

FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM

PLEASE DO NOT TAKE TO  
PRIVATE ROOM

JAN 10 1951

# *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*

---

JANUARY 1951

---

RIGHTS OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

JOSEPH JOUVANCY: JESUIT TEACHER

ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL STATISTICS  
1950-1951

DEPARTMENT HEAD VISITS THE CLASSES

---

Vol. XIII, No. 3

---

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)



# Contributors

FATHER VICTOR ALET (1827-1890) taught grammar, humanities, rhetoric and philosophy throughout French schools and wrote books and articles on ascetical, historical, classical and educational subjects.

FATHER FRANCIS E. CORKERY, President of Gonzaga University, presents the results of a survey on intercollegiate athletics in Jesuit colleges and universities.

FATHER JOSEPH K. DRANE, Dean of Arts at Loyola College, gathers available data on the content of the Medical College Admission Test.

MR. HARRY W. KIRWIN, PH.D., currently chairman, Department of History and Political Science at Loyola College Graduate School and Evening Division, offers interesting observations gathered from his visits to evening classes.

FATHER WILLIAM J. MEHOK, Managing Editor of the *Quarterly* and Assistant to the Executive Director, presents Jesuit enrollment statistics for the current year with a brief analysis.

FATHER W. EUGENE SHIELS, professor and department chairman of history at Xavier University, offers an opinion on a most timely subject, the rights of professors to organize within a university to bargain with the institution.

MR. EARL A. WEIS, Regent at St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati, recounts the progress of his search for a cultural curriculum for non-classical students.



# Jesuit Educational Quarterly

*January 1951*

---

## CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS . . . . .	130
Rights of University Professors	
<i>W. Eugene Shiels, S.J.</i> . . . . .	133
Joseph Jouvancy: Jesuit Teacher	
<i>Victor Alet, S.J.</i> . . . . .	139
An Analysis of National Statistics, 1950-1951	
<i>William J. Mebok, S.J.</i> . . . . .	157
As They Like It: An Experiment in Shakespeare	
<i>Earl A. Weis, S.J.</i> . . . . .	164
Intercollegiate Athletics in Jesuit Higher Institutions	
<i>Francis E. Corkery, S.J.</i> . . . . .	171
Department Head Visits the Classes	
<i>Harry W. Kirwin, Ph.D.</i> . . . . .	179
Content of Medical College Admission Test	
<i>Joseph K. Drane, S.J.</i> . . . . .	185
News from the Field . . . . .	188



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

## EDITORIAL STAFF

### *Editor*

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

### *Managing Editor*

WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

### *Advisory Board*

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

EDWARD B. BUNN, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
HUGH M. DUCE, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
JOSEPH D. FITZ GERALD, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
MARK GAFFNEY, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
JOHN F. LENNY, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
WILFRED M. MALLON, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
LAURENCE M. O'NEILL, S.J.	<i>New Orleans 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, JANUARY 1951

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY



# Rights of University Professors

W. EUGENE SHIELS, S.J.

A quite modern problem is the rise of economic and professional organizations among university professors, who seek in union to find the protection and advancement that they feel may be denied to them in ordinary academic administration. The American Association of University Professors have a rather long history of making themselves heard on matters of academic freedom and proper treatment of professors. The University of California anti-Communist oath is the most recent manifestation of their concern. Chief among their weapons is boycott against taking posts in the school singled out for criticism. They exert force through their quarterly *Bulletin*, in news releases of their judgments, and in the debates carried on in faculty meetings. It will be observed that their boycott strikes directly against the managers of the plant rather than by picketing students or mobilizing the public against the university under condemnation.

The other type in operation of late is the teachers' section of the American Federation of Labor. This union was originally formed to be a kind of check on the domination of the National Educational Association, but that aim seems to have dissolved in the more feasible working of a trade group within a school. With its functioning on the grade or high school level, this paper has no concern, but there is a certain timeliness to discussion of the matter in university circles.

To give point to the question, a case is posited in a Jesuit university. A certain professor is directing the teachers' union, a fraction of the faculty in that institution. His president, apprised of the fact, orders him to desist from organizing and directing the union under penalty of dismissal. His answer is to call a strike of unionized professors; thus to gain recognition for his rights and those of the union.

To unravel the complexities of this question demands at least a cursory study of the various forms of strikes, of the morality that must regulate them, and of the special character of the work done in a university.

Why, *de facto*, would they form a union? The aim is to establish the custom and right of mass bargaining, in place of the time-honored individual teaching contract. The salary-and rank-differentials in these contracts run counter to the ideas of those schooled in union views. The individual contract sometimes irks the impatient young teacher, or the



weaker-than-average and those declining in efficiency, all of whom argue forcefully that for "equal work" they deserve "equal pay" and that only by union organization can this right be enforced. Other and perhaps wiser heads point out that a group contract would not be a wise choice. There is tenure in the individual contract, instability in the group contract unless it embrace the entire faculty, and that is unlikely in view of the opinions of men skilled and experienced in the profession. Nor would a group contract ever repay their individual worth in a field where individual qualities are so much desired and respected, nor would it hold out for them an incentive toward betterment of rank. A further argument urged by the union view is that it represents good Catholic Action: that every man in a trade group is obliged to belong to the union in his trade; and that the academic group must take an apostolic stand on this, no matter what danger lies ahead for a permanent teaching position.

So run the usual statements of union-minded teachers. There is the further fact that, broadly speaking, a strike is accepted today by many people as an ordinary thing and something just and proper whenever it occurs. The very frequency of its use has induced this public attitude. Widespread interest identifies it as the core of the famous *Rerum Novarum* of Pope Leo XIII. No large study of the matter is as yet evident in manuals of morals; yet, what there is inclines one toward a certain careful stepping among the many distinctions and limitations imposed by the masters of the subject.

An excellent definition is found in the *Code of Labor* of the Republic of Costa Rica, published on August 26, 1943, after submission to and approval by a board of Roman canonists.

A legal strike shall signify a temporary stoppage of work in any enterprise, called with the consent of three or more workers exclusively for the improvement or defense of their common economic or social concerns. (Title 364, translated from Spanish.)

Three factors stand out in that definition. The political strike is excluded. Strikes aiming to realize the *interests* of the workers are distinguished from those called to defend their *rights*. There is in both the right to bargain through workstoppage when employers refuse collective bargaining; but in the interest strike there is no antecedent right to this or that result, while in the defense strike justice is involved in recovery of the rights thwarted.

Strikes fall into classification according to their incidence. There is the work-stoppage in offices of government, between officials and the sovereign power, as in the post office, army, police, courts, prisons, hos-



pitals and other vital State services. Then, in the public services, there is the stoppage of transport, electricity and light, water, milk, bread, telephones. Father Oscar Alvarez, S. J., in *La Cuestion Social en Mexico, El Trabajo*, (Mexico, 1950. Page 174), the latest and one of the best manuals on the ethics of labor disputes, states that these two types of strike ought to be absolutely prohibited on moral grounds. Codes of Labor in Catholic countries do so prohibit for the reasons that a) this kind of strike does immeasurable harm far beyond any good sought by a union, and b) it violates the principle that bad means may not be used for good ends, in that it attacks the employer through his public rather than directly against the supposed wrong-doer. The third class embraces a multitude of actions against industries, commercial enterprises and private services. Where university professors belong in these categories is part of the state of the question.

Strikes are generally considered—cf. for example, Merkelbach, *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, II, 587—as economic civil wars carried out in an area where public law does not compel specified quantities or agreements between competing parties. If these wars are to be just, they must conform to correct principles on the *double effect*, *material cooperation*, *violation of right*, and *probability*. Thus if, in this matter, the opinion favoring the strike be probably right, and yet the action would necessarily entail the violation of *certain* rights of a third party, the strike could not be licitly called. It is because of these apparent difficulties that Merkelbach (*ibid.*),—with Tanqueray, Alvarez (*ibid.*) and many others, echoing *Rerum Novarum*,—declares:

Practically speaking and in view of the concrete circumstances, even *defensive* strikes are not easily proven licit, on account of the many and grave evils—both material and moral—that they ordinarily bring upon workingmen, owners and the entire community.

A strike is licit when it is carried on

1. By fit persons, namely those engaged in commerce or industry and not bound by oath or vow to carry out the work.
2. In an operation against which it is ethical to strike. (See the first and second classes of strikes *supra*.)
3. In circumstances that are proper, namely:
  - a) without violence to person or property rights,
  - b) with solid probability of succeeding in the aim sought in the strike's call,
  - c) with the good results overbalancing the concomitant evils,
  - d) against the owners of the business itself, not against an outside party or the public. For then one would do wrong to an in-



nocent party in order to gain a good end—a repugnant idea in morals.

- e) in the absence of a contract. The contract of work is a bilateral contract and binding in justice as long as it persists, and may be changed only by consent of both parties.
- 4. For a good purpose and one related to the business itself in which the workers are employed. A strike against a business may not be called to gain an alien good, for example, to put pressure on other businesses, to aid the cause of workers in another concern, to gain prestige or profit for officials in unions, and especially to join the class war. The theory that workers naturally oppose the owners is Marxian. (Indeed they should take a deep interest in their fellow-workers and support them, but not as enemies of owners or "oppressors." The organic character of society is a basic fact in Catholic morality.)

How do these principles affect the strike of university professors? What is a university?

A university is a special kind of enterprise. At Bologna it was called a union of professors and students associated for the instruction of youth. Its end is the removal of ignorance and the growth of knowledge and wisdom, so that to the Catholic mind it is a high work of mercy. What funds it finds are for its fabric, its clients, its staff. The heart of the university is its teaching corps, and all other officers and assistants cluster round the work of instruction. The classic picture is Mark Hopkins at one end of a log and a student at the other: that is a university. No sale of product goes on, for the product is the very life of the teacher; it is himself, the projection of his personality in action. Newman once asked why students go up to a university instead of a library where they could read all that a professor might say. They go there to contact the living embodiment of wisdom and knowledge, and from that contact to acquire similar virtue by an osmotic process that non-chemists call "imitation." The teacher, though, never gets back an equivalent for what he gives. His work is professional, not commercial. His ethics rests on his position of service to his fellowman. And in like manner the university rests on him. He and his colleagues know, by supposition, how and what to teach. Their collective views, as transmitted upward through departmental conference and higher council meetings, are enforced by executive decision, as are their norms of stipend, tenure and rank. They formulate academic policy, and rely on their directive officers to put it into practice.

A union of teachers within a university that is not identical with the entire faculty and administration would seem destructive of the unity so



essential to a teaching staff. Indeed the idea of a faculty is that of a union in itself. The name of university in its origin connotes a guild. In Paris it elected the Rector, made rules for classes and the conferring of degrees, defended the *Studium Generale* against hostile forces inside the *universitas* and without. And with a few changes in language, this is also true of a Jesuit university. Whoever acts against such a society in an organized way, such as a strike, would appear to be a revolutionary, and in the whole law of corporations—both civil and moral—deserving of exclusion.

It is surely supposed here that there is a true faculty (not a faculty merely in name which is in reality a group of subjects ruled by an absolute power). If, for example, the lay faculty is totally excluded from contributing to policy: if they are dealt with as non-members and simply daily workers, if they direct no departments, have no voice in decisions, sit in no councils; then the entire parallel collapses. But if they be in actuality part of the faculty, it seems unreasonable that the totality would willingly undergo intolerable conditions which a fraction cites as sufficient reason for a strike, or even for a union without strike intention, (though, contrary to Father Cronin, it seems that such a union is visionary.) That fraction would be declared at war with its society. And this is recognized in another matter by the A. A. U. P. which, for instance, served notice that it would not recommend "contract-jumpers" if they were certified to it in provable form.

From a fresh standpoint, the university as a juridical entity stands as a public thing, both in power to grant degrees and in its fiduciary character by which it is entrusted with material means so as to educate its public. Its trustees have a real function; they are not titular non-entities. It lives entirely under the laws of corporations. It must answer to the State for its acts: for funds it receives to further its work; for its satisfactory performance in teaching; for care of its external fabric; for the right to sue or be sued. It is under the police power of the State for the decency of its teachings, though not for its academic curriculum and method. Its executive receives from the State the power to order studies, students and professors toward the proper granting of degrees, to disburse its material and immaterial goods so as to preserve the good status of its teaching function. Strike action against such a body should at once go to the courts.

Again, a contract to teach includes provisions for increase in stipend and in academic rank and tenure. It retains to the executive the right of judgment as to the qualifications of teachers: their fidelity to duty, unity and good will toward their colleagues, soundness of doctrine and method



of instruction, behavior within and outside the school, and support of the good name of the institution committed to them by society.

Moreover a strike against the administration, or a stoppage of teaching, would be more accurately an action against the students and the university-public, in the expectation that the latter would take action against the administration and force it to yield to the demands of the strike.

Nor could a strike carry on without serious scandal. It would present the public with a picture of open break in the school. It would diminish confidence in the professional ideals of the university and thus injure its good name, so much needed for its work.

Finally, in a university under the direction of the Society of Jesus, the professors are subject to the jurisdiction of the superior by particular ecclesiastical law. That law the public law of the United States would uphold, as one can see plainly from the many similar cases decided in the Supreme Court. One who operates under ecclesiastical law is bound by that same law and custom, in as far as the civil tribunal will find.

It appears, then, that a strike of university professors has no standing before the bar of morals, and may not occur in a society that makes claim to operate under the standard of rights. What preventive medicine should be applied is beyond the purpose of this paper. There is a plain lesson to develop and carry on a true faculty life, and at the same time to see that symptoms of trouble be spotted and medicated.



# Joseph Jouvancy

## Jesuit Teacher

VICTOR ALET, S.J.<sup>1</sup>

In his catalogue of writers of the century of Louis XIV, Voltaire wrote the following lines: "Jouvancy, Jesuit, born at Paris in 1643. He has the rather dubious merit of writing in a Latin style that is as perfect as our day has seen. His book, *Ratio Discendi et Docendi*, is one of the best of its type since Quintillian, but too little known. In 1710 at Rome he also published a partial history of his order. Living in Rome, he wrote this as a Jesuit and as a Roman. The parliament of Paris, which thinks little of Rome and Jesuits, condemned this book. In it Fr. Guignard was justified. He has been condemned to death by this same parliament for the assassination of Henry IV by a schoolboy called Chatel. It is true that Guignard was no accomplice and that he was judged too strictly, but it is no less true that this rigor was necessary in these unhappy times when part of Europe, blinded by a horrible fanaticism, regarded the stabbing of the best of kings and the best of men as an act of religion. Jouvancy died in 1719."

This judgement of Voltaire on Father-Joseph Jouvancy is superficial and certainly not in line with the reputation of *Ratio Discendi et Docendi* which is known today as a classic. Without too much effort Voltaire might have been able to say something better about the humanist who made one of the greatest contributions to public education in the Europe of his day. There is little value in "writing an impossible language as well as possible." Little value too is there in writing a good book but one unknown and useless after Quintillian's, (as if there were nothing in common between the *Institutiones* of Quintillian and the *Ratio* of Jouvancy.) Finally, rightly to be condemned is this judgment that condones the condemnation of a poor religious who was neither a criminal nor an accomplice. (It is genuine historical blindness to suggest that Fr. Guignard was judged a "bit rigorously.") Poor Jouvancy! Or rather poor Voltaire with his daring affirmations, his flippant tone, his views so lively, so independent, so ironical, so hypocritically indignant!

We do not ask Voltaire if parliaments are justified in thinking little of

---

<sup>1</sup>This is a translation by Father Morton A. Hill, S.J. of "Un Professeur d'Autrefois," by Victor Alet, S.J., *Etudes Religieuses Historiques et Littéraires*, V, 27, 2. (1872), p. 745. Though somewhat dated, this article was considered worth reprinting in translation as the best obtainable biography of this much praised but little known Jesuit teacher.



Rome and Jesuits. Rome and even Jesuits, in spite of all their disasters, are still very much alive. But fortunately, the day is already far gone when every word of the great mocker was a prophecy and every one of his judgments a decision without appeal. No longer do even prejudiced men of no critical sense dare to call Voltaire "the prince of our historians" without smiling.

