seminary, and then "writing it down" to the level of the layman, the college or university student. This provides only a rhetorical distinction between the courses given in seminaries and that given to laymen. I wish to suggest that the distinction must be much more profound and my central contention rests on two cardinal principles, scil.,

1. That theology is an essential ecclesiastical science; it is social in its origin, in the collective faith of the Church; and it is social in its function—it exists for the benefit of the life of the Church.

2. The service to be rendered to the Church by priest and layman is quite different. There is an essential difference between the two ranks, and each has its own proper duties and responsibilities, its own function in the Church, its own life.

Theology for the priest stands wholly in the service of the teaching Church—this is the cardinal principle. It aims, therefore, at meeting the specific needs of the teaching Church. In a brief formula, the specific finality of the clerical course may be thus summed up: "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."

It is not easy to describe the precise function of the layman in the Church. The doctrine of the active function of the laity in the Church has undergone an immense development in our own times. The present developed concept of the role of the laity in the Church has its origins in the great "social transformations" which have affected what we ordinarily call the secularization of modern life, the gradual development of a complete separation, and, in fact, an active opposition between the spir-

¹Condensed from two articles: John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Towards a Theology for the Layman; The Problem of Its Finality," *Theological Studies*, Vol. V, No. 1 (1944), Pages 43-75; and John Courtney Murray, S.J., "Towards a Theology for the Layman; The Pedagogical Problem," *Theological Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (1944), Pages 340-376.

itual and the temporal, between the Church and human society. On the one hand, the expulsion of the Church from secular affairs has, indeed, favored an immense growth and a new vitality in her inner life. But, on the other hand, it has tragically resulted in the progressive destruction of that temporal milieu favorable to Christian faith and virtue which centuries of labor had patiently created. Those who have been most helplessly exposed, the masses, have been slowly dechristianized and demoralized.

The solution in this situation is an immense penetration of the life of the Church *ad extra* with the purpose of transforming the total milieu of modern life. The initial principle commanding such a program is the fact that the Church cannot refuse her divine mission in the temporal order, nor consent to her own exclusion from secular affairs. The Church's task of furthering the common good of mankind remains a necessary, if secondary, part of her saving mission. And the problem was to devise a new formula whereby she might prosecute this mission. The answer was an appeal and a command to the laity. The penetration, shaping, and control of the temporal order would be an essentially religious and spiritual action, whose carriers would be the Christian laity, and whose effects, therefore, would be felt throughout the whole range of the social life of humanity in which the life of the laity is enmeshed. By this tactic, Church and State, remaining perfectly distinct as societies, would become one in the same spirit, the Christian spirit, communicated to secular society by the Christian laity, organized to receive Christ from the hands of the priest to communicate Him to the modern world.

The success of this formula depends on two things. The first is the intensification of the inner life of the Church, the lifting of the level of sanctity among both clergy and laity. The second is the communication to the laity, the Church's single preoccupation—that Christ may reign, not only over men as individuals, but over human society in all its groupings, domestic, national and international, through the reconstruction of a social order whose institutions will be conformed to the laws of God and so animated by a Christian dynamism that they will serve at once the eternal salvation of the human person and the stable prosperity of the State.

The function of theology for the layman must be to serve the needs of the Church towards the realization of these two conditions of success. A lay course that does not consciously and explicitly pursue this end would be open to the charge of diletantism.

An effectual reconstruction and control of the temporal by the spiritual would seem to imply contacts between them that would violate their mutual distinction and their respective sovereignties. The problem

would be insoluble were it not possible to find a mediator who is sufficiently of the Church and sufficiently of the temporal order to assure by his mediation their necessary union, and who, at the same time, is sufficiently distinct from the Church, as such, and from the profane, as such, to assure in the course of his mediation the indispensable freedom of each. It is through the layman that there must flow into the world those supernatural energies which, as faith teaches, are necessary in order that man may achieve even his proper humanity—his personal freedom, his social unity.

Finally, one special characteristic of lay action in modern times—it must be social. It is social in its principal and term, for it is the apostolate of the whole Church upon the whole State, by the intermediary of the lay zone, the frontier between the temporal and spiritual, with a view to gaining not this soul or that but the whole profane milieu, civil society.

The mission of the laity as such has for its domain not the life that is properly divine, but human life in its relations to the divine life, to which it must be adapted. The ministerial priesthood is to mediate the Holy spirit to the soul of man; the lay priesthood is to mediate the Christian spirit to the institutions of civil society, a mediation exercised in that borderland of the spiritual and temporal, wherein the life of the Church makes vital contact with the terrestrial life of man, to effect its humanization. The lay priesthood is of quite different order than the ministerial priesthood, and has the perfection proper to its own order.

Hence, what the layman need is not a sort of diminished theology, only quantitatively or rhetorically different from that taught in the seminaries, but a theology that keeps to an order of its own and has all the perfection proper to that order. Over against the formula previously fashioned for the clerical course, we may now set another, conceived in the light of our description of the special function of the layman in the Church, which will express the specific finality of the lay course: "That intelligence of faith, especially in its relations 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 Holy See has vehemently insisted that the success of lay action depends entirely upon the interior formation of the laity, and their consequent high level of Christian sanctity. It is the need of this religious and moral foundation which creates our pedagogical problem, the essence of which lies in the fact that the theological instruction of the layman has also to be made the instrument of a religious formation at

once rounded and specialized, which will issue in a complete Christian layman.

The professor of dogmatic and Scholastic theology is normally concerned with only one pedagogic norm, clarity and orderliness in exposition. His teaching methods are not conditioned by the need of making his theological instruction the vehicle of a full religious formation. The seminarian is simultaneously receiving from other sources his complementary religious formation.

However, if theology is taught to laymen, this ideal situation does not obtain. Consequently, the professor must undertake and emphasize the task of imparting a full religious formation. His course must have a characteristic and conscious orientation toward the development in the student of a completely Christian personality, imbued with the total ideal of a Christian lay life, and dedicated to the full vocation of the contemporary Christian man. The ultimate religious finality of the course lies more in the realm of charity than of intelligence; its aim is to convey an intelligence of the Christian life, as a power for personal and social regeneration, especially in its relation to the contemporary culture of human society. Emphatically, the course must remain academic and, *suo modo*, scientific. Obviously, an academic course, methodically taught, can communicate ideas and form an intelligence. But can it communicate charity and form an apostle who is a man not only of ideas but of dynamic love? There is the problem,—in a sense insoluble,—how to make an academic course the instrument of a religious formation. Of themselves, courses in theology will not make dynamic laymen any more than they make saintly priests. But there are two principles of at least partial solution.

The first principle is the primacy of the teacher over the sheer course as such; for in the matter of religious formation personal influence is decisive. The teacher's problem is so to present the word of God that it will be seen not only as true but as demanding an answer in terms of life. He must have pedagogical gifts of a high order—psychological insight, imagination, rhetorical power, a warmth of personality—joined to an interior spirit that is discreetly and unconsciously radiant. Also required is a wide knowledge of the contemporary situation of the Church and of the world she is to save, a sympathy with the mood of present thought and sentiment, a sense of the aspirations that men have today, a profound grasp of the problems in the field of religion and culture that are vexing them.

But most particularly there is required theological scholarship of a higher order than is normally achieved in an undergraduate seminary course. This is not necessarily a criticism of the seminary course, which

does what it is designed to do but is not an adequate preparation for teaching theology to laymen. This is a specialized task and requires a specialized training.

This training should start with intensive research in the papal theory of Catholic Action, against its proper background, the cultural history of our times. Then, from the standpoints thus acquired, (which are not those of Scholasticism), there should be a review of, and specialized work in, the fields of dogma, scripture, history, liturgy, and ascetical and moral theology, conducted along lines other than those of the ordinary classroom manuals, and with consistently synthetic preoccupations. Finally there should be an extensive study of the whole social doctrine and program of the Church.

The second principle of solution of our pedagogical problem concerns the structure and framework of the course itself. Here two principles may be laid down. The first is that doctrinal instruction will be religiously formative only if the manner of its organization and exposition is adapted to the psychology of the student and to his existent state of mental and spiritual development. Generally speaking the study of scientific apologetics, which is of inestimable value for a man of developed philosophical intelligence, is of small religious value, and may do positive harm in the direction of rationalism and scepticism, to the mentally and religiously amorphous college freshman. In designing a course for laymen it is important carefully to observe the law of psychological effectiveness, rather than the law of abstract logic. The two laws may, but do not necessarily, coincide.

Secondly, doctrinal instruction will be religiously formative in proportion as it puts the student in the way of gaining an insight into Christian truth as a harmonious, ordered, organic whole, whose parts are all illuminated by reference to a single interior principle of intelligibility, and all vitalized by reference to a common focus—the sanctification of the total life of man.

Today, unlike the Middle Ages, the world is alienated from the Church, and the faith of the ordinary Christian gets hardly any support from his environment. Almost unconsciously he can come to regard the Church respectfully, indeed, but in a certain spirit of indifference or even challenge; to feel his membership in her as a burden, not a joy; to feel his faith as a constraint and a disadvantage, not an enrichment and a liberation; to value it as at best a form of defense against some of the uglier aspects of the world, not as "the victory which overcometh the world." Our problem is to form Christian men strong enough to be plunged into the modern secularized milieu and confidently left to the inner resources of a mature faith that is able to stand by itself, supported

by the strength of its own deeply experienced reality. More than that, our problem is to develop Christian men who will be intelligent and strong enough to reform the milieu itself.