This is an example of Voltaire's critical judgement even when he is driven by no particular malice. Such an example, however, is but a by-product of our work. Our aim is much broader. We want to give a rapid picture of the life and works of Jouvancy. We want to reconstruct the personality of a hard working and devoted professor, a man holy and learned, a perfect realization of the ideal traced in the institute of St. Ignatius. It is doubtful whether the history of the Society presents a more perfect model of a man. Even Jesuit enemies and rivals often testify to the worth of his productions and to his personal goodness. Almost all Europe adopted his works. The University of Paris and especially the University of France have cleverly taken over his editions of the classics and after two centuries of investigation, present day pedagogy is often content to translate or abridge his notes and remarks. They reproduce his work with changes which are not always for the better.

## I

Toward the end of the seventeenth century the Jesuits had four houses in Paris. They had the College of Clermont, the Professed house of St. Anthony whose beautiful church had been enriched by an elegant facade, the gift of Richelieu. Near the Seine and close to the Louvre they also had a retreat house. Finally, not far from St. Sulpice they had a novitate with a beautiful chapel that was commonly called the "jewel of the capital." Today not even the ruins remain.

On the first of September in 1659 a young Parisian left the world and went to knock on the door of this last house. He was not yet sixteen. He was born in 1643 of a good and distinguished family. His father was a doctor. Young Jouvancy appears to have followed the courses at the college of Clermont from his earliest childhood. Clermont was later to become the principal theater of his zeal and glory. Certainly he knew many famous French Jesuits and possibly even had one of their greats as a teacher of literature. He took to the life of prayer, work and sacrifice as he freely offered his generous will and precocious talent to the army of Christ. The gate of the Novitiate closed behind him as he put on his black habit and daringly applied himself to the spiritual struggle, the secret work of interior reformation. He had to purify his taste, elevate



his motives, direct all his thoughts toward the glory of God, at the same time enlarging his intelligence and his heart. The Novitiate is the first normal school a Jesuit attends and probably the best possible normal school that can be found though few students of the Society understand this.

We are forced to treat this phase of Jouvancy's life briefly for he has left us few, if any, traces of these days. Before his death he left some precious spiritual writings with strict orders that they be destroyed. These have never been published. In them we find all the movements of his soul, his practices of devotion, his faults, his combats, his victories, all carefully preserved. But no document initiates us in his secret experiences of the Novitiate. All that can be said is that to judge Jouvancy by his writings, by his career and especially by this manuscript notes to which we have just referred, he must have shown in the beginning a solid mind that was precise and brilliant, an amiable and lively character, and upright and generous soul, a scrupulous fidelity to rule, a great love of work and a constant striving to use every minute.

After his two years of probation he bound himself to the Society by his first vows in the beginning of September, 1661. He was transferred at once from the Noviceship to the college of Clermont where he devoted two full years to the study of philosophy, his eighteenth and nineteenth years. During the first year the catalogues show him among the "logicians", during the second year among the "physicists". This was the current terminology. In 1663 at the age of twenty we find him in the College of Compiègne teaching, the fifth class, lowest grammar. There he passed five full years and, following a custom of great value, he taught the same class up to rhetoric.

## II

What did he make of his first period of teaching which was to take the best years of his youth and which was to exercise a decisive influence on the general direction of his life? In reply we have three elegant latin letters which he sent to Fr. Labbe as well as the *Ratio Discendi et Docendi*, though he wrote this work later. His purpose in the *Ratio* was to give scholastics of the society a method of imparting a classical formation to the boys entrusted to them. Everything leads one to believe that this excellent work, to which Rollin himself has given such high praise, presents either as directives or as suggestions, the methods universally practiced by the Society in his time. Our young teacher himself was no exception. Consequently, this period of teaching exercised no small effect on his personal interests.



First he applied himself vigorously to the Greek language, studying from the grammar which Labbe had used so effectively twenty years earlier. He read the best of the Greek classics in prose and verse until he lost himself in their spirit. Jouvancy tells us that with ordinary talent and one hour of work a day two years would be enough to acquire what he calls, "*aliqua sermonis Graeci facultas*", provided one had a good teacher. But after reproducing one of Jouvancy's letters we can scarcely visualize his resting content with a superficial knowledge of Greek literature. We know to what extent he caught the language secrets of Homer and Demosthenes from the excellence of a work published in 1681, the "*Apparatus Graeco-Latinus*". Since he declared it a shame for a Jesuit not to have at least skimmed Pindar and the tragedians, how could he have dispensed himself from studying even these most difficult of poets? Jouvancy believed in Virgil's celebrated "*A teneris assuescere multum est*" to the extent that he was convinced one must learn Greek in one's youth or never learn it.

But the language of Rome had to march apace with the language of Athens. Even more sustained efforts and endeavors are required for a mastery of Latin. We might here briefly recall some of Jouvancy's techniques which are so precisely developed in his *Ratio Discendi et Docendi*.

First exercise: Give a brief summary of a passage from Cicero or translate it into the mother tongue. Then let the students put this passage into latin and compare it with the model. This exercise will develop a vocabulary and give them an insight to the structure of the language.

Second exercise: Analyze a discourse, noting only the plan of development and the main ideas. Have the boys assemble a new piece from the outline. This exercise will give boys confidence and little by little initiate them into the secrets of artistic writing.

Third exercise: Imitate an author by copying his phrases, his figures, his cadences, but develop a new topic or a topic that merely resembles the model. This exercise will stimulate creative writing. After a mastery of this kind of writing one can fly on one's own wings.

Jouvancy's rule was to never let a day pass without writing. "*Faciendum nulla ut dies sine aliqua scriptione nobis abeat*". Even though his work may have been somewhat mechanical, it was vivified by constant reading, reflection, as well as note taking from all the great Latin authors. Is it difficult to understand how he attained mastery of Cicero and Virgil after a few years?

Nor did he ever neglect his mother tongue even though he never gave it his full attention. Faithful to the *Ratio Studiorum*, from time to time



he worked out vernacular translations. He tried to speak with perfect diction and was careful to turn out exact phrases that carried his precise meaning. Although many classics had already been written in the vernacular by 1670, Jouvancy probably read but few works in his mother tongue. He strictly warned students against escape literature; explaining that this did more harm than good. He was convinced from the writings of contemporaries that one did not have to study vernacular models to develop a vernacular style. Perhaps he even anticipated that French literature, in spite of its marvelous achievements in every field, would be thoroughly impoverished and would progressively lose its natural originality and power in proportion as it separated itself from Greek and Latin sources from which it had borrowed its treasures for so long. Actually the experience of the following centuries justified his fears only too well. Certainly Jouvancy's views were not challenged by de Maistre in his classic letter on public education in Russia. He explains how Russia was often not stressed in school. "It is only in rhetoric", he comments, "that Russians begin to use the mother tongue with skill because they understand what is universally true, that the past must be studied before the present, especially in the matter of artistic expression". Surely this same method has not been a failure in France.

Jouvancy's knowledge extended into many fields. As a kind of past-time he studied history and geography, heraldry, epigraphy and symbolism. His knowledge of these fields was clear and precise even though not that of an expert. Jouvancy always said it was the mature man who ought to give himself to these fine points which are always helpful in the study of literature and sometimes quite necessary. In a graceful passage he advised, "On vacation days you will enjoy giving some of your time to history and geography. Read Petavius. Steal a little leisure for the best writings of the mother tongue. They will enliven holiday trips through the country". This is the way hard working men make the best even of leisure! How well he understood and practiced, "*Noscere omnes, excellere in una*".

After this brief review of his attitudes on knowledge, three of his hitherto unedited letters will perhaps be found to take on a new interest. All three are sent from Compiègne to his friend Fr. Labbe, then prefect of the college of Clermont. Certainly this veteran, a scholar in so many branches, noticed or sensed the talent of the young professor and encouraged, perhaps even directed, his first efforts. These letters show Jouvancy to have been a man of great intellectual stature as well as a refined and cultured religious. They are written in beautiful Ciceronian style.

The first is dated July 7, 1665. The young professor of the fourth



class in the college of Compiègne does not want to see the scholastic year close without a few words of gratitude to his priest friend in Paris. He warmly congratulates his Clermont professor for several successful speeches he had given and for an excellent poem which he had just published. He closed, disappointed that a certain Fr. Denys, who has been promised to Compiègne, had not been able to come. He describes the nice things about his own college, the garden, the scenery, the view of the village. This is the most lively and joyous part of a letter written with much spirit and warmth.

The second letter is dated October 31, 1665. Jouvancy has just been named professor of the third class. After having congratulated his former teacher for his literary achievements at the opening of the school year, he describes the more simple opening of his own school. On Sunday, the feast of St. Luke, the professor of rhetoric had given a public address on the value of history. On Monday, the professor of the second class spoke of the spirit of the world. Tonight it was Jouvancy. He read a poem on the eldest son of the French king. After a series of details that give a good inside view of life within a Jesuit college of the period, Jouvancy explains to Fr. Labbe with the utmost simplicity his plans for his own class and asks his more experienced friend for guidance and help. This letter is a touching example of the sweet and simple friendships in religion which join together the fire of youth and the wisdom of age with great profit to both.

The last letter is of less importance. It is dated January 13, 1666 and merely contains a new year's greeting. Even this, however, is in choice Latin phrases. The postscript extends greetings to several religious who later become more or less famous. The note added by the Rector is an indication of the simplicity that characterized the men of that century.<sup>2</sup>

About the time Jouvancy composed a poem on the art of speech, called "De, Pronuntiatione, Carmen." If he is not the author, at least he transcribed it completely by hand. We have the autograph in his own writing. The poem has 400 verses. We do not believe it has ever been printed. It deals with a little known event in the life of St. Francis Xavier. The first twenty-three lines describe a sermon of Xavier. Though his hearers understood not a single word, the saint touched their hearts and brought them to the gospel. The key lines read as follows:

"Turba loquentem,  
quamvis illa nihil verborum intelligat, audit  
miraturque . . ."

---

<sup>2</sup>(Translator's note. These letters are reproduced in their entirety in the *Etudes* article from which this translation was taken.)



One can form one's own opinion of this extraordinary eloquence where surely the Holy Spirit had more part than man but it is evident that the verse flows along nicely and the idea is well expressed.

Jouvancy spent only five years at Compiègne. In 1668 we find him at La Fleche with the title of tutor. He then made his four years of theology at Paris. Ordained priest in 1672 at the age of twenty-nine, he taught rhetoric again at Caen for two consecutive years. In 1675 he made tertianship at Rouen. He returned to the college of La Fleche in 1676. In 1677 at the beginning of his thirty-fifth year he was appointed to teach rhetoric at Clermont where he remained until 1699, a period of twenty-two years.

### III

Perhaps this would be the place to study Jouvancy, the teacher. We have no doubt but that he knew more than enough. Knowledge, however, and the ability to teach are two different qualities. Such an erudite scholar could be a mediocre or even a poor teacher. Such, however, was not the case. A mediocre teacher would never have had the same grade for so long a time. Jouvancy's fame as a teacher perdures to this day. While his *Ratio Docendi* traces out the portrait of a finished professor, it also serves to present a picture of the ideal for which he himself constantly strove. This educational classic gives us an insight as to how its author worked to inspire his boys to grow in knowledge of God and man.

But we do not want to analyze the second part of Jouvancy's work. Is there an outstanding Jesuit teacher who has not listed to Jouvancy's advice on developing habits of silence, regularity and concentration in the boys under their charge? Few Jesuit teachers there are who have not studied his excellent prelection models and attempted to imitate them. Jouvancy's initiation into the secrets of great teaching is done with great care as he presents the step by step procedure of good Latin teaching. Well known too is the moving prayer which he composed for his students. He urges every teacher to recite this before the Blessed Sacrament on the way to class. Well known too the litanies which he made of the Baptismal names of his pupils in order to commend them often to their patron saints. Such is the spirit of Christ-like teachers.

But perhaps it is useless, even annoying to insist on these things. Our preference is for exterior facts, unfortunately too rare for the biographer of Jouvancy since his routine life of teaching was rarely interrupted.

It was only on the day classes opened that teachers of the higher courses broke away from the silence of their scholarly lives to speak to the public



and demonstrate that their aim of powerful oratory was not an idle dream. Jouvancy appears to have given his first Latin discourse at Caen in 1673 at the age of thirty. He spoke about recent French military victories and especially that of Maestricht. Jouvancy made his first appearance at Paris in 1678 where he captured everyone's attention. His theme at Paris was that Flanders, already half conquered by French armies, must be under the complete control of France. Occasions like this bound the Jesuit College close to France.

Jouvancy's fifteen academic speeches were published in one volume in 1701 by Fr. Le Jay, the Jesuit who succeeded Jouvancy as chaplain to King Louis. In the article "Jouvancy" in the *Biographie universelle de Michaud*, we read: "The subjects of his discourses are hardly interesting but a beautiful style makes up for the lack of substance." The rest of the article is sufficiently praiseworthy of Jouvancy's achievements. With due apologies to the author, however, and in the interest of truth, we must say that this judgment is not based on the reading of these speeches. We grant they were written for delivery before great crowds, we grant that Jouvancy spoke of contemporary events, we grant that a reading of his speeches cannot excite the same enthusiasm created on their initial delivery. Yet every one of them gives us a faithful and interesting insight into the mentality of the period. They are not biased in spite of the panegyric form. They concern significant historical events whose true nature was often colored by political feeling. Some concern national topics, others are more general. The tone is always elevated and they are full of interest to a Frenchman.

In the fourteenth of these speeches, given before the king in 1698, his theme was the mutual relationship existing between the Church and France since the time of Clovis. Truthful and brilliant was his development of the providential destiny and the eminently Catholic Mission of France, a most dear daughter of the Church. No little courage was required to recall these memories before a powerful king whom a Gallican vision of absolute power had often blinded. Jouvancy was well aware that his king had often forgotten the noble example of Charlemagne and St. Louis in matters pertaining to the Holy See. This point, however, has already been treated thoroughly in this periodical. (*Etudes*, Dec. 1866, Marquigney.)

Another discourse of patriotic interest is that given in 1690 in which Jouvancy makes it clear that France ought to take care of the education of the young Duke of Bourgogne. Fenelon was present on the occasion, having been a teacher of the prince. He had made Jouvancy promise that he would not praise him. But the talented professor was able to make a



graceful reference to this very promise, the delicacy of which did great honor to both men.

The sixth discourse too is of great interest. His theme here was a grave error of the day, the danger of giving too much intellectual recognition to the Reformers. He delivered this in 1683, evidently directing his words against the Jansenists and their followers. He attacks them as a philosopher, a grammarian and as a theologian; for Port-Royal had pretended discoveries to remake everything, from the dogmas of grace to new methods of teaching. Jouvancy shows that they are often forced to translate into French whatever they have that is good, in translations less appealing than the original Latin. Jouvancy points out all the weaknesses of Jansenism, an ideology of shallow-thinking young students with time on their hands, men who understood not a word of the subjects discussed though they showed themselves vigorous champions of the reformers.

These three speeches taken together give some interesting data on Jansenism. Add to them a few sermons of Bourdaloue and a few of de Maistre's chapters on Port Royal from his *Gallican Church* and one can gain a rather thorough knowledge of this school which stressed so much the role of nature. But the point we make now is that these scattered examples show there were few dull spots in Jouvancy's speeches.

At the time Jouvancy left for Rome in 1699, Fr. La Jay, his successor to the King, took great pains to see that Jouvancy's works were published.

The year 1681 was a memorable one for the college of Clermont. Louis honored the College by his presence at a Latin tragedy produced by the boys, probably under the direction of Jouvancy. At the highpoint of the play, when everyone was in suspense and all hearts were moved, a gentleman next to the king cried out, "This is marvelous!" "Why not?", replied the king, "This is my college." The college actually took the name of Louis the Great and the King constituted himself its titular founder.

We have nothing more to say or to conjecture as to Jouvancy's public career. In 1682 his title in the Province Catalogue read, "Professor of Rhetoric, Director of the Congregation for externs." These were the occupations that took his time and left him precious little leisure. At this time of the Society's history, literary academies of the higher classes were frequently directed by retired professors who had grown old in the classroom. These eminent men, once of great name, exercised great influence on the young. Students were most eager for their direction. They realized the great opportunity afforded by the Jesuit academy. The system in use gave the boys the opportunity of having the finest teachers and at the same time released the active faculty from the burdensome task of supervising the academies.



## IV

We must now speak of Jouvancy's publications in the field of classics which came from his pen in a steady stream from the year 1681. The first of these publications is a work of philology, a Greek-Latin dictionary, with a title which should be transcribed in its entirety, *Novus apparatus Graecolatinus cum interpretatione gallica, ex Isocrate, Demostene aliisque praecipuis auctoribus Graecis concinnatus, in quo exquisitissimae phrasae et reconditorum locutionum deliciae, ad elegantiam et ornatum utriusque linguae, diligentissimo plurium annorum studio atque indefesso labore insertae sunt . . . ab uno e Societate Jesu.*

It might be noted that Jouvancy's name does not appear. We might note too the important words of the title, "this carefully planned work, many years in the making . . .". This dictionary is one of the best in existence today, possibly the best. Its purpose is to initiate students into the writing of the classical languages, especially the language of Demosthenes. It is not a dry collection of words like other famous lexicons. For every important word there is a series of choice expressions, almost always selected from Cicero and translated into a well turned Greek that is patterned on the best writers. The promise of the title is justified, namely, ". . . carefully chosen expressions from both tongues . . .". One need only open this dictionary to feel how useful a work it is. It contains the very best of Jouvancy's fine ideas and their expression, gathered from the ancient classics since the early days of his regency. Moreover, since his aim was practical, he carefully placed the French equivalent next to each Latin word. Thus, less advanced students who needed help could use his dictionary. At the same time the work itself was not too large. We think it a conservative judgment that the reprinting of this work, with the necessary changes, would be a real benefit to classical students. Nor should one be astonished that so eminent a man should deal with grammar and vocabulary. He sought the greater glory of God and His Mother but underlying this was the conviction that many moderns do not share, that grammar is the indispensable foundation of all great literature. Fortunately this is still an elementary principle of the Society of Jesus.

La Rue published his Virgil in 1675. Ten years later Jouvancy published an expurgated and annotated edition of Juvenal and Perseus. Two years later another edition followed. A third edition is dated 1697; a fourth, 1702. This was published in Venice and is to be considered Jouvancy's last word on Juvenal and Perseus. It was reprinted in Rouen by the Lallemand Brothers while the author was still alive.

We are not the ones who have to determine the worth of Jouvancy's editions of the classics. History has already passed a judgment which can-



not be recalled. His erudition was unerring, vast and well balanced. His expression was neat and precise. His insight into a text was always penetrating. Almost always his comment will give the true sense of a text and the most delicate shade of meaning. These are some of the superior qualities of editions which have earned the esteem of Europe. Modern research and the discoveries of modern philologists have not by any means completely superseded them. Critics agree that his Latin interpretation of Latin authors maintains a happy medium between a verbal paraphrase and a word for word rendition.

We also have the opinion of de Maistre as to the worth of Jouvancy's editions. Surely de Maistre's competence in this field is uncontested. He himself had been educated in accord with methods used before the Revolution and was profoundly learned in classical literature. In his well written pages on the Gallican church from which we have already quoted, de Maistre compares the methods of teaching used by the Society of Jesus and the methods used by the Jansenists. After a quick enumeration of the classical works of the Jesuits, a list begun by the Latin grammar of Alvarez and closed by the small catechism of Canisius, he continues in these words: "It is only just to recall the editions of the Latin poets produced by the Jesuits. They added a simple translation in Latin prose and certain notes to explain the text. The editions were surely the best method cultured men have yet devised to impart the classical tradition. Whoever understands a text only by recourse to a dictionary or by a vernacular translation, must admit to himself that he is almost a total stranger to the language of the text since he understands it only in his own language. All kinds of discouragement springs from this source. But he who understands Greek and Latin by means of Greek and Latin themselves, far from being discouraged, is constantly encouraged by his double success in understanding the text through the interpretation. I admit one must taste this success before becoming convinced. I realize that the idea of these translations is not new and that ancient grammarians had employed them to teach Greek to Greeks. However, without examining whether Jesuit editors drew their idea from other sources, we must admit they deserve credit for making use of a very philosophical method and for having made excellent use of it."

These ideas, so simple yet so fresh coming as they do from so great a writer, should make us stop to think. We too believe in the method advocated by Jouvancy. It does not take long before one can see the usefulness and the practical possibilities of this system, so highly recommended in our *Ratio* and followed for a long time in our colleges, a system used with great effectiveness by people like La Rue and many others in their valu-



able commentaries on Virgil and Cicero. Today line by line translations are used, sometimes even inter-line translations. This means less work for teacher and student, but results are disastrous. The mind is little by little cut off from the beauties of the ancient languages. The result is an overpowering distaste for books which one is supposed to have mastered.

An expurgated edition of Terence appeared in 1687 and was reprinted six or seven times before Jouvancy's death. Here again let us quote de Maistre: "What a debt we owe," he writes, "toward those learned religious for their corrected editions which they produced with so much toil and with such good taste. In the first centuries the classics were so corrupt that the first writings of Virgil, the wisest of the writers, shocked parents who saw their children reading them. The painstaking chemistry which disinfected these beverages before presenting them to the lips of the innocent is vastly superior to that of Port Royal."

We must make no mistake as to Jouvancy's purpose in publishing his Terence. He never pretended that the Menander of the Romans was able to become a class author. He would have been the first to protest against certain modern universities which dared to print the text of certain of his comedies, for example *Andria*, in accord with the custom of certain youthful scholars. Jouvancy was faithful to tradition and to the rules of his order on this point. He only wanted to render acceptable one of the finest Latin poets so that all might read him.

The motives of this learned religious editor become more intelligible when Jouvancy's preface is recalled. According to Cicero, Ovid, Caesar and Horace, the most perfect model of Latinity is none other than Terence, "*auctor optimus latinitatis*." Of particular interest in this regard is the letter of Bossuet to Pope Innocent XI on the education of the crown prince. The great bishop expresses himself thus: "It is hard to express how much pleasure and usefulness his majesty finds in Terence . . . In his reading the prince observed manners of great variety and characters of all temperaments as well as of all ages. How well Terence depicted character before his eyes! How well he portrayed natural feelings! What charm and propriety he saw in Terence! However, not everything is to be pardoned in this diverting poet! His licentious passages merit a just rebuke! Yet we must admit our astonishment that so many moderns write with much less reserve. It is this type of writing we criticize as destructive of sound morality."

When such a great bishop does not judge it beneath his dignity to criticize the comedies of Terence to the Holy See, there is no reason for astonishment that a religious should feel it his duty to purify this precious classic and render it inoffensive. Would we not rejoice to see Plautus



undergo a like purification? Then the pearls cast before swine could be recovered. Perhaps such a correction of Plautus would be impossible.

Before we leave Jouvancy's Terence, we ought to note an accompanying work that treats of versification, very often a difficult subject in Latin comedy. This clear and revealing little treatise has been reproduced by editors of Terence down to our own day. Also remarkable is his treatment of lyrical meters which is found in the beginning of his expurgated edition of Horace.

This novel edition of Horace appeared from the pen of Jouvancy in 1688. It is as valuable as any other of his works. Everyone knows that Jouvancy was the man who definitely fixed the classical text of the Latin lyric. Since his edition no one has attempted a further expurgation nor have there been any complaints at the slight changes, always for the better, which he occasionally introduced.

In this matter of censure it is interesting to note that he became more exacting at Rome than he had been in France. In the Roman edition of 1702 which Jouvancy himself checked, certain suppressions and alterations of the text are seen which he had previously judged unnecessary. It was this last edition of Horace, quite superior to the first, that was reprinted in Rouen in 1709 and 1711 by the Lallemant Brothers. It was this edition which was used exclusively by our colleges. It was also imitated or rather copied for the students of the University of Paris, less often, however, than the edition of 1688. We will say nothing about more recent editors except that in general (and this applies also to these who rightly pass for conscientious) they have limited themselves to translating the notes of Jouvancy, sometimes abridging them, sometimes adding undigested remarks that are of no worth. Moreover, we can say this without fear: except for a very small number of texts for which modern scholarship has produced more correct readings, true understanding of Horace has not advanced a step since the 17th century. As a matter of fact, certain contemporary translations might even justify the statement that Horace is less understood. Here we might again quote de Maistre, who, cites one of the great German Hellenists, Gottlieb Hermann, "It is a great error to believe that only of late the foundations for a good Greek grammar have been laid. . . . We will hear Homer and Plato no better than our ancestors and as well as our successors."

Jouvancy published his Martial five years after his Horace in 1693. This was also reprinted at Rome without any notable changes. The preface, though too long to be produced here in its entirety, seems to us to be a little classic in itself. Jouvancy first mentioned previous works, especially those of Fr. Rodelle, a Jesuit, who had preceded him in the publication



of an edition of Horace and had also corrected many books of Martial. Rodelle is outstanding for his penetrating insight and especially for a certain fearlessness of interpretation which have won for him a distinguished place among critics. His Parisian confrere, however, has completely eclipsed his reputation. After having paid tribute to preceding commentators, Jouvancy explains his own aim and traces out his own plan. He has pruned away, he says, all grammatical questions which readers do not expect to be clarified. His titles and notes are developed only enough to understand the text. Finally, he drew up three tables, the first an alphabetical table of all the epigrams contained in the volume; the second is a table of the same epigrams arranged under different titles, i.e. epigrams destined to serve as epitaphs, epigrams against the avaricious and envious; the third is a table of contents especially of matter explained in the notes. It became a custom of Jouvancy to compose a similar index for all his editions. Finally, he insisted with the greatest determination that nothing be admitted into the text which might in the least trouble the imagination or upset the hearts of the young.

The year following 1693 saw the successive appearance of many works of Cicero. These formed a unit for the third grammar class and contained the three books concerning the Offices, the famous dialogues on old age and friendship, the paradoxes and the dream of Scipio. This time Jouvancy was satisfied to borrow from the commentaries of a 16th century writer, Peter Marso; yet he added much and produced an edition as good as any of his others. About this time he also published the first Philippic of Demosthenes with a Latin translation and collection of notes. This was reprinted in 1744 with a French translation. From the time of Jouvancy Greek was often explained in Latin. This method had the advantage of keeping the student in a classical atmosphere. He had to exert himself, yet his task was rendered less difficult.

The last of Jouvancy's classical editions was that of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* which appeared for the first time in Rome in 1704. It was dedicated to Charles Albani, nephew of Pope Clement XI. Jouvancy continued according to his usual procedure though this edition is distinguished by the famous appendix concerning the gods and poetic heroes, so often reprinted along with editions of Horace and Virgil and translated into French under the general title of a *Summer of Mythology* for those who do not know much Latin. The Society has two reasons for not making this a class text. First, although the Latin was perfectly correct, it was by no means a safe model. Second, it was not right that boys should give their complete attention to infamous pagan mythology, however reserved the treatment might be. Jouvancy's whole purpose was to give students



the necessary help to understand the classics, but his book was to be used only in time of need much as one uses a dictionary. The unfortunate idea of editing the *Summary of Mythology* for a class text for the lower grammar classes came not from the Society but from certain university professors.

Now that we are at the end of this review, one might inquire into the exact worth of those editions which cost Jouvancy so much labor. This question is easy to answer. Besides the purification of the pagan classics, his work had two other great values. The first was to give boys the right kind of help in the understanding of the classics without at the same time dispensing them from intellectual labor. The second value of his work, greater than the first, consisted in making boys love the classics in that they could read them easily and delightfully without a lexicon. This last point is to be insisted upon because it is closely connected with good teaching. A professor who has not aroused curiosity, a professor who has not inspired students with a desire to understand, a professor who has not given students a high esteem, a taste and a love for the classic authors studied, such a professor has accomplished nothing. No craftsman will deny this. But how can this eagerness and enthusiasm be stirred up? Will it be by themes or by translations or even by explanations of beautiful passages? A task that is artificial, in which one struggles against an impossible text to one's own boredom, cannot produce an ever growing love of the best in literature. A detached section of a classic, however beautiful, has no great interest. There must be contact with a great mind which is had only when an author's thought and ideal are grasped in their totality. Only this spirit of personalism can generate enthusiasm. This is what the best Jesuit professors have always known. This is what Bossuet so beautifully explained in his letter to Innocent XI which we previously quoted. Another passage of his has been recently quoted: "We did not think it advisable to have the prince read small sections of the classics, i.e. one book of Caesar or one book of the Aeneid. We made him read each work completely, at once and as if in one breath, in order that he might gradually accustom himself to consider not one thing in particular but the principle aim of the work and the connection of the parts. We are certain that sections of a work are never understood clearly. Parts are understood only as one understands the whole. A work of literature must be understood as one studies a building, understanding the whole design and the totality of the idea."

It might be retorted that this idea might be all right if a teacher has one student, not if he has forty or fifty. We reply from personal experience that there is room for delusion in this retort. There is no doubt that



not all students react the same way. Some will slip behind out of sloth, others because they are not talented; but, the greater number of boys are open to inspiration. Teachers should aim at this majority. A professor should love literature with all his heart and his boys more for God than for themselves. He ought to be devoted, not seeking self, with no personal ambition. He should create a religious atmosphere in the classroom. His assignments should not be multiplied, disconnected and beyond the age of the boys. If students find in their books and in their teacher something to inspire them, they will surely develop a taste for study and a love of the classics. This idea is not current today. We must return to tradition and some common sense.

### V

These reflections do not separate us from Jouvancy. He realized, or came close to realizing, the ideal we have just sketched. By his books, his Latin discourses, by the hundred other productions of his life that are too numerous to mention, by his studies of teaching methods which prevailed long before his time, by these means he drew his students to a marvelous love of the ancient classics, making the dead languages live, or should we say "immortal"?

In 1699 after twenty-five years of teaching, his superiors told him to prepare the Greek manuscripts in the king's library for publication. An order from Father General, however, drew him from this work to Rome to work on the history of the Society. From then on this was to be his chief work though he never completely separated himself from the classics. We have spoken of his revisions of almost all the editions of the classics and particularly of Ovid, the perfection of his work. In 1702 he composed an allegorical drama for the Roman college. Without pausing over any of his works of this time, we might finish our review by calling attention to two rather important publications which were done at Rome. The first is *Candidatus Rhetoricae*, a course of precepts and exercises for the second class. It has often been reprinted since. The second is an elementary work on poetry. These works are practical and full of examples. They contain no theory. Citations are from the best passages of the best authors. He wrote nothing of ideals, of the beautiful, of the philosophy of art. Young people cannot understand these things.

We must add a few words about Jouvancy, the historian of his order. His predecessors in this immense task were Orlandini and Sacchini who began the first five volumes. Jouvancy added the sixth, covering the years 1591 to 1616. It was published at Rome in 1720. We have already quoted Voltaire as to why the Paris Parliament condemned this book. Jouvancy



wrote with the concise brevity of Sallust, a style almost perfect for this type of work. In the midst of this work of sifting all kinds of documents, he found time to compose a short history of the Society in Latin. This work was published for the first time in 1844 in four volumes. He also translated several biographies of saints into Latin some of which are always unedited. In fact, this work of translating, which relaxed his mind in the midst of his more austere labors, was one of his favorite occupations even in early life. Many years before he had translated some of the theological dissertations of Fr. Daniel and especially his famous reply to Pascal's *Provinciales*.

We have only to inspect his personal notes on holiness. They form a book of sixty pages. Perhaps a patient biographer will some day be able to understand them completely though they are filled with abbreviations, some of which are quite puzzling. The writing is neat, almost straight up and down, in keeping with 17th century handwriting. They record intimate confidences between his soul and God. There are outbursts of love, confessions, regrets, memories, desires, hopes. Often too there are outlines of meditations, especially on the Holy Eucharist. Frequently he writes on the mysteries of the life of Jesus. The collection is outstanding for its eminently practical character. It is always Jouvancy who speaks. He is as methodical in his quest for holiness as he was for literary excellence. His life followed a plan from morning to night, from hour to hour. He records progress and failure. No negligence is excused. He constantly checks all the exercises of his religious life for fervor or tepidity. His notes are full of his efforts to control corrupt human nature, of victories over his tendencies, of energetic efforts at reform. The world would call his attention to these fine points of religious life a display of childishness, but it is attention to these things that lead to personality and holiness. The following passage is a sample: it deals with the dispositions one ought to have toward study. "Pray before you start. Pray from time to time during your work. Check your eagerness. What can you do of yourself? May I know you, O God, may I know myself. We must fight against vanity. The opinion of men is vain. What does it matter what is thought of one! For two reasons it is wrong to seek the good will of men. God loses for He is deprived of glory, we lose for we are deprived of a portion of our eternal reward. The good will of men is frivolous, a trifle, fickle, passing, uncertain. Lord my God, throne of holiness, seat of glory, give me of your wisdom that it may dwell with me."