The consequent problem is, how may this type of spirituality be created, at least in so far as doctrinal instruction can create it. I do not think it will be created by an emphasis on apologetics and apologetic argument. We have a more fundamental problem than that of fortifying the student against particular difficulties. It is to prepare students to issue, singly and in solidarity with one another, a victorious counter-challenge to the basic challenge of the day, which is not Protestantism, but secularism and religious indifferentism, diseases, which have to be healed at a level in the soul deeper than that of reason. Their appeal is that of a spirit, a total and generalized way of life, an all-pervasive mode of thought, affection, sentiment, action. And this appeal can only be met successfully by the creation of a counter-spirit, generated by a vision of the whole Christian truth about God, man and the world, which in turn generates a victorious sense of the uniquely salvific value of faith. Only this vision and this inner experience can fortify the spirit against infection from our secularist environment. What it needs is solid nourishment, and exercise in the full orb of Christ, the Light of the World; medicine, minor surgery, isolation, and the careful application of little apologetic "band aids" here and there will not suffice. To a radical and total challenge, one must fling a radical and total answer. That answer must be the total apposition of divine truth which will reveal Christian faith to be no mere set of propositions satisfactorily proved, but a splendid organic "good news" which in its wholeness is "the power of God unto salvation," personal and social, temporal and eternal.

Obviously other factors, beyond the intelligence of faith, must enter into the formation of the genuine and finished Christian man,—the molding influence of personal prayer, sacrificial charity, works of zeal, the experience of social worship and the corporate fellowship of the Church, sustained obedience to the moral law.

The solution for the lay course in theology is to establish a course that will be a living, organic whole, and through a mood of teaching that will be pacific and positive. The approach to each truth must be from the standpoint of its inner idea as a vital member of the Christian *corpus doctrinae*, not from the standpoint of the attacks made upon it. Faith must be presented as more than an *assensus in verum*, but as more fundamentally a *consensus in vitam*. For faith itself is not a carefully calculated admission of a set of propositions that cannot reasonably be denied by some disembodied critical intelligence; it is a joyfully obedient acceptance, by mind and will, of a Father's promise, made to His un-

comprehending Child, of a deliverance, a dignity, and a destiny. All theology, especially a theology for laymen, must not only notify men of the truth, but move them towards the salvation which is in the truth; it must set them on the way to life in God.

The layman's theology should be modeled on the Scriptures rather than Scholasticism. Its perspectives and movement should be manwards, towards an intelligence of the "economy" rather than the mysteries of God Himself. We see this adjustment of emphasis in the Apostles Creed itself, whose framework is indeed trinitarian, but whose focus is on man, loved by the Father, redeemed by Christ, sanctified by the Spirit in the Church. Whereas Scholasticism studies the world in God, a lay theology will study God in the world. Moreover, the layman's theology, by reason of his specific function in the Church, must illuminate for him the relations between divine truth and a special aspect of the life of man—his temporal and social life. It must be a theology of the *incobatio vitae aeternae* in this life, the rescue of man from temporal damnation, the perfecting of humanity as humanity by the power of the grace of Christ. It must be soberly but strongly supernatural humanism.

The course is indeed scientific but in that broader sense that simply implies these four elements:

- 1) A unity of theme or subject matter (material object)
- 2) A singleness of interest and viewpoint (formal object *quod*)
- 3) A methodical procedure in development
- 4) An organizing activity directed towards the constitution of a true body of knowledge.

Again, since we wish to construct a science that will be religiously formative of the intelligent and dynamic layman, attention must be directed primarily to the aspect of things *quoad nos*, rather than *quoad se*; to psychological effectiveness of presentation rather than to abstract logic; to the whole truth in its relation to personal and social life rather than to single truths in relation to rational philosophy. Such a concept will in no sense contradict the classic theory. It will be simply another concept, not an opposed concept.

The general quality of thought will be biblical rather than Scholastic. Its subject, its central theme or master idea will be the *Christus totus*, Christ, head and members. This truth assures the course both of its academic unity and of its religious power.

In its historical and progressive character, and in its marvelous adaptation to fundamental human psychology, the method of revelation itself is a divine masterpiece of pedagogical art. It will furnish us, therefore, with the main lines of our method of teaching theology to the layman.

It is more particularly desirable—and this should be an outstanding

feature of a lay theology's method of handling Scripture—that the books of Scripture especially the New Testament, should be known in their entire argument, in the full sweep of their story, in the full illumination that each throws upon the mystery of the whole Christ. It is not a question of exhaustive exegesis of a few texts, classic for their “probative” value. The ideal is rather more synthetic presentation, from a theological point of view, of scriptural doctrine, either the complete content of a particular book, or the complete data on a particular topic.

A layman's theology will also rely heavily on the use of the liturgy as an approach to dogmatic truth. *Quoad se* liturgy has its genesis in dogma. But, understanding liturgy for the moment in the narrower sense of rites and ceremonies, *quoad nos* the process is usefully inverted, as a point of pedagogic method. It is increasingly realized today that the liturgy is a particularly effective means of doctrinal instruction; for in the order of discovery it has a certain primacy over dogma, at least in the sense that our knowledge of the Church's doctrine and of the mysterious grace that dwells in her has a uniquely dynamic quality when grasped through a study of the visible signs in which her beliefs and sanctifying action are, as it were, dramatized. The *sensus Christi* cannot be brought to real experiential keenness save through active participation in the liturgy of the Church, especially in the Mass—which is the whole Christ, Head and members, united in the central Christian act of worship and sacrifice—and in the Eucharist, which is the *sacramentum ecclesiasticae unitatis*, the cause and sign of Christian solidarity. The liturgy furnishes an important way to an intelligence of the *totus Christus*; and then this theology is reconverted, as it were, to produce a more profound intelligence of the liturgy. And both together, the intelligence of the doctrine and the experience of its reality in social worship, combine to strengthen that sense of the unity of all men in Christ which is the inspiration of all Christian social action. Today we see in the life of the Church thru “movements” intimately interwoven, the theological movement towards a wider intelligence of the doctrines of the Mystical Body of Christ, the liturgical movement towards a more active participation in the liturgy of the Mystical Body of Christ and the social movement towards a more universal participation in the hierarchical apostolate of the Mystical Body of Christ. It is abundantly clear that the Church wishes every layman, and especially an elite, to be responsibly engaged in all three. It is precisely the function of a lay theology to enlighten the layman as to his responsibility, and in its own way to engage him in these three movements. Genetically, the ideal process is: *scientia fidei—actio sacra—sensus Christ—actio Catholica*.

Objectives of a Jesuit College

MATTHEW J. FITZSIMONS, S. J.¹

There is no satisfying and generally-accepted description of the objectives of an American Jesuit college. But this should not deter us. In this discussion of objectives we readily accept all the glowing descriptions in catalogs of Jesuit colleges; that we aim at the harmonious development of all the powers of man, that our method is that of the *Ratio Studiorum* which has the experience of Four Hundred Years of education behind it. We likewise can accept many of the recent descriptions of liberal and general education that have poured from the press in recent years, a happy orientation in the college sphere.

The first check to our placidity may come from the criticism that all such descriptions treat of aims, commonly so broad and general that anyone can subscribe to them, not merely too broad but too remote. The only way we can tell whether the aims are getting results is to measure or observe what students do as a result of them. The general results, we admit, may be intangible—as character and culture—but in academic practice we can accept only as an aim of a course what can be tested at the end of the year to judge the achievement of the aim.

Moreover, educational associations when engaged in the evaluation of an institution may legitimately ask questions that may be summarized as: "What are your aims? Show us your means. Show us your product." We can approve of those criteria in the educational field. Furthermore, the importance of objectives is described by Zook and Haggerty in *The Evaluation of Higher Institutions*:

This declared policy of Objectives . . . is not a separate and discrete factor. It threads across the entire map (of evaluation) determining the values given to all the items there listed. The

¹ This paper was first circulated in *Jesuit Educational Association Proceedings of the Institute for Jesuit Deans*, by Wilfred M. Mallon, S.J. (Editor), Denver: Regis College, August 3-13, 1948, pp. 4-14. In using it, the following caution inserted on page 3 of the Foreword is to be observed: "With the approval of the Board of Governors, these *Proceedings* are published and circulated without specific approval of the content in advance by the Fathers Provincial. They represent merely the editorial effort of the Editor, although they have been read and approved of prior to publication by two other members of the Executive Committee of the Association. The *Proceedings* carry no authorization or approval to adopt recommendations."

qualifications of a faculty, the curriculum, the library, the administration, or the character of the student body, may be excellent or inadequate in terms of the institutional objectives sought.

Responsibility for declaring its purposes rests upon an institution. It is assumed that the declared objectives will fall within the accepted patterns of higher education, that they will be stated comprehensively and unequivocally, and that the institution provides the facilities necessary for their realization.

In the present state of vagueness and confusion about the aims of higher education it will be a wholesome activity for institutions to seek improvement through more careful definition of their objectives.²

We need not be discouraged or alarmed at this insistence on the importance of objectives, if we consider the difficulty met in this matter of adequate formulation. For the past ten years, several efforts of considerable moment have been made to describe college education from the American, or secular, from the Catholic, and from the Jesuit viewpoint. I shall mention them briefly.

SUMMARY OF EFFORTS

1. *In the Secular field:* In 1943 the Association of American Colleges published the Report of its Commission on Liberal Education. The members of the Commission included prominent and serious educators, and Father Allan P. Farrell, S.J., was a member of the Commission and one of the committee of six who drew up the final statement. The report describes *The Nature and Purpose of Liberal Education*. A liberally-educated person was described in terms of specific skills and abilities, areas of knowledge, and types of integration. The report also makes a reverent and sincere bow to spiritual values and moral character. The report is satisfactory and helpful in many respects for Catholic education.

The Report of the Harvard Committee, *General Education in a Free Society*, published in 1945, contains many good things, as you recall. Description of traits of mind; to think, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgments, to discriminate among values, was a notable concession to mental training. Likewise, its statement that college education cannot be discussed without consideration of the type of education

²George F. Zook and M. E. Haggerty, *The Evaluation of Higher Institutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936, Vol. I, pp. 106-107.

in the high school, is worth the attention of all college administrators. The report shied away from any commitment on norms of truth, secular or religious, and this betrays its lack of fundamental values.

In the early 40's, many college programs were published by individual colleges. The common feature is the program for the first two years, or Lower College, consisting of prescribed general courses in the humanities, sciences, social studies, as a "broad foundation in the chief fields of knowledge." The upper two years have no adequate program except the customary *concentration* in a single field or combination of several fields. (Prophecy is a dangerous relaxation, but on basis of past experience I am willing to wager that in five or ten years all American colleges, including the Jesuit, will have adopted this three-fold survey of the fields of knowledge in its first two years of the curriculum.)

The six volumes of the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, of this year, is a significant document. Although its recommendations are considered fantastic by its critics, it cannot be dismissed too lightly. One critic has said that its sub-title should be: "A Fifty-Year Program." Each Catholic college received a review of the report by a special committee of the N.C.E.A. (February 1948). This review was later reproduced (with some omissions) in a pamphlet, "Whither American Education?" (America Press), edited by Reverend Allan P. Farrell, S.J. The first volume of the commission's report, *Establishing the Goals of Higher Education*, selects as the principal goals:

Education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living.
Education directly and explicitly for international understanding and cooperation.

Education for the application of creative imagination and trained intelligence to the solution of social problems and to the administration of public affairs.

If we make a distinction in the meaning of democracy, we can accept these general goals. We know there is a danger of a "pantheistic worship of society" in the modern emphasis on democracy. Naturally, the 102 pages of the volume contain many pertinent ideas and criticism of current practice. On page 70 there is a criticism of the Senior (upper division) Liberal Arts College. "We cannot terminate liberal education at the end of the conventional sophomore year and turn the colleges and universities over thereafter to academic specialization and professional education." And the following statement on the influence of graduate schools on the college may be either a clarion challenge or, at least, straws in the wind, for the future: "The imposition of the narrow specializa-

tion of the graduate school on undergraduate education is unfortunate because the purpose of the senior college is basically different. Specialization at the graduate level is organized to train a few highly selected persons for careers in research and scholarship. Programs of concentration in the senior college, however, need to be built around a much wider range of intellectual and occupational objectives to serve a much larger and less selected body of students." (I select that quotation for two reasons: (1) The demands of the graduate schools have interfered with our concentration in philosophy; and (2) Earl J. McGrath, who will speak here on General Education, was prominent in the formation of the report. Does the statement I quoted mean a break on the part of the colleges from the demands of the graduate schools?) But for the rest of the first volume, if you wish a description of purely secular education you will find it in this report; education on a vague, humanitarian basis, no norm of truth, no criterion of action, of right or wrong, and on this basis it would build democracy. I have mentioned three outstanding reports on the nature and purposes of college education from *the secular viewpoint*.

2. *In the Catholic Field*: In 1943 the Executive Committee of the College and University Department of the N.C.E.A. appointed a committee to report on Liberal Education in the Catholic College. After three years' work, the report (98 pages) was circulated to member colleges in mimeographed form and entitled: "The Liberal College in a Democracy." At the N.C.E.A. meeting in Saint Louis, April 1946, a panel discussion of the report was offered and later was printed in the *Proceedings*. The first critic concluded: "I must repudiate the report . . . for the good of the Catholic college and its fair repute. . . . I should wish the report to be suppressed."³ The second critic expected that the report would "give us something that is distinctively our own, a new philosophy of college education that is at once brilliantly Catholic and fiercely American," and "Let us leave off this playing with impossible objectives . . . and meet the present and future needs of the greatest number of students."⁴ Distinctions were made by the third critic who felt that the editors of the report, among other details, did not understand the meaning of "concentration" in the liberal college curriculum, i.e., studying deeply in one special field. The report attempts to describe the curriculum of the liberal arts college by using "the analogy of an apple," and describing the studies "first of the core, secondly of the sphere, and lastly of the periphery as applied in the curriculum."

The core of the curriculum is philosophy, theology, language. The spherical curriculum is six subjects for breadth, history, mathematics,

³N.C.E.A. *Proceedings*, April, 1946, p. 182.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 187.

natural and social sciences, literature, fine arts. The peripheral curriculum is field of concentration *or* a professional curriculum. The report contains much good material. Chapter IV on the Student, and Chapter V on Administration, make many brave statements and should not be missed. In the panel discussion, one of the critics thought that the chapter on the Student and Student Responsibility was worth the whole effort of the undertaking.

An appendix of eighteen pages offers a "Curriculum for a Catholic Liberal College." This is well done from the viewpoint of describing the disciplinary effects of each subject, viz., "the essential modes of thought in a field of study as outcome of the discipline." For example, the study of language develops expression, history develops perspective, mathematics develops precision, and so on. But, as we shall note later, precision and perspective and objectivity as listed are not *intellectual habits*. The intellectual habits or virtues are art, prudence, understanding, science, wisdom, and if we do not return to that basis, we shall be lost in educational jargon.

3. *In the Jesuit Field*: In 1940 a sub-committee was appointed by the Executive Committee of the Jesuit Educational Association to formulate the *essentials of the Ratio* for application to Jesuit education in the United States. A year later, a preliminary draft of the report (27 pages) was sent to Jesuit educators for criticism. The report was entitled "Objectives and Procedures of Jesuit Education," and thereafter known as the OP report. The comments ran the gamut of criticism; from praise, "this is what we have been waiting for; send me a dozen copies" to several pages of searing analysis with the conclusion: "I cannot accept the unsupported opinions of the authors." Nevertheless, judging from the demand, this document seems to have fulfilled a need. Three mimeographed printings have been exhausted. Copies of the last issue were requested by Jesuits in South America, Ireland, Australia, Canada, and the Philippines. In a recent meeting of Jesuit high school delegates, after the report was quoted, the questions were asked: "Where can we get a copy?" "Why has this been kept from us?" Apart from whatever value the report may have, it attempted to cover too much; to describe Jesuit education from the secondary to the graduate and professional level. *Nimis probavit*.

During the war, in 1943, sharing the common concern of educators from the post-war world, the Executive Committee of the Jesuit Educational Association appointed a Committee on Post-War Jesuit Education. Again, a preliminary report was completed in outline, treating of our education under four headings: I. Metaphysical Basis of Catholic Education, II. Distinctive Jesuit Educational Directives, III. Educational Areas Needing Study and Improvement, IV. Specific Application of

Preceding to our Jesuit Schools. The second topic was well treated and contained definitely valuable views on "distinctive Jesuit educational directives derived from the spiritual exercises, the *spirit* of the Constitutions, and the *Ratio Studiorum*, for employing means to fulfil the common aims of Catholic education." The report was not completed when the war ended and the committee was dismissed.

The latest effort to describe modern Jesuit education was made in 1945. It was called the Map of American Jesuit Education, map in the sense of a credo or manifesto. It covered the same field as previous reports and added ten hallmarks of Jesuit education, e.g., "Continuity with the Past," "Adaptability to Needs of the Times," "Christian Humanism," and so on. Again, the critics were vocal. On one side, "this is brief, adequate, Jesuit." On the other hand, the explosion of a Jesuit educator, "Mere verbiage."

From the experience of these three efforts, the procedure or recipe seems to be as follows: draw up a description of Jesuit education and ask Jesuit educators for their opinion of it. You may be sure that, in reply, the *eloquentia* of our training will blossom as the desert rose, embowered in thorns. Nevertheless, I believe that if these three reports and the lengthy and detailed comments on them were published, you would have an excellent summary of current Jesuit thought on education. Many, many hours of discussion and compilation were involved in their composition. They are now mouldering or smouldering in the files of the Jesuit Educational Association.

It is evident, then, that a satisfactory description of Jesuit education in the United States is yet to be written. It might resemble in scope and extent some of the better published studies, e.g., the Harvard Report. We have tended, by some occupational disease, to write outlines, viz., 1, 2, 3, a, b, c, etc. And an outline, without amplification and confirmation, is always unsatisfactory and often violently rejected. If any of you have this book in mind, the line forms on the right.

DIFFICULTIES

I have given a brief, or rather rough, account of the efforts of the past ten years in the secular, Catholic, and Jesuit fields to describe education at the college level. *Why* have these attempts met with only partial approval and with so much dissatisfaction and criticism. One reason may be that they are, as mentioned previously, so broad and general that anyone can subscribe to them and too remote from actual conditions and realities. They cannot be tested for validity. A second reason many derive from the changing or evolving nature of the college. The

American college has been for some years the object of defense and the target of criticism. Perhaps a good description of the present status of the American college is offered by a critic of the Report of the President's Commission.