When a whole life is animated by these thoughts, it is transformed, enriched, stamped with a simplicity and grandeur that is unknown to souls whom Christ has not touched with the breath of His grace.



The Annual letters of the French Province for 1719 contain a beautiful testimony to Jouvancy. It is eloquent in its brevity. We reproduce it in Latin lest we detract from the original. It could well be inscribed under statue of Jouvancy on the campus of a Catholic college. But do such men ever have statues?

*Josephus de Jouvancy obiit Romae 28a Maii. Hunc virum ingenii tum doctrinae, tum virtutis laude superiorem, Galliis invidit Roma. Hunc Gallia eloquentiae magistrum suspexerat; hunc Roma historiae nostrae scriptorem pari iure admirata est. Ubique vitae integer; sanctus aequae ac doctus habitus. Quos edidit libros veteres ab omni obscoenitate purgatos legere quisque amat; quos ipse suos edidit veteribus non impares quisque existimat.*



## Enrollment, 1950-1951, Jesuit Colleges and Universities

	Liberal Arts	Commerce						Law						Totals						Summer			
		Day	Night	Dentistry	Divinity	Education Univ. College	Engineering	Graduate	Day	Night	Medicine	Nursing	Pharmacy	Miscellaneous	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full & Part	Extension, etc.	Short Course Low Tuition	Grand Total	Veterans	Graduate	Undergrad.
Alma College .....	..	..	..	..	110	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	110	..	110	..	..	110	..	..	..
Boston College .....	2,599	1,405	..	..	120	..	..	598	345	225A	..	612	..	882B	5,657C	1,129	6,786	..	250D	7,036	1,957	354	915
Canisius College .....	854	607	278	..	..	..	..	282	..	..	..	45	..	835	1,654	1,247	2,901	125	..	3,026	725	135	524
College of the Holy Cross...	1,746	..	..	..	..	..	..	7	..	..	..	..	..	1	1,754	..	1,754	..	200	1,954	212	..	..
Creighton University, The...	948	395	..	156	..	..	..	106	175	..	300	322	143	..	2,370	175	2,545	..	130D	2,675	958	246	512
Fairfield University .....	781	..	..	..	..	..	..	79	..	..	..	..	..	..	852	8	860	38	..	898	177	22	158
Fordham University .....	2,097	1,307	542	..	..	2,573	..	1,142	409	247	..	..	412	697	6,742	2,684	9,426	145	..	9,571	2,352	654	2,368
Georgetown University .....	1,438	..	..	338	..	..	..	608	471	432	431	250	3	1,359	4,863	467	5,330	..	..	5,330	2,128	302	580
Gonzaga University .....	526	259	12	..	111	166	240	..	..	268	..	298	..	33	1,816	97	1,913	..	43	1,956	576	53	316
John Carroll University .....	1,639	185	210	..	..	..	..	98	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,433	699	2,132	..	..	2,132	597	96	517
Le Moyne College .....	1,344	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,111	233	1,344	..	175	1,519	251	..	88
Loyola College .....	652	..	250	..	..	150	..	77	..	..	..	..	..	..	652	477	1,129	15	..	1,144	..	77	314
Loyola Univ., Chicago .....	1,269	842	2,393	354	185	E	..	603	156	150	341	378	..	273	3,768	3,176	6,944	638	..	7,582	1,697	527	1,319
Loyola Univ., Los Angeles...	525	448	..	..	..	31	151	11	188	152	..	..	..	24	1,323	207	1,530	..	212	1,742	403	..	433
Loyola Univ., New Orleans..	862	238	..	186	..	..	..	..	119	70	..	..	213	892	1,459	1,121	2,580	..	103	2,683	1,068	..	879
Marquette University .....	2,116	1,096	954	423	..	..	917	552	312	..	377	554	..	620	6,191	1,730	7,921	..	210	8,131	2,949	700	1,226
Regis College .....	608	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	448	160	608	..	..	608	157	..	98
Rockhurst College .....	297	178	475H	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	595	355	950	..	350	1,300	496	..	293
St. Joseph's College .....	2,022	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,212	810	2,022	..	300	2,322	544	..	..
St. Louis University .....	3,638K	605	1,010	301	133	..	692	1,027	204	230	481	475	..	91	6,499	2,388	8,887	56	..	8,943	3,121	1,243	2,624
St. Peter's College .....	735	404	562	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,534	167	1,701	..	..	1,701	102F	..	..
Seattle University .....	906	349	99	..	..	241	299	5	..	..	..	197	..	106	1,964	238	2,202	112	45	2,359	658	54	1,143
Spring Hill College .....	678	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	601	77	678	121	..	799	102	..	354
University of Detroit .....	2,711G	1,360	1,298H	274	..	..	1,862	334G	397	231	..	..	..	377G	6,928	1,916	8,844	..	..	8,844	3,712	250	1,385
University of San Francisco..	1,274	599	568	..	..	70	..	40	287	304	..	32	..	..	1,807	1,367	3,174	109	120	3,403	1,174	15	1,501
University of Santa Clara...	510	312	126	..	..	..	252	..	79	..	..	..	..	..	1,148	131	1,279	..	..	1,279	348	..	..
University of Scranton .....	2,283	..	..	..	..	..	..	140	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,336	1,087	2,423	..	201	2,624I	1,557	..	810
Woodstock College .....	..	..	..	..	253	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	253	..	253	..	..	253	..	..	..
Xavier University .....	1,557	486	645	..	..	..	..	163	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,484	1,367	2,851	..	..	2,851J	720	253	437
Totals 1950-1951 .....	36,615	11,075	9,422	2,032	912	3,231	4,413	5,872	3,142	2,309	1,930	3,163	771	6,190	67,564	23,513	91,077	1,359	2,339	94,775L	29,501	4,981	18,794
Totals 1949-1950 .....	38,162	13,729	9,270	1,950	804	4,397	5,235	5,137	3,463	2,086	1,854	3,315	759	7,771	73,006	24,866	97,872	2,048	3,077	102,997	41,827	5,094	19,611
Increase or Decrease .....	-1,547	-2,654	152	82	108	-1,166	-822	735	-321	223	76	-152	12	-1,521	-5,442	-1,353	-6,795	-689	-738	-8,222	-12,325	-113	-817

(A) 218 students carried prescribed 9 hrs. (B) 449 students carried 10-11 hrs. (C) 667 students carried less than 12 hrs. (D) Estimated. (E) Included in Commerce—Night. (F) Arts only. (G) 8 hrs. or over considered full-time. (H) 10 hrs. or over considered full-time. (I) Includes 33 duplications. (J) Includes 93 duplications. (K) Includes Corporate Colleges. (L) Includes 126 duplications.



# Fold Out Here

\* \* \*

## Nicole

fold out

Summer		Increase or Decrease	
Graduate	Undergrad.		
..	..	22	
54	915	-26	
135	524	32	
..	..	-49	
246	512	7	
22	158	-106	
554	2,368	-24	
302	580	-7	
53	316	8	
96	517	1	
..	88	-17	
77	314	-3	
527	1,319	16	
..	433	63	
..	879	21	
700	1,226	44	
..	98	0	
..	293	45	
..	..	19	
243	2,624	-9	
..	..	-2	
54	1,143	5	
..	354	8	
250	1,385	18	
15	1,501	-17	
..	..	-28	
..	810	14	
..	..	-62	
253	437	-31	
981	18,794	43	
094	19,611	9	
113	-817	21	
hrs. or over		27	
		1	
		10	
		39	
		97	
		-18	
		..	
		..	
		171	

Boston  
 Canis  
 Colle  
 Creig  
 Fairfi  
 Fordl  
 Geor  
 Gonz  
 John  
 Le M  
 Loyol  
 Loyol  
 Loyol  
 Marq  
 Regis  
 Rock  
 St. Jo  
 St. L  
 St. Pe  
 Seattl  
 Spring  
 Unive  
 Unive  
 Unive  
 Unive  
 Xavie  
 Tot  
 Incre



# Jesuit Educational Association High School Enrollments 1950-1951

# Freshmen 1949-1950, 1950-1951

	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors	Specials	Total 1950-1951	Total 1949-1950	Increase or Decrease
Bellarmino College Preparatory, San Jose....	217	189	177	142	..	725	703	22
Bellarmino High School, Tacoma.....	98	96	99	57	..	350	376	-26
Boston College High School, Boston.....	461	291	307	290	..	1,349	1,317	32
Brooklyn Preparatory School, Brooklyn.....	168	296	264	172	..	900	949	-49
Campion, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin.....	137	133	118	105	..	493	486	7
Canisius High School, Buffalo.....	182	201	191	173	1	748	854	-106
Cheverus Classical High School, Portland, Me.	78	75	68	60	..	281	305	-24
Cranwell Preparatory School, Lenox.....	30	25	31	30	31	147	154	-7
Creighton University High School, Omaha..	142	127	121	114	..	504	496	8
Fairfield College Preparatory School, Fairfield	270	260	225	204	13	972	971	1
Fordham Preparatory School, New York....	139	154	139	91	..	523	540	-17
Georgetown Preparatory School, Garrett Park	52	57	55	45	46	255	258	-3
Gonzaga High School, Spokane.....	143	197	123	102	..	565	549	16
Gonzaga High School, Washington, D. C....	233	182	138	97	..	650	587	63
Jesuit High School, Dallas.....	91	68	55	46	..	260	239	21
Jesuit High School, New Orleans.....	256	184	168	174	..	782	738	44
Jesuit High School, Tampa.....	40	57	39	36	..	172	172	0
Loyola Academy, Chicago.....	215	199	174	159	..	747	702	45
Loyola High School, Towson, Md.....	178	136	130	112	..	556	537	19
Loyola High School, Los Angeles.....	252	199	194	170	..	815	824	-9
Loyola School, New York.....	11	8	5	18	13	55	57	-2
Marquette High School, Yakima.....	68	80	79	47	1	275	270	5
Marquette University High School, Milwaukee	222	233	194	170	..	819	811	8
Regis High School, Denver.....	101	69	71	69	..	310	292	18
Regis High School, New York.....	158	141	126	116	..	541	558	-17
Rockhurst High School, Kansas City.....	82	88	62	67	..	299	327	-28
St. Ignatius High School, Chicago.....	265	251	255	214	1	986	972	14
St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland.....	206	218	208	194	..	826	888	-62
St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco.....	220	195	221	198	..	834	865	-31
St. John's High School, Shreveport.....	51	43	53	34	103	284	241	43
St. Joseph's College High School, Philadelphia	280	211	189	170	..	850	841	9
St. Louis University High School, St. Louis..	208	204	183	182	1	778	757	21
St. Peter's College High School, Jersey City..	283	247	228	190	..	948	921	27
St. Xavier High School, Cincinnati.....	191	169	135	144	..	639	638	1
Scranton Preparatory School, Scranton.....	67	54	52	27	..	200	190	10
Seattle Preparatory School, Seattle.....	150	107	95	104	..	456	417	39
University of Detroit High School, Detroit..	320	255	178	175	..	928	831	97
Xavier High School, New York.....	291	242	278	273	1	1,085	1,103	-18
TOTALS 1950-1951 .....	6,556	5,941	5,428	4,771	211	22,907	..	..
TOTALS 1949-1950 .....	6,720	5,955	5,097	4,787	177	..	22,736	..
INCREASE OR DECREASE.....	-164	-14	331	-16	34	..	..	171

	Liberal Arts		Engineering		Commerce		Total		Increase or Decrease
	1949-1950	1950-1951	1949-1950	1950-1951	1949-1950	1950-1951	1949-1950	1950-1951	
Boston College .....	745	503	..	..	402	327	1,147	830	-317
Canisius College .....	236	215	..	..	176	119	412	334	-78
College of the Holy Cross.....	450	516	..	..	..	..	450	516	66
Creighton University, The.....	290	270	..	..	122	95	412	365	-47
Fairfield University .....	208	189	..	..	..	..	208	189	-17
Fordham University .....	513	465	..	..	466	426	979	891	-88
Georgetown University .....	469	419	..	..	327	211	796	630	-166
Gonzaga University .....	72	86	51	51	79	48	202	185	-17
John Carroll University.....	306	236	..	..	178	131	484	367	-117
Le Moyne College .....	294	274	..	..	..	..	294	274	-20
Loyola College .....	249	187	..	..	..	..	249	187	-62
Loyola University, Chicago....	362	402	..	..	178	225	540	627	87
Loyola University, Los Angeles..	148	157	35	45	116	109	299	311	12
Loyola University, New Orleans	188	215	..	..	80	72	268	287	19
Marquette University .....	679	618	234	187	337	292	1,250	1,097	-153
Regis College .....	159	148	..	..	..	..	159	148	-11
Rockhurst College .....	126	95	..	..	72	70	198	165	-33
St. Joseph's College .....	247	260	..	..	..	..	247	260	13
St. Louis University.....	1,136	1,043	233	223	553	416	1,922	1,682	-240
St. Peter's College .....	217	209	..	..	123	116	340	325	-15
Seattle University .....	815	813	110	71	135	96	1,060	980	-80
Spring Hill College .....	169	180	..	..	..	..	169	180	11
University of Detroit.....	693	712	398	301	500	402	1,591	1,415	-176
University of San Francisco....	189	138	..	..	44	41	233	179	-54
University of Santa Clara.....	174	166	72	59	75	82	321	307	-14
University of Scranton.....	295	272	..	..	..	..	295	272	-23
Xavier University .....	285	253	..	..	175	147	460	400	-60
Totals .....	9,714	9,041	1,133	937	4,138	3,425	14,985	13,403	-1,582
Increase or Decrease.....	-673	..	-196	..	-713	..	-1,582	..	..



# An Analysis of National Statistics

## 1950-1951

WILLIAM J. MEHOK, S.J.

Although Jesuit school enrollment, this year, shows an over-all decrease of 6.841%, relative to estimates available at the time of writing, the figures are more optimistic than those for the country generally. Chief point of concern again is the decline in freshman enrollment.

Jesuit high school enrollment this year stands at 22,907, an increase of 171 students, or .746%. College and University enrollments show a grand total of 94,775 or a decrease of 8,222 students which comes to a sudden decrease of 8.675% over the .936% drop of last year. The over-all total high schools, colleges and universities, this year, is 117,682 or a drop of 8,051 from the 125,733 of last year.

Both the high school and college and university, however, show a less drastic trend than nation-wide predictions. The 11.8% decrease in freshman enrollment, however, will show up in later years.

Owing to the shortness of time allowed between the compiling of statistics and our press deadline, it was deemed expedient that the Central Office both compile the statistics and prepare the analysis. The *Quarterly* cannot fully express its gratitude and thanks to Father Charles M. O'Hara of Marquette University, who since 1941 prepared the "Analysis" and during six of those years was responsible for the compilation of the statistical tables.

As in the past, this analysis will follow the general headings: I. The High Schools, II. The Colleges and Universities, III. Interpretative Notes on the Tables, and (if available before printing) IV. Comparison with National Statistics.

### I. THE HIGH SCHOOLS

Despite the fact that an early estimate, made by the U. S. Office of Education and published in the *New York Times* for September 6, 1950, shows that high school enrollment throughout the United States would drop about 2%, Jesuit high schools have shown a slight increase of .746%. Private high schools, however, show about the same increase as Jesuit high schools. If they are available, more accurate comparative figures will be given in section IV.



The Jesuit high school trend over the last nine years is indicated in the following chart:

1942-1943	8.52	1946-1947	4.33
1943-1944	8.12	1947-1948	.58
1944-1945	8.26	1948-1949	—2.46
1945-1946	4.25	1949-1950	— .94
	1950-1951		.746

The distribution according to the four high school years is shown by percentage in the following chart. (The fraction of one percent in special grade and post high school classes is omitted.)