In the section of the Report dealing with colleges of arts and sciences, the Commission's statement gives clear evidence of need for further definition and analysis of purpose and function. It reflects the current widespread confusion arising out of the facts that these colleges symbolize the sentimental tradition of round-the-clock joys of college life on a beautiful campus for four years; stand for the broadening and deepening of individual and group academic culture; act as vocational-training institutions for teaching, journalism, business, and so on; serve as preparatory training for medicine, law, university teaching, and some other professions; *and lose* about half of their students before the beginning of the junior year. . . .⁵

Another view would have it that the college is a period of education jammed between the expanding secondary schools and the demanding graduate and professional schools. According to the late C. H. Judd, many high schools have laboratories, shops, libraries, and staffs, that are better than those of neighboring colleges and many colleges do little more than duplicate courses now given in secondary schools. Colleges have been forced to provide for junior and senior students a miscellaneous series of special courses which can in no sense of the word be classed as traditional liberal arts courses. Judd's solution is that of President Hutchins; give a baccalaureate degree at the end of sophomore year and organize upper levels of the work into a three-year unit leading to the Master's degree. Hutchins has claimed that the American college has no defense of its four-year unit. And a defense of the present practice would be difficult to find. College curriculum-makers do not know what to do with the upper two years. I would like to recall here that the traditional A.B. curriculum of the Jesuit college was the only defensible four-year college. The first two years of humanistic disciplines prepared the student for the abstract thinking of philosophy, but that type of A.B. curriculum has mostly gone with the wind, and we must develop a *rationale* of the four-year curriculum. In stressing the four-year A.B.

⁵C. A. Dykstra, "Organizing Higher Education," *Journal of Higher Education*, April, 1948, p. 185.

curriculum, there is no intention of minimizing science and the B.S. curriculum. As Father A. H. Poetker, S.J., has well written:

The sciences themselves have a very definite cultural value and provide an area of knowledge, without competence in which there can be no liberal education. The principles of sciences are the principles of truth, whose study is ennobling because it attempts to solve the mystery of the universe. There can be no doubt that the natural sciences afford material which is as suitable as languages or the social sciences for the development of those capacities of human personality that are the formal object of our education—logical reasoning, discrimination, philosophical generalization, rigorous mental discipline, accuracy, intellectual honesty, even imagination and the esthetic sense.

In the matter of the college, then, what is needed is not complaints on what it is but an analysis of what it should be. At present it is attempting too much and too little!

When Catholic colleges describe their aims, they generally cull magnificent quotations from the Encyclical on Education. All the ultimate aims of education are listed, and are accepted with wholehearted approval. But these objectives pertain equally to elementary, secondary, and higher education. Admitting all the ultimate aims, we need to emphasize the proximate aim of the college, described as "intellectual education—its own essential function." That which makes a man man, is mind. Distinctions of physical, mental, social, and religious development are logical distinctions made for clarifying thought.⁶

A Jesuit college is also a Catholic college and a college in the American scene, and shares the difficulties of both and adds something peculiar to itself. What do we feel about our performance? The answer may be that there is the discouraging sense of tension which arises from the realization of what our colleges should be or profess to be, and what they are. One peculiar difficulty comes from the *aura* with which we surround and halo the past and the recklessness with which we rush into the present. We made loud claims to our tradition in education and our practice belies them, and perhaps necessarily so. We know that an important contribution of the *Ratio* was a unified system—the three grammar classes preparing for the next two years of humanities and rhetoric. The scope of each class was minutely defined. I believe at present that in the average Jesuit college from fifty to eighty per cent of the freshman students come from non-Jesuit high schools. Is there

⁶W. F. Cunningham, C.S.C., *The Pivotal Problems of Education*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940, pp. 557-559.

a magic in the walls of our freshman classrooms that immediately prepares a student for receiving the peculiar Jesuit training we subscribe to? I mentioned that the Harvard Report was much concerned with the quality of education in the secondary schools, and I have heard that the directors of the St. John's experiment at Annapolis have realized that they must have a secondary school to prepare students for the type of work they wish to develop. In place of complaints of the work the well-known boast of developing leaders. A balanced view of this matter might be the following excerpt:

The development of Catholic leadership in the nation presents many difficulties. First, leaders of men are born rather than made. Besides, very many of our Catholic students come from home surroundings that do not suggest the ambition for leadership. However, the Catholic college is to do whatever in it lies to foster latent possibilities along this line. For instance, to discourage students except for the standard degrees in Arts and Sciences, that is, to concentrate all their energies in promoting the cause of a liberal education and not in professional or pre-professional course; secondly, to devote special attention and to offer special opportunities to the most talented among their students, so as to develop whatever gifts they may have both for independent thought and independent action. How this can best be done must be left to the consideration of each college, according to its financial resources and the competence of its faculty.

But a more satisfactory viewpoint is this statement: "The Christian social ideal of leadership is not domination, but *service*." And from that viewpoint of Christian service we can endeavor to educate a vast army of students for "participation in the religious, civic, social, and political life of the nation."

At the end of this list of difficulties in establishing aims for the American Catholic Jesuit college, we may insert the thought that Jesuit education has gone on in the past and will continue for the future and will make progress no matter what gloomy thoughts we may have of the reality at any point of time.

A SOLUTION

The second directive of Father Mallon for this paper was "we need a good, sound statement of worthy academic objectives in order to get

our feet on the ground right at the start." In other words, "present a basic, workable aim."

Before attempting that, I must digress for a moment on the revised *Instructio*, a copy of which is at hand. We cannot and should not go on as if the *Instructio* did not exist. It is the latest official directive for Jesuit education in the United States. The Commission on Higher Studies of the American Assistancy was appointed in December, 1930. Its report appeared in 1932. This report was the basis of the *Instructio*. From it we can derive a good description of the aims of Jesuit education, with the necessary proviso that it includes both secondary and higher education. These are some excerpts from the Report of the Commission: "We may sum up the principal characteristics of our Jesuit philosophy of education under the following heads: (1) The student is a human being who is to be educated as such for his individual proximate end and especially for his final end. (2) All his powers of soul and body are to be harmoniously developed under the influence of Divine Grace by methods of teaching which will form habits of correct and vigorous thinking and of courageously effective and virtuous acting. (3) These methods consist largely in: (a) clear-cut organization of successive objectives to be attained by the student; (b) frequent provision for stimulating the student to organize in his own mind the knowledge he has thus far gained; (c) prevention of any attitude of passivity or mere absorption of information; by the use of objection and discussion as an essential part of the teaching technique; (d) continual urge to self-expression in accordance with the ideals of intellectual and moral order; (e) personal interest in the student, spurring him on and encouraging him to do his individual best in acquiring both learning and virtue." ("Report of the Commission on Higher Studies of the American Assistancy of the Society of Jesus," pp. 17-18.)

The *Instructio* of 1934, revised and approved in 1948, expresses in summary form the same general aims and methods. The 1932 report and the *Instructio* contain well-expressed and excellent directives which, of course, must be applied in both the work of administration and in the classroom. We are concerned, however, with a description of aims of our educational work on the *college level*. "The aim of a college must be what can only be obtained through the process of the college—namely, higher education." To arrive at such is the concern of this discussion. We will be concerned these days with qualitative standards, as listed in the excellent program of the Institute, with instruction, with the subjects of the curriculum, and college programs—all in complexity of detail. Have we, then, a workable basis for these discussions—a basic aim to serve as groundwork? And, especially, have we a norm by which to test the product of the college, and likewise to test the efficiency of

the means employed? As administrators, you are concerned with the product. Can you approve of it? Can you guarantee it?

When the report referred to as "Post-war Jesuit Education, 1944" was sent out for comment, one Jesuit educator asked the question: "Is it possible to have a re-statement of the *Ratio* directives issuing in the light of Faith, from a metaphysics of knowledge and the traditional doctrine of the intellectual and moral virtues?" It was such a good question that the immediate answer was: "Yes; will you do it?" This Jesuit educator agreed, and presented an outline. The author may remain anonymous at present, as the work was not for publication, and anonymity may allow us to concentrate on the statement without the distraction of "a local habitation and a name." We are sincerely for his contribution. His report treated of the ultimate and immediate objectives of Catholic education, the objectives of theological and natural knowledge, and of their integration. Then, the objective of Jesuit education, channelling through the *Ratio*, was outlined, first, on the high school level, and then on the college level. This last is our present concern: "The immediate objective of the *Ratio Studiorum* at the college level is to increase the perfection of the student's intellectual virtues in relation to the same (high school level), through elaborated, and different subject matters. For instance, rhetoric is the same subject in both high school and college; whereas Livy is a different author from Caesar, and trigonometry differs from geometry." Next follows the statement I would dwell upon: "It does not seem possible to measure the degree of intellectual habits which students must attain before graduation except in the following terms: In the practical order the student must be able to read and write well. In the speculative order, he must be able to paraphrase the notable content of the various fields of college instruction."

As mentioned previously, the question asked by the writer was on the possibility of restating our aims from a metaphysics of knowledge and the traditional doctrine of the intellectual and moral virtues. It seems that Catholic education has neglected to make sufficient use of this traditional doctrine of the intellectual and moral virtues. This doctrine seems the best basis for a consideration of the liberal arts, of the integration of knowledge, and the psychology of learning, all based on the nature of the educand—to use a pedagogical word.

Allow me to impose upon your time to recall by brief summary this doctrine taken from the remarkable work of Father Walter Farrell, O.P., *The Companion to the Summa*:

A habit is by its very nature a principle of activity. Intellectual habits perfect the intellect for its activities. A habit is something distinctly human . . . the animal cannot have habits. To illustrate this—animal nature is a small cup full to the brim;

human nature is an expanding vessel whose capacity grows with the amount poured in. . . . These additions, these modifications, these capabilities by which human nature alone grows, are habits. Physical habits may improve the body. Intellectual habits improve the mind; only moral habits improve the man.⁷

Virtues, then, are acquired good habits. If it is a human virtue, it is the result of our actions. The intellectual virtues are practical and speculative. The two practical virtues are art and prudence; art including the liberal and fine arts, and all the possibilities of inventive genius, of technological perfection. Prudence, partly intellectual, partly moral, provides the direction without which activity is in vain. The speculative virtues are (1) *understanding*, or the habit of first principles, for example, the principle of contradiction, of finality, of sufficient reason, or of good to be done, evil to be avoided. (2) *Science*, the deduction from first principles or induction from facts, arriving at truth through demonstration, as in mathematics, science, and in much of philosophy and theology. Another name for this virtue of science is knowledge. (3) *Wisdom*, through the former two virtues, the mind acquires wisdom, the last truth, the last explanation, as well as the first truth and the relation of one truth to another, the relation of all to the final goal.

Perhaps if we give this wisdom its ordinary names, its work will be better understood; if it is Divine wisdom, we call it theology; if it is human wisdom, it is called first philosophy or metaphysics. In either case, it is the supreme speculative virtue for any human life. . . . It should be the prime object of education. And it is one intellectual virtue which is a stranger to the American educational system.⁸

Have we, then, after so much noise come to anti-climactic, and too elementary conclusion in offering as a working aim the following: In order to measure the intellectual habits of a college product—in the practical order, the student must be able to read and write well; in the speculative order, he must be able to paraphrase the notable content of the various fields of college instruction. Let us see. “The student must be able to read well.” That is a high aim. It includes all training in self-activity and ability to interpret a book, both the required reading and free reading of the student. Herein lies all the good things you may say about libraries. “To write well”—to express oneself in solid prose

⁷Reverend Walter Farrell, O.P., *The Companion to the Summa*, Vol. II. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1945, Chap. VIII passim.

⁸Farrell, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

is a satisfactory norm and more practical than talk of creative writing. "To paraphrase the content of the various fields of college instruction" expresses the fundamental and realistic aim of work. We have often been warned not to expect too much of college education; that it is a beginning, and that education does not end with college. The statement includes the notion of *College Level Work*, an aim that has too little attention in discussions. I emphasize the word "*paraphrase*." It is well chosen. It is not parroting, the mechanical repetition of words. It implies that the content of the study has been so grasped and mastered by the student that he can restate the sense, the meaning, in another form, in his own form, if you will, giving a clear and full exposition. We know that it is by mastery of the content that the habits are developed. Secondly, the aims of the college work described in the statement, can be measured, and proof of a student's grasp of a subject can be satisfactorily judged. Moreover, the statement summarizes the specific aim of intellectual education, the training of the mind; and in its context, presupposes the moral virtues and full panoply of the supernatural order. At least, it seems to me, that this approach to our objectives of college teaching results in a realistic attitude, and will keep our feet on the ground, and prevent our heads from knocking against the stars of beautiful but vague objectives.

Colleges Attended by 1947 Jesuit High School Graduates

I—INTRODUCTION

What colleges do the graduates of the Jesuit high schools attend? Why? What courses do they take? What subjects occupy most of their time and effort?

The Executive Committee of the Jesuit Educational Association at its Dallas meeting in the Fall of 1947 posed these questions to be answered by the Commission on Secondary Schools. There was a highly regrettable, but unavoidable, delay in beginning the study.

On January 14, 1948 the Chairman of the Commission sent letters to the other members, and included the following materials in sufficient quantities to supply the high schools of each member's area: a letter to the Principal, explaining the study; a sample form for the graduates' questionnaires; and a three-page summary form on which to report the responses to the questionnaires. These forms were sent in order to insure uniformity in the tabulating of the data. Principals were asked to send questionnaires to all students who graduated on any date in 1947.

The request caught the Principals at a bad time—just before the turn of the semester. A reminder was sent on February 24 to those who had not yet sent their returns. The Chairman's report was revised three times just before the San Francisco convention, in order to include late returns and to make the report more representative. Even so, there were gaps, and the oral report had to be rather sketchy. Accordingly, the Chairman promised the meeting that he would prepare and mail a more complete report later. "Later" proved to be very late, indeed. However, it was felt that the report could be of considerable value to administrators, and so it was thought worth sending. It is regrettable that some schools are not included. In some cases the material was quite incomplete. However, some information was received from 32 of the 38 schools, distributed by Provinces as follows: California, 1 of 3; Chicago, 6 of 6; Maryland, 4 of 5; Missouri, 5 of 5; New England, 3 of 4; New Orleans, 4 of 4; New York, 6 of 7; Oregon, 3 of 4.

II—GENERAL INFORMATION

Table 1 shows that a total of 3,897 graduates received diplomas from 32 Jesuit high schools in 1947. Of these, 1,800, or 46.2 per cent, replied to the school's questionnaire. The true percentage of graduates who are

attending college is not known. In the reports from some schools this figure was based on the replies of graduates, and since these were not complete, the figures are not complete either. Most schools reported the number of graduates in college on the basis of other information in their files. *Only these figures are used in Table 1, Columns 3 and 4.* Hence, the percentage of graduates in college must be considered as a sampling only.

TABLE 1. NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES OF 1947 ATTENDING COLLEGE; NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES REPLYING TO SCHOOL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

PROVINCE	GRADUATED		ATTENDING COLLEGE*		REPLIED TO QUESTIONNAIRE	
	TOTAL	ADJUSTED*	No.	%	No.	%
California	202	202	150	74.2	97	48.0
Chicago	956	551	451	81.9	535	55.9
Maryland	339	195	148	75.8	154	45.4
Missouri	702	702	574	81.7	370	52.6
New England..	311	311	236	75.9	125	40.2
New Orleans..	255	217	172	79.2	77	30.2
New York	901	380	278	73.2	402	44.5
Oregon	231	231	169	73.1	40	17.3
Total	3,897	2,789	2,178	78.0	1,800	46.2

*In columns marked with * those schools are omitted which based their figures on returns from questionnaires only.

It is clear from the figures given in Table 1 that at the present time our schools are preparing the majority of their graduates for college. The average proportion in the Assistancy is 78 per cent,¹ and this is very evenly distributed. The Chicago Province is highest, with 81.9 per cent, and the Oregon Province lowest with 73.1 per cent.

¹A parallel survey based on J.E.A. High School Blanks gives the actual percentage of 4,492 graduates in Fall 1947 from 38 Jesuit High Schools who are continuing their formal education in colleges (exclusive of the armed services) at 3,606 or 80%. Mehok, William J., S.J., "Survey of Jesuit High School Faculty and Students: 1947-1948," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 4 (March, 1948), pp. 232, 234.

III—DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATES IN THREE TYPES OF COLLEGES

The figures in Table 2 make it clear that the graduates of Jesuit high schools have confidence in the excellence of Jesuit education. On the basis of the figures used, 72.2 per cent of the graduates attending college are in Jesuit institutions. This proportion varies from 76.6 per cent in the Chicago Province to 56.6 per cent in the New Orleans Province. The basis for the figures used in Table 2 differs from that used in Table 1. In the second table the numbers are usually calculated from the responses of the graduates, except in a few cases where the school records are more specific.

TABLE 2. NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF GRADUATES OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS ATTENDING JESUIT, CATHOLIC NON-JESUIT, AND NON-CATHOLIC COLLEGES*

PROVINCE	COLLEGES ATTENDED						TOTAL
	JESUIT	OTHER		NON-CATHOLIC			
		CATHOLIC	No.				
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
California . . .	71	74.7	6	6.3	18	18.9	95
Chicago	367	76.6	42	8.7	70	14.5	479
Maryland	130	65.6	34	17.2	34	17.2	198
Missouri	362	76.0	37	7.7	77	16.2	476
New England . . .	104	74.8	14	10.0	21	15.1	139
New Orleans . . .	86	56.6	2	1.3	64	42.1	152
New York	270	71.4	59	15.6	49	12.9	378
Oregon	57	64.8	7	7.9	24	27.2	88
Total ²	1,447	72.2	201	10.0	357	17.8	2,005

*Numbers calculated from responses of graduates, except in a few cases where the figures obtained from school records are more accurate.

It has been seen that generally speaking the graduates of Jesuit high schools continue in Jesuit colleges. It does not follow, however, as later analysis will show, that the old Jesuit six-year Arts curriculum could easily be restored. Many Jesuit graduates change to a scientific or pre-professional course upon entering a Jesuit college. Eighteen high schools sent graduates to Georgetown, and the same number to Holy Cross.

²*Op. cit.*, 232. The proportion based on complete coverage shows that 82.8% of the graduates attended Catholic schools and 17.2% attended non-Catholic schools. The near identity of these percentages (82.2% and 17.8) supports the validity of the sampling.

Fordham claimed men from ten schools, Marquette and St. Louis from seven. Detroit, Loyola of the South, and Regis each from five schools.

An even 10 per cent of our graduates enter Catholic colleges under other than Jesuit control. Some of these are seminaries, or preparatory seminaries. It is seen, therefore, that 82.2 per cent of the graduates of Jesuit high schools continue in Catholic colleges—a fine tribute to their faith in the quality and worth of Catholic education! Graduates from 17 schools entered Notre Dame, from five, Mt. St. Mary's, and from four, St. Bonaventure, Manhattan, and Villanova.

The distribution of our graduates in non-Catholic colleges varies from 12.9 per cent in the New York Province to 42.1 per cent in the New Orleans Province, where few Catholic colleges exist. In all, 17.8 per cent attend non-Catholic colleges, for reasons which will be reviewed below.