Year	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors
1944-45 . . . . .	35.2	27.2	20.7	16.3
1945-46 . . . . .	32.3	28.3	21.9	16.8
1946-47 . . . . .	28.8	26.7	23.7	19.6
1947-48 . . . . .	28.9	24.9	22.4	21.7
1948-49 . . . . .	29.8	24.1	22.4	22.0
1949-50 . . . . .	29.5	26.2	22.4	21.0
1950-51 . . . . .	28.6	25.9	24.0	20.8

This year the freshman class is decidedly smaller than the average, and sophomores number a shade less. It is the junior class that skyrockets proportionately, with seniors slightly above the average. One might say, however, that the distribution shows a rather even gradation. It appears that the schools are finding themselves after the years of contending with bumper crops of freshmen. Possibly a cycle comparable to that following the year 1946-47 might be expected, other things being equal.

Of course, financial considerations, in view of the present cost of living, must not be forgotten, but they have apparently not yet affected the enrollment numerically although it is more than likely that the quality of student has changed. Such considerations are outside the scope of the present study.

The number of schools showing a drop in enrollment for the past five years was seven, twenty, twenty-four, twenty-two, and seventeen. This year the number is fourteen. Canisius, with a drop of 106 showed the greatest decrease, and Detroit with an increase of 97 showed the greatest rise.

Only two schools rise above a thousand in enrollment. Boston College High School with 1,349 and Xavier High School, New York, with 1,085. Fairfield Prep., St. Ignatius, Chicago, St. Peters, University of Detroit High School and Brooklyn Prep. follows them in descending order.



II. THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

As we pointed out earlier in this report, the decline in Jesuit higher institutions was 8,222 or 8.675%. The United States Office of Education in the *New York Times* report mentioned estimated that the drop would be a mere 2%. Subsequent estimates and studies prove this to be very low. Dr. Raymond Walters, in his advance release based on 75% coverage, states that more institutions fall in the bracket of 8% to 14% decrease than any other category. Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president of the Association of American Universities, in a report appearing in *Education Summary* for November 7, 1950, states that colleges and universities face an enrollment decline of 30% to 40% regardless of final student deferment policies.

As we glance at the enrollment chart, we find that the largest drops are in the commerce—day, education, engineering, law—day and miscellaneous columns and the greatest gains are found in graduate, divinity, law—night and dentistry. The drop of 36.1% in education is partially explained by the fact that St. Louis discontinued that school but the 24% drops in both commerce—day and miscellaneous are scarcely offset numerically by the 12.5% gain in the graduate schools. Again this year the proportion of part-time students is increasing over revenue bearing, full-time students. Summer school enrollments dropped, but slightly.

The progress of the G. I. Bill is clearly depicted. Benefits are starting to run out, with 41.8% fewer veterans and those most probably in the expanded graduate and professional departments.

The size of the freshman class has normally been used as a predictive measure of future enrollment. Let us first test the validity of that norm in the case of the arts, engineering and commerce schools of Jesuit colleges and universities. The following table shows the percentage of increase and decrease in those three schools both in their freshman classes and the entire four years.

Year	Percentage of Increase or Decrease Schools of Arts, Commerce, Engineering	
	Freshmen	Entire School
1945-1946.....	31.1	22.2
1946-1947.....	67.3	69.3
1947-1948.....	— 4.2	19.2
1948-1949.....	— 4.5	.2
1949-1950.....	— .9	— 3.1
1950-1951.....	—11.8	— 7.9



Although there is not exact identity between the percentage of increase or decrease of the freshman classes and the entire schools four years later, still the trend is apparent in the lag of about three years between the downward trend of the two columns.

By way of digression, the trend in engineering schools might be taken for more careful study. Dr. S. C. Hallister, Dean of the College of Engineering, Cornell University, conducted a survey of about half the engineering students in the country. This survey was reported in the *New York Times* for November 13th. On the basis of his survey, enrollment in engineering schools dropped 24.9% in 1949-1950 and 39.2% in 1950-1951. Jesuit drops for those two years was 8.0% and 18.6% respectively. In the freshman class for those two years the decline was 30.6% and 37.8% while the corresponding drops in Jesuit engineering freshmen was 38.3% and 20.9% respectively for the years 1949-1950 and 1950-1951.

### III. INTERPRETATIVE NOTES ON THE TABLES

In the columns of college and university statistics, the *Nursing* column includes students in either the B.S. or R.N. curriculum. The breakdown is as follows: Boston College, 493 R.N., 119 B.S.; Canisius, 45 B.S.; Creighton, 278 R.N., 44 B.S.; Georgetown, 213 R.N., 37 B.S.; Gonzaga, 274 R.N., 24 B.S.; Loyola, Chicago, 378 B.S.; Marquette, 554 B.S.; St. Louis, 105 R.N., 370 B.S.; Seattle, 38 R.N., 159 B.S.; San Francisco, 32 B.S.

The *Miscellaneous* column includes: Boston College, intown college of arts and science 765; social work 117; Canisius College, prenursing—day, 150; evening division 685; Holy Cross, special 1; Fordham, social work 328; adult education 369; Georgetown, dental technology 1; medical technology 13; foreign service—day, 734, foreign service—night, 352; Institute of Languages 259; Gonzaga, journalism 24; medical technology 9; Loyola, Chicago, social work 128; social industrial relations 72; graduate students in medicine 73; Loyola, Los Angeles, unclassified 24; Loyola, New Orleans, music 88; evening division 804; Marquette, dental technology 78; journalism 266; medical technology 52; speech 69; engineering evening 155; St. Louis, social work 91; Seattle, medical technology 46; music 20; medical records library 10; veterinary 2; pre-nursing (B.S. nursing education) 28; Detroit, dental hygienist 14; dental assistant 26; engineering evening, 337.

The *Extension* column includes: Canisius, extension 125; Fairfield, extension 38; Fordham extension 145; Loyola, Baltimore, extension 15; Loyola, Chicago, home study 617, extension 21; St. Louis, extension 56;



Seattle, extension 112; Spring Hill, extension 121; San Francisco, extension 109.

The explanation of *Low-Tuition* or *Short* courses is: Boston 250 (estimated); Holy Cross, labor 200; Creighton 130 (estimated); Gonzaga, cultural 43; Le Moyne, labor 175; Loyola, San Francisco, labor 212; Loyola, New Orleans, labor 103; Marquette, labor 210; Rockhurst, Institute of Social Order, 350; St. Joseph's, labor 300; Seattle, cultural, religion 45; San Francisco, labor 120; Scranton, industrial relations 201.

*Part-time* students, as well as they can be separated, total as follows:

*Boston College*: commerce—day 2; graduate 382; law—night 7; nursing—R.N. 391; social work 31; intown college of arts and sciences 316. Total 1,129.

*Canisius College*: liberal arts 13; commerce—day 7; commerce—night 274; graduate 250; nursing—B.S. 43; pre-nursing (day) 3; evening division 657. Total 1,247.

*Creighton*: liberal arts 71; commerce—day 16; graduate 58; law—day 3; medicine 7; nursing—B.S. 14; dental technology 6. Total 175.

*Fairfield*: liberal arts 8. Total 8.

*Fordham*: commerce—day 2; commerce—night 23; education 1,510; graduate 616; pharmacy 1; social work 183; adult education 349. Total 2,684.

*Georgetown*: liberal arts 12; graduate 113; foreign service—day 27; foreign service—night 115; Institute of Languages 200. Total 467.

*Gonzaga*: liberal arts 27; commerce—day 15; commerce—night 12; education 24; engineering 7; law—night 12. Total 97.

*John Carroll*: liberal arts 411; commerce—night 210; graduate 78. Total 699.

*Le Moyne*: liberal arts 233. Total 233.

*Loyola, Baltimore*: commerce—night 250; engineering 150; graduate 77. Total 477.

*Loyola, Chicago*: liberal arts 35; commerce—day 15; commerce—night 2,122; graduate 475; law—night 150; medicine 2; nursing—B.S. 283; social work 53; institute of social industrial relations 41. Total 3,176.

*Loyola, Los Angeles*: liberal arts 22; commerce—day 7; education 12; engineering 3; graduate 11; law—night 152. Total 207.

*Loyola, New Orleans*: liberal arts 231; commerce—day 4; law—night 70; music 12; evening division 804. Total 1,121.

*Marquette*: liberal arts 120; commerce—day 43; commerce—night 772; engineering 18; graduate 369; law—day 11; nursing—B.S. 240; speech 2; engineering evening 155. Total 1,730.

*Regis*: liberal arts 160. Total 160.



*Rockhurst:* liberal arts 12; commerce—day 4; commerce—night 339. Total 355.

*St. Joseph's:* liberal arts 810. Total 810.

*St. Louis:* liberal arts 1,412; commerce—day 23; commerce—night 269; engineering 14; graduate 470; law—day 1; law—night 15; medicine 1; nursing—R.N. 69; nursing—B.S. 97; social work 17. Total 2,388.

*St. Peter's:* liberal arts 25; commerce—night 142. Total 167.

*Seattle:* liberal arts 82; commerce—day 26; commerce—night 87; education 29; graduate 5; music 9. Total 238.

*Spring Hill:* liberal arts 77. Total 77.

*Detroit:* liberal arts 733; commerce—day 33; commerce—night 448; dentistry 3; engineering 94; graduate 231; law—day 12; law—night 100; dental assistant 26; engineering evening 236. Total 1,916.

*San Francisco:* liberal arts 495; commerce—night 568; law—night 304. Total 1,367.

*Santa Clara:* liberal arts 3; commerce—day 1; commerce—night 126; engineering 1. Total 131.

*Scranton:* liberal arts 947; graduate 140. Total 1,087.

*Xavier:* liberal arts 592; commerce—day 7; commerce—night 645; graduate 123. Total 1,367.

#### IV. COMPARISON WITH NATIONAL STATISTICS

Using as a basis of comparison the major changes in Jesuit college and university enrollment, i.e., a decrease of 8.675% in total enrollment, 11.803% drop in freshmen enrollment and 41.8% drop in Veteran enrollment, we shall proceed to compare these with the latest available figures for the nation as a whole.

The *College and University Bulletin* for November 1950 publishes the U. S. Office of Education survey. According to this survey the decrease in enrollment in all institutions of higher learning is 6.6%. Universities dropped 7.8% and liberal arts colleges went down 8.6% over the Fall of 1949. The freshman drop was 7.3% with universities suffering the greatest decline of 11.0% and liberal arts colleges dropping 7.2%. Veteran enrollment for all higher institutions was down 32.9% with universities dropping 32.4% and liberal arts colleges falling 38.6%. In general, Jesuit institutions dropped lower in all categories than corresponding schools throughout the nation.

The *New York Times* for November 27, 1950 conducted an independent but somewhat more detailed survey. The over-all decline in enrollment this year over 1949-50 was 7.4%. Even at that an increase of 59.5% over 1941-1942 is shown. The decrease in freshmen for all higher institutions



is 8.6% over 1949-50 but an increase of 28.5% over 1941-42. Graduate and professional enrollment went down 4.7% since last year but shows an increase of 103.4% over 1941-42. Veteran enrollment shows a decline of 35.1% from last year.

Other interesting findings of the *Times* survey, but not comparable with available Jesuit figures, are that 80.1% of all schools were prepared to admit more students if they had applied. 18.2% of the schools were forced to turn away students owing to a lack of facilities. Only 46% of the institutions feel that their peak enrollment has been reached, and those that do not, think it will come in 1954. Qualified teachers were available to 86.5% of all schools. It is in the field of tuition that the pinch was felt, but only 10% plan to raise the fees. Whereas a year ago tuition fees were \$276.15 and \$303.58, this year they are \$281.60 and \$310.54 for undergraduate and graduate departments respectively. The total annual cost to students attending colleges and universities in 1949-50 was \$860.33 and \$877.46 in 1950-51. 78.1% of all colleges balanced their budget and 74.6% of them have made plans for a building program.

Whereas this article began on a note of optimism, based on the figures then available, it ends by tempering that judgment. In general, the changes in Jesuit enrollments follow rather closely the pattern of the nation as a whole. Needless to say, the whole basis of this analysis could be nullified by the decisions arising from the present unsettled world conditions.



# As They Like It

## An Experiment in Shakespeare

EARL A. WEIS, S.J.

"There was a time," an executive of the American Book Company wrote to us, "when in any given year there would be a number of Shakespearean plays produced at St. Xavier. Unfortunately, that situation no longer exists, and I'm not sure that students nowadays are the better for it." This executive was an old alumnus of our school to whom we had written for the purpose of asking advice in choosing a text for the new Shakespeare course we were introducing two years ago. One may guess that his sentiments would be echoed by many a graduate fortunate enough to have received his education in those bygone days.

It does seem an exceptional pity that so many students passing through the four years of a Jesuit high-school course never study a great author so thoroughly that they can call him their own. Frequently, the mark of an educated man is to "follow" some classic author, frame his thought in the mold of a classic utterance, whether it be of Homer, Horace, Vergil, Milton, or Shakespeare. And yet, many of our students never receive a full introduction to one of these writers in the whole of their high-school careers.

This does not refer to those in the classical course, who take four years of Latin and two of Greek. These have the opportunity of spending quite some time with Cicero, Vergil, and, in recent years, Homer. They are getting a full Jesuit education. The difficulty is with those in what are euphemistically called the scientific and general courses, who take two required years of Latin and then transfer to some modern language. They begin the study of grammar again just when they are about prepared to take up a classic author and spend a year of five classes a week in the appreciation of his style and thought. Such students never relish, have never learned to relish, a great writer, although savoring the ideas of classic minds is as profitable to the intellect as savoring spiritual lights is to the soul.

Keeping these students with small Latin and no Greek in mind, we effected a change two years ago in the high-school curriculum at St. Xavier in Cincinnati. Previously, seniors not in the classical course were given Latin American history, an apparent filler. We have no dispute with those who favor Latin American history, either as a background for Spanish, which many of these students were studying, or as a means to



promote better understanding between the Americas. Suffice it to say that we were looking for something better fitted to fill the literary deficiency in our senior's background.

The experiment was to begin in the second semester of the 1948-49 school year. There were several possibilities open to us, any of which would, in a measure, offer our non-classical students something of what we had in mind. For a while we considered a brief survey of Greek and Latin literature in translation. However, it was virtually impossible to find a suitable textbook. Those that existed were meant for college classes and were too bulky, too comprehensive, and too expensive. Moreover, we decided that a survey was not the proper medium for relishing literature. There was the alternative of taking a single Latin or Greek author in translation, but the genius of a language is so often lost in translation that this plan too seemed not to be the answer to our problem.

Finally, the Principal, Father Patrick W. O'Brien, suggested giving these seniors a special course in selected plays of Shakespeare. The boys were, after all, best prepared to deal with the language of this classic writer. They were better prepared to study Shakespeare than third-year Latin students were to handle Cicero. English was native to them. Besides, texts would be readily available.

Had they perhaps already had enough Shakespeare? True, in sophomore year they had read *Julius Caesar* and as freshmen had studied *The Merchant of Venice*. However, by questioning them we learned that their recollection of these plays was hazy. The name Shakespeare instead of suggesting appreciation and reverence was coupled with memories of difficulty and insipidity. When they had studied his plays in the first two years, they were too young and untrained really to value and relish his genius. Whereas classical students had full years with Cicero, Vergil, and Homer, these students had been allowed a mere three scattered months—if we include the time they would spend on *Macbeth* in fourth-year English—with the greatest writer in their native language.

Senior English instructors were regularly successful in arousing classes to a great interest in *Macbeth*, because seniors were more mature and had already been given three years' training in poetry and drama. This success with *Macbeth* made us hope that other plays of Shakespeare would evoke interest and diligent work even from these weaker senior students whose natural bent was not literary. Hence we decided to experiment for a semester with a full-fledged course in Shakespeare. In this course, for once in their high-school careers, they would be given an opportunity to concentrate on and relish a classic author and make him their own.

There were about seventy-five students in the two classes taking the



course. Our texts were Pocket Book editions of *The Four Great Comedies* and *The Four Great Tragedies*.

From the beginning we resolved that we would concentrate on the plays themselves—not on Shakespeare's life, the Elizabethan background, or other Shakespeareana except in so far as they affected a clear understanding of the plays. After the manner of the Kenyon school of critics, we were going to address ourselves to the solid body of the matter.