IV—COURSES CHOSEN IN THREE TYPES OF COLLEGES

TABLE 3. COURSES CHOSEN IN JESUIT COLLEGES BY 1947 GRADUATES OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS

COURSES	California	Chicago	Maryland	Missouri	New England	New Orleans	New York	Oregon	Total	Per Cent
AB with Greek...	2	17	10	16	41	0	20	1	107	7.7
AB with Math...	11	16	10	23	22	3	69	8	162	11.7
BS in Science....	4	22	13	30	8	10	30	2	119	8.6
BS in Soc. Sc.....	6	20	5	16	10	2	32	2	93	6.7
B Bus. Admin....	27	77	18	73	15	26	57	8	301	21.1
Pre-Medical	6	52	25	59	7	14	48	8	219	15.9
Pre-Dental	1	15	2	5	2	13	8	1	47	3.4
Pre-Engineer	3	55	8	25	1	1	10	13	116	8.4
Pre-Legal	13	41	1	28	7	17	12	4	123	8.8
BS in Commerce..	0	16	0	3	0	0	0	0	19	1.4
Ph.B.	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	1.1
Miscellaneous ...	0	8	8	16	3	4	2	15	56	4.0
Total	73	354	100	294	116	90	288	62	1,377	98.8

The figures in Table 3 would seem to indicate clearly that our Jesuit colleges are losing their characteristic mark, the liberal arts curriculum. The Arts Courses, Greek and non-Greek combined, enroll only 19.4 per cent of graduates of the Jesuit high schools. Perhaps it follows all the more that the high schools should emphasize the classical courses, since so few of our students will study the classics in college. Or will some argue that the courses we give in high school kill off all interest in the

classics, so that, once freed of the necessity, students will have no more to do with them? The largest number of our graduates enter business courses, 22.5 per cent. Some of the professional courses run surprisingly low—Pre-Engineering, 8.4, Pre-Legal, 8.8 per cent.

The New England Province retains the strongest hold in Greek, enrolling 35.3 per cent of its high-school graduates. New York has 6.9 per cent; Missouri, 5.4; and Chicago, 4.8 per cent.

It is interesting to notice which course has the lead in numbers enrolled in each Province: California, Chicago, Missouri, and New Orleans, Business Administration; Maryland, Pre-Medical; New England, AB with Greek; New York, AB without Greek; Oregon, Pre-Engineering.

TABLE 4. COURSES CHOSEN IN CATHOLIC, NON-JESUIT COLLEGES BY 1947 GRADUATES OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS

COURSES	California	Chicago	Maryland	Missouri	New England	New Orleans	New York	Oregon	Total	Per Cent
AB with Greek...	0	3	1	1	1	0	10	0	16	8.8
AB with Math....	1	1	2	1	3	0	7	4	19	10.5
BS in Science....	0	3	3	3	0	0	8	0	17	9.4
BS in Soc. Sc.....	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	0	6	3.3
B Bus. Admin....	0	9	6	7	2	0	12	2	38	21.1
Pre-Medical	0	2	3	1	0	1	10	0	17	9.4
Pre-Dental	1	2	1	1	2	0	1	0	8	4.4
Pre-Engineer	0	3	13	2	0	0	6	0	24	13.3
Pre-Legal	1	4	1	3	1	0	5	1	16	8.8
BS in Commerce..	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.0
Ph. B	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.6
Miscellaneous	0	6	3	6	0	1	2	0	18	10.0
Total	3	35	33	26	10	2	64	7	180	99.6

Table 4 shows that in non-Jesuit, Catholic colleges the Business Administration course also is chosen by the largest percentage of graduates, 21.1. Pre-Engineering follows with 13.3 per cent. The Greek and non-Greek Arts courses together draw 19.3 per cent; Greek alone 8.8 per cent, which is higher than in Jesuit colleges. This is accounted for by the fact that students in these colleges are frequently studying for the priesthood.

In Table 5 are given the data for the choices of our graduates who attend non-Catholic colleges. Most are prompted by occupational considerations. Thus, Pre-Engineering attracts 31.7 per cent, Business Administration, 17.4 per cent; Pre-Medical, 14.4 per cent. These figures seem to bear out what the graduates say later about their reasons for

choosing non-Catholic colleges. These data seem to point to the necessity of building up our own professional schools and of guiding prospective students to those already existing.

TABLE 5. COURSES CHOSEN IN NON-CATHOLIC COLLEGES BY 1947 GRADUATES OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS

COURSES	California	Chicago	Maryland	Missouri	New England	New Orleans	New York	Oregon	Total	Per Cent
AB with Greek...	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.3
AB with Math...	1	1	1	0	0	2	7	4	16	5.4
BS with Science..	1	3	2	2	0	2	6	0	16	5.4
BS in Soc. Sc....	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	4	1.5
B Bus. Admin....	2	15	7	10	1	5	2	10	52	17.4
Pre-Medical	5	14	3	2	2	13	4	0	43	14.4
Pre-Dental	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	1.7
Pre-Engineer	6	24	4	15	4	30	10	2	95	31.7
Pre-Legal	0	2	1	4	2	5	2	2	18	6.0
BS in Commerce.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.3
Ph. B.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.0
Miscellaneous ...	4	7	5	14	7	1	8	2	48	16.1
Total	19	70	23	48	16	59	42	22	299	100.2

V—PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS STUDIED BY GRADUATES

In Table 6 the graduates' programs are analyzed to determine which are the principal subjects that they are studying. By principal subjects is meant the subjects which occupy most time in their schedules. In Jesuit colleges, the subject which occupies most time in most programs is chemistry (251), followed by Latin (199), mathematics (181), and English (154). Second place in the time schedule is claimed by English in 405 cases, by mathematics in 272, and by chemistry in 126. For third place the order is English (325), mathematics (219), and religion (109). If the demands of first, second, and third place subjects are combined, English leads with 884, followed by mathematics (672), chemistry (397), and Latin (278).

In the non-Jesuit Catholic colleges the subjects which occupy first place in most time schedules are mathematics (42), English (29), and Latin (28). If first, second, and third places are combined, the order is mathematics (95), English (93), chemistry (67), and Latin (42).

The order of importance differs somewhat in non-Catholic colleges, where chemistry claims first place in 80 schedules, mathematics in 61, and English in 34. The combined total of first, second, and third places

in the time schedule amounts to 156 for mathematics, 149 for chemistry, and 140 for English.

TABLE 6. SUBJECTS OCCUPYING FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD PLACES IN TIME SCHEDULE OF 1947 GRADUATES OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS NOW ATTENDING JESUIT, NON-JESUIT CATHOLIC, AND NON-CATHOLIC COLLEGES

SUBJECTS	FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD PLACES IN TIME SCHEDULE								
	JESUIT			NON-JESUIT CATHOLIC			NON-CATHOLIC		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
English	154	405	325	24	27	42	34	37	69
Latin	199	55	24	28	10	4	0	2	6
Greek	15	58	17	1	10	4	2	1	0
Mathematics . . .	181	272	219	41	28	26	61	52	43
Physics	86	41	11	2	4	10	19	17	11
Chemistry	252	126	19	29	34	4	80	50	19
Biology	106	50	7	8	6	2	10	12	7
Soc. Sc.	55	48	70	2	8	14	16	22	20
Religion	6	32	109	0	4	10	0	0	1
French	27	35	66	6	3	5	4	6	8
German	20	38	80	3	3	2	4	8	6
Spanish	43	28	41	6	8	6	9	5	6
Economics	69	40	23	4	3	4	11	5	6
History	32	59	74	7	8	8	3	7	7
Philosophy	24	34	35	0	4	4	0	0	0
Accounting	141	31	10	19	4	3	16	4	3

VI—REASONS GIVEN BY GRADUATES FOR ATTENDING COLLEGES OF CHOICE

The 1947 graduates of Jesuit high schools were also asked to give their reasons for attending the colleges in which they are now enrolled. No reasons were suggested, no checklists were given. Each graduate, therefore, originated his response. A difficulty was encountered in the tabulation. On the summary forms furnished to each school principal to fill out, spaces had been provided to indicate the number of individuals who had listed each reason for attending his college. The totals would have indicated the relative strength of the different motives for choosing the colleges. Unfortunately, many principals failed to indicate these numbers. The tabulator therefore resorted to a somewhat arbitrary device to indicate the relative force of the different reasons given. A rating of 5 was assigned to the reason listed in first place by each school, in those cases in which no numbers were indicated, as well as in the reports which did indicate actual numbers of graduates listing each motive. Similarly, the

motive with the second highest number of tallies, or in the second place on the report, received 4 points, and so on along the scale. This procedure gives a rough indication of the relative strength of the various motives which impelled graduates to choose the college which they attend. It is important to recognize that in Table 7 the figures given are not tallies, but the sums of ratings.

TABLE 7. REASONS GIVEN BY 1947 GRADUATES OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOLS FOR CHOOSING JESUIT, NON-JESUIT CATHOLIC, OR NON-CATHOLIC COLLEGES

REASONS	COLLEGES		
	JESUIT	OTHER CATHOLIC	NON-CATHOLIC
To continue Jesuit education.....	119*
Proximity to home.....	99	40	49
To continue Catholic education.....	76	44	..
Scholastic reputation of college.....	72	52	71
To take a particular course.....	43	48	100
Lack of financial resources.....	8	10	53

*Figures indicate not tallies but sums of ratings on a 5-point scale, in which 5 represents a first place, etc.

An analysis of Table 7 strengthens the conclusions reached in Section III of this study—that graduates of Jesuit high schools have confidence in Jesuit education, and in Catholic education in general. This appears directly in the figure 119 in the Jesuit column and the 44 in the Catholic non-Jesuit column. But it also appears indirectly, in the 72 points given to "reputation" in the Jesuit column and the 52 points to the same motive in the Catholic column, where it stands first. The same indication appears in the fact that it is a particular course, often a course not available in a Catholic college, which is the leading motive in drawing students to non-Catholic colleges. The fact that the financial motive places so prominently in the case of the non-Catholic college points in the same direction, as in not a few cases the students are attending tuition-free state or municipal institutions.

Commission on Secondary Schools

Charles E. Burke, S.J.

John J. Foley, S. J.

Christopher J. McDonnell, S.J.

Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J., Chairman

Claude J. Stallworth, S.J.

BOOKS

College Organization and Administration. Deferrari, Roy J. (Editor). Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947. 403 pp. \$4.00.