*Hamlet* was the first play we took in the course. Lawrence Olivier's motion-picture version, which was being shown at a local theatre, stimulated interest. Next we took *The Tempest*, and finally *Romeo and Juliet*. *Hamlet* stirred up the greatest interest, even more than *Macbeth* did in the regular senior English classes. The delightful *Tempest* was a pleasant change from the somber note of tragedy, though it did not appeal to the students as much as *Romeo and Juliet*, last on the list.

Three plays. We did not hurry through them, but moved steadily along, going over the meaning of each line in class. The Pocket Book editions have no notes, but they do have excellent glossaries. Notes were supplied in class by the instructor. Students copied them on the margins in small handwriting and with well-pointed pencils, since the margins are narrow. The instructor prepared his classes from annotated editions of the plays, though in class he used the same text as the students to avoid confusion arising from variant readings.

The usual procedure was for the instructor to go over a passage in class and explain the meaning of each line, pointing out its significance in the play as a whole, translating the meaning of unusual words, and adding anything else which he had garnered from his study which would add to the understanding of the lines being taken. The next day, at the beginning of the period, he invariably subjected the students to a quiz on the same matter. To review the matter taken in class and to study their written-in notes was regular homework for the students.

In addition to this the instructor assigned a great deal of memory work. The famous passages had to be known by heart. Ten lines a night three or four times a week was not extraordinary. Our conviction was that the fine rhythm of Shakespeare's sentences moving in the students' minds would inevitably affect their own writing. The heaviest memory work came with *Hamlet*, since its long soliloquies lend themselves to this type of exercise. The memory work in *The Tempest* and in *Romeo and Juliet* was lighter for the opposite reason. Eventually the students were prepared for the conclusion of the recurrent brief enthymeme, "It is beautiful; it is famous; therefore it is to be memorized," and after the first two comments, they would wait with a wry smile for the inevitable third.



But we thought it part of a cultured man to know some of Shakespeare by heart, and we noted with pleasure that certain students gradually found ways of slipping quotations from Shakespeare into their conversations and into their writing.

Other assignments consisted of essays on characters and problems of the plays. Moreover, the instructor designated sections which the students had to translate into modern, idiomatic English.

We used transcriptions of Maurice Evans, Lawrence Olivier, and John Barrymore, all as Hamlet, with great success, after we had taken the play thoroughly without their help. Recordings made at the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre of Stratford gave us excellent selections from *The Tempest*. When we had recordings of the same passage by different actors, the instructor pointed out variations in interpretation. During the playing of these records, one could have heard a pin drop, so keen was the attention of the students. Often their lips moved as they recited silently passages from memory along with the famous Shakespearean actor.

About the middle of the course, Cornelia Otis Skinner appeared on the Xavier Forum at the Taft Theatre. Through the courtesy of Father Alphonse Fisher, its director, about forty of the Shakespeare students attended her performance to see how effective dramatic monologue can be.

At the end of each play taken in the course, the students wrote a comprehensive examination on the characters, plot, setting, unusual words (in and out of context), and memory work. The examinations were difficult, but even the poorest students sometimes did very well. One of them told the instructor that the Shakespeare course was teaching him how to study.

In the first play the duty of explaining the meaning and significance of the text lay almost entirely on the teacher. In the second play he frequently delegated this task to the students. In the last play he shifted the burden almost entirely to their shoulders, and they showed themselves surprisingly well prepared to carry it, even though they did not have the help of glosses. The reason was that they had greatly enlarged their familiarity with Shakespeare's language and style; their experience made them quite capable of handling all the lines except those which were very difficult.

The many mythological allusions gave them acquaintance with Greek and Roman fables, as well as those of England. They learned the Elizabethan meaning of English words and compared them to present-day meanings and, hence, were able to see something of the development of modern English. Their ability to understand and enjoy poetry also grew; the teachers of their regular English classes attested to this fact. Those



who planned to go to college received a good preparation for studying Shakespeare there. But it was really more than a mere preparatory course, since few college classes will devote as much time to individual plays and, therefore, to appreciation as we gave. Those who did not intend to go to college were given an understanding of an author whom otherwise they would have known only in passing.

Many passages of Shakespeare lent themselves to amplification along the lines of Christian philosophy and correct principles of aesthetics. For an example of the latter we have only to mention Hamlet's advice to the players. It is a neat compendium of the canons of true art, "whose end, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature." The plots of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* threw light on the nature of classic tragedy. The Catholic philosophy of Shakespeare was a strong bridge over which a true view of life might pass to the minds of the students while they were enjoying the plays.

English teachers noticed that these students were able to understand *Macbeth* more easily when the time came to study that play in the regular English class and, in fact, outstripped many of the students in the classical course. The Shakespeare students, however, could not help being conscious of the absence of fine feeling in *Macbeth*—a delicate sensitivity which is so marked in the three plays they took in the special course, but which is conspicuously rare in the rough, gory, half-melodramatic tragedy of the Scots king.

The students themselves, most of them in the scientific or the easier general course, were appreciative of the training in Shakespeare which they received, even though it demanded more work than Latin American history, which they had in the first semester, or the Economic Geography to which we had descended some years earlier. A poll was taken of the larger class at the end of the year. Out of forty-two students, thirty-seven were glad that they had been given a special course in Shakespeare, three were indifferent, and two were sorry. The count is startling if we bear in mind that the students of the two Shakespeare classes were, from a scholastic point of view, made up of the weakest seniors.

One of the factors which brought home to the students the importance of Shakespeare was this. After they had studied *Hamlet* and committed important passages to memory, they began to recognize Shakespearean quotations in their other reading, whether of novels, biography, or national magazines like *Time*, the captions of which are often borrowed from the Bard. They knew then that all these allusions had escaped them before.

Common phrases which they themselves had used were charged with new significance for them when they realized, for example, that Shake-



speare first said in *Hamlet*, "flaming youth," "to the manner born," "the primrose path," "It smells to heaven," and "Something is rotten in the State of Denmark."

Book titles such as *All Our Yesterdays*, *The Witching Hour*, and *Brave New World* also had new meaning for them. It gave them a feeling of competence to meet these expressions and know where they were from, a sense of being, in some small way, educated. Before, they had been in a position comparable to that of the bumpkin who, on first reading a bit of Shakespeare, was surprised to find that he used so many quotations. Now, with a certain sheepishness it dawned on these students that they had been missing much of what they thought they understood.

One boy wrote:

"Yes, I am very glad I took the course. Although it was harder for me than history, I think I got something out of it I can keep and enjoy even fifteen years from now. Shakespeare's thoughts are not easily forgotten."

Such a student, an instructor feels, has finally arrived at a genuine relish for a classic author. Others said:

If I had not taken this course, I doubt whether I ever would have been able to understand what he wrote, and that, you might say, would be a tragedy in itself.

I didn't appreciate Shakespeare at first, but now I like him a great deal.

It was a change from the old humdrum high-school course. I am glad I took it not only because of the knowledge I gained, but because of the enjoyment.

I wish it had run the whole year.

My pastor told me he wished he had been given the opportunity of taking such a course.

This last quotation is from a June graduate who, when the following September he happened to drop into the high school, greeted the instructor with the words, "Well, I read *King Lear* last summer."

Heartened by the fruitfulness of this one-semester tryout, and with the enthusiastic approval of the Province Director of Studies, we scheduled the course for both semesters in the school year of 1949-50. Two classes again took the course. To *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *The Tempest* we added three more plays: *Richard II*, *Henry IV, Part 1*, and *Othello*.

We decided to change the texts to give the students more help by way of footnotes. Even with all the texts of Shakespeare in print, we found



only one set suitable to our needs, the Crofts Classics, published by Appleton-Century-Crofts. Retailing at thirty cents apiece, these sturdy little books each contains a brief introduction, small bibliography, the play itself, and footnotes at the bottom of the page on the meanings of difficult words. No variant readings or long glosses cumber the text. These footnotes enabled the students to prepare the class matter themselves without long prelections and were of the greatest assistance.

The local library has a stock of Shakespeare recordings and filmstrips which proved useful. The students saw Olivier's *Hamlet* which was again in town, a number of them returning to see it a second time with their "dates," they enjoyed it so much. The Catholic University Players on tour presented *Much Ado about Nothing*; both classes attended and appreciated it, the more because they were prepared for it at the class immediately preceding.

The results of the full-year trial were again satisfactory. The instructor allowed Shakespeare to speak for himself, the students reading the text in class and explaining the passage after they had read it. The Province Director of Studies during his visitation expressed amazement at their ability to read smoothly and interpret correctly blank verse—at first sight, at that. A teacher of graduate English expressed the fond wish that he might presume such familiarity with the plays in his own students.

To these testimonials, parents contributed their share. One father said that he noticed his son was becoming a Shakespeare enthusiast. Since the boy had till then shown no literary inclinations, it was perhaps the last thing in the world he expected. A mother, whose son's stock of English words had been confined to the quite basic English of the average high-school student, found that his word power was growing rapidly. When the lad retired to his room one evening after a prolonged conversation with his parents, her husband turned to her with a mystified look and asked, "Where in the world is Tom getting that vocabulary?"

And so we go into our third year of experimentation, planning the same course as last year for two classes of seniors. Probably we shall substitute *Lear* for *Othello*, since the latter focuses attention on a problem already too much in the consciousness of the modern schoolboy. Then again, we may take only five plays and spend the extra time on dramatic interpretation and, possibly, a modest production of one of the plays.



# Intercollegiate Athletics in Jesuit Higher Institutions

FRANCIS E. CORKERY, S.J.<sup>1</sup>

This subject scarcely lends itself to a learned disquisition. It is one of those things where opinions are quite sharply divided—not on general principles, but the application thereof. All agree upon the necessity of physical education to attain the "*Mens sana in corpore sano*." Most will agree that intercollegiate athletics are a means to that end—not the only means, perhaps not the best means. But the fact of the matter is that intercollegiate athletics are here to stay—they are part of the scene of American higher education, and under proper control, can play an effective part in the program of Jesuit colleges and universities.

Practically all institutions of higher learning in America including our Jesuit colleges and universities do and have for many years participated in some type of intercollege sports program. There is a wide range of games, some eleven in all including football, basketball and baseball, track, tennis, boxing, golf, skiing, fencing, swimming, hockey. The most universal is basketball, in which almost all colleges compete, and which seems to be fast approaching the top spot in spectator and public interest, once securely held by intercollegiate football. Football still maintains its position of prominence, though a goodly number of schools, Jesuit and otherwise, have found it necessary for various reasons to discontinue participation in this sport. Baseball is common, but not too popular in some sections, owing perhaps to weather conditions and lack of spectator interest. The other sports enjoy varying degrees of interest and participation depending on local and regional attitudes, upon physical facilities, upon sports and upon the availability of worthwhile competition.

Intercollegiate sports as part of the physical education program have both their good points and their weaknesses and dangers. Good intercollegiate competition develops a healthy rivalry and a strong competitive spirit in a sportsmanlike atmosphere. A successful intercollegiate program can do much to develop that intangible but very real something called school spirit. It is a healthy release for the pent up energies of player and spectator alike. It can provide to students a healthy and enthusiastic interest, and keep their minds from preoccupation with things less good, if not actually evil.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paper read at the Meeting of the College and University Delegates at the Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, New Orleans, April 10, 1950.



On the other hand there are weaknesses and dangers in the American program of intercollegiate sports. There is the tendency to over-emphasize the intercollegiate program giving it a prominence and importance out of all proportion to its proper position. This tendency may result in a false sense of values, placing too much emphasis on physical prowess, as opposed to intellectual and moral development. It may also result in long absences from class, due to protracted trips. This evil, in part, is lessened in recent years by the availability of air-travel. Another undesirable tendency of the intercollegiate program, is the tendency to limit the benefits of active sports to the few, making mere spectators of the many. This problem may be solved by a strong intra-mural program. Most schools find it very difficult to develop and maintain interest in intra-mural sports, but such a program is very necessary, especially where a goodly number of students are "boarders" living on the campus day and night. If an idle mind is the devil's workshop, an idle body is the devil's playfield, especially the body of energetic, vibrant youth. Some form of physical exercise is almost as vital for our college youth, as is mental exercise, if we are to develop the well rounded man. Physical, mental and moral development must go hand in hand, in the educational process.

In recent years we have read much about the excesses that have crept into the field of intercollegiate sports, with the brunt of the criticism falling upon big-time football. We have been told that these excesses amount to an open scandal—that the game is no longer an amateur intercollegiate sport but an out and out professional promotion with big gates and big money as the ultimate goal. It is said that the subsidization of players has become an open competition with the better players going to the highest bidder, and consequently in most cases to big schools. Football has become a very lucrative financial venture for the big school with a big stadium and big competition; a tremendous economic hazard for the smaller school, which is not too successful, or is situated in a small population area, and cannot play to large weekly crowds.

These charges are serious. They have been aired in the press and over the radio by educators as well as by sports writers, and generally speaking, we know they are not without foundation. All of us perhaps know of instances of grave abuse in the matter of subsidization. We know of instances where the academic content of courses provided for the not-too-bright players, is hardly collegiate calibre. We know that for many institutions the high cost of successful competition has become a serious economic hazard. The action of the NCAA, and its Sanity Code is an open admission of grave abuse.

On the other hand we should beware of unjust and wild exaggeration,



and of all-inclusive universal condemnations. We should avoid the error of the Prohibitionist, who would abolish the use of alcoholic beverages, because of their abuse. First, let us say that the criminal in the piece, if such there be, is not football alone. Whatever charges can be substantiated against football, apply with equal and ever increasing force against other intercollegiate sports, especially against basketball, a game that is making a mighty bid for top-spot in the intercollegiate sports picture. Whether you consider the brisk competition for players, the ever increasing number of games per season sometimes several a week, the pre-season barnstorming tours, the increasing number of seasons-end tournaments—the picture differs little from that of big-time football, except that basketball is less expensive to operate owing to the smaller number of players and coaches involved.

Granting for the moment the existence of grave abuses in intercollegiate sports, what are the chances of a cure of the evils from within. What chance has the NCAA Sanity Code, or some such movement, of becoming really effective. Certainly it is a consummation devoutly to be wished for. There are those who say it is impossible; that the game has become so big and so much money has been invested in it, that it cannot be cut back. On the other hand the Chairman of the Compliance Committee of the NCAA in his report to the Association January 7th, 1949 concludes as follows:

“There are some institutions, and I believe a very few, who are paying little, if any, attention to the NCAA or its Code; there are others, which by reason of tradition, or pressures, or size, or location, or for other reasons, are encountering difficulties in the transition, but they appear to be making an effort to put their houses in order. The great majority of the active members of the NCAA appear to be conducting their athletic programs on a sound and ethical basis and well within the requirements of the Code.”

Where lies the truth? I think only time will tell—maybe a year or two, and we will know—whether member institutions of NCAA are serious and determined in their efforts to correct abuses; and if so, whether they can accomplish it by such an instrumentality as the Sanity Code.

Now where do our Jesuit colleges and universities stand in this matter? Since football has been the center of most of the controversy on the state of intercollegiate athletics, it was suggested that I send questionnaires to the Presidents of our schools to ascertain the status of football in the Jesuit institutions of higher education in America. This I did, and was



most gratified and appreciative of the prompt, frank, and almost universal replies. Of the 27 colleges to whom questionnaires were sent, replies were received from all but one. Realizing how exasperating the flood of questionnaires can be for busy executives, I am most appreciative of this fine response.

As you know there are 27 Jesuit colleges and universities in the American Assistancy. Of these at the present time, 13 participate in intercollegiate football—some in big time, that is playing top ranking teams in their league or area—others having less potent competition, and fewer spectators. These schools stretch from coast to coast, and represent both larger and smaller institutions. Fourteen of our schools do not participate in intercollegiate football. All I believe, with one possible exception, participate in basketball and other intercollegiate sports. These institutions again represent every section of the country, from border to border, and from sea to sea. Evidently then, no conclusion can be drawn on any regional basis. Neither can any conclusion be drawn from the type of institution involved. In both groups are large and small institutions, liberal arts colleges, major universities, and every type of Jesuit institution of higher learning.

Of the 14 schools who do not participate in intercollegiate football, four never did participate. The other 10 did at one time participate, some on a big scale others in lesser degree. The sport was first dropped by one of our major schools in 1932, others followed in 1934, 1938, 1939, 1941, 1942 and 1949, a period of 17 years, which fact would indicate no concerted move but rather a decision on a case by case basis, as seemed warranted in each instance. However, judging from answers to questionnaires, there is a definite pattern and certain inescapable conclusions, in the case of non-participating schools.

- 1) The economic factor was a major consideration, perhaps the major consideration, in almost every case where intercollegiate football was discontinued. The economic loss suffered was substantial. It was judged unjustifiable and was not considered to be compensated for by other benefits. *This was a unanimous response.*
- 2) Six of the ten schools discontinuing the sport gave "academic" reasons as a major factor in their decision. Seven declared that the reasons were a combination of academic and economic. Two indicated other reasons. Here is a typical remark—"To field a winning team, academic sacrifices and concessions were necessary. The economic loss could not be justified." It is my judgment that the economic factor was predominant.
- 3) Judging again from the questionnaire, none of the schools which



have dropped intercollegiate football would consider reinstating it at this time. This is a unanimous and emphatic reply.

- 4) To the question, "Would you consider going back into intercollegiate football at some future date?"—nine respondents replied in the negative, one in the affirmative. Typical remarks to this question were, "No likelihood unless radical changes are made." "If the game is returned to amateur status and prohibitive costs are eliminated." "I can see no reason to; we are better off in every way."
- 5) None of the administrators of schools that have dropped football consider that they are under any considerable pressure to restore the game, either from faculty, student body, or general public. In general, the faculties of non-participating schools would seriously oppose a move to reinstate football. Occasional pressure is brought to bear by one group or another; but in no instance does it assume any real importance. Here again there seems to be unanimity.
- 6) It is evident from the questionnaire that none of the respondents feel that their institutions have suffered as a result of dropping football, either in the attitude and spirit of the student body, or in the attitude and loyalty of the Alumni (except in one case where one professional group has been quite critical), or in the attitude and support of friends of the institution. To the contrary an affirmative response was *unanimous* to the question, "Do you feel that your institution has benefited by withdrawal from intercollegiate football?" Among the benefits indicated are better faculty morale, better public support, better academic tone, better financial status.

Hence we must conclude from the above that there is a definite unanimity among this group—

- 1) As to reasons for discontinuing football.
- 2) As to their determination not to resume participation.
- 3) As to the absence of pressure to do so.
- 4) As to the opinion that these institutions have not suffered but profited by this action.

There is I think a serious problem created by the absence of intercollegiate football from the campus. The institution which I represent dropped football in 1941. Like the rest, we are happy with the situation, except for one thing. We have been totally unable to find any substitute for football, anything to take its place. As a result, the period from September to December tends to be quite dull. We feel the need of some-



thing around which to center student interest, student enthusiasm and spirit. Since the first weeks and months of the school year are so important, and tend to determine student attitudes, I would appreciate knowing if other schools have found a happy solution to this problem.

On the other hand respondents for institutions which participate in intercollegiate football, feel that both the University and the students derive definite and valuable benefits from this participation. Among the benefits indicated are the following: it is a good public relations instrument; it is a rallying point for Alumni, keeping their interest and bringing them back to the campus. It unites the student body. Is a good emotional release for faculty and student body. In some instances intercollegiate football pays for the rest of the athletic program (a real benefit).

A typical response "Football gives a certain prominence to the university comparable to that of most universities and colleges across the country and contributes to the spirit and recreation of our students and faculty." "It enables men to get coaching jobs in the educational field—especially in the public school system—a real value to our institution and to Catholic education."

In the participating schools the faculty attitude towards intercollegiate football is reported as running from "favorable" to "mixed" or indifferent. Four report the faculty attitude as distinctly favorable (one remarks "maybe too much so"). Nine report a mixed or indifferent attitude. In no case is the faculty attitude considered unfavorable, though some complaint is noted especially from heads of more difficult and demanding departments and schools. In this matter the following is a typical remark. "Any faculty that is intellectually alive will have a mixed attitude toward any question not defined by the Church. In general, the faculty looks on football as one of the extra-curricular activities. The student is marked on his academic achievements."

With the participating schools, as with the other group, the economic factor is vital. Six schools report that football pays its way. Five indicate that it makes a profit. Five report financial loss, and in four of these cases the loss is considered substantial.

Where football makes a profit, its excess funds are used to support the rest of the athletic program and for other good purposes. Where substantial losses occur, the question of discontinuing the sport inevitably arises. This is indicated by the response to question 4. "Have you ever seriously considered dropping participation in intercollegiate football"? To that question four answer in the affirmative, and give as the reason the "economic" factor. Three schools indicate that their economic losses



are compensated for by other benefits; two are doubtful; one definitely reports that its losses are not compensated by other benefits. Quite evidently the financial element plays a very important role in the whole football picture. It was an important consideration in the decision to discontinue football in almost every instance where it was discontinued. It is the reason why some participating schools have considered discontinuing intercollegiate football. And it is an important consideration for the schools who find football a profitable means of supporting the rest of a costly sports and physical education program.

There remain two things about which there is much controversy and apparent difference of opinion, i.e., the question of scholarships and scholarship. Are there grave abuses in the giving of football scholarships; and can the football player maintain required academic standards? Most of the schools who do not now participate report that they had to grant numerous scholarships in order to compete in anything approaching big time football. The scholarships generally included, board, room, tuition and fees; and in some cases additional benefits. This was one of the heavier costs that accounted for substantial financial losses which ultimately led to the elimination of intercollegiate football in these schools.

All but two of the participating schools report that scholarships are granted, varying in number from 18 to 100. (Quite generally these scholarships include board, room, tuition and fees for out of town students and tuition and fees for local students.) In some instances these scholarships create a financial problem; in others they do not. Several major schools report that their program is in strict compliance with the NCAA regulations of the Sanity Code. Some remarks by respondents seem pertinent here. "I am satisfied that there is no abuse in the matter of granting scholarship aid here. The number of students at reduced rates is made up of non-athletes. Non-athletic scholarships are greater beyond all comparison, than athletic scholarships." Another major institution reports, "Granting of scholarships is completely consistent with the Sanity Code and the conference to which we belong." "No great abuse on the part of Jesuit Colleges with whom we compete for players." "If the aid granted is not excessive and is administered by the College Administrative officers (not Athletic Association) the abuses will not be great." "We have tried to follow the Sanity Code which became effective January 1948."

As to the ability of students who play intercollegiate football to maintain satisfactory academic standards, you can have any answer you want, from a categorical "no" to one equally categorical "yes". At least one school gives this as the prime reason for discontinuing this com-



petition, and reports as follows—"To field a winning team it was necessary and would continue to be necessary to make definite academic sacrifices—concessions. A certain percentage of a typical squad simply could not meet the minimum requirements of the University." Another non-participant reports, "In general the academic standards were fairly good". Again, "Most players were quite good in studies, a few were superior, some definitely inferior."

Among the schools which participate, ten answered the question, as to whether football players could maintain satisfactory academic standing, in the affirmative; none in the negative. Some of the affirmative answers were qualified; some completely unqualified. One major institution responded "The answer is an emphatic yes." One institution indicates that they apply a careful screening process and thus have little trouble. Another replies, "It is the conviction of our faculty that the football player who fails, would fail whether he played football or not. Football, or any other activity, may be the excuse for failure; it is seldom the real cause." Again "A majority of our varsity team members graduate with excellent records." Several point out the number of successful doctors, lawyers, priests and other professional people who have gone through college on their athletic ability and those who are doing so now, quite successfully.

So much for the information gleaned from the questionnaire. I have given you as best I could analyze it, the "testimonium aliorum" from witnesses whom I deem to be "tū scientes tū veraces."

Based upon the testimony I would venture the following opinion. Intercollegiate athletics have a definite place in Jesuit colleges and universities. Their benefits are manifold. Caution should be exercised to avoid over-emphasis and excess, to maintain high academic standards, and to avoid unjustifiable economic losses. If in the case of any given sport, these things cannot be safeguarded, that sport becomes an unjustifiable liability and should be eliminated. If these things are safeguarded, the benefits of any given sport are evident.

Again, from the testimony it is clear that the schools which, after due consideration, and considered judgment, have dropped football have acted wisely and have done well by their institution. We must, however, avoid the hasty conclusion that "Therefore all of our schools should take the same action." Some have expressed the opinion that we would gain academic stature by such unanimous action. Maybe so, if the action were voluntary and based on the facts. Any action that does not take into consideration the varying circumstances in which our schools are operated is unrealistic. This is true in academic as well as athletic matters.



# Department Head Visits the Classes

HARRY W. KIRWIN, PH.D.

In so far as the writer knows there has been little material of any consequence passed on to educators which aims, by and large, to analyze in a spirit of constructive criticism the techniques of college teachers from a supervisory point of view. Indeed, it is a rare Dean or Head of Department who deigns seriously to call in question the pedagogical behavior of his confreres. Yet the teacher who desires to improve in the presentation of his material must have the benefit of such supervisory interest, or he may never learn of his faults or come to correct them. The writer makes no pretense to any special knowledge. Much less does he care to arrogate to himself the right to sit in judgment on his peers. It has been his good fortune merely to have had the duty and the privilege to observe his colleagues in their teaching of history and political science, from which educational experience he hopes the comments herein set forth will not be without some interest and value to the reader.

At the outset it ought to be noted that the supervisory visits which form the basis of this writing were made to night school classes composed, for the most part, of persons of adult age level, of both sexes, some of whom were students taking make-up courses to fulfill special requirements; others of whom were business people confronted with the necessity of obtaining their education while they were otherwise engaged in earning their living and supporting their families. Under such circumstances the teacher's task must needs assume the proportions of a great challenge. For it is not alone sufficient that he be merely a capable craftsman. Grant him that advantage. Still there is more to it than that. Fundamentally, the teacher of night classes must be ready, willing and able to expend himself. Unless he is willing to give of himself, he cannot hope to justify the trust and confidence reposed in him by those whose continued presence in the classroom after a hard day's work is ample testimony of a disposition to learn.

Perhaps the reader will say there are many who attend night school classes simply to hibernate throughout the long scholastic winter of their educational career. This may be entirely true. No institution of learning is without its share of intellectual drones, whether they choose to settle comfortably in their seats by day or night. It is well known, too, that



some people come to night school, no less than to day school, to get an education, as it were, by osmosis; others are bored and, not knowing what to do with themselves, sign up mainly to while away the time; many others are earnest seekers after something they themselves cannot clearly define, nor do they know why they want an education. Many more are genuine students. What attitude ought an educator to assume toward the class in the light of this apparent confusion of purposes? If we could be sure that every student in our room neither could nor would be likely to change his outlook towards study, the whole problem would be vastly simplified. But by the same token also there would be little reason to call ourselves educators if we were content to accept such scholastic stratification with complacency.

It seems to me that until the facts demonstrate unquestioned incapacity or deliberate disinterest, the student ought to be given the benefit of the doubt. In other words, the presumption of sincerity ought always to run in favor of the student. A teacher who enters a night school class prepossessed of the notion that the pupils sitting before him are a species of cattle to be driven to graduation as if to market, who expects to carry them along by threats and recriminations, who literally herds them to their goal, may congratulate himself on the completion of his task; but he is no educator. Just as bad is that type of teacher who, from either apathy or indifference, pursues the even tenor of his way, not caring whether his pupils loiter aimlessly along the highroad or waste their time in wandering down unimportant bypaths in search of stray bits of unrelated learning. The effect in either case is about the same; the student is the loser. Moreover, it is small consolation to the latter for the teacher to argue in his own defense that he never wanted to teach night school classes in the first place.

Before one undertakes, therefore, to teach in an environment where it is known beforehand that the students will not be able to devote their full time to their studies, the prospective teacher owes it to his own peace of mind to realize that with this kind of teaching assignment an added exertion will be expected of him. If he is not willing to accept the burden, he has no business assuming its unusual responsibilities. For example, he must have the good grace to realize that his time in the classroom is not his own; it belongs primarily to his students. That means he will be content not only to present his matter with clarity and precision, but he will repeatedly call attention to the interrelation of the material of the moment to that of the previous moment and of the moment to come. This may sound quite elementary, but the principal failing in night school teaching, from what I see of it, comes squarely under this heading: fail-



ure to integrate the materials being taught with the rest of the subject material, and failure to resolve the course material into workable conclusions.

At the risk of belaboring the point, let me repeat that it appears to me that the prime fault with the present method of teaching night school students is just this: we do not come to conclusions. Hence our teaching lacks an element of conviction. This is particularly noticeable if the issue in point requires settlement by venturing into a field other than our own specialty as if history could be taught in a vacuum without any relation whatever to theology, art, science or literature. Instead, too many of us are content to pour out a mass of facts, which the student dutifully commits to his notebook, placing them alongside of other facts given him by other faculty members—both student and teacher laboring under the illusion that the transmission of such facts from teacher's notes to student's notes constitutes the whole function of education. If this is the sum total of the process, then we are committed to an impossible task. For at that rate there are neither minutes nor hours enough in a scholastic lifetime to account for all the facts that ought to be tucked away in one's notebook.

That raises a question that some of us may be minded to ask. Is it an impossibility to obtain a genuine education on a part-time basis? Is it not impossible for any teacher, however well disposed, to give the training to a student who must undergo the process amid a multitude of distractions? To answer such an inquiry fully, involves more time and learning than the writer has at his disposal. As far as the night school teacher is concerned, the question is actually an irrelevant one. His task is to teach the class to which he has been assigned to the best of his ability. The problems raised by such an inquiry rightly belong to administration for decision. Yet the conscientious teacher can hardly deny that such questions may have a bearing on his own outlook. Above all, he ought to be on his guard against assuming a defeatist attitude, thereby furnishing for himself an alibi in behalf of his own shortcomings. Just what circumstances constitute the ideal environment conducive to the furtherance of man's educative powers defies exact analysis. I, for one, am not at all certain that, given an ideal environment in which to ply the work of instruction, I could guarantee the end product as superior to that taught under more trying circumstances. The contrary is more likely to be true, as life and history seem to testify.

Moreover, to say out of hand that it is impossible to give an adequate education to night school students strikes me as a form of presumption. For what assurance have we that any of the products of our system of



education ever meet with the true measure of success we wish for them? In fact, for every outstanding act of subsequent achievement on which we may care to pride ourselves, there must also be thousands of other rightminded acts—political, intellectual and spiritual—performed by our students as a result of our training about which we can never have the faintest inkling. Were it otherwise, then we had failed altogether. Is it not because we are confident that these acts are being performed everywhere, every day, that gives us reason to believe in the worth of our influence and courage to persist in its continuance? Now as regards the night school students, is there any reason why we should believe our work must needs bear less fruit simply because the competition for our attention in their young lives is much greater?

In this respect it is not at all likely that we are the best judges of our own accomplishments. Sometimes the student senses the value to him of our educational endeavor long before we can have any knowledge thereof. To some extent, therefore, it may be wise to accept his verdict on our teaching efforts. If he is impatient with us, there is no harm of taking stock of his objections. If he makes demands on his teachers, perhaps it is because others, in their turn, press hard on him. That does not mean that the school must abdicate its right to make policy to its students nor that the individual teacher must feel constrained to water down his offering to the entire satisfaction of the least competent bench-warmer in his room. Of dissatisfaction and dissent there will never be an end as long as men are men. But if we, as educators, make it our business to study the curricula, to eliminate reduplication of effort, to integrate our materials, and to unify the contents of our teaching, we cannot help but satisfy him and achieve also the purposes for which we labor. Besides that, we may be pleasantly surprised to find some compensation for ourselves in this life as well as in the hereafter. For night school students, having to educate themselves, know all the better how to appreciate what they must earn. As a rule, then, they are far more apt to be grateful for what is done for them than their day school confreres.

Yet the charge may be levelled that this insistence on forcing conclusions cannot help but result in an undesirable indoctrination of the pupil since it forces him to accept the conclusions of others whose process of thought he has not been permitted to challenge. The briefest answer to this charge is to say that any and all teaching may be considered a species of indoctrination. Excesses on the part of some teachers may occur, but unless a student is taught to draw conclusions from the facts, there can be no mental growth whatever. Since this is not a faculty automatically bestowed on youth, at least in the beginning, the student must be guided



to accept conclusions with which he may disagree. To permit a student the unqualified privilege of drawing his own conclusions from the facts as he sees them, leads straight to educational anarchy. Some conclusions he must accept if for no other reason than that he has only one life to live, and he will be required to utilize his time to some better purpose than that of sifting the value of every fact he draws upon to form his conclusions.