For ten days in the summer of 1946 ninety-four administrators and faculty members of Catholic colleges met on the campus of the Catholic University of America. The results of their discussions Dr. Roy Deferrari has gathered in *College Organization and Administration*.

Books and journal articles on college administration are abundant but disparate. Some are too technical to be satisfactory for any except experts in administration; at the other extreme are many others which are nothing more than sage reminiscences of superannuated administrators. Moreover, little of the literature is pointed specifically towards the unique problems of Catholic institutions. Consequently these Workshop Proceedings gathered into one book serve at least two very practical purposes. They furnish, first of all, a comprehensive view of the outstanding administrative problems. They might furnish a Jesuit suddenly assigned to administration a quick over-view of the machinery of higher education with special reference to Catholic higher education. The book, secondly, contains chapters which might serve to inaugurate discussions at faculty meetings. A stimulating program could be built around a review or a criticism of one or another of the topics by one of the teachers.

It is fair to say that there is an unevenness in the quality of the chapters. Some seem to be quite casual papers, while others bear evidence of some very substantial research supplemented by discriminating bibliographical notes, e.g. Fr. Alcuin Tasch's treatment of "Organization and Statutes."

The spread of the collection may be indicated if we know that included are thirty-one papers discussing purpose, institutional statutes, admission problems, and job analyses for the president, the dean, the dean of men and women, and the registrar. Other papers are on individual curricular problems in the fields of Religion, Philosophy, and Psychology. On the business function there is discussion of insurance and annuities, budgeting, accounting, and public relations. On the instructional front there

is an article on the college library, one on collegiate instructional problems, and one on the desirable college teacher.

J. J. Ryan in his "Secularization *vs.* Spiritual Objectives" gives in 16 pages the substance of his 1945 book, *The Idea of a Catholic College*. He may irritate his readers, but they will probably read him through and grudgingly be a bit more alert to find a place for Christian culture in their professional disciplines.

Any college Community might well work into its refectory reading the work of the Augustinian, Father Edward V. Stanford, on "Public Relations and the Catholic College." He quickly destroys the illusion that public relations are localized in one office or one officer of a school: he saddles the responsibility squarely where it belongs, namely on every teacher, administrator, student, and functionary of the college.

The editor himself, Dr. Deferrari, is responsible for two notable papers. The first is a very sound and authentic description of the nature of accreditation today. His historical background of the accreditation movement is well organized and instructive. In brief, the evolution of the movement is mirrored in the change of words used to describe it:

Thus the term *standardize* became most distasteful to all. It was at first replaced by the word *accredit*, but *accredit* also has in recent years been thought of not to reflect exactly the new philosophy of the supervising groups, and it is being gradually superseded by the term *approve*.

The editor concludes the proceedings with a splendid plea for "Cooperation in Catholic Higher Education." If Catholic colleges are to survive financially and to improve the quality of their product, there must be far wider sharing of resources than is now evident. The war of attrition, e.g. between two Catholic colleges serving the same community and duplicating expensive curricula, will effect their mutual destruction. Indeed this problem is not restricted to Catholic institutions. There is plain need for wide-range planning both for the placing of new colleges and for the better cooperation between those now flourishing. Wide distribution of this article through the faculty might do much to counteract what the author calls "narrow institutionalism." The observation is in place here that, of the ninety-four persons listed on the roster of this Workshop, I find not one from a Jesuit institution. Fortunately we have these Proceedings. We can learn from them, we can criticize them, and we can build upon them.

WILLIAM F. KELLEY, S.J.

Charters of Philanthropies. By M. M. Chambers, New York. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1948, pp. vii, 247. No price.

Current trends in higher education have made administrators more conscious than ever of the need of tapping hitherto untried sources of revenue.

The trend of legislation colored by the President's Commission on Higher Education points more and more to the exclusion of privately controlled institutions from federal funds. Setting aside the principles and expediency in this matter, one threat still emerges. If publically controlled colleges are given federal funds, they will seriously threaten the balance between the two classes of institutions and may come out virtual dictators in the field of higher education.

It is difficult to say if this threat will become actual. At any rate, it should be considered. Prescinding from federal funds, then, to whom will private schools turn?

The raising of tuition and fees will put education out of the reach of many or most of those that can now afford it. Popular and local drives will therefore have to be stepped up. Even here a serious drawback arises in the inability or unwillingness of corporations to contribute owing to tax restrictions. Note, for example, "The Business of Giving" in *Fortune* for December 1948. This problem was treated in great detail at the January 1949 annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges.

These limitations force administrators to look to a fruitful but neglected source, the charitable trust. The United States Treasury Department listed over 10,000 active organizations classifiable as philanthropic foundations administering funds amounting to an estimated two billion dollars for educational institutions alone.

The purpose of *Charters of Philanthropies* is to make a selection of such typical agencies. Basic documents appertaining to eighteen selected foundations are listed. These exhibits are preceded by a brief introductory text on charitable foundations in general with specific mention of particular features of the legal basis of thirty-seven selected philanthropies along with other documents. In all, about seventy-five institutions, their charter purposes, structure, powers, relationships with public authorities and legal trends are outlined in more or less detail.

Most of the foundations reviewed are general in their purpose and might admit grants to worthy educational projects. Four are specifically educational: Carnegie Corporation of New York, General Education

Board, The John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation and the Juilliard Musical Foundation. Others have purposes allied to education, such as, foundations for children and youth, research, specific universities, health and medical care, and for specific callings.

The chapters on governing boards are particularly useful as they give information on the number, qualifications, tenure and powers of the men who administer the funds.

Even if the foundations listed prove useless, they at least give clues to further inquiry. Often a judiciously placed word can repay much seemingly wasted effort. This was brought home very vividly when the director of one of the largest national benefit drives was asked why it was that certain Jesuit professional schools did not profit by the proceeds. His answer was simply that none of them asked. Needless to say, he is now being asked and the likelihood is that the requests will be answered in sizeable research donations. *Charters of Philanthropies* may help in locating others likewise waiting to be asked.

WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

News from the Field

GENERAL

HARPER'S MAGAZINE for November contains an article by Jules Weinberg on the work of the Xavier Labor School under Father Philip Carey.

VICE-PRESIDENT of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is Father Andrew Smith who was appointed at the annual meeting held in Memphis in late November. Father Smith is the second Catholic nominated and elected to a major office in the association, being preceded by Father Percy A. Roy, in 1939.

IMMORTAL DIAMOND, a recent book on Gerard Manley Hopkins to be published by Sheed & Ward, was edited by Father Norman Weyland and has articles written by several American Jesuits.

CATHOLIC PRESS ASSOCIATION November 15th opened its new national headquarters on the Fordham Campus. The trade organ of the Association, *The Catholic Journalist* will be published from Fordham.

FATHER SCHWITALLA received a gold medal and citation from the American Medical Association for his "outstanding effort for the public welfare on a national level and for his service to American medicine," at a public gathering in Kiel Auditorium on December 22nd.

THE WESTERN COLLEGE ASSOCIATION has appointed Father Hugh Duce to act on its Committee on Membership and Standards. The Committee is charged with the task of drawing up the accrediting procedures of the Association.

HIGH SCHOOLS

TWENTY COMPETITIVE SCHOLARSHIPS were won by the recent graduating class of St. Joseph's. These included two of the Mayor's sixteen scholarships.

PRE-COLLEGE GUIDANCE PROGRAM sponsored by Saint Louis University gave guidance counsel to approximately 350 high school seniors from the greater Saint Louis area.

ST. IGNATIUS HIGH SCHOOL, Chicago, is expediting its report card problem by using an I.B.M. machine to record the grades on composite cards. Semester averages will be calculated by the machines.

BIGGEST NEWS OF THE WEEK CONTEST, conducted under the auspices of the Times Picayune Publishing Company, was won by the

Jesuit High School of New Orleans. In the ten contests conducted since 1944 this school has won six and has been awarded two permanent trophies.

CONTEST: Both Loyola High School, Los Angeles, and St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco, won first places in their respective cities in the Hearst American History Contest.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

THE EDMUND CAMPION SOCIETY at Canisus College began its third year by inviting prominent Protestants to attend a series of lectures on Catholicism. About 30 Protestants attended the first meeting and 40 were at the second.

RHODES SCHOLARSHIP to Oxford University was won by Richard Sylvester, Arts senior at St. Louis University. He was one of four Midwestern contestants of the total number of thirty-two in the United States. The award entitles him to a two year scholarship and an annual stipend of \$2,000.

XAVIER UNIVERSITY, Cincinnati, has provided the faculty members with the recreational facilities of a local club. Finest results are promised from this free and voluntary association of Jesuit and lay faculty.

PURCHASE CARD SYSTEM that will entitle holders to from ten to twenty-five percent discount at certain department, book, and clothing stores in the Chicago area has been inaugurated at Loyola.

FAMILY ALLOWANCE will be added to the salaries of Rockhurst faculty members. The allowance, which was instituted last September, will be given to faculty members with more than four children.

COMMUNICATION—ARTS CONTEST on Creighton's 70 Years of Service brought 700 entries in the written speech contest and 100 in the preliminary oral contest. The history of Creighton and the advantages of Jesuit education were the general topic. Faculty consensus was that no single event in recent years had done so much as this contest to promote genuine school spirit.

RECTOR-PRESIDENT: Fordham's administrative organization will change February 2nd from independent rector and dependent president to an independent rector-president and dependent religious superior. Fathers Murphy and Gannon will be succeeded by Father Laurence McGinley as rector-president and Father Charles Deane as religious superior of the Fordham community.

FACULTY MEETINGS at John Carroll University are conducted according to parliamentary procedure thereby encouraging greater general participation of all faculty members.