Any teacher, therefore, who for fear of unduly indoctrinating a student, refuses to assert himself emphatically in the interests of forming the mind of his charge is derelict in his duty to his high calling. This does not mean that the teacher is at liberty to play fast and loose with the facts. It simply means the latter has an obligation so to exercise care in selecting and marshalling his facts that the propriety of his conclusions cannot possibly be questioned. In short, he must teach his students a method by which the art of integration and the skill in synthesis can be acquired, and he must do it with a minimum of waste in time and effort.

Is this asking too much of him? Perhaps it may be. One thing is certain, however: he ought not to shy away from the attempt for fear he may be found out to be the mental inferior of his pupils. After all, his achievements as a teacher will not be judged according as it appears from the record that he was more talented than any of his pupils. He will succeed or fail as he has been able to inspire them to make the advance along the highroad towards scholastic accomplishment on their own power. His job is to acquaint them with the mechanics of learning. He has to show them how to use the brains God gave them. The claims of Caruso's teacher to our gratitude are not gainsaid because he could not outsing his famous pupil.

There are other points of interest which deserve a passing notice—more like acts of omission than commission—of which a night school teacher may be guilty. Where a class is not very large, there is no excuse for not learning the names of the students and using them constantly until they are thoroughly familiar to us. Then again, such a simple thing as the erasing of the blackboards before the beginning of each class ought not to be overlooked. Otherwise, not only is a fertile source of distraction furnished to a tired listener, but, as I can testify from having witnessed it, the subsequent user of the boards is apt to be placed in the incongruous predicament of trying to interweave his material on the 14th Amendment within his predecessor's generous scrawls representing the sweep of the Mongolian invasions across Asia. Unusual names, either of places or of authors, should be spelled out or written clearly on the board. If an



extract is read to the students, its source should be given, and the student should be told how much of it is significant—that is, how much he should take down in his notes. At any event, the reading of long passages to the students ought to be avoided. Nothing can be more annoying than this, nor is there any surer means of losing contact with the class. Last, but by no means least, every effort should be made to speak out loudly. To this end there is only one way to discover whether or not contact has been established with the last row in the class. You must look at the students in the last row. You cannot do this, of course, if your head is buried in your notes.

Lest anyone imagine that the writer concedes that all the faults lie only with the other fellow, it seems the appropriate and proper thing to close these remarks by observing that his experience in making supervisory visits to other classes has convinced him of his own shortcomings more readily than any other device imaginable. *Videre est credere*. Perhaps the Dean or the Head of the Department or your best friends won't tell you, but he will testify that there is nothing to equal sitting in on your neighbors' classes in order to find out your own deficiencies. Not only will it be an experience fraught with benefit to yourself, but your students, who have to bear the heat and the burden of your day in class, will rise up and call you blessed.



# Content of Medical College Admission Test

JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.<sup>1</sup>

At the January 9th meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association Liberal Arts College Commission, it was suggested that, in the current endeavor to improve relationships between our Jesuit colleges and our Jesuit schools of medicine, an effort be made to present to Ours a brief report describing what could be discovered about the content of the Medical College Admission Test.

Obviously there can be no fair inquiry into the actual detailed content of the examination material, that is, the actual questions to be asked. Such material is necessarily confidential. Nevertheless, published sources, correspondence with the Educational Testing Service and the Association of American Medical Colleges, and the testimony of some twenty recent examinees have developed a few useful characterizations of the content of the examination.

The 1950 Bulletin of Information of the Educational Testing Service, *entitled Medical College Admission Test*, presents an outline of the three sections of the test and give important sample questions. Since this bulletin must be quite familiar to all pre-medical advisors and deans, it need not be expanded upon here, except, perhaps, for the suggestion that all future examinees should be required thoroughly to verse themselves in the content of this Bulletin of Information. Familiarity with the form in which the questions are presented may prove as important for many students as the content itself.

Correspondence with the Association of American Medical Colleges: To an inquiry that perhaps was overdiscreet, Dr. John M. Stalnaker, Director of Studies, replied shedding little light on the content of the test but contributing the following items that are germane to the larger issues of this present meeting:

There is no significant correlation, at present, between test results and success in medical school because the test has been given for such a short time by the Educational Testing Service;

---

<sup>1</sup>This report was delivered at the meeting of College and University on the occasion of the Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association, New Orleans, April 10, 1950.



It is recommended that the test be used negatively, that is, for the elimination of candidates rather than for their selection. Low scoring candidates should not be accepted. But characteristics other than success in the test itself should determine the selection of students from those who have achieved a satisfactory score. Hence, a high correlation between test results and success in medical school should not be looked for.

Correspondence with the Assistant Director of Test Development of Educational Testing Service brought forth the following observations regarding that section of the test which is entitled "Understanding of Modern Society":

The content of this section of the test is factual in the sense that expressions of opinions which reflect certain schools of philosophy or thought would not be required.

The examinee will not be required to take a stand on a controversial issue and his personal opinions should have no effect on his test performance.

The examinee is expected to understand different points of view and to recognize expressions of these differing points of view, but the test questions themselves do not require him to subscribe to one point of view rather than another. On this score, every effort is made to maintain an unbiased point of view.

Testimony of Recent Examinees: Some twenty recent examinees were polled regarding their impressions of each section of the test and each of its subdivisions. Briefly, their impressions are summed up as follows:

General Scholastic Ability, Verbal Ability, Verbal Questions: half the students encountered difficulty with this section and alleged the following reasons: lack of time; selection of nearest antonyms or synonyms; many words were regarded by these students of Saint Joseph's College as not only unfamiliar, but as quite rare; the students clearly indicated about this section of the test that the difficulty was not with scientific or technical words.

Comprehension Questions: The students found this perhaps one of the most difficult sections of the test. Their questionnaires indicated they found difficulty making the *inferences* from data supplied in the comprehension passage. This difficulty, it appears, was due more to their unfamiliarity with comprehension questions than from the difficulty of the passages in the examination or the difficulty of the inference from which they were to choose. Pre-medical students who are about to take the examina-



tion should be drilled in a few such comprehension questions as are contained on page 13 of the Bulletin.

**Quantitative Questions:** Many of the quantitative questions apparently involved the use of graphs. Our students found these graph questions difficult. They were also pressed for time in this section. Some of the questions involved mathematical progressions and also statistics.

**Understanding of Modern Society:** The examinees indicated that they had encountered difficulty with terminology in the broad social science fields, and the meaning of words used to describe broad economic, social, and political issues. They also indicated that there was a comparatively slight stress on strictly factual knowledge and information on strictly current events.

**Science, Biology:** The students emphasize that many of the questions were from Botany and General Biology. They had to draw very little on the subject matter of Advanced Biology courses in order to answer these questions.

**Physics:** A number of the more fundamental formulae from all the basic branches of Physics occurred—a large number from the field of Electricity.

**Chemistry:** It appears that in the Chemistry section, the larger portion of the questions was taken from General or Inorganic Chemistry and involved the use of remembered formulae. A smaller portion of the questions were from Analytic Chemistry and a few easy questions from Organic Chemistry.

In conclusion, it must be acknowledged that this report has brought out very little fresh knowledge about the content of the Medical College Admission Test. It is planned at Saint Joseph's College to develop further the questionnaire to be administered to pre-medical students shortly after they have taken the Medical College Admission Test in order to discover more about the content of the test. Meantime perhaps the most important single item gleaned from the questionnaire thus far is this, that students who have not been drilled upon the form in which the Medical College Admission Test presents its questions will find its form more difficult than the material itself.



# News from the Field

---

## CENTRAL OFFICE

J. E. A. DIRECTORY 1950-1951 has been printed and distributed to administrators named in it and to those ordering copies. Additional copies are available at the Central Office at the cost of \$.35, three for a dollar. An added feature this year is the Jesuit map in the center spread.

ENGINEERING: In conjunction with an editorial appearing in *America* (Nov. 25, 1950), the Central Office prepared a page listing the offerings of Catholic schools of Engineering. A limited supply of copies are available to student counsellors requesting them.

AMERICA ADS: The new series of advertisements in *America* will feature individual Jesuit schools while listing all.

DIRECTORY CHANGES 1950-1951: Page 29, Sacred Heart Novitiate, Rev. James Healy, S.J., Master of Novices replacing Rev. Francis J. Seeliger, S.J.

## COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION: Jesuit Colleges and Universities, and Spring Hill College in particular, were honored when President Truman appointed Father Patrick H. Yancey to the 24-man Board of the National Science Foundation. Established in 1950, the Foundation is charged with developing and encouraging the formation of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences.

SEISMOLOGY: History of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Jesuit Seismological Association was recorded in a 347 page book edited by Father James B. Macelvane. Universities and colleges whose seismological stations are described in the book include Canisius, Loyola of Chicago, Xavier, John Carroll, Regis, Marquette, Loyola of New Orleans, Fordham, Saint Boniface, Saint Mary's of Kansas, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Spring Hill, Georgetown and Holy Cross.

VOCATIONS: Holy Cross College—32, 8 Jesuits; Xavier University—15, 5 Jesuits; Loyola University, Chicago—17, 8 Jesuits; Canisius College—6, 3 Jesuits; St. Joseph's College—17, 7 Jesuits.

THREE JESUIT UNIVERSITIES among forty American Universities participating in the International Universities Conference in Nice, France are Fordham University, St. Louis University and Georgetown University.



NEWLY ELECTED PRESIDENT at the thirty-sixth annual meeting of the Association of Urban Universities is Father Paul Reinert of St. Louis University.

"DOPE BOOK" on St. Louis University is an unconventional but highly useful manual to be distributed to press, radio and publicity agencies. It contains useful information on the institution. Not pretending to be exhaustive, it does however, make selections of more newsworthy events and personnel from more bulky catalogues as well as add such information, usually deemed beneath the dignity of most printed sources, such as, telephone numbers, location of buildings, or too recent, such as, a comprehensive calendar of all schools of the university and statistics.

WORLD'S HOTTEST FURNACE is what *Life* called Rockhurst's solar furnace. Controlling heat twice that of an acetylene torch, it melts fire brick to incandescent gravy.

RELIGION WORSHIP: Maryland Province college teachers of religion went into consultation at Georgetown University August 21-26, 1950, and came out with a thick book of proceedings.

ALL-JESUIT ALUMNI ASSOCIATION of LeMoyne College has been organized and held its first spiritual, business and social meetings.

BUILDING: Holy Cross, New biology building.

John Carroll University, Military Science building.

Xavier University, R.O.T.C. Armory.

University of Santa Clara, New dormitory building.

Regis College, New 15-room class building.

Loyola, Chicago, facilities to house Union, lounge and recreational halls at lake-shore campus building.

Marquette University, Business administration building, corner stone laid.

Xavier University, plans for new science building being laid.

MEDICAL SOCIAL WORK: Saint Louis University is one of only 23 universities in the entire country which offer to medical social workers the approved graduate curriculum required by the American Association of Medical Social Workers, according to a recent announcement by the Women's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor.

MEDICAL RESEARCH: Several projects made possible by a \$47,000 grant of the U. S. Public Health Service, are reaching completion at Loyola University, Chicago. A radio-isotope cancer laboratory is foremost among them.

RESEARCH BULLETIN: *Marquette Memo*, publication of the Marquette University Bureau of Business and Economic Research, is concise and attractively printed.



HONORS PROGRAM has been inaugurated at Fordham College. Besides individual mentors, fifty students will receive optional courses or guided reading programs in addition to their regular classes.

ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE to Massachusetts legislature this fall while a student at Holy Cross, Hon. John W. Costello, continues his course there to complete senior year.

NEW RADIO STATION at the University of Scranton, WUSV-FM, has arranged with two Philadelphia musical organizations to rebroadcast tape-recorded productions of twelve of their operas.

M.G.M. CONTRACT has been signed by Father Richard Grady releasing his radio play, *Angels in the Outfield*.

SECOND CONSECUTIVE YEAR of competition brought a Fordham University Law student top honors in the N. Y. State Bar Essay Prize contest.

RESEARCH FOUNDATION at Fordham University swung into operation. Aimed at promoting research in all departments it will engage in twelve governmental and seven research projects which have a total value of \$344,000.

GUIDANCE CENTER opened to public at Xaxier University campus.

FUND RAISING: Holy Cross, \$50,157.50 Alumni Fund.

Marquette University, over two-thirds of \$600,000 goal for medical school attained.

STUDENT RECRUITING: As part of its student recruitment program, Fordham University will invite high school students to a day of inspection of science laboratories and a Seminar in Scholastic Journalism.

#### HIGH SCHOOLS

DRAMATIZING: the solidarity of Jesuit high school education, the academic career of a member of an ice review offers an interesting but not generally recommended solution for peregrinating prodigies. Enrolled in Loyola High School, Los Angeles, Richard Dwyer, 14 year old skating star, has continued his education in Jesuit high schools in Chicago, Omaha and Cincinnati.

BUILDING: University of Detroit High School, a new gymnasium. St. John's High School, Shreveport, new gymnasium.

"BOYS STATE" GOVERNOR of New York, Don Swanz, Canisius High School senior, failed by narrow margin to be elected President of the U. S.

GROUP GUIDANCE for ten minute daily sessions was introduced at Rockhurst High School this fall.



PUBLICATION IN BOOK FORM of selections from West Baden promoted *Practice*, a leaflet of methodology, is now in progress.

FUND RAISING: Rockhurst High School, \$13,000 from Curtis Magazine drive.

#### EXPANSION, GIFTS, SCHOLARSHIPS

##### EXPANSION:

The New Orleans Province is putting on an intensive drive for \$950,000 for the erection of their new Philosophate. This is the first general and public appeal in the hundred years of the Province's history. The new building will occupy land on the present campus of Spring Hill College.

New Novitiate building is being planned for Shadowbrook.

##### SCHOLARSHIPS:

Full and partial scholarships valued at \$4,800 will be awarded by Scranton University to area high school graduates.

Scholarship drive, conducted by the Fathers' Club of St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland, has netted \$200,000 in the last four years.

Annual grant of \$2,000 to John Carroll University from the Henry Beckman Coakley Foundation to be used to provide scholarships for needy students.

##### FULBRIGHT AWARDS:

Fulbright grants were awarded to four Fordham University graduates one each for the United Kingdom and Netherlands, and two for Italy.

Father Joseph M. Costelloe, who is taking his doctorate in Latin at the Catholic University, has been granted a Fulbright Scholarship for a year's research in Rome on the legal aspects of the Christian persecutions.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

BUILDING: An interesting article on the reconversion of an old building into St. Joseph Hall, Decatur, Illinois, appears in *Catholic Building and Maintenance* for March, 1950.

BUILDING: Florissant, new novitiate building completed September 9th.

ALMA THEOLOGIANs heard wire recording of Blanshard-Dunne debate.

HOST to special sessions of National Catholic Rural Life Conference was the Bellarmine Villa community.



## INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS AND POLITICS

Although I have long been connected with privately controlled universities, I am an enthusiastic advocate of the kind of opportunity presented by our state universities and believe in strengthening them to meet naturally developing needs with all of the local, indigenous tax support that can be adduced. But I don't want to see higher American education subjected progressively to the dangers of political control. The first move in every instance of totalitarian rule has been to seize control of the universities. As long as our state universities look after themselves, and as long as our independent colleges and universities are permitted to survive, that thing can't happen here.

About half the load of higher education in this country is now borne by the private institutions. They are rendering a public service at private expense. Were it not for them, taxes supporting higher education would have to be doubled. What is more important, these independent institutions have been the trail blazers, the pace makers, the standard setters, the politically immune elements in the American educational scene for the past three hundred years. In a truly vital sense they represent our most redoubtable citadels of freedom. As long as they flourish, education in this country can never be made the instrumentality of authoritarian government. It is in the public interest, I submit, and not merely in their self-interest, that any measures looking toward the financial domination of higher education by our central government, tending to inflate the public institutions and to desiccate the less affluent independent institutions, should be vigorously opposed.

HAROLD O. VOORHIS, Vice-Chancellor, New York University, "Let's Stop Leaning on Washington," *School and Society*, Vol. 68, No. 1771, (Dec. 4th, 1948), pp. 379-380.