STUDENT LOANS at Loyola University Chicago have been instituted to help faculty and full-time students. The fund was created by Leon Mandel I, of one of Chicago's large department stores.

JOHN A. COSTELLO, Prime Minister of Ireland, was presented an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws at a ceremony at Fordham which was presided at by Cardinal Spellman.

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE at Creighton has received a grant of \$2,500 for research in cancer from the Nebraska Cancer Society. The School of Dentistry has received a \$4,050 cancer teaching grant from the U. S. Government.

FOUR of the five prizes offered at the meeting of the Midwest Clinical Society in Omaha were won by doctors from the School of Medicine of Creighton.

SCULPTURE EXHIBIT by Mr. Richmond Barthe, one of the foremost of our negro artists, was held in St. Peter's College library.

EVELYN WAUGH, who holds an honorary degree of Doctor of Literature from Loyola College, spent several days there while in Baltimore. He made a tour of the early Jesuit Mission centers in St. Mary's County.

TO AID its graduating members in finding suitable jobs, the Marquette chapter of Beta Alpha Psi, honorary accounting fraternity, has issued a four-page booklet containing their photographs and qualifications.

SEATTLE COLLEGE officially changed its name to Seattle University on May 28, 1948.

NEW LIBRARY: Permission has been obtained to erect a million dollar Library at the University of San Francisco. Construction will begin in early Spring.

TEACHER TRAINING: The California State Board of Education has approved Loyola University, Los Angeles, as a teacher training institution. Graduates who have followed the teacher training program will be eligible for the Secondary Credential which enables them to teach in the public high schools and junior colleges of the State.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

INDEX TO VOLUME XI

June 1948 to March 1949

Articles are entered under both author and subject heading. Book reviews are listed under the title with author and the name of the reviewer in parentheses, also under author and title and under reviewer and title. The figures refer to the initial pages.

<i>A History of Boston College</i> , David R. Dunigan, S.J. (John P. Porter, S.J.)	184
Analysis of National Statistics, 1948-1949, An, Charles M. O'Hara, S.J.	167
Books	179, 250
Britt, Laurence V., S.J.: The Prelection Method	49
Bunn, Edward B., S.J.: Jesuit Dean's Institute Denver—1948	95
Burke, Charles E., S.J.: Colleges Attended by 1947 Jesuit High School Graduates .	242
Burke, James L., S.J.: Busses, Released Time and the Political Process	15
Burke, James L., S.J.: The First Freedom	205
Busses, Released Time and the Political Process, James L. Burke, S.J.	15
Challenge to Catholic Colleges, A, James W. Culliton, Ph.D.	174
Chambers, M. M.: <i>Charters of Philanthropies</i>	252
<i>Charters of Philanthropies</i> , M. M. Chambers, (William J. Mehok, S.J.)	252
Colleges Attended by 1947 Jesuit High School Graduates, Jesuit Educational Association Commission on Secondary Schools	242
<i>College Organization and Administration</i> , Roy J. Deferrari (Ed), (William F. Kelley, S.J.)	250
Commission on Liberal Education of the Association of American Colleges, The Place of Letters in Liberal Education	153
Constitution of the Jesuit Educational Association	87
Contents	3, 67, 131, 195
Contributors	2, 66, 130, 194
Cooper, Russell M.: The Marks of a Superior College	113
Culliton, James W., Ph.D.: A Challenge to Catholic Colleges	174
Deferrari, Roy J. (Ed.): <i>College Organization and Administration</i>	250
Denver—1948, Jesuit Deans' Institute	95
Dunigan, David R., S.J.: <i>A History of Boston College</i>	184
Enrollment, 1948-1949, Jesuit Colleges, Universities; High Schools; College Freshmen	opp. 167
Farrell, Allan, P., S.J. (Ed.): <i>Whither American Education?</i>	182
First Freedom, The, James L. Burke, S.J.	205
Fitz Gerald, W. Edmund, S.J.: Jesuit Deans' Institute Denver—1948	95
Fitzsimons, M. J., S.J.: Jesuit Deans' Institute Denver—1948	95
Fitzsimons, M. J., S.J.: Objectives of a Jesuit College	229
Foley, John J., S.J.: Colleges Attended by 1947 Jesuit High Graduates	242
Glose, Joseph C., S.J.: The <i>Ratio</i> and Self-Activity	146
Graduate Studies, Status of, 1948-1949	209
Guidance at Scranton Prep, John F. Lenny, S.J.	161
Guidance Program: University of Detroit High School, George A. Wallenhorst, S.J.	197

Hamm, Victor M., Ph.D.: Notes on the Commissions' Report.....	158
<i>Handbook for Remedial Reading</i> , William Kottmeyer, (John W. Paone, S.J.).....	183
Henle, Robert J., S.J.: The Problem of Philosophy in the Liberal Arts College...	123
<i>Instructio Pro Assistentia Americae</i> , John B. Janssens, S.J.....	75
<i>Introduction to Philosophy</i> , Louis De Raeymaeker, (W. H. Turner, Ph.D.).....	180
Janssens, John B., S.J.: <i>Instructio Pro Assistentia Americae</i>	75
Janssens, John B., S.J.: Letter to the Fathers and Scholastics of the American Assistancy	69
Jesuit Deans' Institute Denver—1948, Edward B. Bunn, S.J., W. Edmund Fitz Gerald, S.J., M. J. Fitzsimons, S.J.....	95
Jesuit Educational Association Commission on Secondary Schools: Colleges Attended by 1947 Jesuit High School Graduates.....	242
Jesuit Educational Association, Constitution of the.....	87
Jesuit Educational Association, Program of Annual Meeting.....	58
Jesuit Educational Association, Report of the Executive Director, 1948.....	5
Jesuit Education and the Jesuit Theatre, Victor R Yanitelli, S.J.....	133
Kelley, William F., S.J.: Review of <i>College Organization and Administration</i>	250
Kottmeyer, William: <i>Handbook for Remedial Reading</i>	183
Ledochowski, W., S.J.: Letter to the Fathers and Scholastics of the American Assistancy Announcing the New Instruction on Studies and Teaching.....	72
Lemieux, Albert I., S.J.: Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education	25
Lemieux, Albert I., S.J.: Review of <i>Whither American Education?</i>	182
Lenny, John F., S.J.: Guidance at Scranton Prep.....	161
Letter to the Fathers and Scholastics of the American Assistancy, John B. Janssens, S.J.	69
Letter to the Fathers and Scholastics of the American Assistancy Announcing the New Instruction on Studies and Teaching, W. Ledochowski, S.J.....	72
Liberal Education, The Place of Letters in, Commission on Liberal Education of the Association of American Colleges.....	153
Marks of a Superior College, The, Russell M. Cooper.....	113
McDonnell, Christopher J., S.J., Colleges Attended by 1947 Jesuit High School Graduates	242
Mehok, William J., S.J.: Review of <i>Charters of Philanthropies</i>	252
Mehok, William J., S.J.: Survey of Jesuit High School Graduates and Admin- istration 1948-1949	215
Murray, John Courtney, S.J.: Towards a Theology for the Layman.....	221
News from the Field.....	61, 187, 254
Notes on the Commission's Report, Victor M. Hamm, Ph.D.....	158
Objectives of a Jesuit College, M. J. Fitzsimmons, S.J.....	229
O'Connor, Paul L., S.J.: Religion in the Undergraduate Jesuit Colleges.....	41
O'Hara, Charles M., S.J.: An Analysis of National Statistics 1948-1949.....	167
Paone, John W., S.J.: Review of <i>Handbook for Remedial Reading</i>	183
Philosophy in the Liberal Arts College, The Problem of, Robert J. Henle, S.J.....	123
Porter, John P., S.J.: Review of <i>A History of Boston College</i>	184
Prelection Method, The, Laurence V. Britt, S.J.....	49
Program of Annual Meeting, Jesuit Educational Association.....	58
Raeymaeker, Louis De: <i>Introduction to Philosophy</i>	180
<i>Ratio</i> and Self-Activity, The, Joseph C. Glose, S.J.....	146
Reed, Lorenzo K., S.J.: Colleges Attended by 1947 Jesuit High School Graduates.	242

Religion in the Undergraduate Jesuit Colleges, Paul L. O'Connor, S.J.....	41
Report of the Executive Director, 1948, Edward B. Rooney, S.J.....	5
Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education: Albert I. Lemieux, S.J.	25
Requirements for the A.B. Degree in Jesuit Colleges, The, Andrew C. Smith, S.J...	35
Rooney, Edward B., S.J.: Report of the Executive Director, 1948.....	5
Smith, Andrew C., S.J.: The Requirements for the A.B. Degree in Jesuit Colleges.	35
Stallworth, Claude J., S.J.: Colleges Attended by 1947 Jesuit High School Graduates	242
Survey of Jesuit High School Graduates and Administration, William J. Mehok, S.J.	215
Taylor, John H., S.J.: Review of <i>The Nature of the Liberal Arts</i>	179
<i>The Nature of the Liberal Arts</i> , John E. Wise, S.J. (John H. Taylor, S.J.).....	179
Towards a Theology for the Layman, John Courtney Murray, S.J.....	221
Turner, W. H., Ph.D.: Review of <i>Introduction to Philosophy</i>	180
Wallenhorst, George A., S.J.: Guidance Program: University of Detroit High School	197
<i>Whither American Education?</i> The Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. Allan P. Farrell, S.J. (Ed.), (Albert I. Lemieux, S.J.).....	182
Wise, John E., S.J.: <i>The Nature of the Liberal Arts</i>	179
Yanitelli, Victor R, S.J.: Jesuit Education and the Jesuit Theatre.....	133